

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE IN THE FACE OF THE CHALLENGES AND PROSPECTS OF THE EXISTING WORLD ORDER

Muhammad Sazzad Hossain Siddiqui¹
Kawser Aziz²

Abstract

The contemporary world stage is marked by profound discord and conflict among global leaders, driven by stark ideological disparities and elusive national interests. This paper contends that these prevailing conditions render the pursuit of global peace a formidable and intricate endeavour within the framework of existing global governance. The central argument of this paper underscores the imperative for a humane global governance paradigm to achieve global peace and security. Findings reveal that multilateral diplomacy, characterized by its inclusiveness, must serve as a potent tool for strengthening international organizations and global governance. Consequently, it will nurture the development of agreements within a rule-based framework, enabling us to effectively confront the issues raised by nationalism and populism. This, in the end, contributes to solidifying backing for initiatives promoting global governance. In doing so, it adopts a methodological approach that draws on pertinent literature, individual perspectives, academic publications, and selected journal articles that bear relevance to these matters.

Keywords: global governance, global peace, conflict, ideological disparities, national interests

Introduction

In today's political landscape, which predominantly centres on the nation-state, there exists an unprecedented level of interconnectedness and rapid transformations. Within this context, the concept of global governance has risen to paramount importance. It serves as a critical framework for comprehending the functioning of the world on a global scale. Central to global governance is its capacity to shed light on the intricate network of interactions, relationships, and power dynamics that shape the international arena (Betsill & Bulkeley, 2004). As articulated by Ruggie (2014), there is a discernible purposefulness in the design of the global landscape. Control here is not merely exerted; rather, it often appears as

¹ **Muhammad Sazzad Hossain Siddiqui**, Associate Professor, Department of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Dhaka, Dhaka-1000. Email: sazzadhsiddiqui@du.ac.bd

² **Kawser Aziz**, Deputy Secretary, Cabinet Division, Bangladesh Secretariat, Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. Email: pme_sec@cabinet.gov.bd

if it is itself subject to control. These patterns of influence and interdependence indicate that some form of management or regulation is not only viable but also imperative for the harmonious coexistence of nations and the resolution of global challenges (Hossain, 2023). The existing world order is marked by a complex interplay of geopolitical, economic, and socio-cultural forces. It presents both formidable challenges and promising prospects for the international community. As nations grapple with a spectrum of issues—from climate change and transnational threats to economic disparities and technological disruptions—the need for effective and inclusive global governance mechanisms has never been more pressing (Bulkeley & Newell, 2023). The ascent of these nations and their evolving roles on the world stage introduces fresh dynamics and complexities to the global governance landscape. Grasping their impact is pivotal in charting a course toward a more stable and just global order.

This paper focuses on the multifaceted concept of global governance, recognizing its growing significance in providing solutions to the myriad contemporary global challenges we face. To initiate this exploration, it introduces the fundamental concepts of global governance. Subsequently, it examines the emerging powers within the context of global governance. Furthermore, it explores the implications of humane global governance, a vision that prioritizes values of compassion, equity, and justice in the management of global affairs. This perspective holds the potential to reshape the way global governance functions and, in turn, its impact on global peace and security. Finally, it analyses the various factors that are currently shaping the future of global governance. These factors, ranging from technological advancements to changing geopolitical dynamics, have a profound influence on the evolution of global governance structures. An in-depth understanding of these forces enables us to discern pathways that could lead to a more secure and peaceful world, where nations cooperate effectively to address shared challenges. In essence, this paper embarks on a journey through the intricate realm of global governance, with the overarching aim of shedding light on its potential to contribute to global peace, security, and the betterment of human societies in an increasingly interconnected world.

Thus, the knowledge gap and problem identification of this paper highlight the need for a better understanding of how global governance can address contemporary global challenges and contribute to global peace, security, and the betterment of human societies. The specific areas that need further exploration include:

1. The fundamental concepts of global governance, such as its definition, scope, and principles.
2. The influence of emerging powers on global governance and how it is reshaping the world order.

3. The implications of humane global governance for global peace and security, as well as other important issues such as sustainable development and human rights.
4. The factors shaping the future of global governance, such as technological advancements, climate change, and new security threats.

By bridging this knowledge gap, researchers and policymakers can develop more effective and inclusive global governance mechanisms that can address the pressing challenges of the 21st century.

Global Governance and Theoretical Viewpoint

The concept of global governance is much talked about and commonly known for becoming a controversial aspect of academic and international politics. The previous two decades provide that the concept of global governance focuses on the overview of the political theories with the meaning being broader while including the disciplines (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010). Diehl (2010) accepts that the implications of global governance emerge from the aspect that the concept is evoked where governance has been introduced within the political domains and it is found to be challenging in different contexts. This further reflects that the idea of global governance is linked with the processes of the political domain while focusing on the accountability, democracy, and legitimacy of authority. It is being done with the increase in market liberalization as well as programs for reducing poverty that can address the global issue.

Karns & Mingst (2009) stated that the perspective of global governance can be reflected in two parts namely normative and analytical use. The normative use is referred to as the political program because it is not an empirical term to the significant extent of being the political concept capturing the vision of ways through which societies are required to address the most challenging global issues. This concept of global governance reflects the fact that global governance is political, but it does not necessarily reflect the concerns of all people on all issues, especially those related to political efforts, democracy, and power. The global governance at this point is apparent as compared to the details of the actual position of the international aspects. The analytical use of the level of implementation along with the pursuit of goals is found to be important for global governance (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010; Diehl, 2010).

Halliday's (2000) central argument is that, despite the challenges, global governance is essential for addressing the world's most pressing problems. He calls for several reforms to improve the effectiveness and legitimacy of global governance institutions, such as making them more representative and

accountable, and strengthening the role of non-state actors. In a similar vein, Kim (2020) argues that the network approach is a powerful tool for understanding the complex and fragmented architecture of global governance. She contends that the network approach can help us identify effective ways to improve the performance of the global governance system in addressing global challenges. Drawing insights from the environmental experience, Young (1997) provides a valuable contribution to the understanding of global governance. It demonstrates that it is possible to achieve international cooperation on complex and challenging issues, even in the absence of a world government. It also highlights the importance of non-state actors and the need for flexibility and adaptability in the design and implementation of global governance institutions.

The process of global governance is found to include the system of rule at every level of human activity from families to international organizations. Generally, this aspect provides that the level of implementation of the global governance is found to be important and it can be identified from the families to the international extent. Therefore, the term global governance does not imply the interactions between international organizations in nature only but it also highlights the resolution of conflicting issues at different levels of state, region, and international. The concept of global governance is considered the way of resolving the issues at international levels. Most of the studies provide that this concept is the process of seeking solutions to the issue at the global level (Harman & Williams, 2013). Wilkinson (2005) argued that global governance reflects the outline of global governance being an activity in the context of the efforts to bring reliability to the issues of the political and social domain that are found to be beyond the capacity of states to address them individually.

The above aspect of this concept implies the evaluation of global governance being an instrument based on global issues. Therefore, the individual states cannot solve the emerging crises from the domain of humanity and politics. Apart from the above scholars and their aspects, many researchers explain that global governance is found to be the process being insufficiently integrated with the global solution (Harman & Williams, 2013). In other words, Nye (2020) believes that while most countries accept the need for global governance, the current system of global governance does not adequately reflect or promote moral values such as compassion and equity. This sort of situation shows that global governance demonstrates the process being insufficient to provide a global solution because of the international institutional failure to respond immediately to humanitarian crises. An example of such an aspect includes the Rwanda genocide of the year 1994 in which the UN forced the Tutsi military to stop the massacre in the early phases.

Moreover, global governance possesses an insufficient correlation with the process of globalization. Therefore, this concept has extended the gap in the process of democracy and economic interactions along with the balance of power between developed and underdeveloped countries (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010). As per Ruggie (2014), global governance is not concerned with the results of substantive democracy along with the concerns of the results of the unregulated globe. Therefore, it further analyses the process of globalization being the democratic process at the national level but global governance is not found to be effective in highlighting the issues at the national level.

However, the political model has been selected as the theory of corporate governance because it recognizes the allocation of corporate power, profits between owners, managers, and stakeholders, and privileges to be determined by ways through which governments favour their constituencies. The ability of corporate stakeholders to influence the allocations at the micro level is responsible for the macro framework (Harman & Williams, 2013). As per Wilkinson (2005), the political model of corporate governance has influenced on corporate governance developments in the last few years. Bernstein and Cashore (2012) focus their discussions on the micro aspects of shareholders influencing organizations. Organisations are influencing in altering the political or regulatory system of the United States Supreme Court.

Challenges for Global Governance

The most challenging issue for the present global governance is the establishment of shared responsibility for the most intractable issues of a single polar world. Sufficient parts of the world are bothered by the significant power of the United States after the end of the Cold War. Many countries enjoyed its critical strategies in the decades after the Cold War. However, more countries are required to assume the role of responsible shareholders as observed in the year 2005. China serves as the most prominent example of the country having significant power at the international level. The capital of China has been found active in dealing with the international community in the most effective ways. However, it has been observed that the unexpected consequences of international politics are unavoidable on the global interface while structuring and restructuring of the international system as well as global governance may lead to hope (Zelli & Van Asselt, 2013). Considering this aspect and the example of China, decision-makers from all over the world are facing a complicated environment on the international level, and some of the prioritized challenges of global governance are discussed below:

Avoidance of Missing Era in Europe

The leaders of Europe made some important decisions in 2012 to address the eurozone crisis. They established a banking union and created a financial firewall to protect the deficit countries. However, the euro crisis has not been fully resolved. The euro has not collapsed, but it is still under pressure. This is because the leaders of Europe have not been able to close the competitiveness gap between the creditor countries and the debtor countries. The creditor countries, such as Germany, have strong economies and can export more than they import. The debtor countries, such as Greece, have weak economies and are unable to export enough to pay their debts. This competitiveness gap makes it difficult for the debtor countries to recover from the crisis (Orsini, et al., 2013).

The leaders of Europe are now trying to implement structural reforms to close the competitiveness gap. These reforms include reducing government spending, cutting taxes, and making it easier for businesses to operate. However, these reforms are difficult to implement and they will take time to have an effect. The response of the European leaders to the euro crisis is important for global governance. The international economy is multipolar, meaning that it is no longer dominated by a single country or region. The United States, China, and Europe are the three most important economic centres in the world (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010). So, it can arguably be said that if the European leaders fail to implement the structural reforms and the eurozone crisis worsens, it could hurt the global economy.

The leaders of China and the United States are also facing challenges. China is dealing with a slowdown in economic growth, and the United States is facing a political impasse. If the leaders of these countries fail to address their own challenges, it could also lead to instability in the global economy. In Fact, the avoidance of a “missing era” in Europe is important for global governance. Because, a weak European economy would have a negative impact on the global economy. Europe is a major trading partner for many countries, and a decline in European demand would lead to job losses and economic hardship in other parts of the world (Hafner & Raimondi, 2020).

A eurozone crisis could lead to political instability in Europe. The euro is a symbol of European unity, and a collapse of the euro could lead to a resurgence of nationalism and populism in Europe. Moreover, a “missing era” in Europe would be a missed opportunity for global cooperation. Europe is a leader in many areas, such as climate change, international development, and human rights. A weak Europe would be less able to contribute to these global challenges. So, the leaders of Europe, China, and the United States need to work together to address the

challenges they are facing. If they are successful, it will help to ensure the stability of the global economy.

Problematic Transitions in the Middle East and North Africa

In the case of the Middle East and North Africa (MENA) region, the sequential implementation of political and economic reforms has emerged as a critical determinant of the trajectory of revolutions. Over the past few years, this region has witnessed both promising strides and formidable challenges in this regard. For instance, Egypt's President, recognizing the need for a strategic shift, has taken the bold step of pushing for constitutional reforms. This move is designed to create an environment conducive to fostering economic growth, representing a calculated gamble in pursuit of stability and prosperity. Conversely, Tunisia's secular coalition within the Islamic government has opted for a different approach. Here, the emphasis lies on consensus-building around political reforms as a fundamental precursor to unleashing the full potential of economic development. This approach acknowledges the inherent risks involved in aligning political transformation with economic progress, reflecting a nuanced understanding of the complex interplay between these domains.

In response to these delicate transitions, global stakeholders including the United States, Europe, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank have stepped forward with a commitment to actively support these endeavours. Their assistance takes various forms, including substantial financial backing and strategic incentives aimed at opening markets and fostering an environment conducive to foreign direct investment. This collaborative effort underscores the recognition of the importance of stabilizing and strengthening the MENA region, not only for its inhabitants but also for the broader global community (Weiss & Wilkinson, 2014). By carefully navigating the complex dynamics between political and economic reforms, leaders in the MENA region are endeavouring to chart a course towards stability, prosperity, and ultimately, sustainable development. The outcomes of these endeavours will not only shape the future of the region but will also have far-reaching implications for global economic stability and security. It is within this context that the collective support and strategic engagement of the international community play a pivotal role in ensuring the success of these critical transitions.

Multilateral Security in East Asia

When Japan and China ended with the diplomatic tie over the islands of Senkaku or Diaoyubeing likely to persist in the year 2013, the leadership of China was unwilling to tolerate a return to the current position of the sovereign control of

Japan regarding islands. Simultaneously, the new prime minister of Japan has campaigned on the hard line towards the new demand of China. The approach of China reflects the significant strategic decision for strengthening the communication within and out of the coastline of China for the growing needs of energy along with the maritime trade. These developments consider the need for multilateral security architecture within East Asia while considering ways to create architecture within the region in the middle of the rebalancing of economic and political power. This is so because it deserves to be at the core of thinking about global governance in the year 2013 (Orsini, et al., 2013).

Emerging Powers and Global Governance

The increasing diffusion of power in the global arena has led emerging powers to take on a more proactive role in various multilateral forums, seeking to drive normative and operational shifts. This transition is marked by a desire for greater autonomy and recognition on the international stage, resulting in an uneven development within the realm of global affairs. These nations have honed their focus on shaping the rules that govern global agendas and institutions. Simultaneously, they are broadening and deepening their commitments to other developing countries, demonstrating a dedication to fostering a more inclusive and equitable global order. This collaborative spirit is exemplified by initiatives like IBSA and BRICS, the latter comprising Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa, which also originated in 2003 (Wilkinson, 2005). In a significant development, in August 2023, BRICS leaders made the decision to broaden the bloc's membership to include Argentina, Egypt, Iran, Saudi Arabia, and the United Arab Emirates. These countries are set to become full-fledged members of BRICS by January 2024, further amplifying the influence and reach of this influential grouping in shaping global governance dynamics. This expansion underscores the growing significance of emerging powers in redefining the contours of global governance (du Plessis, Miridzhanian, & Acharya, August 25, 2023).

Domain of IBSA

The IBSA (India, Brazil, South Africa) coalition stands as a formidable force in the realm of affirmative multilateralism and political coordination within the Southern Hemisphere. Established in 2003, this collaboration has witnessed six ministerial meetings and five heads of state summits, signalling a commitment to sustained dialogue and cooperation (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012). Over the years, IBSA has not only fostered a robust institutional framework but also catalysed the formation of sixteen working groups, each dedicated to specific areas of interest. Noteworthy among these is the Facility for Alleviation of Hunger and Poverty, a testament to IBSA's shared commitment to address critical issues plaguing their

respective regions (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012). Moreover, the coalition has taken strides in the implementation of various South-South cooperation initiatives, further solidifying their collaborative efforts (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012). One of IBSA's distinctive approaches lies in its diplomacy of niche, a strategic manoeuvre tailored to the unique challenges faced by developing nations. This approach not only distinguishes IBSA from more Western-centric initiatives but also underscores its dedication to preserving the autonomy and identity of the global South. Notably, the coalition has directed special attention towards critical geopolitical concerns, including efforts towards brokering peace in the Palestine-Israeli conflict, bolstering stability and unity in Iraq, and supporting the peace process in Sudan.

However, IBSA's impact extends beyond regional matters. The coalition has assumed the role of a proactive advocate for structural reforms on the global stage, particularly within the United Nations framework and the broader international financial architecture. This stance was reiterated in the fifth summit declaration of 2011, which underscored the imperative of transparent processes in power distribution within multilateral institutions. Notably, this declaration also galvanized efforts to influence the selection of the next leader of the World Bank in 2012, further emphasizing IBSA's commitment to shaping the global financial landscape (Karns & Mingst, 2009). The essence is that IBSA stands as a beacon of collaborative diplomacy, demonstrating the potential of dynamic partnerships between developing nations. Through its multifaceted approach, the coalition not only addresses pressing regional concerns but also advocates for a more inclusive and equitable global order. By championing reforms within international institutions, IBSA asserts its position as a catalyst for positive change on the world stage (Karns & Mingst, 2009).

Working as a Team at the United Nations Security Council (UNSC)

The opportunity of sitting at the UNSC during the year 2011 as the form of temporary member has become a major opportunity for the IBSA. This year also brought the ability to share and reinforce the values and perspectives on security and politics at the global level. These pillars of the South reflect the critical appraisal of the concepts and perceptions of liberal peace after the Cold War (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012). In this regard, the pivotal points from Weiss and Wilkinson (2014) and Wilkinson and Hughes (2002) can be listed as follows:

- Foreseeable relationship between the security and development in Afghanistan and Somalia
- The unavoidable relationship between peace, sovereignty, and sustainable development while recognizing the Palestinian state.

- The development of political liberties, resolutions of peace, national sovereignty, and the integrity of territories in Libya and Syria.
- The requirement of this aspect is required to be more cautious with the forced strategies signifying the initial steps towards the military action in Iran.
- The requirement of being cautious using the UN charter while addressing domestic crises.

There are some of the permanent members of the Council have moderate significance in the review of methods and processes. IBSA countries have transmitted specific concerns about the drawbacks of bureaucratic coordination of the UN along with the requirement for improvement in the relationship between the SC, GA, and executive boards of the UN agencies (Harman & Williams, 2013).

The Case of Brazil

Brazil stands as a critical voice in the global discourse on governance, emphasizing the need for a comprehensive re-evaluation of global institutions, particularly the imperative reform of the UN Security Council. Central to Brazil's concerns is the fundamental issue of legitimacy surrounding international interventions, with a particular focus on the humanitarian impact of military actions. In this context, Brazil underscores the importance of achieving a delicate balance between sustainable development, solidarity, and peace, recognizing the complex interplay between these vital elements. Notably, Brazil's priorities are directed towards promoting the capacity for development and fortifying national institutions. Rather than resorting to coercive measures to address internal political turmoil, Brazil advocates for inclusive, institution-building approaches. This approach not only reflects Brazil's commitment to fostering sustainable progress but also highlights its dedication to nurturing a resilient and self-sufficient political landscape on the domestic front (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012).

Moreover, the existing world order is facing a number of unprecedented challenges, including climate change, infectious COVID-19, food insecurity, nuclearization, and the revival of inter-state conflicts like Russia-Ukraine. Notably, the persistent Palestine-Israel conflict shows no signs of diminishing, resulting in over 1,300 casualties. Israel is conducting airstrikes in Gaza, while clashes persist between Hamas militants and the Israeli military. This conflict has led to the deaths of more than 800 Israelis and approximately 500 Palestinians in intense fighting and bombardments following the most significant attack by the Palestinian group Hamas on Israel in many years (Al Jazeera, 2023). These challenges are putting a strain on the global governance system, which is already struggling to keep up with the pace of change.

Implications for Humane Global Governance

Since the advent of the nuclear age, there has been increasing anxiety about the human civilization is found to be sustainable within the framework of states across the globe. This sort of restrictive outlook reflects the restrictive framework embodying bio-politics on the global level as well as human anxieties in the form of the species living under the threat of survival. It is evident that the preoccupation includes the exploration and depiction of the survival and imaginary human quest while supplementing the orientation of survival by the concerns of combining human dignity for people having meaning for life on the grounds of spiritual aspects. This aspect is referred to as humane global governance involving the normative and practical dimensions of the world order in a desirable order (Diehl, 2010).

The difference is extracted between the normative and practical deficiencies in terms of the world order in the form of an operative frame for global activities. This is considered the darkest shadow of the human future because it assumes that the bio-political future of the human species is found to be at severe risk (Orsini, et al., 2013). These threats include climatic change, economic collapse, and nuclear weapons. With some sort of doubts, the twenty-first century has initiated to unfold the widespread sense that human beings are jeopardized and the fact that the future of humans is expected to be based on the unprecedented coordination of political aspects along with the cooperation on the behalf of global interests (Zelli & Van Asselt, 2013). The extreme point is the historical insistence involving the emergence of the global state or the government is the indispensable foundation for gaining the important level of coordination as a sequel to the experience with different stages of political domains of the state. This claims that the trends towards global governance over the past few years have caused the emergence of the global state or the global government within a short period (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012).

If it is conceded that such emergence is more likely to be observed in the future, then there is a wide range of opposing views regarding the time frame and the actuating conditions. There are some advocates of global government considering that it is expected to emerge as a result of education along with the influence of public reasons with overall rational adjustment to realities in the absence of the accompanying trauma (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010). Diehl (2010) observed the sceptical landing of such nature with the belief that such global polity is expected to be the reality in the environment of catastrophe where older order is being reduced to disasters. Such disasters confront humanity, energies for coordinated, equitable response to global warming, and mobilizing resources to reduce the possibility of apocalyptic warfare. Wilkinson (2005) believes that a foreseeable

transition to the global government is expected to freeze or deepen the inequities of the current order of the world while relying on the repressive implications of governance to sustain stability and maintain control. Such global government is expected to be regarded as the form of a global empire of unprecedented scope and undoubtedly administered by the leadership of recent hegemonic actors of the state. It is argued that in the response of America to the 9/11 attacks during the early years of the Bush presidency was seeking a global order solution in these aspects (Ruggie, 2014).

Factors Shaping the Future of Global Governance

The political aspects are one of the major factors shaping the future of global governance. It is so because the weak economic activity along with the lower growth of production implies that the real wages and the consumption are more likely to continue to be at disappointing levels. When the reality is having insufficient expectations, there are criticisms to be discovered because people like Donald Trump, Nigel Farage, Bernie Sanders, Jeremy Corbyn, and Pablo Iglesias Turrión are taking advantage of living standards being stagnated with the increasing economic insecurities. There are different factors reinforcing populism as well as discontent. Job security is found to be undermined by robotization and digitalization. The opportunities for new work are found to be based on short-term contracts, part-time employment, and self-employment in the absence of complete social benefits and job security (Wilkinson & Hughes, 2002; Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010; Bernstein & Cashore, 2012).

The demands for education and social skills are expected to take a significant leap with the increased threshold for people seeking the labour market. The increased insecurity within the labour markets the lower levels of productivity and inappropriate negotiation power are building limitations for negotiations on wages. The era the enhanced economies needs strong governments to implement structural reforms through which voters have appropriate favours for the short term while seeking appropriate solutions (Weiss & Wilkinson, 2014). To restore political trust, the government needs to deliver an increase in real wages along with the appropriate jobs and welfare. It can happen in case growth is being strengthened by the reforms for increasing flexibility of the labour market and enhancing the environment for the business. It is an apparent threat to global governance that the political aspects are expected to undermine the way through which leaders deal with the challenges in the long term. It further creates a malicious negative spiral in which disappointment weakens the trust in governments (Clapp & Wilkinson, 2010).

The 2024 United States presidential election is expected to be the major political event because it has the potential to shape the future of the United States and the world. It is important for all eligible voters to participate in the election and to make their voices heard. From the global perspective, the major issue is the expectation of the next president to restore the US being the global force for the stability. Another period of the United States having insufficient direction in foreign policy is expected to establish the issues for security with the combination of reluctance for involvement with the military forces in challenging regions. It is evident that Europe is required to establish its ability to deal with security issues apart from the fact that it is not likely to result in the absence of leadership from the US. The 2015 Paris tragic events have established a coalition bringing the United Kingdom, France, and the US along with Russia for a push-back on the aims of Daesh to establish the Caliphate. It appears important for the US and Europe to counter religious extremist terrorism. The countries such as Sweden, Austria, Germany, and Italy are found to be the most affected countries in Europe (Wilkinson, 2005). The inflows for the highest per capita have declined in the past few days and it could be due to the temporary harsh weather. It is a fact that the European Union has made a political agreement with Turkey and it could be another major factor shaping global governance (Bernstein & Cashore, 2012).

Conclusion

One of the key challenges facing global governance is the rise of nationalism and populism. Nationalist and populist leaders often reject the legitimacy of international institutions and rules. They also tend to be more unilateralist in their approach to foreign policy, which can undermine cooperation on global challenges. Another challenge is the growing great power competition between the United States and China. The two countries are increasingly vying for influence in the global economy and security order. This competition is making it more difficult to reach consensus on global issues and to implement effective solutions. Despite these challenges, there are several reasons to be hopeful about the future of global governance. First, there is a growing recognition of the need for global cooperation to address shared challenges. Second, there is a growing network of non-state actors, such as civil society organizations and businesses, which are working to promote global governance. Third, there is a growing body of international law and norms that can provide a basis for cooperation on global issues. In this regard, global governance – the system of rules, norms, and institutions governing cross-border relations – is crucial for addressing the pressing global challenges. Despite these obstacles, there are reasons for optimism. There is a growing recognition of the necessity for global cooperation, a network of non-state actors dedicated to promoting global governance, and a foundation of international law and norms for collaboration. To enhance global governance, it is imperative to support existing

institutions, foster new forms of cooperation, and implement purposeful strategies to address global challenges. It is also crucial to mitigate unilateral rule, which can lead to harm, particularly for vulnerable groups. Promoting multilateral diplomacy, with its inherent inclusivity, can be a powerful mechanism to reinforce international institutions. This, in turn, fosters consensus-building within a rule-based system. By doing so, we can effectively address the challenges posed by nationalism and populism, ultimately bolstering support for global governance initiatives.

References

- Al Jazeera. (2023, October 9). Death toll soars to 1,300 as fighting between Hamas and Israel rages. Retrieved on 11 October 2023 from <https://www.aljazeera.com/news/2023/10/9/death-tolls-soar-as-fighting-between-israel-and-hamas-rages>
- Bernstein, S., & Cashore, B. (2012). Complex global governance and domestic policies: Four pathways of influence. *International Affairs*, 88(3), 585-604.
- Betsill, M. M., & Bulkeley, H. (2004). Transnational networks and global environmental governance: The cities for climate protection program. *International Studies Quarterly*, 48(2), 471-493.
- Bulkeley, H., & Newell, P. (2023). *Governing climate change*. Taylor & Francis.
- Clapp, J., & Wilkinson, R. (2010). *Global Governance, Poverty, and Inequality*. London: Routledge.
- Diehl, P. F. (2010). *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World* (4th ed.). London: Lynne Rienner.
- du Plessis, C., Miridzhanian, A., & Acharya, B. (2023, August 25). BRICS welcomes new members in push to reshuffle world order. Reuters. Retrieved on September 13, 2023, from <https://www.reuters.com/world/brics-poised-invite-new-members-join-bloc-sources-2023-08-24/>
- Hafner, M., & Raimondi, P. P. (2020). Priorities and challenges of the EU energy transition: From the European Green Package to the new Green Deal. *Russian Journal of Economics*, 6(4), 374-389.
- Halliday, F. (2000). Global governance: prospects and problems. *Citizenship studies*, 4(1), 19-33.
- Harman, S., & Williams, D. (2013). *Governing the World? Cases in Global Governance*. London: Routledge.
- Hossain, M. I. (2023). Global Citizens, Civic Responsibility, and Intercultural Communication in a Rapidly Globalising Multicultural World: Community Revitalisation and Reflective Practise. *Ethnopolitics*, 1-28.
- Karns, M. P., & Mingst, K. A. (2009). *International Organizations: The Politics and Processes of Global Governance* (2nd ed.). London: Lynne Rienner.

- Kim, R. E. (2020). Is global governance fragmented, polycentric, or complex? The state of the art of the network approach. *International Studies Review*, 22(4), 903-931.
- Orsini, A., Morin, J.-F., & Young, O. (2013). Regime complexes: A buzz, a boom, or a boost for global governance? *Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations*, 19(1), 27-39.
- Ruggie, J. G. (2014). Global governance and “New Governance Theory”: Lessons from business and human rights. *Global Governance*, 20(1), 5-17.
- Weiss, T., & Wilkinson, R. (2014). Rethinking global governance? Complexity, authority, power, change. *International Studies Quarterly*, 58(1), 207-215.
- Wilkinson, R. (2005). *The Global Governance Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Wilkinson, R., & Hughes, S. (2002). *Global Governance: Critical Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Young, O. R. (Ed.). (1997). *Global governance: drawing insights from the environmental experience*. MIT press.
- Zelli, F., & Van Asselt, H. (2013). Introduction: The institutional fragmentation of global environmental governance: Causes, consequences, and responses. *Global Environmental Politics*, 13(3), 1-13.