

Global Governance from the Perspective of Marx's World History Theory¹

HU Jian

HU Jian, Professor, Director, Center for Soft Power Studies, SASS

E-mail: hujian@sass.org.cn

This paper in Chinese was originally published in *World Economics and Politics*, 2012 (11).

Abstract: Generally speaking, global governance was arising along with the increasingly deepened globalization and gradually prominent global problems brought by globalization after Cold War. However, this is the narrow sense of the global governance which means global common governance. In a broad sense, global governance rose when the bourgeoisie initiated the world historical process and the transnational relations emerged. The difference is that such global governance in the age of capitalism uses capital as the instrument and tool to ultimately pursue capital proliferation. Since the nature of capital is to pursue maximum residual value, the capital-driven global governance would lead to a lopsided and amoral global order. Just as domestic governance mechanism, global governance mechanism is also value orientated. Despite the alienation between facts and values, the current global common governance is based on democracy, justice and other universal human values. However, in the global governance system under capital, capital was not only the core of all links, but also the shackle fettering man's all-round way development; thus Marx had to pin his hopes on the Communist model of global governance in the future to realize global good governance. Before setting up the "Free Union" model of global governance, no other could be effective even though it might in some areas achieve a certain effect, which can only be a temporary compromise among the behavioral agents of global governance.

Key words: Marx, world history theory, world history process, global governance, global good governance

I. Introduction

The world history theory is not original to Marx. In ancient Greek period, views about world history had sprung up in many research results of European scholars. Herodotus, known as the "Father of History", exactly described a kind of simple world history concept in his book-*History*. In the Middle Ages, St. Augustine and other famous theologians presented another kind of world history concept for people, where they took advantage of the God to break through the narrowness of nation history concept

¹ Proper revision opinions from anonymous evaluation experts of *World Economics and Politics* are sincerely appreciated and any omission in the text shall be the sole responsibility of the writer.

and achieved abstract universality, and also established historical progress concept, God teleology and historical space-time concept.¹ Later, Dante Alighieri regarded world history as the development process of human intelligence and potential, set right the relation between God and human beings reversed in Middle Ages, reverted the concept that world history was created based on the intension of God into a view that it was the creation activities of human beings, and created humanistic world history concept. Thereafter, the world history concept went through a long history from “philosophical promotion” of Giambattista Vico, “civilized evolution” of Francois Marie Arouet Voltaire, “construction of world citizen society” of Immanuel Kant, the establishment of humanism world history paradigm of Johann Gottfried Herder, to the world history summarized as “world spirit” by George Wilhelm Hegel.² These all produced significant influences to a certain extent on Marx to change the world history theory. However, the Marx’s world history theory clarified the concept of “world history” for the first time, and held the opinion that “the world history had never been existent in the past”.³ Marx’s “world history” specially referred to “the entire world history was gradually formed on basis of great industry and general communications among nations since the 16th century, which emphasized the interactive and inter-dependent overall relations among nations and human development and final liberation”, “a history of which the space connotation excludes the history yet to be an organic integrity before the 16th century when all nations, countries and regions were isolated and independent from each other.”⁴ Marx rejected the world history concept that placed God ahead of human beings in Middle Ages and criticized the idealist history conception of rationalism in which world history was regarded as the progression of freedom consciousness, but he absorbed the humanistic world history concept of Dante et al and reconstructed world history theory scientifically on the basis thereof.

Earlier in 1840s, Marx and Engels had put forward and explained “world history” theory in many works including *The German Ideology* and *The Communist Manifesto*. With this theory, Marx revealed the internal consistency between world history and human development and took human development as the essence and core of history development. Marx pointed out: “the whole history is a preparation enabling ‘human’ to become the object of perceptual consciousness and the need of ‘human being human’ to be a need (development history).”⁵ However, world history for Marx was actually explored by abstract labor producing exchange value other than by special labor producing use value. The transformation from special labor to abstract labor is

¹ Zhao S F., *World History and Harmonious Development-Contemporary Research on Marx's World History Theory* [In Chinese], Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 2006, pp. 26-27.

² Hegel summarized the world history as a spiritual area, and held the view that the “spiritual” consciousness was its “freedom” consciousness and the realized development generated from such “freedom” consciousness. Refer to the *Philosophy of History* written by Hegel and translated by Wang Z S., Shanghai, Shanghai Bookstore Publishing House, 1999, p. 66.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 2, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1995, p. 28.

⁴ Zhao S F., *World History and Harmonious Development-Contemporary Research on Marx's World History Theory* [In Chinese], p. 117.

⁵ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 2009, p. 194.

exactly the dissimilation process of labor and also the formation process of capital. Since the nature of capital is to pursue residual value endlessly and blindly in the process of direct production, it is bound to open up wide markets beyond narrow national, regional and historical boundaries. Just as described by Marx and Engels in *The Communist Manifesto*: “as bourgeois opened up the world market, the production and consumption of all countries has turned out worldwide”, “the old local and national self-sufficiency and closed state has been replaced by mutual exchanges and mutual dependence of nations in all aspects. This is the case for material production, so is spiritual production.”¹ Marx also noted: “the trend of creating world market has been incorporated directly in the concept of capital.”²

According to Marx, capital has transformed the interpersonal relationship into relentless “cash transaction” and materialized social relationship into a shackle fettering individuals. Marx noted: “in the world market, an individual has connection with everyone while such connection is independent of individuals.” “The premise that the exchange value is the objective basis of the whole production system has incorporated a force on individuals rightly at the beginning. Direct products of individuals are not for individuals, and they are for individuals only in social process, therefore, a general and superficial form shall be used; individuals only exist as the producers of exchange value, which is actually an absolute denial of individuals’ natural existence. Therefore, individuals are totally determined by the society.”³ This shows Marx has not only revealed how capital opened up world history but also revealed how capital imposed worldwide control on world history process. This is the global governance from the perspective of Marx’s world history theory. However, it is a pity that the global governance idea of Marx failed to arouse attention of the world just as the “world history” theory due to limitations of the age. Nevertheless, nowadays we have to mention Marx’ global governance idea when discussing the ideological source of global governance.

II. Initiation of World History Process and Origin of Global Governance

In researches so far, it is generally believed that global governance was arising and attracted extensive attention of global society under the background where globalization was increasingly deepened and global problems brought thereby were gradually prominent after Cold War; at the beginning, the academic world did not give a clear definition of the concept “global governance”. After the world system centered on countries was formed, corresponding rules (including reasonable and unreasonable) were established so as to solve the security dilemma confronted by countries, or to expand the territory and increase influences, thus, transnational governance began to take shape. It was James N. Rosenau who firstly put forward the concept of “global governance” and introduced it to the academic field. Although he seldom used this concept directly, he surveyed global life from global perspective and

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume1, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1995, p. 114.

² *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume1, p. 388.

³ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 46 (First), Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1979, p. 108, 200.

used the term “global governance” at this level. In this opinion, “governance was involved with both governmental mechanism and non-official non-governmental mechanism. With the expansion of governance scope, all classes of people and all kinds of organizations can use these mechanisms to satisfy their own needs and realized their own desires.”¹ In an influential book of David Held-*Global Transformations*, he also mentioned: “Global governance not only means that official institutions and organizations, such as the national agencies and intergovernmental cooperation, make (or not) and maintain rules and norms regulating the world order, but also means that all other organizations and pressure groups, from multinational corporations, transnational social movements to many NGOs, pursue for targets and objects that affect multinational rules and authoritative systems.”² Chinese academic circles introduced the term “global governance” in a later time, but it was still based on the negative influences of globalization, tried to establish global order and further discussed the connotation of global governance. YU Keping should be the first one who introduced the term “global governance” to Chinese academic circles. In his view, “the so-called global governance means that the binding international regimes solve global conflicts, ecology, human rights, migration, drugs, smuggling, epidemics and other problems so as to maintain normal international political and economic order.”³ To this day, Chinese academic circle’s understanding about global governance has basically inherited this connotation.

If global governance mainly refers to the pursuit of international order regardless of value orientation, then global governance should be deemed occurring when large-scale capitalistic production and general communication emerged and all nations depended on each other and developed in an organic integrity i.e. when regional nation history was replaced by global world history. In another way, global governance was preconditioned on the initiation of world history process. And the global governance then was more about the management of global capitalism. Now that global governance means cross-border influence of rules and orders, then cross-border relation should appear first. Without such relation, there would be no rules and orders regulating such relation. What is the reason to initiate such cross-border relation on earth? Undoubtedly, this should be attributed to the great geographical discovery. Thanks to the great geographical discovery, human society ushered in the times of world connection and communication in real sense. It was during more than two hundred years after Columbus discovered the New World that the human beings closely tied all continents separated by oceans as well as all civilized countries isolated by deserts and mountains, which fundamentally broke the closed world contact and communication and gradually transformed the regional national history under decentralized development into the world history under

¹ James N. Rosenau ed., translated by Zhang S J., Liu X L. et al, *Governance without Government*, Nanchang, Jiangxi, People’s Publishing House, 2001, p. 5.

² Written by David Held, et al, translated by Yang X D. et al, *Global Transformations-Politics, Economics & Culture*, Beijing, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2001, p. 70.

³ Yu K P., *Global Governance Introduction* [In Chinese], from *Marxism and Reality*, 2002(1), p. 25.

integrated development. As said by Engels: “the world grows bigger by more than ten times in a sudden; what is shown to western European people now is a whole planet instead of a quarter. They rushed to seize the remaining 7 quarters. Traditional thousand-year barriers of thoughts in the Middle Ages collapsed with the old narrow barriers of homeland. A vast and infinite horizon has been unfolded in front of people both in physical and spiritual senses.”¹ Leften Stavros Stavrianos, an American historian, also noted: “Actually, the world history in strict global sense began since Columbus, Vasco da Gama and Magellan started ocean voyage for exploration. Before this, only relatively parallel history of each nation existed, other than integrated human history.”² Nevertheless, the geographical discovery alone is not sufficient to establish such transnational relation, and the real contribution is made by the power of capital. The nature of bourgeoisie is limitless occupation of residual value and the nature of capital is profit-oriented. Such nature of capital drives bourgeoisie to expand its occupation of the residual value in one country and one nation to the whole world. Especially with the development of bourgeoisie’s production mode and the significant improvement of bourgeoisie’s production efficiency by the great industry, they “continuously expand sales channels of products”, “settle everywhere, develop everywhere and make connections everywhere”.³ At first, such connection established by bourgeoisie was simple and loose, but thereafter, it was changed gradually into a connection tied by capital as the flow of capital was accelerating and social labor division was extended to the whole world from their own countries. This kind of global capitalistic “connection” tied by capital is exactly global governance mechanism using capital as tool and instrument.

Why does global capitalistic “connection” tied by capital need to be governed? Although Marx did not use the concept-governance, he, in revealing how bourgeoisie initiated world history process, found sharp internal contradictions in bourgeoisie which objectively need the governance of global capitalism. Of course, it is impossible for bourgeoisie to be self-conscientious, but capital, while working as the tie of global capitalistic connection, also serves as a “conscientious” instrument to impose global governance on capitalism. As is known to all, bourgeoisie of different countries and different nations had different positions in the world history process, which was attributed to their different levels of productivity. This at the same time defined the extreme complexity of mutual relations among all nations involved in the “history of civilization”. “The mutual relations of all nations depend on the development degrees of productivity, labor division and internal communication of each nation.”⁴ The bourgeois with developed productivity tended to dominate in the process of world history, while those with relatively backward productivity had to be subject to the former. The nations “drawn into” the world history process had to obey

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 4, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1995, p. 79.

² Written by Leften Stavros Stavrianos, translated by Wu X Y. and Liang C M., *A Global History-The World Since 1500*, Shanghai, Shanghai Academy of Social Sciences Press, 1999, p. 3.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 276.

⁴ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 68.

their orders and slavery of the first two. As a result, in the process of world history, a special kind of hierarchy or multi-level global governance relation was established. The bourgeoisie was only addicted to infinitely taking possession of the residual value, with no idea of the existence of such a global governance structure. However, capital, as the most important link, is quite clear about this global governance structure and plays a critical role in maintaining such structure. The productivity levels are seriously out of balance in bourgeoisie, as an inevitable result, the contradiction between capitalistic productivity and production relations is difficult to conquer. This contradiction often first occurred in one country, and then it rapidly spread to all other countries and nations “drawn into” the world history process with the expansion of bourgeoisie production mode to backward countries and external colonial plunderage of the bourgeoisie. Thereupon, “the production and exchange relations and all ownership relations of bourgeois in this modern bourgeois society, which ever created such tremendous means of production and exchange with magic-like methods, now just like a magician can no longer control the evil it has conjured with its own magic. Decades of industrial and commercial history are just the history that modern productivity defends against modern production relations”.¹ Therefore, the global governance with capital as the tool and instrument, in fact, is the governance on the basic contradiction between capitalistic productivity and production relations by capital. However, profit-orientated nature of capital decides that the governance of capital on global capitalism is invalid. The invalid governance was demonstrated by cyclical economic crisis of capitalism and large-scale foreign wars waged to shift crisis.

III. Global Governance by Means of Capital and Realization Mode

The world history process initiated by bourgeoisie created the possibility to realize global governance by means of capital. However, to work as the tool for governance of global capitalism, the capital has to meet the following conditions: firstly, the world history process is a process under the control of capital; secondly, the capitalistic mode of production has prevailed all over the world and formed a relatively unified integrity; thirdly, the world history process and world market objectively have the demand for global governance, and the bourgeoisie itself also has such demand.

First of all, whether the world history process is under the control of capital? In the opinion of Marx, the formation of the world market was the foundation of capitalism’s survival and development, and also an important symbol showing the initiation of world history process. Hegel held the view that the world history was nothing but the externalized and realized “world spirit”, and world spirit determined world history, while world history was created by God; “the God reigns over the world, and world history is the actual administration by God and the implementation of God’s plan”.² However, Marx regarded human development as the essence and

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, pp. 277–278.

² Hegel, *History of Philosophy*, p. 38.

core of world history development, and thought that “the whole so-called world history is nothing but a process in which human beings are created through their labor and a creation process of nature for human beings. There is visual and indisputable evidence showing his self-creation and formation process.”¹ More importantly, Marx revealed the great significance of capital and developed private property in overwhelming feudalism and initiating world history. Marx pointed out that the development of capital and private property broke the regional and national constraint of feudal land relations and was realized “as the regional and national regulations on private property beyond the nature of human beings to further exert a cosmopolitan and universal power destroying all limitations and constraints, so as to replace these regulations as the only policy, universality limitation and constraint”.² Finally, “all wealth turns out to be industrial wealth and labor wealth, while industry is finished labor, just like the factory system is the developed nature of industry or labor and the industry capital is the finished objective form of private property. We can see it was only at this time that the private property achieved its reign over human beings and became a world historical power in the most universal form.”³ Thus it can be seen, while the bourgeoisie was exploring world market, they also spread the internal competition of bourgeoisie from one country to the whole world covered by capitalistic production mode, and further made capital the actual controller of world history process in that age.

Secondly, how is capitalistic production mode prevailing all over the world and forming integrity? In analyzing the nature of capital, Marx ever noted that “currency, as wealth, as a general form of wealth, and as the value fixed because of value function, is an endless desire beyond the limitation of amount: an endless process.”⁴ It is in the process of satisfying such desire that capital continuously gains value and promotes the progress of productivity. To this end, “the capital tends to (1) expand the circulation scope continuously; (2) and turn the production in all places into the one driven by capital”.⁵ The bourgeoisie’s occupation of residual value on one hand objectively serves as the driving force to create material foundation for the world history process, and on the other hand forces the bourgeoisie to “make constant revolutions on production instruments, then production relations, and further all social relations, otherwise, they couldn’t survive”.⁶ The bourgeoisie opened up the world market by capital, and where they have arrived, they used capital to crash the feudalism shackle fettering people without natural authority and rapidly end the scattered state of means of production, property and population, so that the world became a unified economic and political entirety, “each independent region with almost only alliance relation, and different interests, laws, governments and customs duties, now has formed a unified nation with the single government, laws, national

¹ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 196.

² *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 179.

³ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 182.

⁴ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 46 (First), p. 226.

⁵ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 8, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 2009, p. 89.

⁶ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 275.

class interests, and customs duties”.¹

However, such an “entirety” in fact embodies sharp contradictions. That is attributed to the endless desire of the bourgeoisie to pursue residual value worldwide. Such desire certainly drives bourgeoisie to constantly expand reproduction all over the world. Then there is a contradiction between the finite world market and infinite desire of bourgeoisie that is bound to result in more and more intense competition among the bourgeoisie, and the contradiction also becomes sharper and sharper. And final approach to solving such contradiction is reduced to battles among the bourgeoisie to plunder the world market. From this angle, the bourgeoisie only plays a role of unselfconscious subject initiating the world history. However, the development of world history process and world market needs global governance, especially for restraining the desire of bourgeoisie to pursue residual value endlessly. In addition, there is also irreconcilable contradiction between the organized production of capitalistic enterprises and the anarchy of social production. Due to the occurrence of large-scale mechanical industry, the production capacity of the bourgeoisie tended to be stronger and the social productivity was also in constant improvement, but the disorder and anarchy of social production, in turn, prevented further improvement of the social productivity. It then inevitably led to the outbreak of capitalistic economic crisis. Worse more, this was not a one-time but a cyclical economic crisis. In such circumstance, in order to maintain capitalistic production, the bourgeoisie subjectively also had a demand for global governance.

With such demand for global governance, how is global governance realized by means of capital? Firstly, the first step for capital to impose global governance is that the bourgeoisie capitalizes everything. Although the capital initiated world history process, it is an unselfconscious tool of such process. However, in the process of pursuing residual value, it did act as a conscious tool of global governance. The bourgeoisie opened up the world market by means of capital and therefore initiated the world history at the first time, but such initiation by bourgeoisie was absolutely not intended to submerge itself into the world history process, instead, they took advantage of this process to maximize the interest. Marx pointed out that the nature of capital is mercenary. To realize this purpose, the bourgeoisie capitalized everything, including “transforming personal dignity into exchange value”, so that interpersonal relations are simplified as “barely interest-related, no any other relation except relentless ‘cash transactions’”, “the bourgeoisie eliminated the holy auras of ever honored and respected professions. It transformed doctors, lawyers, priest, poets and scholars into purely employed laborers it has recruited with money.”² In this way, the capital is able to become a power dominating everything in this world history process it has initiated.

Secondly, the bourgeoisie drew all nations into the capital “civilization” by means of

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 277.

² *Selections of Marx and Engels*, Volume 1, pp. 275, 276.

capital. It firstly incorporated the backward nations and classes into the capitalization process, “so that rural areas submit to the governance of cities”, “most residents get rid of the ignorance state in rural life”.¹ Then the bourgeoisie expanded capitalization to everything, which was not limited to only one country, but to the whole world. The process that bourgeoisie expanded capitalization to the whole world firstly relied on the rapid improvement of the means of production, convenient transportation and the opened new sea routes; and then relied on the cheap commodities of bourgeoisie. The former enabled capital to go out of Europe and cover the whole world, while the latter enabled capital to root in Americas, Asia, Africa and other regions and conquer “barbarians” in inhumane manner. In this way, the bourgeoisie “compels all nations-for fear of extinction-to adopt the bourgeois mode of production; compels them to launch the so-called civilization i.e. become bourgeois. In one word, it creates a world based on its own appearance”.² In this world, “barbarian and semi-civilized countries are subservient to civilized countries, so that the nations of farmers are subservient to the nations of bourgeoisie and the east is subservient to the west”.³ In short, in the world history process and the world market, all shall be subordinate to capital.

Then, the bourgeoisie “compels all nations to adopt bourgeois mode of production” by means of nothing but capital. The power of capital resulted in that “the old feudal or guild industrial operation way can no longer satisfy the demands increasing with emerging markets. Handicraft workshops replaced this operation mode. Guild master workers were supplanted by industrial middle class; the labor division among organizations of each sector gradually disappeared with the occurrence of labor division inside each workshop”.⁴ In a word, capital destroyed all fetters of feudalism society and covered the world by virtue of new sea routes and new sailing technologies. Accompanying the opening of new sea routes, the capital started crazy primitive accumulation by colonial plunderage with blood and fire. After new sea routes were opened, the bourgeoisie centered on Europe began colonizing Americans, Asia, Africa, etc. by both pillage with force and commercial trade. Taking Britain as an example, Marx revealed that the bourgeoisie actually leveraged more means of colonial plunderage than means of trade when compelling other nations to adopt bourgeois mode of production. According to Marx, “throughout the 18th century, the wealth flowing from India to Britain was obtained mainly by direct plunderage from India other than the secondary trades; they looted huge amount of treasure and transferred them to Britain.”⁵ But it doesn’t mean colonial plunderage has impaired the function of capital, on the contrary, it demonstrates that the “compelling” effect of capital has been enhanced. That’s because general trades only reflect the natural development speed of capitalism and the natural conquering over other nations by

¹ *Selections of Marx and Engels*, Volume 1, p. 277.

² *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 276.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 277.

⁴ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 274.

⁵ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 9, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1961, pp. 173-174.

capital, while the natural development speed of capitalism can not satisfy the endless avarice of bourgeoisie, and the nature of capital and the unlimited desire of bourgeoisie strongly demand a sharp acceleration in the development of capital. Then where is such acceleration in the development of capital from? It is from nothing but plunderage by force. That is to say, colonial plunderage serves the accelerated addition of value of capital and enables capital to “compel” all nations to accept the control of capital. In addition to colonial plunderage, the inhuman slave trade is also used to realize such acceleration of addition of capital’s value. “Without slavery system, there would be no cotton, and without cotton, there would be no modern industry. The slavery system makes colonies valuable where world trades were created, and the great industry is preconditioned on such world trades.”¹ Thus it can be seen, world market internationalized capitalistic mode of production, while colonial plunderage and slave trade enabled capital to get control of the world market and all nations in the process of acceleration.

Finally, the purpose of global governance for capital is to maximize capital gain under the control of capital, instead of establishing stable order. It seeks for a kind of abnormal order for the purpose of residual value and realizes global governance by means of such abnormal order. Undoubtedly, human beings need to pursue a kind of ideal order, but what is ideal order on earth? The earliest discussion about this issue can be dated back to an ancient Greek philosopher-Plato, who described in *The Republic*: “we founded this country for the sake of the maximum happiness of all citizens instead of separate and prominent happiness of any single class; because we believe it is most possible to find justice in such a city state while most impossible to find justice in the worst city state.”² Thereafter, Aristotle put forward the standard for judging “ideal order”, i.e. “judging based on absolutely fair principle”.³ According to the Marxism concept of order, the order must be “for the sake of the equal rights and equal obligations of all”.⁴ Before the barbarian nations were involved by capital, the original society had its order. Just as told by Engels when commenting the internal organization characteristics of clans: “there is no army, gendarme and police, no noble, king, governor, magistrates or judges, no jail, no litigation, yet everything is well organized.”⁵ With the development of social production, the society “finds such a demand: summarize the actions and behaviors of production, allocation and exchange of products repeated every day with a common planning, and manage to make individuals submit to the general conditions of production and exchange”.⁶ “General conditions” here refer to order. However, when the capital forced all nations to get to the capitalization process, all orders were founded by capital and serving the addition of value of capital regardless of whether it is nationwide or worldwide. Under such an

¹ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 4, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1958, p. 145.

² Written by Plato, translated by Guo B H. and Zhang Z M., *The Republic*, Beijing, the Commercial Press, 1986, p. 133.

³ Written by Aristotle, translated by Wu S P., *Politics*, Beijing, the Commercial Press, 1981, p. 132.

⁴ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 17.

⁵ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 4, p. 95.

⁶ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 18, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1964, p. 309.

order, the whole society was split into two major directly opposite classes—bourgeoisie and proletariat, and the employed and enslaved proletariats had nothing but the right and freedom to choose which capitalist they would be sold to. Therefore, such an abnormal global governance order is bound to be unstable and changeable. As Marx said, “unceasing change of production, ceaseless social turbulences, and forever instability and changes are rightly the differences of bourgeois age from all previous ages.”¹

IV. Value Orientation of Global Governance by Means of Capital

Domestic governance mechanism is value-targeted. YU Keping put forward “good governance” value orientation from the aspect of domestic governance, and revealed the value composition of “good governance” from ten aspects including legality, rule of law, transparency, accountability, response, efficiency, participation, stability, honesty and fairness.² Similarly, global governance mechanism is also value-targeted. In terms of this aspect, Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane made very helpful researches. They think global governance mechanism has value, and even have elaborated the public standards of the legality of global governance mechanism. In their opinions, “the global governance mechanisms are valuable because they have created the rules and information based on which the membership countries and their actors are able to coordinate the behaviors of each other on mutual benefit basis. They can reduce transaction cost, create opportunities for membership countries and other actors to display creditability, conquer betrayal of commitments, and provide public products including the methods to solve conflicts based on principles and peacefully”.³ As for the public standards of the legality of global governance mechanism, they put forward three kinds of independent standards about legality, including state consent, democratic countries’ consensus and global democracy. They also hold the view that, guaranteed by value target, the global governance mechanism can provide and maintain earnings that a country can not supply, which will further strengthen the legality of global governance mechanism.⁴ According to Tony McGrew, where higher level of global social justice and human security is prevented, it is “distorted global governance”.⁵ Therefore, human right and democracy is the core value of the value structure supporting global governance. Chinese scholars also made relevant researches on the value orientation of global governance. For example, according to CAI Tuo, “the global governance system rules are consistent with the social public concepts, culture and values that are to some extent value-orientated”.⁶ In other words, the rules of global governance system are a kind of reproduction of

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 275.

² Yu K P., *Global Governance Introduction* [In Chinese], from *Marxism and Reality*, 2002(1), pp. 23-24.

³ Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, *Legitimacy of Global Governance Mechanism*, *Journal of Nanjing University*, (Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences), 2011(2), p. 30.

⁴ Allen Buchanan and Robert O. Keohane, *Legitimacy of Global Governance Mechanism*, *Journal of Nanjing University*, (Philosophy, Humanities and Social Sciences), 2011(2), p. 34.

⁵ Tony McGrew, *For Real Global Governance*, from Yu K P. ed., *Globalization: Global Governance*, Beijing, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2003, p. 160.

⁶ Cai T., Wu J., *Justifying Legitimacy of Global Governance* [In Chinese], *Teaching and Research*, 2005(4), p. 35.

generally accepted values such as democracy, justice and equality. Although even in current global governance system this is not an actual existence, the rules of global governance system objectively require that the process of global governance should display democracy, justice and equality. It provides a value goal for global governance, which is also the ideal order that human society pursues. According to REN Jiantao, “the value basis of global governance has the function of restricting the orientation of global governance concept”, but “seen from the actual status presented by the value basis of global governance, the global governance value is far from reaching a value consensus adaptive to it. How to reach the value consensus of global governance based on the cultural value of each nation-county that has its own origin correspondingly became a critical issue supporting or disintegrating global governance.”¹

The global governance with capital as the tool and instrument is also value oriented, but it is immoral. Just as Marx noted, “the capital came to the world with its every pore from head to feet dripping blood and filth.”² Thus we can understand the immoral value orientation of global governance with the capital as tool. To realize global governance, the capital has to take itself as the core link of capitalistic mode of production. In capitalistic mode of production, it is not about any single capitalist and individual worker, but two directly opposite classes: capitalist class and working class. On the surface, workers are free, which means it’s at the discretion of the worker to choose which capitalist they would be sold to, however, once a capitalist employs the worker, it actually transfers part of its capital into labor, and thus the capitalist adds value to its own total capital. Therefrom, “the individual consumption of the working class within absolutely necessary extent is just a conversion of labor materials used by capital for exchange into labor available for capital to exploit again. This kind of consumption is the most indispensable means of production i.e. workers’ own production and re-production. It is thus clear that the individual consumption of workers is always an element of capital production and reproduction whether in factory or not and whether in labor process or not, just like scrubbing machines, whether conducted in the process of labor or at any interval of labor process, which is always an element of capital production and reproduction”.³ Therefore, capitalism reproduction process goes like this, “not only produce commodities, residual value, but also produce and reproduce capital relations: capitalists are one part, and the employed workers are on the other part”.⁴ The capital binds the capitalist class and the working class tightly together in order to gain maximum value for capital.

Secondly, the global governance under capital is immorally orientated also on the basis of the colonial plunderage of capital. Through the enclosure movement, Western

¹ Ren J T., *Between Consensus and Difference: Seeking Common Values of Global Governance* [In Chinese], *Journal of Xiamen University* (Arts & Social Sciences), 2004(4), p. 5.

² *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 2004, p. 871.

³ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, p. 660.

⁴ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, pp. 666-667.

European bourgeoisie placed all farmers' lands under its control, turned free farmers to hired workers, and thus free farmers were capitalized. But the capital accumulation of bourgeoisie was not over; instead, it started external colonial expansion for the purpose of rapid capital growth. "The colonial system announced that making money is the ultimate and only purpose of human beings."¹ For this purpose, Western European bourgeoisie opened up a bloody road of increasing value by colonization: kill aboriginal, traffic in black persons between Africa and the Americas, implement person-stealing system in Java, etc.. So, the history of Western European colonialism "shows an ingenious picture of treachery, bribery, massacre and doggeries".²

Thirdly, the so-called "public credit system" of bourgeoisie is actually a powerful evidence of the immoral value orientation of global governance under capital. The capital is not just the core link between capitalists and workers, but also the core link between different capitalists (capitals of different locations). Then what does the relation between capitals of different regions rely on to be regulated? It first relies on industry capital which conducted colonial plunderage by means of new technologies and new sea routes and finally established industrial capital hegemony. "The dawn of capitalism production age" under the industry capital was coming in reliance on "the discovered golden mines in Americas, the aboriginal being exterminated, enslaved and buried into mine wells, conquering over and plunderage in East India, and the change of Africa into a commercial place for capturing black people".³ The colonial system also greatly promoted the development of trades and industrial hegemony brought commercial hegemony. Thus the tool regulating the capital relationship between different regions was soon replaced by commercial capital. The commercial capital at first, however, couldn't separate from the industrial capital and survive independently; therefore it had to create new conditions to support its independent existence. This tool is public credit system. In this system, national debt goes first and it actually regulates the relationship between the bourgeois rulers and the mass. National debt issuers loot the scanty wealth in people's hands by virtue of public bonds in equivalent amount so as to make themselves a windfall; at the same time, banks masked in the name of the country "take out with one hand and bring more in with the other hand; worse more, when it brings in, it is still the forever creditor of nationals until the final copper coin is paid off".⁴ In brief, it is to drain nationals. Accompanying national debt system, the international credit system also occurred. This system can not only conceal the capital source of bourgeois primitive accumulation, but also be used as a means to strengthen international colonial plunderage of capital. Because of international mutual loan of capital, weak capital gains more strength thanks to such loans and therefore is able to carry out more brutal colonial plunderage. It is also because of such loans, as described by Marx, "when the downfallen Venice lent huge amount of money to Netherlands, the doggeries under

¹ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, p. 864.

² *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, pp. 861-862.

³ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, pp. 860-861.

⁴ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, p. 865.

the looting system of Venice therefore became the foundation for such concealing of capital wealth of Netherlands. The same relation also exists between Netherlands and Britain. At the beginning of the 18th century, the workshop handicraft industry of Netherlands had lagged far behind and Netherlands was no longer a dominant industrial country any more. Therefore, lending of huge amount of capital became one of major businesses of Netherlands during 1701-1776, especially lending to its powerful competitor- Britain. In nowadays, the similar situation also happens between Britain and America. Much unknown capital appearing in America today was the capitalized baby blood of Britain just on the previous day”.¹ Looking at the process of international capital loan, we can still find the immoral value orientation of global governance under capital as well as the general history process of the vicissitude of large western countries.

However, the barbarism of capital is not a denial of the civilization trend of capital. In the *Manuscript on Economics (1857-1858)*, Marx explicitly pointed out: “the simple concept of capital certainly contains the civilization trend of capital, etc. naturally, and this trend is not just represented in external consequences as described in economics books created so far. At the same time, the simple concept of capital has potentially contained these contradictions to be exposed in the future.”² The reason that the simple concept of capital naturally contains the civilization trend of capital is the capital inherently requires nature to be part of culture. The “nature” here includes both external nature, i.e. the generally called natural world, and human nature, i.e. the generally called humanity.³ The civilization trend of capital means that the humanized nature driven by capital tends to replace the pure nature, while human “demand formed historically” tends to replace the “natural demand”.⁴ Specifically, the civilization trend of capital is at least represented as: firstly, the capital has cleared the remnants of feudal production relations and promoted local adjustment and change of social production relations; secondly, the capital has contributed to the development of social productivity at an unprecedented rate. The main purpose and direct motive of capital is to produce residual value, and the externalization of such inner purpose is bound to allow “capitalistic mode of production to contain absolute trend of productivity development.”⁵ It can even be described as so: “developing social labor productivity is the historical task of capital and also the reason for its existence.”⁶ Therefore, the productivity created by bourgeoisie during its class governance for less than a hundred years is much more and greater than the overall productivity created in all previous ages. Third, the capital objectively created conditions for comprehensive and free development of individuals. The development of capital has created conditions for the bourgeoisie to change the bloody barbarism

¹ *Das Kapital*, Volume 1, p. 866.

² *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 30, Beijing, People’s Publishing House, 1995, p. 395.

³ Tong S J., *Civilizing Tendencies of the Capital and the Limits Latent within Them* [In Chinese], *Academic Monthly*, 2006(10), p. 19.

⁴ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 30, p. 286.

⁵ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 2, p. 462.

⁶ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 2, p. 466.

practices in primitive accumulation of capital, so as to be able to justify the reign under capital. For example, with the development of technology, the capital continuously reduces necessary labor time and greatly increases the rest time, which also means more free social time and the increase of free time means the expansion of space for free development of human beings. As Marx said, “saving labor time means increasing free time, i.e. increasing the time of full development of individuals, and the full development of individuals, as the greatest productivity, reacts on labor productivity.”¹

However, the civilization trend of capital does not mean that the global governance under capital is a kind of moral value orientation. That is because the nature of capital is to drive the hired laborers to create residual value in the rest labor time beyond necessary labor time, and this nature also determines that capital only pursues “economic efficiency” worldwide but does not obey to “social morality”. Therefore, Marx pointed out: “the universality pursued by capital unstopably is restricted by its own nature. When the capital develops to a certain stage, these restrictions will make people realize that the capital itself is the greatest limitation of this trend, and further drive people to eliminate capital by taking advantage of capital.”² In other words, because of the immoral orientation of global governance under capital, such form of global governance is bound to be vulnerable and unsustainable.

V. Marx's Pursuit of Global Good Governance

The so-called good governance objectively exists in domestic politics. As said by John Rawls, good governance should embody justice. The justice should follow two basic principles: First: each person is to have an equal right to the most extensive basic liberty with a similar liberty for others. Second: social and economic inequalities are to be arranged so that they are both reasonably expected to be to everyone's advantage and attached to positions and offices open to all.³ Then, does the so-called global good governance exist? If so, what's the content of global good governance? In Marx's opinion, global good governance objectively exists but is not a reality. He believes the ideal global good governance is a situation that human's free and all-around development is guaranteed in the Free Union.

As discussed above, the world history process initiated with capitals is a precondition to the rising of global governance. Without the world history process or the cross-border relations in the world history process, there would not be the so-called global governance. Marx's world history theory not only denied Hegel's standpoint that the formation of world history would be regarded as a spirit, but also revealed the intrinsic consistency between the development of world history and all-around development of individuals. Marx stated, “each individual's emancipation extent is

¹ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 31, Beijing, People's Publishing House, 1998, pp. 107-108.

² *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 4, p. 390.

³ Written by John Rawls, translated by He H. H. et al, *A Theory of Justice*, Beijing, China Social Sciences Press, 1988, pp. 60-61.

consistent with the extent of transformation from history to world history.¹ In other words, at the very beginning, Marx reflected on “the human’s all-around development” from global perspective. The development of each individual or any individual in each country must be associated to the development of all other individuals in the world, because “each individual’s free development is a condition to the free development of all”.² Thus it can be seen, the human’s all-around development is not an issue of any individual, nation or country, but an issue of all human beings, and the common goal of all human beings in the world history process. Just because of this, Marx considered the all-round development of people from the angle of world history process, especially from the perspective of global governance, and regarded all-round development of people as specific representation of global good governance.

However, in the age of capitalism, the capital first alienated labor; as Marx stated, “the objects of labor production, i.e. labor products, are opposite to labor as alienated things and a power independent of producers.”³ In the opinion of Marx, labor should be like a romantic pastoral poem, however, under the production conditions of capitalism, the free and voluntary life activities of laborers were reduced to the means of subsisting physical body, “alienated labor reversed such relation, and humans have turned the life activities and their nature into a means of subsisting themselves just because they are conscious existence”.⁴ As a result, instead of displaying the nature of humans as humans, labor became a shackle imprisoning human nature and the chief culprit alienating human beings; therefore, “as long as the physical constraint or other constraints on labor disappears, humans will escape from labor just like escaping from plague”.⁵ The capital not only alienated labor but also alienated humans by labor alienation. Marx said, “alienated labor, due to (1) alienation between humans and nature, (2) resulted in alienation of humans, their activity functions and life activities, therefore, alienated labor led to alienation between similar people; for humans, alienated labor changed similar life into the means to support individual life: first, it alienated similar life and individual life; second, it changed individual life in abstract form into the purpose of similar life which is also in abstract form and similar form.”⁶ Under such alienated labor state, “laborers deny rather than recognize themselves, feel unfortunate rather than happy, and suffer both physically and spiritually rather than freely exert their physical and spiritual power”.⁷ Therefore, in capitalistic age-more exactly-in the age of global governance under capital, all-round development of humans in reality is just a kind of extravagant hope, but it can not negate human’s pursuit of it as an ideal. In fact, all-round development of humans was rightly the ideal that Marx pursued in respect of future global good governance.

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 89.

² *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 294.

³ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 156.

⁴ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 162.

⁵ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 159.

⁶ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, pp. 161-162.

⁷ *Collected Works of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 159.

First, Marx fully recognized the elimination of alienation for further realization of human liberation. There is no other solution but to eliminate capitalist ownership by proletarian's violent revolution and further liberate and develop productive forces, which could provide basic premise and guarantee for all-round development of humans. Marx noted, "to enable the oppressed class to liberate themselves, the coexistence state between the vested productivity and the existing social relations shall be terminated."¹ That's because under the capitalist ownership, "this rational kingdom is just an idealized kingdom of bourgeoisies; eternal righteousness is realized in the administration of justice by bourgeoisie; the equality comes down to the equality of bourgeoisies before laws; the ownership of bourgeoisies is declared as one of the most important human rights; and the rational state and Rousseau's social contract in practice is and can only be represented as the bourgeois democratic republic"² Thus, to realize all-round development of humans, the proletariat had to overturn bourgeoisies and established its own rule. However, the proletariat, after overturning bourgeoisies and seizing power, "couldn't simply manipulate the existing state apparatus and utilize it for their own purpose. The political instrument enslaving them can not be used as the instrument to liberate them."³ Only when the old state apparatus is smashed and the capitalist ownership is destroyed completely, can the soil for labor alienation be eradicated and further the road for full development of humans be opened.

Second, Marx thought the proletariats all over the world must take joint actions in order to realize global good governance under which all-round development of humans is realized. For Marx, "joint actions, at least, should be the joint actions of civilized countries, and it is one of the primary conditions of proletariat liberation".⁴ The reason is that the proletariat is weaker in power compared with bourgeoisie, and the power of an individual separated from certain social relations is even more insignificant. In case of the powerful capital, "as the activities of any single person are expanded to be world historical activities, they tend to be dominated by the power of their aliens as well as the power increasingly growing and fundamentally represented as world market."⁵ In one word, the power of a single person can in no way get rid of of the control of capital, which also fully demonstrates the conclusion that "individuals can only obtain the means for their full development of talents in groups". Just because of this, Marx pointed that "the class (proletariat) being exploited the oppressed, if not procuring the whole society to get rid of the exploitation, oppression and class struggles once for all, can no longer be able to liberate itself from the class (bourgeois) exploiting and oppressing it."⁶ In Marx's view, the all-round development of humans is actually the existence process of world historical individuals. And the world historical individual mentioned by Marx refers to a real

¹ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 194.

² *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 3, Beijing, People's Publishing House, 1995, p. 720.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 3, p. 117.

⁴ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 291.

⁵ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 89.

⁶ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p.252.

person who has got rid of national and geographic limitations, established real connection with the whole world production, including mental production, and is able to use the comprehensive production capacity of the world. That is to say, Marx's world historical individual idea indicates that the free and all-round development of humans is the process to realize the liberation of the relationship between an individual and human beings. In order to “achieve human’s free and all-round development” purpose, as stated by Marx, the proletarians all over the world must unite together and communists must support all revolutionary movements launched wherever against the existing social system and political system.

Finally, Marx thought that, free and all-round development of humans, as the goal of global good governance, can only be realized in communist society. Marx summarized the development process of humans into three stages: the first stage is the dependence of human beings. In this stage, individuals have no independence and are directly attached to certain social communities. The second stage is individuals’ independence stage based on object dependencies. In this stage, the sociality becomes a system of general exchange of substance, comprehensive relationship, various requirements and comprehensive abilities. The third stage is free personality based on the condition that the personal all-round development and their common social production capacity become their wealth. In this stage, free and comprehensive development will be available for people in rich and comprehensive social relations, and humans will become persons with free personality and become world historical individuals. However, the process from the first stage to the second stage and to the third stage is not a naturally developed process, and it has to go through battles of blood and fire. Especially in the second stage, “tasty wine is available only in a wine glass made of skull”.¹ In this stage, it is impossible to realize the goal of comprehensive development of human beings. For Marx, the real liberation and all-round development of humans should be conditioned on “the existing social system is overturned by communism and the private ownership of the similar significance with this revolution is eliminated”. Because it is the only way “for individuals to get rid of all kinds of national and geographical limitations, establish real connection with the production of the whole world (also spiritual production), and obtain the ability to utilize such comprehensive global production (creation by humans)”.² By then, social members will completely get rid of the restraints from private ownership of productive means, the social productivity reaches a high level of development, the society is able to provide sufficient material life and spiritual life for every social member, labor becomes the first need of people’s life, and each social member can “fully develop and display all their physical and mental capabilities”, thus, “humans finally become the master of them by social bonding, further the master of nature, and then the master of themselves-free human”.³

¹ *Karl Marx and Frederick Engels*, Volume 9, People’s Publishing House, 1961, p.252.

² *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 89.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 3, p. 760.

VI. Conclusion

Regarding global governance as a phenomenon rising in late 20th century actually means taking global governance as an order construction process based on democracy, equality, justice and other generally accepted values and “a process in which the governments, social organizations and enterprises jointly impose effective management on global issues beyond the jurisdiction of international community over sovereign states by establishing various international systems, and finally procure the internal community to be approaching to order”.¹ However, global governance at this level is of narrow sense. The global governance in narrow sense mainly refers to the pursuit of global order and avoidance of global issue flooding by such order. From this perspective, the global governance in narrow sense is actually the “global common governance”, because global issues need global cooperative actions. The global governance in broad sense occurred along with the initiation of world history process by capital and the emerging of cross-border and transnational relations. Although the global governance in broad sense initiated by capital also pursues global order, such order is not the result of global cooperative actions, but imposed by capital as a particular power and intended to pursue maximized interest of capital-such a “particular power”. The global governance discussed in nowadays is global common governance which suffers the alienation between facts and value, that is to say, global common governance is in fact short of resources and also suffers serious deficit in value.² Nevertheless, this global common governance is based on democracy, equality, human rights and other contemporary values, while the global governance emerging after the world history process was initiated by capital is to seek maximum residual value, therefore, the global governance with capital as tool and instrument is a kind of abnormal order based on immoral orientation. Such abnormal order is doomed to be unsustainable, because “the weapon that bourgeoisie used to overthrow feudal system now is targeted at the bourgeoisie itself”; besides, in the process of global governance under capital, “the bourgeoisie not only forged the weapon that would kill itself, but also created persons operating such weapon-contemporary workers, i.e. proletarian”.³ The current global governance mechanism is vulnerable and has limited functions, and in comparison, the global governance dominated by capital is more vulnerable because the capital has led the world into civilization while the global governance under capital is against civilization.

In the age of Marx, capital was used as the tool and instrument of global governance, and because its goal was to realize addition of capital value, the capital proliferation became the goal of the global governance under capital. Such “trine” global governance incorporating means, tools and goals determined that the global

¹ Su C H., China and Global Governance-The Process, Behavior, Structure and Knowledge [In Chinese], *International Politics Quarterly*, 2011(1), p. 35.

² Ren J T., Between Consensus and Difference: Seeking Common Values of Global Governance [In Chinese], *Journal of Xiamen University (Philosophy & Social Sciences)*, 2004(4), p. 6.

³ *Selections of K. Marx and F. Engels*, Volume 1, p. 278.

governance under capital should be realized in a compelling manner. In other words, under the global governance by capital, everything all over the world was governed, capitalized, drawn into “civilization”, captured and regularized by capital, and serving for capital proliferation. Therefore, such global governance was prominently characterized by bloody colonialism just at the beginning of the initiation of world history process by capital.

However, this does not mean that global governance does not exist. On the contrary, global governance exists theoretically, not in the capitalism era but in the future communist society. The global governance system under capital has serious defects in the instruments, means and objectives, so Marx did not incorporate the value objective of global good governance into the capitalism global governance framework, but pinned hope on the future communist society. It is the communist global governance mode that will replace the capitalist one. In the communist global governance mode, human’s all-around development can be realized and the human society be under global good governance in real sense. Marx knew that the capital, as a tool and instrument for global governance, is unlikely to put real global governance into practice, and on the contrary would bring about global crisis, including periodic capitalist economic crisis and even the environmental crisis, ecological crisis and resource crisis as a result of capitalist plunderage that will endanger human survival and hinder humans’ all-round development. Seen from these situations, the current global governance is believed to emerge with global issues and actually extends the theoretical logic of global governance under the perspective of Marx’s world history theory. Global governance will ultimately serve the all-round development of humans and all factors hindering such development should be subject to global governance revolution. Therefore, Marx had been seeking for new tools, means for implementing global governance and even new global governance mode by way of proletariat revolutions. Of course, when the proletariat revolutions succeeded, the tool for global governance was still temporary, because there is a long lasting battle between proletarian socialism and the bourgeoisie and whole capitalism. Only when the revolution wins victory worldwide and the “Free Union” becomes the subject of global governance in place of countries, will global good governance be achieved. Therefore, before setting up the “Free Union” model of global governance, no other could be effective even though it might in some areas achieve a certain effect, which can only be a temporary compromise among the behavioral agents of global governance.