

# Conquest, Contest, and Consent: Evolution of Global Governance

PingPing Zhu Lincoln

[Abstract] Governance implies both control and coordination. Within a domestic context, authoritative regimes exercise more control whereas democratic governments play the role of coordination. Within an international context, powers and superpowers pursue global dominance whereas most members of the world welcome global governance. Different from domestic governing, global governance is neither through a world government, nor controlled by power. It is both a process and a system of managing the world. Global governance means coordination among countries on various issues including economy, environment, and education. The evolution of global governance can be divided into three stages with characteristics. 1 ) Europeanization: conquest of the world by the soldiers, scientists, merchants, and missionaries of European powers; 2 ) Polarization: contest between power blocs, and between superpowers in the areas of economic, military, and strategic politics; and 3 ) Multipolarization and Globalization: consent to regional and global institutions through ordinance and governance. Overlapped in the historical process, three stages are more of literal divisions initiated in this article. The current world is at a transition period with a combination of the legacy of polarization, the development of multipolarization, and the twilight of globalization. The fundamental goal of global governance is to solve the common problems of human society through collective management that every country is involved in and responsible for.

[Keywords] Conquest, Contest, Consent, Control, Coordination

In his speech at Lafayette College in Easton, Pennsylvania in October 2011, the former head of the Soviet Union, Mikhail Gorbachev, pointed out that the cause of all the problems such as environment, backwardness, poverty, and food shortages is “because we do not have a system of global governance,” which empowers the United Nations, governs and regulates human interaction. The word “govern” indicates both to “control” and to “manage” an area, a city, or a country along with its people. The governance of a country has been associated with a government with political authority. However, global governance is defined as “the management of global processes in the absence of a global government” (Rizati, 2006). It is “the complex of formal and informal institutions, mechanisms, relationships, and processes between and among states, markets, citizens and organizations, both inter- and non-governmental, through which collective interests on the global plane are articulated, duties, obligations and privileges are established, and differences are mediated through educated professionals” (Thakur & Weiss, 2006).

According to various definitions, global governance is a long process of evolution in terms of three key elements: collective management, common problems, and international level (NIC & EUISS, 2010).

Lamb (2001) has traced the rise of global governance from Alexander the Great, and stated that “the desire to rule the world has been a part of the human experience throughout recorded history,” and that “history is a record of the competition for global dominance.” Powers and superpowers had a strong hold over the practices of controlling and ruling the world by no means of management but manipulation even before they had the knowledge of the globe and the ability of governance.

The concept of “globe/world” has different connotations from geographical and resource-based, strategic and political, to a full range of aspects and all areas in the world. The concept of “governance” has gradually included the meanings of controlling, managing, and coordinating. Strictly speaking, global governance only exists when there is an understanding, not an imagination, of the globe, and a process, not to control or dominate, but to govern or manage, the world. It took many centuries after mankind had the knowledge of the globe when they started to realize the importance of managing the community they all live. The evolution of global governance has experienced three stages with a tendency of less control and more management. At the first stage, only powers had means to reach the world beyond their own countries. The meaning of “globe” or “New World” is closer to a “region” or a “world” that powers wanted to control, or were able to control with their strength. It was more of a control over weak countries by old powers through manipulation, or cannons and gunpowder that led to an exploitative situation of transnational governance. Yet the formation of international institutions took place when experiences in both control and management accumulated. Meanwhile, powers took turns trying to dominate regions that meant the world to them. Global governance went through a continuous course of conquering colonies, and balancing among powers, meanwhile ignoring the interests of countries conquered. When global governance moved on to the second stage, contest replaced conquest; the conflicted powers kept restructuring their relations. The attributes of control and management in global governance took their extreme or higher forms. The extreme forms of contest for domination among power blocs were two world wars; the higher forms of management for coordination were the League of Nations (LON) and the United Nations (UN). Rising power as a term in international politics is relatively new. Literally, it means a country that has been developing at a fast speed for decades, has gained economic strength, and has a growing influence over the world (Zhu, 2013). Rising powers have brought dynamics to the development of global governance in terms of collective management, common problems, and international level.

This article dates back the beginning of global governance when mankind started to know the world beyond, and traces the steps that international society has taken towards the governance in globalization. The term globalization has many connotations such as international trade, global financial systems, economic integration, multiculturalism, and international organizations. Answers to when globalization started vary from the First World War called the “First Era of Globalization”<sup>1</sup> to 1989, “following the collapse of the Berlin Wall and the break-down of the Cold War system.”<sup>2</sup> But features of globaliza-

---

<sup>1</sup> <http://www.wordiq.com/definition/Globalization>.

<sup>2</sup> <http://www.lehigh.edu/~amsp/eng-11-globalization.htm>.

tion can be traced back to when they were burgeoning. From a historical point of view, colonialism, imperialism, and globalism are the three milestones of global governance; powers, superpowers, and rising powers have taken different roles in the evolution of global governance.

### **Conquest in Europeanization**

The age of conquest covers the periods of colonialism and imperialism from the mid 15<sup>th</sup> century to the mid 20<sup>th</sup> century. Stuchtey (2011) traced the “Europeanization” from the Treaty of Tordesillas in 1494, “a genuine European claim to hegemony,” for its perception of colonial possessions as a political, economic and cultural right and its proclamation of European dominance. The milestones of Europeanization are colonial world empires controlled by the Portuguese, Spanish, Dutch, British, and French, including Victorian England, France Africa, Protestantism in North America and the Catholic forces in South America. The independence of India in 1947 marked the decolonization of British Colonial Empire and the Modern World of “Anglobalization” (Ferguson, 2003), as well as the end of Europeanization.

Discovery of the new world marked the beginning of navigational and long-distance international relations other than those between neighbors and inland countries. The world circumnavigation and more accurate world maps are the main symbols of mankind’s awareness of the globe. New trade routes along with commodities, colonies, and slaves connected European powers with many other areas of the world. Discovery of the new world or the knowledge of the world that is closer to its fact brought to Europeans the question of how to contact or deal with the rest of the world. Thus, international relations started a long process towards global governance. In this process, international relations in fields of economy and culture have been expanded and deepened while barriers and misunderstanding between countries and regions being reduced. However, the bilateral contacts were neither for common problems nor for mutual benefits but for the needs of European powers. For hundreds of years, European powers dominated the trans-oceanic links, and controlled economic, political, and military contacts between continents. They established colonies in areas as far as they could go that led to the age of imperialism.

Powers in the age of conquest have many things in common: economic and technological advancement, political system of modern state, and modern armies especially with a strong navy. These powers reached different parts of the world based on their knowledge, needs, and capacity. For example, based on the technical skills for building the oceangoing sailing ships, “the Dutch, the Scandinavian, the Spanish, the Portuguese, the French and the British were extending the areas of their struggles across seas of all the world” (Wells, 1922). The Dutch reached the new world mainly for trade and mining, whereas the Spanish first claimed dominion over the new world of America. However, the early powers lost their new world without the support from the development of domestic industry and commerce. The Industrial Revolution enabled Britain and France to reach the world outside Europe with extra goods and capital through new types of transportation. As the benefits from the Industrial Revolution, technical superiority, superfluous capital, and military force based on conventional weapons are the determining factors of the powers in the conquest era. Western powers in 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries were “politically independ-

ent and unified, as well as industrially way ahead of vast swaths of the world.” Among other winning elements for western countries then were population, agriculture, food production, and coal as a new energy (Horn, 2012). They formed the foundation of European colonization in the new world, and started free-market trade of new commodities of sugar, tobacco, coffee, tea, and textile. Britain was then the most powerful and influential nation on the Earth, followed by other European powers.

Colonialism is a practice more of domination and subjugation than of management. The trade between European powers and colonies on other continents was out of the needs of European countries not those of colonial countries with a mechanism of exploitation, and was mainly the trade between natural resources of colonies and manufactured goods from European powers, and even bearing a slave trade. In addition to trade, there are two characteristics of colonialism: European settlement on the other countries’ territory and the political control of European powers over colonial countries. So-called international meetings or diplomacy among powers were held to decide on how to control colonies without participation of these countries. For example, the Berlin Conference held in 1884–85, which was initiated by the German chancellor Otto von Bismarck, made the territory adjustment in Africa among European powers under the name of ensuring free trade and navigation on the Congo and the lower reach of the Niger.<sup>3</sup> Such international conferences among powers on how to divide other sovereign territories have the form but not the essence of global governance, not to mention the representation global governance requires. One can argue that it was African rulers who gave away most of their rights to European powers in many treaties they signed but never understood the content and consequences of these treaties. In this sense, they were manipulated, and the process was not regulated by an international organization involving a third party.

Colonialism experienced different stages of transporting populations to a new territory, manipulating trade items including African slaves, and influencing colonies’ governing. There were two trends in the development of colonialism: one towards more power exercised over colonial countries by powers, and the other towards more political and economic control over more territories. The ambition of powers in conquest was conditioned by their geographical location, the relative strength of their economy and politics, and the relations among themselves. As an island state offshore of Europe, imperial Britain “had limited ability to engage continental land armies by itself.” The strategic threat that Napoleon and German leaders in the thirty-year war “posed from and to the European heartland virtually compelled the emergence of ‘balancing’ coalitions against them” (Russett, 2011). At an early stage of colonialism, European powers managed to avoid colonial overlap. Then they had to divide the spheres through competition and negotiation. For example, they divided the North American Atlantic coast “between the French possessions in modern Canada and the Spanish claims in the South” (Stuchtey, 2011). In 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Italians, Belgians and Germans raised a claim to their share of the world, the term “imperialism” “became an ideologically loaded and overall imprecise, but probably irreplaceable historiographical concept” (Koebner & Schmidt, 2010). Thus, imperialism became an unavoidable destination of co-

---

<sup>3</sup> <http://www.answers.com/topic/berlin-conference>

lonialism that the extent of conquest went deeper, and the contest started among powers and between power blocs. When the old powers occupied all possible territory available and divided up the spheres of influence in the world, newer powers like Germany, Italy, Japan, or the US had to gain power through contest with old powers to have shares in new colonies and in the spheres of influence instead of conquering the new territory. When the contests between powers or power blocs went to the extreme, wars became unavoidable. During the phase of High Imperialism between 1870 and World War I, every larger European nation state as well as the USA and Japan participated in acquiring territories outside Europe (Stuchey, 2011). Wars between European powers spread to those between new powers or initiated by new powers, such as the Spanish-American War in 1898, and Russo-Japanese War in 1904 that were fighting for influence and interests in new areas. The conquest abilities of individual powers were challenged and balanced between powers old and new, and between power blocs, in the process towards polarization in wars including two world wars and the Cold War.

In conclusion, Europeanization consists of many practices of colonial rules in which a state is controlled by an alien one (Stuchey, 2011). With violent conquest and colonial control, the overseas as well as the continental colonial empires of Europe guaranteed their economic, military and cultural exploitation, and territorial expansion, and thus established “the unequal interrelationship between colonial societies and a novel capitalism in Europe” (Cain & Hopkins, 1993). They were the adventures of powers reaching the world and dealing with other nations, and the preliminary actions on the 1<sup>st</sup> stage of global governance. Towards the end of this stage, more powers were involved in the conquest. They tried to ease the conflicts among themselves through collective meetings and agreements. However, the areas and regions in the world then were relatively isolated, and had developmental disparities and different problems between powers and countries colonized. There were no collective management practices of common problems at an international level at this stage.

### **Contest in Polarization**

Contest became the main theme during the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage in the evolution of global governance mainly due to the ambition of powers and superpowers, and the spatial limitation of the earth. Conquest and contest in late Europeanization gradually led to Polarization. Fights between two opposing forces led to the wars between the Central Powers and the Entente Powers, the Axis Powers and the Allied Powers, and the Cold War between the US and the Soviet Union. In the age of conquest, European powers showed their ambition in world dominance by winning more profits in trade, occupying more territories, and having influence on more colonies and dominance in ideology. The age of contest lasted approximately one century from late 19<sup>th</sup> century to late 20<sup>th</sup> century. During the first half of the century, there were mainly contests between powers old and new in regional wars, or between power blocs that led to two world wars. During the second half of the century, most powers declined except the US and the Soviet Union that became two superpowers; and the contests between them went on to the Cold War.

At the first quarter of this stage, “competition for world dominance was fierce” (Lamb, 2001).

Wars between Russia and Japan, America and Spain, and World War I were contests between powers on dominance of regions or other countries, and the two superpowers emerged. In Russia, Lenin's party was forging the principles of Communism in 1903, and launched Bolsheviks revolution in 1917. America joined World War I "where the strength of its economy and effectiveness of its technology were displayed to the world." And the American leader, Woodrow Wilson's "Fourteen Points" were accepted by the warring parties and became the basis for the LON (Lamb, 2001). The LON was the primary try of global governance as the first permanent intergovernmental organization in terms of the number of countries joined, its principal organs of the Assembly, the Council, and the Secretariat, and its sub-bodies on social improvement concerning health, international labor, slavery, refugees and women (Richard, 2014). The LON is an important step in the evolution of global governance for it reached the level of internationalization "in order to promote international co-operation and to achieve international peace and security." It started focusing on common problems of mankind including "fair and humane conditions of labor," "just treatment of the native inhabitants of territories," "freedom of communication and of transit," and "equitable treatment for the commerce" (The Covenant of the LON, 1924). However, it was not an inclusive international organization but the one originated from the Allies of the war with a strong inclination. Three of the world's most powerful nations were not its members: America refused to join; Germany and Russia were not allowed to join. The LON had 58 members at its greatest extent, but this number only lasted about half a year between September 1934 and February 1935. Of its 42 founding members, only 23 remained as members until it was dissolved in 1946. It was "the fact that the primary members of the League of Nations were not willing to accept the possibility of their fate being decided by other countries" (Ahmadjan, 2011). For those powerful members, their main goal was to expand their own power at the price of LON's. In terms of global governance, the weakness of the LON existed in its low level at both global representation and collective management. As a result, the LON "did not stop several of the most significant events that led to World War II." However, a few sub-bodies of LON are the precursors to the International Court of Justice, World Health Organization, and the UNESCO in the UN (Richard, 2014).

While the LON was established to end World War I, finding a resolution for World War II was the main purpose of the UN. The first step in the process of establishing the UN was the Atlantic Charter signed by Franklin Roosevelt, Winston Churchill, and other 24 governments in 1941. The UN was also a product of negotiation and balance among powers. The Soviet Union and the United State played important roles in the whole process. Started with 50 governments and some non-governmental organizations, the UN has developed into an intergovernmental organization of over 193 countries including every internationally recognized sovereign state in the world but Vatican City. Its main function is to facilitate "cooperation in international law, international security, economic development, social progress, human rights, and achievement of world peace" (IEEHTN, 2014), which covers all aspects of common problems mankind faces. The specialized institutions in the UN cover nearly all the economic and social aspects of human life with a global perspective. There are non-governmental organizations that work in the areas of global concerns, such as the International Union for the Conservation of Nature, the World Wildlife Fund, World Resources Institute. According to Lamb (2001), "these three NGOs have become

the driving force behind the rise of global governance.”

As an organ of global governance, UN's role in collective management is limited neither to its broad representation, nor to its structure of committees and sub-bodies. It is the participation of all its members in the process of decision-making. However, there have been always powers in the way to UN's function in collective management since it was established. Two superpowers replaced old powers fighting for hegemony during the Cold War. The Soviet Union aggressively spread Communism to many areas including US neighboring country Cuba and an organization in the US. As a reaction to the “Communist threat,” the US sent its troops cross the Pacific Ocean to fight the communism. The determinant factors for superpowers in the contest era are those of military strength based on nuclear weapons, technical superiority, and ideological persuasiveness. The arms race and nuclear deterrence between the two superpowers showed no differences between capitalism and communism. Their powerful positions paralleled with the fact that there were no authority or a global organization that could control or manage them. In other words, they often ignored the UN as an organ of collective management, and refused to be a cooperative member in global governance. As Lamb (2001) indicates “during the 1950s and 1960s, the UN was little more than a debating society that occasionally attempted to referee disputes among major powers.” In this sense, real global governance is possible only when the Cold War ends, or when no powers try to be above the UN.

The Cold War period was the peak of the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage when the contest for control between the two superpowers prevailed in areas of political system, ideology, military, and security. The overwhelming power of the two superpowers played down the UN and other international organizations. They were involved in world affairs with more contest and control than management. However, two positive elements to global governance occurred at this stage. First, there are more countries being involved in the process of controlling and managing global issues. For example, the LON had only 58 members at its peak, and it was mainly in the control of European great powers and the US. But the UN includes almost all countries in the world. Non-Western countries play more important roles than they were in the LON. Within the UN system, there are 17 organizations and specialized agencies that cover all aspects of management in global community. Second, near the end of this stage, some Eastern and Southern powers appeared. Different from old powers at the 1<sup>st</sup> stage, their developments are not beneficial from conquest of the weak countries. They compete but not fight against each other. Rising powers are not trying to manipulate the U.N. or other organizations, but are charted by international institutions.

The evolution of global governance since the Cold War ended has gone through a different route. As the sole superpower in the world, the US has an overall might on economy, politics, and military surpassing greatly all other countries. Fighting for world dominance has been less severe since there is not such a country like former Soviet Union competing with the US openly and aggressively. This phenomenon is theoretically supported by neorealist theory of hegemonic stability (HST). According to the HST, “the presence of a single, strongly dominant actor in international politics leads to collectively desirable outcomes for all states in international system. Conversely, the absence of a hegemon is associ-

ated with disorder in the world system and undesirable outcomes for individual states” (Snidal, 1985). The hegemonic stability has to be based on three premises. First, the hegemonic position of the sole superpower is supported by its might in all fields as US position since 1990s. Second, the hegemonic power has to be politically mature and fair. It has to be “a positive, a leader of a group of states which encourages, cooperates and sacrifices him for the common good” (Agnew, 2005). Third, all countries are willing to accept the hegemonic power as the representative of global governance or the leader of the UN. In short, the HST argues for a collective action or hegemonic cooperation in the international system under the leadership of a dominant state with international justice. However, the reality can be “an exploitive suppressive power which just cooperates with the other in order to gain” for “hegemony is the enrolment of others in the exercise of your power by convincing, cajoling, and coercing them that they should want what you want” (Agnew, 2005). Many countries question the fairness of US involvement in international affairs. Scholars are also arguing whether the US is declining or developing (Drezner, 2012). However, from the perspective of global governance, there should be a structural power determined by a network of economic, political, and cultural cooperation.

In conclusion, polarization and hegemonic stability (HS) might be necessary transitions in the evolution of global governance. But their principles are against the basic elements of global governance: collective management on common problems at international level. The LON and the UN are important milestones in dealing with global issues at international level. However, their functions in collective management have been manipulated in polarization and HS. Their members represent the interests more of their own countries than of the whole global community, which affects their fairness in facing the common problems. There are more of intergovernmental negotiations than global management. Emergence of rising powers has had impacts on the current structure of global governance. Rising powers as new players contribute more to global governance than to global dominance. Their existence balances off the elements of control and contest, and enhances the collective management in multipolarization and globalization.

### **Consent in Multipolarization and Globalization**

The age of consent started from late 20<sup>th</sup> century up to now, and will continue for a long period of time. Stuchey (2011) held that globalization “has a critical background in the world historical involvement of the non-European sphere from the Early Modern Period up and into the period of decolonization.” In the period of polarization, military superiority played a decisive role. When the Cold War ended, it was assumed that “the next century was to be the true American Century, and with the rest of the world molding itself in the image of the sole superpower” (Hiro, 2007). However, globalization is evolved neither from polarization nor from monopolization but from multipolarization. Rising powers have become the multipolar forces for their superiorities in energy, population, and development located in the continents other than Europe and North America, and their involvement and importance in globalization.

The characteristics of rising powers are different from that of old powers and superpowers. Geographically, they are not western countries but southern or eastern countries. Ideologically, they are open,



as British Deputy Prime Minister Nick Clegg said in early March 2012 that the global community is no longer divided along traditional geopolitical lines but into societies that are open and those that are closed.<sup>4</sup> Economically, they are willing to be cooperative in dealing with other nations as long as it is beneficial to mutual development. Politically, they want to have more influence on important issues worldwide through participating and strengthening coordination among countries within the framework of global governance. They appear as equal members on the international stage, holding the standpoint of anti-hegemonism while becoming major players as “energy superpower Russia” and “the rapidly-developing economies of China and India” (Klare, 2009).

The new age is featured in high technology, speedy and broad information, and energy-tight that no countries can keep the supremacy in either technology or energy for a long time, neither can they prevent other countries’ development in these areas. Research and development in many countries, more information channels including TV from non-Anglo-American angles, and energy powers that are not willing to be controlled by the superpower are all the phenomena on the way towards multipolarization. It is an age of globalization based on principles of consent, coordination, and cooperation. In this age, there are no individual countries that are able to solely dominate the world. To the opposite, we are witnessing “a multipolar world in which new powers are challenging different aspects of US supremacy” (Hiro, 2007). Politically, more countries are involved in international affairs at both regional and global levels, especially rising powers such as Russia, China, and India. They are actively participating in regional organizations or activities without US involvement or interference. They express different opinions and play important roles in decision making on regional crises or world affairs. China initiated a regional organization, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), with a focus on countering drug smuggling and terrorism. The Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) has involved 49 African countries since 2000. The themes of the FOCAC are equal consultation, better understanding, consensus, friendship, and cooperation. The FOCAC holds ministerial conference in every three years, discussing issues including new order of international political economy, China-Africa cooperation in economy and trade, pragmatic cooperation and action.<sup>5</sup> Economically, there are characteristics of rising powers that are different from those of old powers and superpowers. Rising powers are pursuing not exploitation and enforcement but mutual benefits and mutual development, especially in areas of agriculture, technology, and energy. Militarily, more countries have mastered the technology of nuclear materials, weapons, and other advanced military devices. More countries take initiatives in protecting regional security through cooperative activities of anti-nuclear proliferation and anti-terrorism. For example, the SCO did joint military exercises to show its vital role in international security. There are other regional military exercises initiated by rising powers without US participation. The determinant factors of rising powers in the consent era mainly are economic strength, technological advancement, energy access, and roles in international affairs. In the age of consent, military plays a less important role.

---

<sup>4</sup> [http://www.upi.com/Top\\_News/Special/2012/03/09/London-eyes-rising-Asian-powers/UPI-143313312818](http://www.upi.com/Top_News/Special/2012/03/09/London-eyes-rising-Asian-powers/UPI-143313312818).

<sup>5</sup> <http://www.focac.org/chn/>.

Like old powers, rising powers have their global impacts significantly on international trade, environment, and global governance. They intend to play their political and economic roles as individual states within the system of global governance. They have to face “both to US hegemony and to the changing character of international society” (Hurrell, 2006). Firstly, in addition to growing economic might, rising powers have potentials and resources to become a military and political power with a reasonable degree of internal cohesion, and certain ability to contribute to the generation of a revised international order. Secondly, each of them aspires to a more influential role in global affairs. Thirdly, relations among the emerging powers have deepened, both bilaterally and within regional and international institutions including military exercises. Despite occasional friction, they have sought to downplay points of contention to avoid the emergence of major crises. Finally, a distinction can be made between the majority of the emerging powers and other Western ‘middle powers’. Unlike Canada, Japan or many European countries, rising powers were never fully integrated into the post-1945 order. Being outside looking in has heavily conditioned their strategic interests and conceptions of national purpose. They can play different roles in the UN and other international organizations that contribute to collective management. The most appropriate behavior for rising powers in the age of globalization is to act positively in global governance by supporting the UN, and following the rules of regional and global institutions. They can play unique roles in areas of their power including market, manufactured goods, labor, or resource supply. The energy and strength of rising powers surpass those of old powers and superpowers. The network of their economic transactions and political deals is all over the world especially in developing regions of Southeast Asia, Africa, the Middle East, and Latin America, which exerts a subtle influence over other nations in models of governing, ways of developing, and areas of strategic interests.

Miles (2011) points out the anxiety of the insecure West that “the balance of global power is shifting inexorably in China’s favor.” He lists anxious books on China’s rise such as “In the Jaws of the Dragon: America’s Fate in the Coming Era of Chinese Hegemony” (Eamonn Fingleton, 2008); “When China Rules the World: The End of the Western World and the Birth of a New Global Order” (Martin Jacques, 2009); “The Beijing Consensus: How China’s Authoritarian Model Will Dominate the Twenty-First Century” (Stefan Halper, 2010). The Western worry is mainly based on the assumption of China becoming an adversary to the Western world, and playing power as Western powers did for colonialism, imperialism, and polarization. However, rising powers are born in the era of multipolarization and globalization, featuring the integration and cohesion among all the countries of the world in the fields of politics, economics, education, and culture. The world is no longer in the ages of conquest and contest but that of consent. Rising powers have brought different mentality and legacy into international relations (Lincoln, 2010; Zhu, 2012, & 2013) and global governance. Participation of rising powers has changed the composition of “American-led global institutional order” including the UN, the IMF, the World Bank, the GATT, and the WTO. “The shifting in the style, agenda, and institutional forms of global governance” are “likely to emerge,” and “two alternative forms of governance are likely to grow in importance” such as the G-8 and the G-20, and more of those regional institutions (Ikenberry, & Wright, 2008).

In conclusion, different from old powers and superpowers competing for hegemony in the regions or in the world, rising powers are the catalyst of multipolarization that speeds up the transition from polarization to globalization when there is more consent than contest, and more governance than dominance. Located in different geographical areas, rising powers are involved in more common problems not for exploitation but for mutual benefits. The concept of “international level” can be understood either quantitatively or qualitatively. Quantitatively, the international level of the UN has almost reached its peak. But qualitatively, it depends on the extent of equal participation of countries working together not for their national representation but for their roles in global governance. When they participate, influence, or play roles in decision making on world affairs, they stand not as individual governments but task forces on various common problems within the system of global governance. Therefore, the process does not connect to control but management in areas concerning the global community including environment, peace and security, science and technology, and education. The participation of rising powers and all the countries will eventually turn the UN from an intergovernmental organization to a non-governmental organization with a system of global governance.

### **Process and System of Global Governance**

Global governance is a process of managing international affairs without a world government. It is a combination of the ways and functions of international institutions managing every aspect of human life. The conceptual understanding of “global governance” is based on the conceptual distinctions between “government” and “governance,” and between “global dominance” and “global governance.” Government is defined as a “group of legislative body that controls a state,” and it “acts as medium which exercises power over the state.” Governance is “the activity of a government,” “the rules set by the personnel appointed the common public,” and “the medium through which these are done” (Vspages, 2014). In short, government is a political organ whereas governance is the combination of rules, activities, and executive organs in many areas other than politics; government is a way of control, governance is a process of management; while government is only limited to a domestic context, governance ranges from a company to an international system. Government has had different forms such as autocracy and democracy, and has its governance with more or less control on people governed. Powers and superpowers have fought for world/global dominance in their trying to control the world. However, global governance has only democratic form functioning not as a world government but as a world system of many institutions that all the countries in the world participate.

The fundamental differences between global dominance and global governance lie in the three elements of global governance: collective management, common problems, and international level. Each of them has gone a long process of evolution, yet none of them has reached its maturity. The process of global governance can be explained in the evolution of its three elements.

### **Process of Global Governance**

The evolution of the three elements of global governance has taken place in the two-dimension of expanding space and overlapping time. The former means the ever-changing concepts of the “world.”

The later means that there is no clear-cut of time for different stages. The intension here is to briefly explain how the three elements have been evolved from 15<sup>th</sup> century up to the present, and finally become the most important connotations of global governance. The time divisions of three stages are overlapping. Stage One is approximately from mid 15<sup>th</sup> century to mid 20<sup>th</sup> century; Stage Two from the end of 19<sup>th</sup> century to the end of 20<sup>th</sup> century; and Stage Three has started since the end of the last century.

### Collective Management



The chart above shows the evolution of “Collective Management” in the process of global governance. The three evolutionary stages of Collective Management are historically related to colonialism, imperialism, polarization, multipolarization, and globalization with the characteristics of conquest, contest, and consent respectively. There are two tendencies of this evolution: from manipulating by a few powers towards more countries participating, and from control towards management. Controlled by a few powers, the colonial empire world and the spheres of power blocs or superpowers do not result from collective management that implies majority and coordination. Yet, it is a transitional period in the process from isolation to intergovernmental relations that leads to non-governmental global governance.

### Common Problems



The impetus for colonialism includes “capitalist striving for profit, the colonies as valves for overpopulation, the spirit of exploration, scientific interest, and religious and ideological impulses up to Social-Darwinistic and racist motives” (Stuchtey, 2011). Although some of them can be considered the common problems of mankind, powers dealt their own problems in colonial or imperial ways. For ex-

ample, the overseas trade in common goods can be a common problem for countries involved whereas the slave trade and British control of gold and diamond mines in South Africa are the practices of commercial politics. In these practices, powers either looked at the common problems from their own perspectives, or dealt with the common problems to their favor by sacrificing other countries' interests. However, "the legend of imperial rule irretrievably lost its legitimacy when in 1956 the British and the French armies had to leave the Suez Canal Zone under pressure from the USA and the Soviet Union" (Stuchtey, 2011). The importance of problems in colonialism, imperialism and polarization is often decided within the context of military politics. In recent decades, more countries work together towards the worldly common problems including environment, food, and energy that are of the same importance to every country.

### International Level



As mentioned above, powers have tried building and controlling their worlds in chronological and spatial dimensions. "Since the 16<sup>th</sup> century, genuine European colonial powers such as Spain, Portugal, France and Britain were distinguished by developing a concept of their world rule and basing it on the legacy of Rome" (Pagden, 1998). However, the European system of great powers was challenged internally and externally: decolonization and global competition from Japan, Russia, and the U.S. Powers fought and negotiated while rebuilding and dividing the world. Rising powers are from and represent a new world. Their participation contributes to regional integration, and multilateral cooperation, and thus enhances the international level of global governance.

Due to the historical limitation, mankind has never realized the most important thing to make the world a better place is not through government but through governance. Many important figures in history urged to establish a new world order, one-world rule or one world government that controls the globe, and has the resolutions to all conflicts and wars among countries. For example, Davie Rockefeller (1991), from a financial perspective, addressed at a meeting, "the world is now more sophisticated and prepared to march towards a world-government," which is "the supranational sovereignty of an intellectual elite and world bankers." Pope John Paul II believed that "one world government is inevitable." He stressed that to bring about peace, it needs to be a new respect for international law and the creation of a "new international order" (2004). Many other politicians including Robert Kennedy, Henry Kissinger, and Richard Nixon, expressed their wish on a new world or a new world order based on their experi-

ences. However, global governance cannot be realized through a government. Its three elements are the crystallization of experiences and evolution as showed in the following model.



Global governance is a process of dealing with all human problems through collective management at the international level. As Nelson Mandela (1994) expressed, it is “the creation of a world of democracy, peace and prosperity for all.” When there are no distinctions between conquerors and conquered, powers and powerless, when the world is “free of violence and war, despotism, arbitrariness and lawlessness” (Stuchtey, 2011), and when every country works for other countries as well as for itself, global governance is forming and functioning. Global governance is also an efficient and beneficent world system that consists of many institutions covering every aspect of human life. No individual countries can control these institutions. With the rise of state and regional economies and their consent to the system, it is free of polar rivalry within global governance. Various tasks covering every aspect of human life are assigned to world members who coordinate and take the executive responsibilities. As a process, it continuously evolves towards a good service for the global community. As a system, it covers every aspect of human life for all countries.

### **System of Global Governance**

Global governance is not a term of conventional international relations, neither “an analytical concept” although it “provides a specific perspective on world politics” (Dingwerth & Pattberg, 2006). Global governance is not to control but to manage the globe. Managing the world covers every corner of the world and every aspect of human life, and there is no single government that can control or manage the world. Global governance treats every country equal, and focuses on important aspects of human life including: environmental, executive, economic, humane, and educational dimensions.



Executive: The international level of global governance is highly relevant to the wide range of common problems it confronts. The executive sector of global governance provides top-quality leadership and good management to institutions and international affairs including peace, security, and conflict resolu-

tion. The quality of this sector is not intergovernmental but non-governmental. The main task of this sector is to ensure the effective cohesion and coordination among local, national, regional and global levels. Personals in this sector represent not their nationalities but the tasks that they are best qualified. Among the qualifications for working in this sector, stateless, objectivity, and fairness are necessary ones.

**Environmental:** Environment is the biosphere of life in the world. Among various tasks in global governance, “environment management is the most wanting in urgent answers to the crisis in the form of collective actions by the whole of the human community” (Pelayo, 2008). This sector deals with environmental issues including climate change, ocean and air pollution, nuclear risks, and reduction and extinction of resources and biodiversity. This sector collects all the experts from the world who have the scientific knowledge, practical experiences, and skills of operating advanced equipment in the field to find resolutions to environmental issues and crisis.

**Economic:** This sector covers economic development and research, international trading, and unified and stable monetary system providing universal standards, overall planning, and coordination on projects worldwide. Economic development and research are led by experts from all over the world to focus on common problems in world economy and the frontier of science and technology. An international trading system serves “the needs of people in both North and South” (George, 2007). The goal of the monetary system is to keep the relative and absolute values of currencies fair and stable, and not to be affected by the domestic factors of individual countries. It concerns the opportunity and fair share of every country or region in development and research.

**Educational:** This sector is to maintain and improve mankind’s knowledge and capabilities for human self-sufficiency as well as good conditions for the life on the earth. Education in global governance is based on a well-balanced developmental need that interwoven domestic and foreign challenges of every country. The plan for cultivating various talents including global elites and utilizing professors and technicians focuses on its efficiency and effectiveness, and puts no limits on national boundaries. Thus the most needed knowledge and skills concerning every state including foreign languages are critical to educational equality in global governance.

**Humane:** This sector is to satisfy the physical and spiritual needs of human being. A health system on a global scale ensures illness to be taken good care of by the best doctors in a reachable distance. Resources in medicine are evenly distributed that nowhere in the world is under the condition of lacking the necessary medical equipment. Nations and peoples have opportunities to promote their traditions, values, and other cultural heritages as well as to absorb the favorable elements of other cultures. Individuals have more opportunities to meet the people with similar spiritual tendencies other than those of the same race from the same country. Spiritual exchange becomes transnational and without hindrance.

There can be more or less than five sectors in the system of global governance. They work as “indi-

vidual agencies focused on specific problems” (NIC, & EUISS, 2010), but function at a global scale. They share the tasks of global governance, as well as the same mission of solving common problems not for a better country but for a better world. Meanwhile, global governance is gradually detached from individual governments.

## Conclusion

Global governance is a process of evolution from Europeanization, Polarization, through Multipolarization to Globalization, accompanied with the change of the principles from conquest, contest, to consent. It is a system of five sectors with three elements. The fundamental functions of executive, environmental, economic, educational and humane sectors depend on their collective management for common problems at the international level. The significance of the LON and the UN in the evolution of global governance can be summarized as the follows: 1) enhancing global representation and international level; 2) more organs working on common problems not of certain countries but of mankind; and 3) from intergovernmental negotiation and balance towards collective management.

It took centuries for countries to understand how to deal with others and how to work together in terms of collective management. Governance controlled by European powers was not really global but regional. When powers tried to control others or the world, wars, “hot” or “clod”, became unavoidable. Neither old powers nor superpowers understood the fundamental principle of global governance: management by all countries at the global level. In the age of globalization, nearly all members in the global community are involved in political, economic, and cultural interactions and exchanges in positive-positive or win-win patterns. Rising powers’ involvement as equal members of the global society strengthens global governance through cooperation and coordination. The process of global governance can be smoother if rising powers do not follow the patterns of old powers and superpowers that fought for the interests of own states and the power for controlling the world. Thus the trend of the process is towards the right direction from more control by fewer countries to more management by more countries.

The focus of global governance has evolved from territory, military dominance, economic exploitation, and political influence in means of conquest and contest to those areas more involving everyday life such as human rights and environment in means of compliance and cooperation. Global governance will reach its maturity when there are no powers over any states but coordinators taking responsibilities. Global Governance without a government means managing the international affairs without powers. The non-governmental yet international characteristic of global governance distinguishes itself from colonialism, imperialism, and polarization in contrast of governance or dominance, management or control, and common interests or self-interests. In her *New Perspective on International Relations*, Zhu (2013) proposed the concept of “country-oriented” which means that a democratic international society should be “of the country, by the country, and for the country.” By “country”, it means “the most majority of countries in the world.” Global governance is a “country-oriented” management for the wellbeing of



mankind.

## References

- Agnew, J. (2005). *Hegemony: The new shape of global power*, Temple University Press.
- Ahmadjan (2011). Weaknesses and failure of the league of the nations. *Study Mode.com*. Retrieved 03, 2011, from <http://www.studymode.com/essays/Weaknesses-And-Failure-Of-The-League-622835.html>.
- Cain, P. J., & Hopkins, A. G. (1993). *British imperialism: Innovation and expansion 1688–1914*. London: Longman.
- Dingwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global governance as a Perspective on World politics, *Global Governance* vol.12 (2006), 185–203.
- Drezner, D.W. (2012). Predictions about the death of American hegemony may have been greatly exaggerated, *Foreign Policy*. From [http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/category/wordpress\\_tag/hegemonic\\_stability\\_theory](http://drezner.foreignpolicy.com/category/wordpress_tag/hegemonic_stability_theory).
- Ferguson, N. (2004). *Empire: How Britain made the modern world*. Penguin Group (CA).
- Forum on China-Africa Cooperation (FOCAC) <http://www.focac.org/chn/>.
- George, S. (2007). Alternative finances, *Le Mande Diplomatique*, Jan. 15, 2007. From [www.resilience.org/stories/2007-01-15/alternative-finances](http://www.resilience.org/stories/2007-01-15/alternative-finances).
- Gorbachev, M. (2011). Pushing new world order, world government. From <http://thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/9626-gorbachev-pushing-new-world-order-world-government>.
- Hiro, D. (2007). Rising powers have the US in their sights, *Asia Times* (online). From [http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle\\_East/IH22Ak01.html](http://www.atimes.com/atimes/Middle_East/IH22Ak01.html).
- Horn, H. (2012). Beating history: Why today’s rising powers can’t copy the West, *The Atlantic* Feb 15, 2012. From <http://www.theatlantic.com/international/archive/2012/02/beating-history-why-todays-rising-powers-cant-copythe-west/253144/>.
- Hurrell, A. (2006). Hegemony, liberalism and global order: what space for would-be great powers? *International Affairs* 82,1. (2006) 1–19.
- IEEEHTN (2014). UN Offices, Model UN’s & Human Rights Organizations. From [ieechn.org](http://ieechn.org).
- Ikenberry, G. J., & Wright, T. (2008). *Rising powers and global institutions*. The Century Foundation, Inc.
- Klare, M.T. (2009). *Rising powers, shrinking planet: The new geopolitics of energy*, Holt Paperbacks.
- Koebner, R., & Schmidt, H. D. (2010). *Imperialism: The story and significance of a political word, 1840–1960*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lamb, H. (2001). Global governance, from [http://www.apfn.org/apfn/global\\_governance.htm](http://www.apfn.org/apfn/global_governance.htm).
- League of Nations (1924). *The Covenant of the League of Nations*. From [http://Avalon.law.yale.edu/20th\\_century/leagcov.asp](http://Avalon.law.yale.edu/20th_century/leagcov.asp).
- Lincoln, P.Z. (2010). China model and its implications, *NUCB Journal of Commerce and Business*, Vol. 54, No.2.
- Mandela, N. (1994). Nelson Mandela on the New World Order, in *The Philadelphia Inquirer* (October 1994).

- Miles, J. (2011). Rising power, anxious state, *The Economist*, June 23, 2011.
- Pagden, A. (1998). *Lords of all the world: Ideologies of empire in Spain, Britain and France C.1500–C.1800*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pelayo, . (ed.) (2008) . Environmental governance and managing the earth. From [www.world-governance.org/spip.php?article380](http://www.world-governance.org/spip.php?article380).
- Pope John Paul II. (2004). Pope calls for a new world order. CNN News, Jan.1, 2004.
- Riazati, S. (2006). A closer look: Professor seeks stronger U.N., *The Daily Bruin*, Oct.18, 2006.
- Richard, K. S. (2014). The League of Nations: From 1920 to 1946 the League of Nations attempted to maintain global peace. From [geography.about.com/...hy/a/The-League-Of-Nations.htm](http://geography.about.com/...hy/a/The-League-Of-Nations.htm).
- Rockefeller, D. (1991). An address to a Trilateral Commission meeting in June of 1991. From [whale.to/b/rockefeller\\_q.html](http://whale.to/b/rockefeller_q.html).
- Russett, B. (2011). *Hegemony and democracy*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Snidal, D. (1985). The limits of hegemonic stability theory, *International Organization*, Vol.39, No.4. The MIT Press.
- Stuchey, B. (2011). Colonialism and Imperialism, 1450–1950. From [ieg-ego.eu](http://ieg-ego.eu).
- Thakur, R., & Weiss, T. (2006). *The UN and global governance: An idea and its prospects*. Indiana University Press.
- U.S. National Intelligence Council (NIC) & E.U.'s Institute for Security Studies (EUISS). (2010). *Global governance 2025: At a critical juncture*. U.S. NIC 2010–08, September, 2010.
- VSPAGES (2014). Government vs. governance. From [vspages.com/government-Vs-governance-2-18441/](http://vspages.com/government-Vs-governance-2-18441/).
- Wells, H.G. (1922). *A short history of the world*, New York: McMillan.
- Zhu, P. (2012). Where U.S. and China soft powers meet, *Journal of US-China Public Administration*, Vol.9, No.2.
- (2013). *New perspectives on international relations*, Taipei: Elephant White Cultural Enterprise Co. Ltd.