The problem of global public goods has systematically become more and more important issue in the international debate among the social science researchers. This debate has been held mostly on the field of economics. There is no surprise – eventually the economist Paul Samuelson introduced in 1954 the theory of public goods. However, i.a. due to the processes of globalization, the representatives of other disciplines has also entered in this debate, such as political scientist, social scientists, and last but not least, academics that deals with a relatively new discipline of public policies which merges both economic and political perspective.

The most important issue is foremost the definition and classification of public goods, or even more precisely global public goods, which are the consequences of the on-going process of globalization. The traditional classification proposed by Samuelson, who introduced two major criteria – excludability and rivalry, do not solve numerous dilemmas that arouse when somebody tries to define a single good as private or public one. This problem has become even more complex since the birth of internet and the information revolution. Many goods, that previously were excludable in consumption (or such exclusion was either easy or cheap), and therefore perceived as private ones, since the beginning of the digital era and thanks to the development of mass communication tools has become public.

As a result, as Simon Marginson defined in 2007, in order to define a good as a public one, it has to meet two basic criteria. Firstly,
it needs to be to a large extend non-excludable and non-rivalrous. Secondly, it should be broadly available for the society. However, according to this adjusted definition, the borderline between private and public goods remains rather blurred. Therefore, the “public vs. private” classification of many goods requires a deep analysis of the particular context.

The second phenomenon that besides the digital revolution has influenced the theory of public goods is globalization. Each public good generates so-called externalities that theoretically from the definition cannot be limited. However, a lot of externalities have had an impact mostly at the national level. Owing to the process of globalization, and foremost the international migrations, the national limitation of externalities has expired. It is however not only theoretical issue. The globalization of externalities brings many dilemmas for entities who are responsible not only for delivery, but also financing of the public goods. This is a fundamental challenge for the welfare states that in contrary to the private multinational companies have so far not been globalized (and in the coming decades rather will not). Although there are a lot of international organizations (some of them such as European Union even pretends to be a quasi-federal state), but they do not have both enough political power and effective policy instruments.

On the other hand, it is worth mentioning that the activities undertaken by the international organizations, as well as their policies and particularly their regulatory regimes, are global public goods themselves. Thus, the authors in this issue of the quarterly “Horizons of Politics” are trying to face aforementioned challenges not only referring to the analysis of particular, globalizing public goods, such as education, social security, internet or culture, but also referring to the policies provided by the international organizations, such as United Nations, UNESCO or International Migration Organization. The authors have not brought clear answers. Their aim has been rather a presentation of a broader scope for the analyses of particular goods. Furthermore, the articles identify the assessment criteria of global policies undertaken by the international organizations.
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