Chapter Eight

International Organizations and Global Governance in the 21ˢᵗ Century

Isah Mohammed Abbass

Introduction

The 21ˢᵗcentury has opened up world governance with unimpeded complex challenges and seeming prospects. All the complexities, challenges and prospects have emerged on economic, political, social, cultural and technological fronts. The rise and fall of the global economy, especially in trade, industry and commerce, have facilitated the increasing coming together of the world, through communications technology, as a global village (Ul-Haque, 1995). In addition, the rise of the European Union (EU) has been greatly expanded in the new century when a common currency, the Euro, was introduced and operated. In global governance, this century has also witnessed enhanced and effective cooperation among nation-states and governments, particularly in the global North, under the aegis of the United Nations (United Nations, 2000) and other international institutions or agencies for universal governance. The opening of the new millennium has, therefore, brought about a growing and deepening anxiety on all forms and specifications of economic, social and political spheres, especially after the 9/11 terrorist episode (Ryan, 2015). Similar terrorist activities include the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)violent interventions in Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria Libya etc. which led to the overthrow of regimes(Ansani & Daniele, 2012).

The impact of these interventions led to political instability and economic crises with adverse effects on the region. However, the rise of the global economy has transformed the global South into all forms of dependency and underdevelopment. During the new millennium, nation-states have found it difficult, if not impossible, and indeed not in a position, to individually handle global concerns. These are largely attributed to the whittling down of states' sovereignties by the fierce intervention of international organisations, especially through the trends of globalization (Edwards 2001). These issues include handling universal poverty, hunger, diseases, natural disasters, violence, wars etc. The current century has further witnessed, in many states of the world, extreme nationalism, nativism and xenophobia (Neocosmos, 2010). These have continued to persist and make the so-called democratic principles meaningless, especially on issues of foreign policy, or foreign relations and diplomacy.

Western European imperialism (or its new face of neo-imperialism) and its legacy have continued to strike profound consequences during the 21st century in the global South. This is especially true in Africa where poverty, hunger, corruption, violence, insurgencies, terrorism etc. have featured prominently in the period before this century (Abbass, 2017). In essence, class conflict/struggle has been tremendously muted in this region of the globe rather than resolved. Other complexities include the effects of global warming and the eruption of the COVID-19 pandemic, which has killed millions of people across the globe with severe economic disruptions.

In addition, this information age of global governance by international organisations has indeed witnessed an upsurge and proliferation of communications technology and order forms of technologies, especially mobile devices and accessibility to internet facilities. Other grand challenges and utopian prospects in the 21st century global governance in the ICT age include artificial intelligence; with data-driven technologies inserted into various aspects of humanity. These have continued to provoke a lot of ethical questions. These involve robotic technological systems with the ethical and safety nature of the future in drones, driverless cars, surgical and other manufacturing robots. The global governance of international organisations in this age is, of course, under the intense influence, authority and power of the global superpowers. This has profoundly influenced the proliferation of small, light and heavy weapons that have continued the intensification of wars, terrorism and insurgencies in the global South.

Global Governance and Global Geography in the New Millennium

Within the scheme of global governance, the global geography is dissected into two major divisions - the global North and the global South. These geographical corners of the world represent, on the one hand, the advanced industrialized States of the Northern hemisphere, and the poor and underdeveloped States of the Southern hemisphere, on the other. The world may further be divided, within the contours of the global governance schemes and geography, into nine regions. "These world regions differ from each other in the number of states they contain and, in each region's particular mix of cultures, geographical realities, and languages" (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009, p. 21). These nine regions are North America, Latin America, Western Europe, Russia/Eastern Europe, Middle East, Africa, China, South Asia and Japan/Pacific.

Global governance is, therefore, the process of universal cooperation among nation-states engaged by or through international organisations. The prominent international institution involved in global governance is the United Nations(UN). This further involves, among others, the transnational actors with the objectives of

reaching agreements and taking feedback on the identified problems that involve the interests of more than one state or region. It is aimed at achieving a global balance which invariably involves multiple states, governments, and international institutions under the guidance or leadership of a State. Others include the International Criminal Court and the World Bank etc. The UN is further in charge of global governance because it is expected to, among others, lead, guide and bring about the diverse global actors or institutions in the coordination and implementation of collective action for global good.

The objectives of global governance include the provision and sustenance of public goods. These include peace and security, maintenance of justice and mediation of conflict. Others are the streamlining of the market and economic forces by unifying standards for trade, commerce and industry. In addition, one of the major responsibilities and mandates of the UN is to preserve global security through the efforts and cooperation of the 193 sovereign states that make up the UN body. This responsibility is also expected to be attained through the cooperation of several agencies and relevant institutions that are designed to work towards enhanced and greater global prosperity with increased global stability. Apart from the UN, there are other institutions like the World Bank, and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as well as private institutions, such as the international nonprofit organisations operating on a global scale. These include the International Red Cross/Red Crescent (international non-government organisation -INGO). These constitute crucial elements in global governance with a mandate to regulate and sustain the tempo of the global politics, economy and markets.

Furthermore, the modern question and contemporary critique of international governance exist within the context of the current trends of globalisation and the globalizing regions of political, economic, social, cultural and technological power. This is, therefore, in direct response to the fierce acceleration of the worldwide interdependence and interconnectedness of human societies and technologies, on the other hand, and humankind and the biosphere, on the other hand. In essence, global governance is primarily concerned with the management of the risings and fallings of global challenges, issues or problems. It is concerned with devising ways to deal with them, how to reform institutions, or how to develop alternative ways and solutions. Therefore, global governance is further affected by several agencies or organisations that statutorily discharge strategic intermediary roles. These bodies are, for instance, the regional coordination of global governance such as the EU, the African Union (AU), or the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN), etc. These coordinate policies, programmes and strategic actions for their respective members within their geographical location.

These may further include some strategic political, economic, cultural and technological approaches to issues towards dealing with a specific problem under the leadership of a state-controlled institution such as NATO under the USA. This also involves, for instance, coordinating defence or economic integration such as the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), APEZ etc. Global governance also relies on looser non-forums of actors such as the G20, G7, and the World Economic Forum. These forums offer opportunities and spaces to enable the groups to strategically gather, discuss and advance their ideas, policies, and programmes and protect their interests. Global governance also includes other categories of various stakeholder organisations such as the Internet Engineering Task Force, the World Wide Web etc. Their primary roles are to streamline global standards and practices for enhanced global best practices, control and governance.

The Role of International Organizations in Global Governance
This millennium, the governance challenges, problems, issues and solutions are strategically located or hinged on and expected to be conquered by international organizations. Within this context, therefore, humanity is expected to have unlimited opportunities to share a common destiny and identify, unite and combine partners with interests that have a strong affinity with each other through the operations or activities of the UN as the world body. In the discharge of their expected roles, international organizations should be responsible for international peace and security to make the world a better place for all. This responsibility may be economic, social, political, environmental etc. and should act in the interest of the international community.

It should, however, be emphasized that international conflict should be settled by cooperation among states, not by the instrumentality of unilateral or combined military force. But in the mundane and unconventional global governance of conflict in this century, there is the predominant use of unilateral superpower force. Even though the use of the instrumentality of military force does not bring about a complete breakdown of international or global law and order, this is not necessarily acceptable and can continue to work. However, this is not based on the mutual advantages expected to be reaped by international organizations and the cooperative activities of global actors on the international scene. On the contrary, this is hinged on the supremacy of the superpower authority in the effective use of smart power.

It is obvious that international organizations, more often than not, reflect and represent the interests of the powerful states. International organizations are expected to express greater transparency in the control and regulations of global events. They are also supposed to support global-level management by predominantly reflecting and representing the interests of the entire global

community. For instance, when states genuinely work and conform harmoniously to the expected norms, and comply with international laws, they are expected to collectively design and develop skills and efficiency to govern or manage their international interactions through established laws and institutions. Therefore, these should be attained through conforming to established global norms, practices and standards based on mutual interests.

With the consent of the states or governments, when they willingly surrender their sovereignty, the role of the international organizations becomes more glaring and real. Even though the UN is not a global government its role is something close to a world government. Therefore, the UN should strengthen the world order through the provision of a global institutional structure where states settle political, economic and social conflicts without the use of force through the relevant international institutions. Thus, institutions must constantly share ideas and thus provide a great opportunity to settle all sorts of disputes amicably. It should be emphasized that the role of international organizations has invariably destabilized the economic and political stability of the Third World by ruining the fabric of their institutional and other settings. These have made the Third World structurally weak and incapable of participating on equal terms with the West.

These have indicated that internal purchasing power has collapsed, farming has erupted, health clinics and schools have been closed down, and hundreds of millions of children have been denied the right to primary education. In several regions of the developing world, the reforms have been conducive to a resurgence of infectious diseases, including tuberculosis, malaria, and cholera. While the World Bank's mandate consists of "combating poverty" and protecting the environment, its support for large-scale hydroelectric and agro-industrial projects has also speeded up the process of deforestation and the destruction of the natural environment leading to the forced displacement and eviction of several millions of people (Chossudovsky, 1998).

International organizations play an important role in a global forum for multilateral negotiations. In other words, the active operations of the UN and other global institutions along with their alliances are expected to constitute great forums for institutional achievements and effectiveness in addressing matters of universal community concerns. International organizations are, therefore, designed to provide a platform for setting up a sustainable global agenda. They are also expected to mediate on political and economic bargaining as well as provide a basis to facilitate political cooperation and coordination for initiatives and collective action. In restructuring the national economies, and dissecting the universe, international organizations have provided platforms for the development and underdevelopment of the global economies, especially in trade policies through the

activities of WTO, World Bank and IMF. The policies of these agencies have established the platform for *policing* the world in the current dispensation by enforcing their conditionalities at the detriment of the underdeveloped region.

The role of international organizations in global governance as well as the contributions of actors involved in international relations cannot be overstressed. Therefore, the multiplicity of influence, control and authority they exert over the weak states is enormous. On the domestic level, the influence over such states may be aggregated in the international scene. This aggregated influence consists of group interests, political institutions and government agencies. Within the domestic arena, however, these groups operate differently with different international impacts on societies and states by different specifications of international organizations. Again, their role in interstate relations and influence on the international system are felt with different outcomes. These have underscored the dynamic interactions of states irrespective of their domestic constitutions or ideology, especially in terms of trade and political diplomacy.

On the global trends and the workings of the political or economic forces and factors that help transcend the spontaneous interactions of states in the international system (North, 1990, Dower, 2003, p. 18), the role of international organizations makes the emergence of human technology and human relations compatible and mutual, on the one hand, and oppressive and incompatible, on the other. This is because as the natural environment has been distorted at the global level, so also the political and economic settings. The influence on the global level has, therefore, brought increasing concerns about transnational integration through scientific and technical advancement along with trade and commerce. This has nonetheless expounded on the lingering consequences of historical imperialism and neo-imperialism in the global South.

The Politics of Global Governance

The politics of global governance is wide, diverse and dynamic. This consists of activities, actions, policies and implications of governance and power-sharing or its monopoly. In essence, this is strategically used to gain access to the corridors of power and province of influence with uncompromised legitimacy and unlimited authority. The world is, therefore, a mix of ambivalence in the politics of global governance. Hence, there are a variety of methods employed and deployed in attaining the form and direction in politics of global governance by states and international institutions. These include the fierce determination to promote and project political and economic views and values. Political globalism may include negotiation with others on a variety of subjects, making international laws and exercising maximum force to get what is essential for one's survival, even if it is at the expense of the rights and welfare of others or against adversaries.

Global governance and global politics are essentially the dynamics of the global political and economic continuum, patterns and trends of the world power relations. In other words, the processes of political globalization and socio-economic power indicate the intricate relationships between the global North and the global South. It also expresses the display of supremacy among the superpowers, on the one hand, and the continuing conflicts among states in the backward state formations, on the other. Since politics directly involves action and activities related to and concerned with the issues of attaining power, authority and influence, the politics of global governance is, of course, the politics concerned with the provision or non-provision of global public goods. The relationships between the multinationals, NGOs and international organizations with the industrialized states and underdeveloped or emerging economies exhibit the real face of geopolitics in global governance. Therefore, what constitutes cruel parts of the top concerns and agenda in global politics and governance bear the provision, maintenance and keeping the global peace and security.

Currently, global governance has its unique and emerging challenges. These challenges are on all fronts of human endeavours. The poor and autocratic leadership of the West in global governance has immensely contributed to the rise of the global South. This has led to the paradigm shift of global power, authority and influence. Hence, the emerging economies, with China leading, have continued to forge ahead in deeper and stronger socio-economic and political partnerships with all the states in the global South. The 21st century has, therefore, profoundly witnessed the expansion of global production and market transactions emanating from emerging economies and developing states. This has brought about open and increasing accessibility as well as amiable economic rules and political legitimacy in the developing world.

Some of the biggest challenges, trends and politics of global governance of the 21st century are the emergence of new dimensions of conflict, diseases and terrorism. Furthermore, the rise and increase of other new generations of global threats and challenges such as climate change, water and food security, floods, energy, new technologies, international immigration, hunger, poverty, insurgencies, pollution, draughts, population etc. have enhanced the currents of authoritarian policies of global politics of Western dominance. Hence, the overbearing global governance of security, finance, migration health etc. in the current century has been inherently underscored by the North-South divide with the emerging economies challenging the North of dominance. The countries in the global South, in the protection of their various interests and groupings, have challenged each area of the Western domineerings of governance. This is done by advancing alternative ways and manners on how the mundane international organizations are being traditionally caged by the US and EU to protect their interests.

For decades, powerful governments have sidestepped the failings of major international agencies. Instead of dealing with out-of-date representation, vested interests, poor leadership and stagnating bureaucracies, they simply created new initiatives to deliver what international organizations could not…. (these include) the proliferation of standards in finance, which substituted for global resolutions; the emergence of the Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM) in place of action through WHO; the rise of informal groups in the UN to bypass a gridlocked and deadlocked UN Security Council; and regional conservative processes on immigration and security to make up for a failure to take forward global negotiation. In each case, governments have sought to avert the slow, cumbersome processes of multilateral institutions by creating more nimble, informal networks and private-public partnerships. They must now turn their attention back to the organizations (Woods, Betts, Prantl and Sridhar, 2013).

In all areas and specifications of global governance, the growth to power and development of the emerging economies, in world politics and economic advancement have vibrated the spontaneous need to reform international agencies. However, due to the increasing global threats and challenges, the traditional superpowers, the Group of 7 (G7) - were forced to form the Group of 20 (G20) to dilute the fierce challenges against their poor leadership. Therefore, the G7 has extended its hands friendship or partnership to the emerging economies of Brazil, China, India, Sandi Arabia, South Africa, Venezuela etc. in global governance, even though the emerging economies understand that multilaterals will continue to work against their interests vis-à-vis the interests of the West. The emerging economies have steadily focused and concentrated on ensuring that their regional, bilateral and national strategies conform with their collective actions, interests and responsibilities. As they no longer rely on the IMF/World Bank, they have been investing in their foreign exchange reserves "using bilateral credit lines in moments of vulnerability and reinforcing regional arrangements" (Woods, et al, 2013, p. 2).

Due to the continuous failings of international organizations, emerging economies have set out new forms of governance for the 21st century. This is to conform to the course of action taken towards bailing out their current and future conditions. These were a result of the long run of increasing ineffective and inefficient delivery of service by the out-modelled forms of public and private governance. The rise of emerging economies has provoked the institution of new global forms of governance that involve them in direct and active participation. This also involves less concentration and more distribution of global power along with more flexibility and dynamism in handling other planet-wide concerns.

In Western industrialized societies, most nation-states are key political actors, and thus determine key events in the international system. In the global society,

therefore, such nation-states have inserted themselves forcedly in also being key international decision-makers. This is through the vast networks and platforms of international organizations towards attaining their objectives in planet-wide settings. These have been consistently attained notwithstanding the odds and dynamics in leadership styles and the collaborative conspiracy of the West against the rest of the planet. Thus, their network of shared values and principles on global governance has been one of the fundamental causes of global instability, insecurity and economic chaos.

Working in tangent with Western nation-states, the international public and private organizations, under the UN body, are characterized by rigid adherence to the set-out conditionalities, serving the whims of their benefactors. They have further instigated intense radical realignments of forces in the global South with agitations against injustice and oppression in the region. These have led to the further escalation of wars, terrorism and insurgencies across the globe, particularly in the African continent. All these have inhibited profound socio-economic and political impacts in the world. How, in essence, can the international system of mismatches be addressed? How can the millennium agenda be forged within the shortcomings of international organizations in an institutional framework for sustained political legitimacy, economic settings and well-being?

In international financial crises created by the G7, all countries of the global South are victims. The global South has thus entered numerous phases of crisis after crisis: global economic meltdown, world depression, currency devaluation, foreign exchange reserve exhaustion, states and governments being forced into the "jam-locked" arms of IMF/World Bank, and the collapse of all programmes, and projects sponsored by international organizations. The developing countries have always taken fruitless but forced actions or measures to no avail. The politics of global governance of finance is, therefore, organized and coordinated through the regional and international organizations directly handled by the IMF and the World Bank Group (WBG) and masterminded by the USA and EU. Even though the rise of the emerging economies has challenged the status quo, this has substantially succeeded in forceful insertions of poverty alleviation, programmes, human rights issues, debt relief provision, environmental concerns etc. on the top agenda of international organizations, G7 and G20.

Since 2002, as emerging economies have become more powerful players in global financial governance, they have taken a new place at the tables of discussions and rule-making. They have become financiers in their own right. And they have developed their own regional monetary and support arrangement. This rapid transformation poses new challenges and strategic choices for developing countries (Woods, et al, 2013, p. 3). Since the aid, grant and loan regimes were created to

primarily satisfy the needs of the benefactors, donors have continuously failed to deliver what was promised in basic recovery initiatives and development programmes. The politics of aid, grants and loans has further weakened the fabrics of national sovereignty and kept the state of corruption, poverty and violence active and vibrant in the global South. These have, in addition, promoted a further state of structural dependence and underdevelopment in the developing region. These have systematically killed people's initiative, efforts, motivation and desire to have use-value in the collective arrangement of productive local institutions.

The global regime of aid and development financing since the opening of the century has indicated the failures of the donors to meet their commitments. But with China, etc. silently pushing its trading tentacles globally; with aid and investments, members of the emerging economies have continued to enhance the development assistance in the developing region during this millennium. The politics of global governance of security in the 21st century has seen some significant and disproportionate scenarios between the global North and global South. Most of the countries in the global South are disproportionately affected by perpetually remaining in violence and conflicts instigated by the Western world. Even though the UN is vested with the responsibility of the maintenance of international peace and security, it is not the apex of global security governance. With global security in a disturbing state of instability and great uncertainties, the gridlocked UN Security Council has continued to fail in global negotiations or decisions on world security, immigration and the cumbersomeness in institutional processes as well as handling of all socioeconomic and political issues.

In the wake of the 2000s, the US dominance pervaded the entire universe but the emergence of the shift in global power has enabled a great deal of power split, with influence jointly shared and exercised and authority compromised but curtailed. The implication of these in global governance is that they have brought about a diffusion of new principles, ideas and values (Hurrell & Sengupta, 2012) in the international system. However, the UN-centered global governance of security, through the weaknesses of the Security Council, reflects its failures on rules and principles for collective decision and action on international security issues. The African continent is the hardest hit on issues of violence and conflict which make the continent fragile. The fragility of African states, for example, in all sorts of security challenges has made it a thriving market for formal and informal international organisations to easily exploit. Thus, the increasing waves of insecurity in the entire global South have challenged the stalemated authority of the UN Security Council ineffective and ineffective to deliver positive outcomes.

Isah Mohammed Abbass

International Organizations and Global Governance in the 21st Century

The study of international organisations and global governance in the new millennium is concerned with the politics of international relations and globalization. This involves complex issues in international relations and contemporary trends of globalization. In essence, these fascinating issues of international relations, therefore, involve the art of governance of people and strategic management of their cultures in global spheres. Hence, the spheres and scope of these interactions are highly complex and complementary amongst the international actors or stakeholders. These constitute and thus pose serious challenges to international relations, especially within the context of the globalizing world. Whereas international relations simply connote "the relationships among world's governments" (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009, p. 3), these relationships are highly integrated and connected with all the relevant actors and other stakeholders.

These actors and their interests in the global environment include international organisations, multilateral corporations and individuals. These are complemented or assisted by the structure of social, economic, cultural and political spheres and thus influenced by historical and geographical factors, among others. These, of course, produce the powerful trends of globalization within the orbit of the UN. Invariably, international organisations such as the United Nations International Children's Emergency Fund (UNICEF), World Health Organization (WHO), World Trade Organization (WTO), United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), IMF, World Bank, World Economic Forum etc. are increasingly significant in enhancing the governance of the world since the beginning of the current century. Therefore, the cacophony of the vested interests and the articulations of various global actors, in various mixes of discordant voices constitute the classical and contemporary issues and challenges in the international system.

Global governance in the 21st century can, therefore, be simply illustrated through the interplay and interconnections of different international organisations. These interfaces and interconnectedness include, for instance, the World Customs Organisation (WCO), the International Telecommunication Union (ITU), the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO), and the International Air Transport Association (IATA). These organisations form an integral part of the everyday lives of people in air travelling, airport transactions, and cellular phone usage in facilitating and enhancing the effective and efficient global governance of international organisations. As technology advances, the world is shrinking year by year. Better communication and transportation capabilities constantly expand ordinary access to contact with people, products, and ideas from other countries. Globalisation is internationalising us (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009).

It should be emphasized that the most important actors in global governance in this century are the powerful states that control international organisations. These States exercise unlimited powers, authority and influence in the global system. They make and enforce explicit and implicit rules or laws and regulations to preserve their vested interests. They further control all events and activities in the international system in the global structured relationships among states. The control mechanisms are, therefore, dictated by their whims and caprices as streamlined in the pattern of the global governance interactions. All these are realised through the anchored direction or inclination of the currents of globalisation, especially in the economic processes, through the power of telecommunication, engineering and weapons (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009).

Since the international scene is filled with huge clouds of international organizations, both large and small, they are invariably and intimately interwoven with tough decisions on global governance in this millennium. Hence, another category of international organizations, but of small size, currently involved in global governance, is the nonstate actors. These nonstate actors are generally referred to as transnational actors because they operate across international borders for cooperation and development in the dynamic world (Abdulai, 2003). In addition, the nonstate actors strongly affect and influence national governments and actors in international relations. Whereas national governments or states, more often than not, take decisions and actions within the purview of intergovernmental organizations, these organizations attain several functions of various sizes for the UN member states. These organizations include the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC), the WTO, military alliances such as NATO and other political groupings such as the AU (Goldstein & Pevehouse, 2009).

Other legitimate transnational actors that have huge and considerable sizes and resources, recognized by the UN and other international institutions, are private organizations. These are generally referred to as the NGOs. The purposes of these actors vary from political to the tempting but misleading humanitarian or economic or technical or even a combination of these purposes (Florini, 2000). In seeking to understand gaps in the international system towards participation in managing such complex issues, the transnational actors examine issues and provide probable solutions by engaging the relevant international institutions and stakeholders.

Since the commencement of the new millennium, the tasks and defining challenges, which the world faces, are to ensure that global governance works. This has led to the creation and enhancement of new partnerships or alliances for policy and strategy to attain the expected global public good. The processes by which this ought to be generated and achieved are through initiatives or innovative and demand-driven problem-solution to improve the global collective action. In addition, this has been essentially designed to strengthen institutional capacities

and organizational networks of ideas in professional bodies across borders. The UN is, therefore, the foremost organ in coordinating international organizations in global governance. In essence, the UN exercises enormous powers, authority, control and influence over the states that permeate global governance. These may be attained through international organizations which affect the actions and thinking of states and state actors.

This information age century is no doubt characterized by rapidly globalizing the world in virtually everything. The flow of global governance phenomena in information and communications technology, trade, commerce, finance and people has dramatically enhanced and enriched a relative degree of governance by specific functionalities of international organizations. These areas of contemporary interactions, amongst people across the globe, are supposed to have provided a beacon that serves humanity with attached and potential good global governance. This is in line with the need to regulate and overcome global challenges and ways to improve effectiveness and efficiency. In addition, it is also expected to serve as a legitimate platform for collective action undertaken by the relevant stakeholder international organizations. These international organizations such as WHO, IMF, UNESCO, and World Bank are agencies of the UN where individuals or groups of states control or influence their activities and functionalities. This invariably impinges on real global governance for the collective global good for all.

However, during the new millennium, the global economic governance business and labour have been well-expounded and entrenched. This has produced profound private sector enterprises with the role of the multilateral economic agencies, such as WTO, International Financial Institutions (IFIs), G7, EU and the International Labour Organization (ILO)etc., to govern the world by enforcing their ideas, policies, programmes and projects across the globe. This has, no doubt, strengthened and advanced the role of the relevant international organizations in improving relative peace and security. It also strengthened in advancing the global governance of economic factors of trade, commerce and other financial transactions with fierce labour opposition. In addition, the advancement and utilization of technologies in the global South has continued to attain the objective of further structural dependency and underdevelopment of the region (Khor, 2003). Relevant programmes and projects of the UN have, therefore, been enhanced in advancing and shaping the global practices and principles; especially in promoting the failed Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs).

On the strengthening or weakening of global security, justice and governance, the place of climate change, COVID-19 and other pandemics in global governance have constituted great threats to human security. The global economy and its inherent crises along with the global politics and instability are highly characterized by unmitigated social dislocation globally. The installed global social, economic,

cultural and political risk elements have cut across the globe that put global governance frequently threatened, notwithstanding the activities of international organizations since the early epochs of the 21st century. This is the world that suffers from a vision of all sorts of futuristic dystopia spewing smoke of socio-economic and political uncertainties on the global horizon. The world has, therefore, witnessed unprecedented pandemics, depressions, wars, conflicts, migration, refugees and Internally Displaced Persons (IDPs) crises.

Global security, justice and governance are inherently related to and connected to advancing global peace. This may be attained through the respective roles of international organizations. It, therefore, suggests that in strengthening and advancing the peace-security-justice linkages, care must be taken to ensure that the threshold of strategic and collective management of the previous, current and emerging global challenges should not be sacrificed on the unilateral state action or a group of states. Therefore, to maximize effective factors in strengthening and advancing global peace, security and justice, the uncertainties in global governance that bring about tensions and insecurity must be avoided because such are the open pathways to injustice and insecurity. The global system of governance architecture should, nonetheless, be upgraded and efficiently managed. This is to provide complementarities and interdependence amongst state actors and international organizations.

The exertion of power, authority and influence by international organizations, through the remote control by the powerful state actors, permeates the global governance processes with hiccups. This has sporadically ruptured the inevitable uneasy peace pervading the international system. This has, no doubt, transformed power in global governance as a critical weapon to advance all specifications of the global oppression and intimidation of the weaker nation-states. The use or display of naked power makes it clear to understand and explain how the international state actors effectively but crudely influence, control and govern the actions and thinking of other weak state actors through international organizations. Thus, the seeming complexities of features and processes of the global governance system make the analysis of the system not far-fetched to vividly understand the politics of international organizations. These can be viewed within the multiplicity of physical, economic, institutional, military, political, and structural power that are mutually reinforced to appear completely immutable.

Power in global governance, through the use of international organizations, by the superpowers in the new millennium, is in two major categories: hard and soft power. The hard power is the coercive use of military force with all the instrumentality of violence and forceful compliance. On the other hand, soft power is the art and capacity to persuade others to act according to one's desires. This involves a strategic use of diplomacy and influence. The 21st-century global

governance has, therefore, employed both hard and soft power politics and approaches. This is used as a continuum with the diversity of instruments of coercion and persuasion in a strategic display or discharge of smart power. In essence, smart power is the combination of both the hard and soft power strategies employed and achieved through the relevant international organizations.

The United Nations system, as an institution of sovereign states, is expected to work along with other associated global institutions to provide the machinery and platforms for global governance. This is designed to find solutions to issues, problems and challenges of state disputes or conflicts and thus deal with all matters of critical concern to humanity. Given all these, therefore, policies of the global community have continuously been shaped through the structured organs of the UN. For example, the UN General Assembly, which comprises all members, discusses and coordinates all development programmes as handled by respective agencies. The Security Council is in charge of the maintenance of international peace and security through the peacekeeping forces in troubled areas. The International Court of Justice and the Secretariat are the World Court of the UN respectively. In addition, the Economic and Social Council coordinates the economic and social activities of the UN. This includes the Commission for Human Rights, Population, Social Development and Regions (Economic Commission for Africa, Europe etc.). All these work with and through the specialised agencies of the UN programmes.

Global governance during this period implies enhanced universal dominance by the powerful states, generated and enforced through the UN and its associated international organizations. The tenet of dominance in global governance, along with the principles of reciprocity and identity provide feasible insights into the central issues of power and power relations in international settings. However, the problem is to ensure that states, nations and governments comply with or cooperate for the enforcement of global governance through international agencies or institutions. The principle of dominance in global governance in the new millennium has underscored the need to establish firm control by those in the business of global power position.

The dominance phenomenon is experienced by those of lower socioeconomic and political status or position in the global order. The art of power of dominance, in the international political economy, makes it possible for a few states and state actors to dictate on all rules, regulations and laws within the entire global system. Whereas the superpowers stand atop the hegemonic and dominant position, this has continued to be regulated, justified and maintained by the UN Security Council with the firm support of some of the world's strongest military powers. These superpowers hold veto power with all the personifications of the principles for dominance governance, sometimes exercised through international organizations.

Hence, the situation in the 21st century global governance has brought about constant oppression of, and resentment by, the dominant members of the global community.

With conflict and tension over control of territories and resources, the dominant superpower states have continued to establish and maintain hegemony and dominance. These have jeopardized the stability and well-being of the dominated global regions and the world at large. While dominance has been formally established, the tenant of reciprocity has, therefore, been designed to address and solve identified states' and state actors' recalcitrant attitudes in pursuance of self-interest aggrandizements at the expense of other states. Thus, in global governance, the place of international organizations constitutes the framework to establish and indoctrinate the expected norms, habits and behaviours of the states in the international system. For instance, the WTO central agreements express the principles of reciprocity as the cohesive element of security in international trade cooperation (Das, 1999, p. 55). This is particularly true in the free trade and open markets for equal and unequal trade transactions. This idea has, no doubt, generated an unprecedented arms race and continuous build-up of weapons by many states globally in the millennium.

The WTO global trade governance structure is made up of many trade agreements reached through negotiations among member states. These agreements include trade in goods, intellectual property, agricultural and textile sectors etc. By the mid and late 2000s, most of the world's majority states have enlisted with the world trading body handling about 95% of the global trade transactions and the only organization dealing with the global rules of trade among countries. Hence, the politics of global trade governance of WTO expresses that "Since the enthronement of WTO in world trade business with the firm control of the world trading regimes, it has continued to work against the weak and poor states of the Southern hemisphere. The sole beneficiaries have invariably tended to be the industrialized nations of the Northern Hemisphere (Abbass, 2020).

Another potential response to the global governance challenges may be located in the identities of the vested interests of members of the power bloc in the global community. Since the principles of dominance and reciprocity contribute immensely towards achieving the self-interests of the dominating states, the tenet of identities does not essentially depend on self-interest alone but on the *sameness* in treating others. This is because the identity of states in international political economy plays some significant roles in addressing some sources of governance challenges in international organizations, especially by the WHO, WTO or even UN peacekeeping missions. All these are connected with and related to the states' self-defined identities in the global community.

Conclusion

International laws, in global governance, are made and enforced within the contours of multilateral institutions as well as within the purview and network of game-mastering techniques of the G7. The emerging economies are indeed poised to resist these game plans towards protecting and guiding their sovereignty and other interests. The key issue or concern is how to establish workable networks and partnerships with the prominent stakeholders of the emerging economies of Brazil, China, India, the Russian Federation and South Africa to collectively address the 21st-century security threats. Hence, global governance and strategies for emerging economies and developing countries will require an evolution of new institutions that will work in their interests, unlike the outmoded and anachronistic Bretton Woods institutions. Regional bodies, insulated from the traditional international institutions, can be more relevant to the 21st-century agenda of emerging economies. In addition, the rise of powerful, transnational NGOs, determined to challenge the multinationals, can make change come faster and more relevant. To foster more effective global governance, there is the need for collective decision and action to be more effective, efficient, transparent, equitable and legitimate to address the challenges of the global future based on the social, economic and political disposition of all the state actors.

REFERENCES

Abbass, I. M. (2017). International political economy and the North-South gap: An overview. *University of Nigeria Journal of Political Economy, 10*(1).

Abbass, I. M. (2020). Impacts of the World Trade Organization (WTO) and ACP-EU agreements on global trade governance in West Africa. In A. Sesay, S. Wapmuk, & C. A. Ugwuanyi (Eds.), *African perspectives on ACP-EU relations* (pp. 123–145). Nigerian Institute of International Affairs (NIIA) Press.

Abdulai, Y. S. (2003). *The OPEC Fund and development cooperation in a changing world*. The OPEC Fund for International Development.

Ansani, A., & Daniele, V. (2012). About a revolution: The economic motivations of the Arab Spring. *International Journal of Development and Conflict, 3*(3), 233-249.

Chossudovsky, M. (1998). *The globalization of poverty: Impact of IMF and World Bank reforms*. Zed Books Ltd.

Das, B. L. (1999). *The World Trade Organization: A guide to the framework for international trade*. Zed Books Ltd.

Dower, N. (2003). *An introduction to global citizenship*. Edinburgh University Press.

Edwards, L. (Ed.). (2015). *The global economy: Changing politics, society and family*. Beulahland Publications.

Florin, A. M. (Ed.). (2000). *The third force: The rise of transnational civil society*. Carnegie   Corporation of New York.

Goldstein, J. S., & Pevehouse, J. C. (2009). *International relations* (9th ed.). Pearson International Edition.

Hjem, M. (2001). Education, xenophobia, and nationalism: A comparative analysis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 27*(1), 1-26.

Hurrell, A., & Sengupta, S. (2012). Emerging powers, North-South relations and global climate politics. *International Affairs, 88* (3), 463- 484. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2346.2012.01099.x

Khor, M. (2003). *Globalization and South: Some critical issues*. Spectrum Book Limited.

Langley, A. (2006). *September 11: Attack on America*. Compass Point Books.

Neocosmos, M. (2001). *From 'foreign natives' to 'native foreigners': Explaining xenophobia in post-apartheid South Africa*. Zed Books.

North, R. C. (1990). *War, peace, survival: Global politics and conceptual synthesis*. Westview Press.

Nyamnjoh, F. B. (2006). *Insiders and outsiders: Citizenship and xenophobia in contemporary Africa*. Zed Books.

Ryan, A. A. (2015). *The 9/11 terror cases: Constitutional challenges in the war against Al-Qaeda*. University Press of Kansas.

Spero, J. E. (1993). *The politics of international economic relations*.

Routledge. Stiglitz, J. (2002). *Globalization and its discontents*. Allen

Lane, Penguin Books. Ul-Haque, I. (1995). *Trade, technology, and*

international competitiveness. Economic Development Institute of the World Bank.

United Nations. (2000). *The United Nations system: Working together for a better Nigeria*. UN Information Centre in Nigeria.

Woods, N., Betts, A., Prantl, J., & Sridhar, D. (2013). Transforming global governance for the 21st century. *UNDP-Human Development Report Office, Occasional Paper, 2013.09*. United Nations Development Programme.