

# Global Governance's Challenging Future Essence and Development of Liberal World

Qifeng Fang

*School of Government, College of Social Science, University of Birmingham*  
*Email: QXF805@student.bham.ac.uk*

## ABSTRACT

Increased involvement of non-state actors in global affairs, the end of the cold war, and globalization are some of the factors that fundamentally represent shifting relations of powers. These factors contribute to the convergence of the policies in different issue domains as they represent the speeding up national economies' integration. This essay will consider the nature of global governance in the future and determine its evolution by looking at various arrangements of global governance. It also looks at the possibilities for future governance due to the challenges that are currently facing governance globally. Presently the arrangements of global governance have been found to favour flexibility over rigidity. This means global governance does not favour binding rules but instead prefers voluntary measures, also favours privilege partnerships instead of individual actions. The equity, the enduring human struggles, and the evolving roles of sovereignty are examined by the state of global governance. The use of the state of global governance to examine these functions plays a crucial role in shaping global governance and international relations among nations. This essay argues that international power shifts, increasing awareness of human security, the liberal world political paradigm, individual empowerment, and institutional complexity are the key features that will determine the future of global governance.

**Keywords:** *Global governance, Human security, Liberal paradigms, Power shifts.*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Global governance is recognized as one of the products of neo-liberal paradigm shifts when nations are politically interacting and at the same time having economic relationships. Global markets favour capital and market mechanisms over the state authorities hence creating gaps in the governance. The governance gaps created by the global market privileges on capital and market mechanisms over state authorities encourage the players from the civil and private sectors to undertake some of the roles and responsibilities that were previously assumed to belong to the State. This aspect has reinforced the divergence of views on how the global concept needs to be defined because it involves issues of priority and utmost importance. Some theorists argue that global governance is constantly developing new tools and measures to solve the problems that have dominated the society over years by constantly adapting readjusting approaches and strategies to solutions [9]. While other scholars believe that global governance has not been working as it is practiced [7]. Instead of judging the current situations of global governance, this

essay offers an overview of the current global governance and the challenges that it faces currently and in its future days.

The essay has employed a unique perspective that looks at current global governance as a tool for identifying the solutions to the challenges that are created by neoliberal globalization [6]. The concept of global governance addresses the challenges that face both local and global communities as it relates to the interaction of myriad collective or personal entities coming from societies and professional orientations, which makes the network addresses these challenges. Hence global governance is more concerned with the challenges that a single nation is not able to handle. Some of the challenges that pose serious threats to human security in both local and international communities are economic volatility, humanitarian crises, climate change, and military conflicts between and within states or nations. Therefore, handling the problems posed to these activities in the society requires different expertise and actors to invent necessary mechanisms for proper handling of the diverse pertinent

policies, frame threats, implement effectively, and evaluate results accurately to prevent these challenges.

## **2. ACTORS, STRUCTURE, AND STAKEHOLDERS OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

The revolution in global communication technology, the end of the cold war, the proliferation of networked global markets, and increased involvement of non-state players in global affairs are some of the main factors that have contributed to the impacts of globalization. When countries are interconnected the exchange of knowledge and information is facilitated because the process of interconnection brings communities and individuals together. This enables the individuals to bring their cultures closer hence promoting the process of solving the challenges that require international collaboration [5]. Most of the modern problems have become global issues hence they are beyond the knowledge of a single state to address. According to Kofi Annan a retired secretary-general to the United Nations (UN) there is no single nation that can secure itself from the possible threats because the threats that are facing the world are currently interconnected [3]. For example, sovereign nations have competitive interdependency and brand strands of cooperation that include networks of experts to handle the interconnected problems.

Some scholars have defined the modern phenomenon of global governance as the emergence of new institutions and mechanisms of global governance beyond the traditional forms of state-led treaty-based and regimes. Other theorists define contemporary governance as the entrance of new actors or agents in addition to the national governments while the third class of scholars argues that contemporary governance is the increased fragmentation and segmentation of the governance system among all the functional levels and spheres [6]. The modern structure of global governance is defined by a multitude of actors. Some of the actors that define the world of politics in multi-actor perspectives include civil society groups, States, International National Organizations, Security companies, scientific experts, partnerships, and private military. These actors play a key role in steering the political system. The modes of global governance greatly vary from one another however four general structures are identified. The four structures are Private governance, Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), International Governmental Organizations (IGOs), Public-Private Partnerships (PPPs), and tripartite governance mechanisms.

There are several mechanisms of state-centred mechanisms of the International Governmental

Organization. These include the United Nations systems and World Trade Organization. However, non-state actors are used by IGOs as partners because they have resources and expertise in their sectors that are lacked by IGO. This expands their capacity since it maximizes the efficiency of Transnational New Governance [1] by creating a partnership with private institutions. Thus, IGO is expected to formulate and shape governance by supporting private enterprises and NGOs.

On the other hand, Public-Private Partnership's strategy is utilized by the United Nations to implement Sustainable Development Goals. United Nations Global Compact is also a PPP organization. It encourages the implementation of Sustainable Development Goals by TNCs. In the future, it expects that best practices record in Corporate Social Responsibility of all stakeholders in local and international levels of governance. The expected outcomes of SDGs will be achieved through collaborative efforts. Moreover, specific standards are set by private governance. This shows that different forms of governance are expected to arise in private, state, and civil society. All these are the tripartite arrangement of governance. They encourage actors of civil society to coordinate corporate and state entities and monitor their activities. Thus, global governance is expected to address global issues in the future.

The state authority has been supplanted by private governance to regulate the industry. These include rules and actions of the International Chamber of Commerce, private bond rating agencies, and international standards of accounting. Codes of conduct of a healthy environment and labour are developed and implemented by these corporations. However, the corporations respond to campaigns of NGOs using these codes ending up targeting the consumers from developed countries and neglecting vulnerable groups of workers. The codes are developed in a way that represents the excluded groups in labour regulations debates and social policy [16]. Additionally, the scope of policy changes and solutions are expected to broaden by the configurations of the multi-actor in the global governance. This will also increase the capacity of learning and sharing information. However, it will segment and fragment various clusters and layers of the making of rules and implementation. Hence the efforts of the cooperative may be paralysed due to increased competition for resources but can also result in innovations.

## **3. PRESENT CHALLENGES OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

Several global actors are currently emerging in the world intending to offer solutions to the Interdependent challenges, clash and sometimes supplementing, with already existing regimes that are created to address and

solve international challenges. According to Hale et al. [9], the present challenges of global governance refer to the current international institutions that have failed to offer solutions to the current challenges that are facing global governance. The new developments in international relations negatively affect and reshape collaborative responses to the challenges that are affecting global governance. Different actors of global governance highly depend on human security, ideas, and human rights norms. However, there has always been a problem of the sovereignty principle challenging the practical applications of these ideas in the international community. During the intrastate or interstate conflicts there are severe and huge violations of human rights and freedom hence human security is eroded in several ways in most of the world countries. Nevertheless, there are active actors of the governance who are tirelessly currently working to maintain justice, peace, security to protect human rights that are eroded by inter or intrastate wars or conflicts. The governance actors working to restore peace and security because lack limited capacity of improving the situations because the process of approval involves complicated procedures of authorization of peacekeeping or humanitarian interventions. For instance, the partisan interests and political divisions in the Security Council use the veto powers that originate from the permanent members. These divisions encouraged the expansion of the war in Syria by blocking all international responses to the mass atrocities committed by the Syrian government. This strengthened the impunity and encouraged crimes against humanity [2]. The increase of nationalist movements and sentiments in Russia eroded international cooperation while responding to the civil wars in Ukraine and a huge influx of refugees. All these situations have created order in general and more specifically international security which was established during the post-Cold War period. Even though the principle of responsibility to protect has acquired international legitimacy and political support over the years it has not managed fully managed to protect the population and prevent mass atrocities in some countries of the world. Therefore, the scholars and policy practitioners need to make positive steps towards the promotion of sovereignty. The erosion of sovereignty and government determination on which actions affect human rights are two decision-making sovereignty that causes severe atrocities among nations.

Several scholars argue that many states are involved in the ineffective exercise of sovereignty over their territory. This exercise introduces huge barriers towards the exercise of protecting individuals' responsibilities in other places [14]. Additionally, the powers in the modern system of governance are currently more diffused. For example, the rise of countries like China, Brazil, Russia and India, and other rising powers are

currently occupied by the power shift which poses several questions concerning shifts and reordering accompanying the modern state of global governance. Countries like India, China, Brazil, and other emerging nations are developing alternative institutions for political and economic stability instead of advocating for the improvements of the global institutions such as the UN Security Council, International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank. Some of the alternative projects from these efforts are the New Development Bank and The Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank.

There have been conflicts over global governance liberal aspects due to differing contours in the society. Global capitalism has shaped the behaviour of rising powers and their structural features. The state-controlled approaches have been challenging open capital accounts, markets, and ideas of Western privatization. For example, national development banks and sovereign wealth funds have been a challenge in private capital and economic affairs globally. This has led to a conclusion that global governance liberal features are contested by the powers. Influential countries such as china reduce the impact of solving global issues because they do not participate in the international treaties and have more negotiating power. Also, multilateral settings are challenged by the configuration power globally. The inequality in political and economic settings has adverse impacts on governance. This has led to social unrest and extremist in society.

#### **4.THE FUTURE OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE**

For the survival of humans both in the present time and future Global governance is arguably inevitable. Sometimes globalization may appear to be ineffective and fragile in the way it responds to the current challenges and those of future generations. The demand for global governance approaches and the trends of globalization has already gone beyond the point of no return. Therefore, the future of global governance is expected to be shaped by five factors in the future. These factors include Institutional complexity, international power shift, increasing awareness of human security, liberal world paradigm, and individual empowerment.

The human race in the present and future generations. The scholars have drawn this conclusion after several observations and findings from different depart and fields such as the global governance sector, security departments, international political economy, and communication sector.

In the first place, the sector of information technology, individual citizens, and mass or social media from the first-class countries such as the United

States of America and Russia are said to have acquired more information of powers more than ten years ago than the developing countries. This means that citizens from developed countries have the capacity of attaining higher awareness of situations that are related to international and national issues at any time. When the people of lived in the 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century are compared with those living in the 21<sup>st</sup>-century majority of the twenty-first humans are said to have easier access to the information that is related to international security. The accessibility of this information has been facilitated by media exposure and the internet. Through the help of these factors, the individual citizens are more likely to understand the impacts and importance of international security on their daily lives. Media exposure and the internet such as the digital media had a major impact in the Arab spring that took in both Tunisia and Egypt in 2011. Through the help of social networks, individual citizens united around the nurture transportable strategies for mobilizing against leaders who had turned to be doctors and around shared grievances [10]. The process of globalizing the new social media platforms shows how individual citizens from all parts of the world can be mobilized for a collaborative response. Globalization of the media also shows a new trend in the conventional media and intersection of the new media such as mobile phones, television, and radio [12]. According to the US National Intelligence, the decreasing influences of the nation and individual challenges are some of the main global trends in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. The organization also argued that the potential political powers of individual citizens have been expanding since the when Cold war ended. The significant increase of individual political powers has been facilitated by the development of transportation technology and the proliferation of information [16]. It is expected that this trend will play a crucial role in strengthening the convergence between international and domestic politics and help in the process of constraining state behaviours. According to Putnam [17], this trend will produce several transnational actors in the industries based on the dramatic increase of individual citizens' access to the information, the rate of analysing the information gathered, and political projections. The factor of individual empowerment is logically expected to provide a better way for handling cooperative global governance. Cooperative global governance is one of the key factors that agitate for peace and since peace is generally preferred for political stability it will then be preferred in the future over the wars by the individual citizens.

Secondly, as the trends of individual empowerment have continued, through the help of global governance architecture, the global society is expected to divert more attention to international human security in the future. International human security is expected to

protect individual human rights from the issues that challenge citizens' dignity and physical safety. According to the individual empowerment principle human dignity will need to be protected from fatal threats no matter whether that dignity is natural or human-made dignity. In the response to the vertical and horizontal threats, human security is expected to be an innovative concept for maintaining security. Horizontal security threats deal with the issues that may bring threats in the political background, interfere with economic stability and military wars. The vertical threats on the other hand deal with threats that are related to the individuals, state, and global in general. In the past, the traditional security concepts have not managed to effectively control both vertical and horizontal threats. The main reason for traditional security failures in handling the vertical and horizontal threats is that the focal point of the state security is very small to accommodate diverse challenges in the society, hence the adoption of individual empowerment principle in the future, will play a crucial role in handling these threats [8]. Currently, the threats of sovereign states that engage in large war are said to be less when compared to the past times. However, the world has not managed to eliminate the war, but instead, the world has shifted to sub-state wars that involve differing identity groups or insurgencies against the state from sovereign versus. The concept of human security is much more concerned with different securities beyond the wars. According to Jang et al. [11], some security areas that the concept of human security is concerned with are personal, environmental, economic food health, community, and political security.

Human security is one of the factors that offer a unique conceptual paradigm that is expected to be compatible with the regimes of global governance in the future. International human security will respond to the transnational and multinationals dimensional threats that are beyond the strengths of a single nation. For instance, several security analyses projects have been established to help the world in the process of recognizing natural disasters and environmental degradation practices that a single state is not able to handle. Some of the environmental disasters that are beyond the efforts of a single country in the world today and in the future includes earthquakes, epidemics, droughts, floods, and military disasters that threaten national security such as military coups [13].

The third principle that the world needs to consider is institutional complexity. According to Barry [4], institutional complexity is one of the key factors that are expected to offer the direction for global governance development in the future. It is expected that the trend of individual empowerment will continue to gain more momentum hence the influence of civil society will

improve in both resources and authority. The increase in resources and authority will make several non-state actors significantly affect the behaviours of national governments. Additionally, these resources will be engaged in the networks of transnational relations actively than before. The organizations in global governance especially the international ones are expected to keep on expanding towards the complexity regimes. According to Raustiala & Victor [18], complex regime refers to “an array of non-hierarchical institutions that are partially overlapping and governing a particular challenge in a specific location”.

The fourth principle that is expected to shape global governance in the future will be the shifting of powers in international relations. It is believed that more than ninety percent of the traditional institutions for global governance were established by European nations. The pluralistic political cultures of western countries and their influence on civil society groups have always dictated the direction of global governance for several decades. Over the last two decades, nations of the Global South such as India and China have increased their relative powers to the Global North. This means that in the future the voices from the States of Global South will play a crucial role in the global governance regimes. Most of the global institutions such as the International Monetary Fund that were previously dominated by the states from the Global North who are the minority will start to be dominated the majority states from the Global South in the future. Therefore, the face of global governance is expected to be made complex by the increase in multilateralism at the traditional global institutions.

It is believed that the future of global governance is based on the liberal Paradigms of world politics. When the world the liberal world order is maintained the non-states and states and other transnational actors in the global governance always tend to be more cooperative with global governance. The liberal paradigms such as human rights promotions, democracy, and bottom-up orientations have evolved with the regimes of global governance. In recent years the advancement of democracy has remained a challenge in the states that have weak traditions due to the impacts of liberal values. This is because democracy has near-universal appeal to individuals from a certain ethnic community or group, every religion. This made several states embrace democracy as one of the norms in the international and transnational networks of organizations [15]. The traditional concepts of the state are challenged by several liberal approaches on the basis that as a unified actor of the global governance does not involve the interpretation of the national interests. Additionally, there are more spaces for international cooperation even in the traditional security sectors. Through the help of

international organizations such as the International Court of criminal justice (ICC), the United Nations, International Atomic Energy Agency have progressed and acquired more influence in recent years. The realist paradigm will dominate the security sector in the world hence the world will have a hard task in the future to fight doubts and uncertainty about the effectiveness of global governance. The domination of the realist paradigm in the world will result in serious threats in global governance. For example, the Middle East conflicts, China versus America competition for world dominance, Russia versus American military confrontation are some of the serious threats that are expected to face global governance in the future.

However, if the members of the global community are going to uphold the liberal paradigms in the global society will be in a position of offsetting all the problems and negative impacts of the mutually suspicious paradigms. Nevertheless, the Liberal paradigms will help the global community to continue generating effective hybrid regimes that will facilitate the process of holding the states potential hence enabling them to create a future world that is secure, more cooperative, and sustainable.

## **5.CONCLUSION**

Global governance is inevitable for the survival of humanity in the present time and the future. Before the global crisis, the capital flows have not yet recovered from their peaks. Trade integration and capital became weaker during the cold war and world wars. Unless the world unites and introduces changes the negative impacts of globalization will continue to have negative impacts on the developing and developing countries. Even though global governance may be ineffective and fragile in the way it responds to the current problems, the need for global governance is inevitable in the global society. Five factors are expected to shape the future of global governance, these factors include increasing awareness of human security, International shifting of powers among nations, Individual empowerment, Institutional complexity, and the Liberal world political paradigm. This conclusion was drawn through observations and applications of findings that are collected from different fields. The main sectors that are included are the global governance sector, International political economy, communication department, and security sector.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1] Abbott, K.W. and Snidal, D., 2010. International regulation without international government: Improving IO performance through orchestration.

- The Review of International Organizations, 5(3), pp.315-344.
- [2] Adams, S., 2015. Failure to protect: Syria and the UN Security Council. Occasional Paper Series, 5.
- [3] Annan, K.A., 2005. In larger freedom: towards development, security and human rights for all.
- [4] Barry, A., 2012. Political situations: Knowledge controversies in transnational governance. *Critical Policy Studies*, 6(3), pp.324-336.
- [5] Bhagwati, J., 2004. In defence of globalization: With a new afterword. Oxford University Press.
- [6] Biermann, F. and Pattberg, P.H. eds., 2012. Global environmental governance reconsidered. MIT Press.
- [7] Coen, D. and Pegram, T., 2015. Wanted: The third generation of global governance research. *Governance*, 28(4), pp.417-420.
- [8] Grayson, K., 2008. Human security as power/knowledge: the biopolitics of a definitional debate. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 21(3), pp.383-401.
- [9] Hale, T., Held, D. and Young, K., 2013. Gridlock: why global cooperation is failing when we need it most. Polity.
- [10] Howard, P.N. and Hussain, M.M., 2011. The upheavals in Egypt and Tunisia: The role of digital media. *Journal of democracy*, 22(3), pp.35-48.
- [11] Jang, J., McSparren, J. and Rashchupkina, Y., 2016. Global governance: present and future. *Palgrave Communications*, 2(1), pp.1-5.
- [12] Khondker, H.H., 2011. Role of the new media in the Arab Spring. *Globalizations*, 8(5), pp.675-679.
- [13] King, G., and Murray, C.J., 2001. Rethinking human security. *Political science quarterly*, pp.585-610.
- [14] Luck, E.C., 2015. R2P at ten: A new mindset for a new era. *Global Governance*, 21, p.499.
- [15] McFaul, M., 2004. Democracy promotion as a world value. *The Washington Quarterly*, 28(1), pp.147-163.
- [16] National Intelligence Council, 2012. Global Trends 2030: Alternative Worlds. National Intelligence Council, pp.8-37.
- [17] Pearson, R. and Seyfang, G., 2001. New hope or false dawn? Voluntary codes of conduct, labour regulation, and social policy in a globalizing world. *Global Social Policy*, 1(1), pp.48-78.
- [18] Putnam, R.D., 1988. Diplomacy and domestic politics: the logic of two-level games. *The international organization*, pp.427-460.
- [19] Raustiala, K. and Victor, D.G., 2004. The regime complex for plant genetic resources. *The international organization*, pp.277-309