The 12th East Asian Seminar on UN Studies(20-21December 2012, Beijing)

Rethinking UN's Roles in Global Governance

Fang Lexian [1]

(School of International Studies, Renmin University of China)

Abstract: Currently the global governance is a very hot topic under the circumstances of deepening trend of globalization. With the looming large of a series of global issues, such as climate change, energy security , terrorism, cross-border crimes, infections diseases spreading, poverty and global economic and financial crisis, both the urgency and complexity of global governance are increasingly noticed by the international community. This paper mainly focuses on the discussion about the UN's role in the current global governance. First, I will briefly summarize the urgent needs for global governance at current situation; Secondly, I will discuss two major arguments about UN's roles in global governance by two theories(Realism and Liberalism); Thirdly, I will discuss UN' s progresses and limits in two major areas of the current global governance-----international security and development. In the conclusion, I will briefly discuss the possibility for the UN to play key roles in global governance.

I. Why Global Governance Really Matters Now?

About 35 years ago, Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, two famous contemporary IR scholars, clearly argued that "We live in an era of interdependence". At that time, they used the term "interdependence" to express a widespread feeling that the very nature of world politics is changing-----the power of nations has become elusive.[2] If we say interdependence was a very popular term in late 1970s, then we can strongly argue that globalization has become a similar widespread term which is used to describe today's much more complex and closely linked world since 1990s. Currently, the term 'globalization' has almost come into all the social sciences discussions, especially eminent in IR literature. Almost simultaneously, the so-called global governance is becoming more and more popular in IR Study. This phenomena is not accidental, it has profound reasons.

First, The increasing intensity and extent of global interactions brings with it a variety of challenges for governance. [3] It's quite obvious that frequent and intensive interactions among sorts of international actors(such as states, international organizations, and multinational corporations)have grown since cold war ended, and accordingly the need for institutionalized cooperation has greatly increased. As we know, in the current international system, states are still primary actors, but the non-state actors are becoming more important than ever before. For example, international organizations such as UN could have more chances to help or facilitate states to cooperate in the pursuit of shared goals and manage competition and rivalry

---

[1] Fang Lexian, Professor in International Relations, School of International Studies, Renmin University of China, Bejing, 100872. E-mail: lxfang@ruc.edu.cn.

[2] Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company(Inc.), 1977. P.1.

[3] Cary Coglianese, Globalization and the Design of International Institutions, in Joseph S. Nye Jr. and John D. Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World,,* Brookings Institution Press, 2000. *pp.*297-318.

in order to avoid conflict and violence.[4] The end of cold war made it possible for the UN and its affiliated agencies to act more actively than ever before, which opened windows of opportunities for a more active and more effective international governance. Besides, the frequency and intensity of interaction among these international actors impressed the international community, especially those liberal scholars(such as Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye) in IR theory. When they talked about the links between globalization and global governance, they even introduced the so-called globalism, by which they stress the plural linkages and global linkages networks of the current world. It is the globalization or globalism that impacts the process of governance, and vice versa.

Secondly, a series of global issues are looming large under the circumstances of deepening globalization, which means that the scopes of governance go beyond traditional state level and regional level. Globalization increases the demands for international action.Therefore, global governance is in need accordingly. As for the definition of global governance, it's really a very difficult task. As a scholar argues,"Global governance is an increasingly over-used and invariably under-specified concept.When used in popular discourse it is not an easily acquired concept."[5] Here I just quote one : "Global governance is generally believed to encompass different systems of rule on different levels of human activity as an organising principle beyond hierarchical steering and the sovereign authority of states."[6] In this sense, it is frequently argued that global governance is an analytical framework to capture systems of rule beyond the state and more traditional forms of international politics.This concept includes (1) non-state actors, (2) analyses multiple spatial and functional levels of politics, (3) is concerned with new mechanisms of producing and maintaining global public goods, and (4)highlights the establishment of new spheres of authority beyond the nation-state[7].

To large extent, It is the current deepening globalization that really put forward the urgency of global governance. The current globalization is featured by the widespread extension of real global linkages and networks, accompanying with faster speed, higher intensity and stronger impact, and penetrating into most aspects of social life. Especially with the development of economic and political globalization, a series of global issues are looming large, such as proliferation of mass destruction weapons, environment degradation and climate change, economic and financial crisis, hunger and poverty, cross-bordering crimes and terrorism, infectious diseases control, etc, which all above means that it's more and more important to carry on the global governance. In this increasingly globalized or highly interconnected world, those global challenges could not be solved by any nation-state alone, more collective and collaborative actions are wanting, which means that the international community

---

[4] Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010. p.1.

[5] R Higgott, "Multilalteralism and the Limits of Global Governance", CSGR Working Paper No. 134/04, Centre for the Study of Globalization and Regionalisation (CSGR), University of Warwick, UK, May 2004.

[6]. Philipp Pattberg,What Role for Private Rule-Making in Global Environmental Governance? Analysing the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)，*International Environmental Agreements*,Vol.5,p.177,2005.

[7] Ibid, pp. 176-178.

needs to get better at building appropriate governance. In this sense, globalization promotes the debate of how the world affairs should be governed with completely new urgency. [8] in other word, it is the quickening globalization that makes these global issues and multilateral cooperation loom large. This is the major motivation and also the major background of current global governance.

Thirdly, with the development of globalization and the increasing demands on multilateral cooperation, the power and authority of nation states have experienced dramatic reformation, and governance is becoming a more complex and more multilateral process. Under this circumstances, nation states have to come to the negotiation table and consult with public or private, domestic or external organizations so as to realize their preferred domestic political goals, carry on essential policy lines and deal with internal crisis. [9] In this sense, It is argued that nation states could play as a kind of strategic role, not necessarily as a dominant role in this new concept of governance. Thus, as a useful analytical tool, global governance could be used to analyse the core issues of political and economic life under the conditions of globalization. This idea refused the traditional state-centric conception, and began to focus on the political implications of global, regional or transnational system or authoritative organizations which decide and implement authoritative regulations for the whole human community. It is this redistribution of authority and the governance that provides the UN------the real global international organization with wider spaces or opportunities to play roles in the world.This naturally puts up the question of UN's actual roles in the global governance.

II. UN and the Global Governance-----Two Theoretical Explanations

It is often argued that there are two predominant views of international organizations: The first is a cynical view that emphasizes the dramatic rhetoric and seeming inability to deal with vital problems that are said to characterize international organizations and the United Nations in particular. According to this view, mirrored in some realist formulations, international organizations should be treated as insignificant actors on the international stage. The other view is an idealistic one. Those who hold this view envisage global solutions to the major problems facing the world today, without recognition of the constraints imposed by state sovereignty. Most of the calls for world government are products of this view. [10]

As the real global international organization, UN is prominent among the current key global governance arrangements. Although UN is the most important machinery for peace and development since the Second World War ended, and although it has played more and more active roles in the world, it still seems disappointing to the international community. In other word, the value of the UN system has been in doubt, especially when its actions or policies produce no effective results in some cases.

---

[8] Similar discussion see 'Introduction ' in David Held and Antony McGrew eds., *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, 2002.

[9] Similar analysis see H. and L. Lunde, Dinosaurs or Dynamos? The United Nations and the World Bank at the Turn of the Century, London: Earthscan, 1999.

[10] Paul F. DiehlPaul F. Diehl eds., *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent WorldThe Politics of Global Governance*(3rd editon), Boulder：Lynne Rienner Publishers，2005, p.3.

Quite similarly, as for UN's role in global governance, on one hand, UN is hoped to play key roles; on the other hand, UN is regarded as ineffective.Thus, it is argued that UN's real capability is not enough to meet the need of dealing with pressing challenges. Admitting the futility of individual states to resolve the transnational issues on its own, the proponents of global governance call for a broadened participation of actors in regulating and managing global issues and problems.[11] These contrasts indicate two different understandings which could be explained by two major theories in IR: Realism and Liberalism.

In general, Realism is based on a view of the individual as primarily selfish and power-seeking. Individuals are organized in states, each of which acts in a unitary way in pursuit of its own national interest, defined in power. These states exist in an anarchic international system in which they can only rely on themselves(ie. self-help). In other words, the essential assumptions of realism include: First, the state is the principal actor in international system; Second, the state is assumed to be a unitary actor; Third, the state is assumed as unitary and rational actor; Fourth, Security issues are the major concern for the state. [12]

The above all assumptions make the realists take skeptical views about international organization and global governance. Realists tend to emphasize the weaknesses of international organizations and point to their failures, they even can not put much faith in the UN, the current real global inter-governmental organization in the world. They can strongly argue that the UN Security Council proved impotent in addressing the conflict between the United States and the Soviet Union during the cold war era when balance of power and deterrence prove more effective than the collective approaches of the UN system. Realists doubt that collective action is possible and refuse to rely on the collectivity for protection of individual national interests.[13] Therefore, when realists talk about global governance, they take similar skeptical attitudes. Realists argue that governance at supranational level are still determined by policies and interests of the most powerful states. In principle, International institutions(such as UN) lack of independent power, they could only act as the instrument for promoting the interests of the most influential states' or their coalition. Even in the era of globalization, the so-called global governance could not deny the fact that the power disparity among states is growing, the current liberal world order is the product of American hegemony and geopolitics.[14] Thus, Robert Gilpin strongly criticizes the concept of global governance from his realist perspective, stressing the actors of global governance do not possess the capability to implement its decisions, and nation-state is the sole entity possessing this kind of capability in the current world. Gilpin believes that global governance is more than a pure rhetoric than an illusion of utopian. [15]

---

[11] Lai-Ha Chan, Pak K. Lee and Gerald Chan, Rethinking global governance: a China model in the making? *Contemporary Politic*s, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 2008, p.4.

[12] Karen Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, New York: W.W. Norton&Company, 1999. pp. 70-79.

[13] Ibid, pp.252-253.

[14] See 'introduction' in David Held and Antony McGrew eds., *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, 2002.

[15] Robert Gilpin, *Global Political Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

In contrast, liberalism holds that human nature is basically good and that innate goodness makes societal progress possible. From the idealism in 1920-1930s to new liberal institutionalism since early1970s, the major assumptions of liberalism school are briefly summed up as follow: first, the actors in the international system include not only states, but also international organizations and non-governmental groups; Second, human nature is basically good and individuals can cooperate; Thirdly, state is not autonomous actor and has many interests; Fourth, the international system is anarchic, there is interdependence among actors, and international society is possible.[16] This vision is also manifest in its understanding of UN and global governance.

According to liberalism, International organization could play important roles in international relations and global governance. Especially the Inter-governmental organizations(IGOs), such as UN, are assumed to be able to play key roles in the current international system and global governance. In the international system, IGOs contribute to habits of cooperation; through IGOs states become socialized to regular interactions. Such regular interactions occur between states in the United Nations; IGOs can establish regularized processes of information gathering, analysis, and surveillance(IAEA); they can develop procedures to make rules and settle disputes(WTO); Some (WHO)can conduct operational activities that help to resolve major substantive international problems,such as the transmission of communicable disease; they can serve as arenas for bargaining and negotiating and facilitate the formation of transgovernmental and transnational networks composed of subnational and nongovernmental actors. Most importantly, IGOs often spearhead the creation and maintenance of international rules and principles, which generally are known as international regimes. [17] The international regimes or international institutions form the core concept of the liberal institutionalism which are typically represented by Robert keohane among the liberalists.

Admitting nation-states are still important actors, liberal institutionalists believe that international regimes or institutions are becoming powerful enough to stand up to the challenges from globalized world economy, they claim that international institutions are very important in parts of supranational governance. It will setback the realization of domestic goals without those international institutions. As Robert Keohane argued, International institutions strengthen the governments rather than limit them. Most importantly, they could cushion the impacts of power politics and promote all kinds of multilateral politics, transgovernmental politics and transnational politics. Acting as relatively independent institutions, they could reconcile the contradictions between the hierarchical structure of states and global public policies.[18] In other words, liberalism, especially liberal institutionalism strongly argues that global governance is not only necessary but also possible on the basis of discussing the demands and supplies of international institutions(or regimes).

In this sense, as a typical international institution, UN is assumed to be able to

---

[16] Karen Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, New York: W.W. Norton&Company, 1999. pp. 66-70.

[17] Karen Mingst, *Essentials of International Relations*, New York: W.W. Norton&Company, 1999.p.241.

[18] See 'introduction' in David Held and Antony McGrew eds., *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, 2002.

act actively and effectively in the global governance. According to liberal institutionalists, UN brings together governments that support the fundamental goals of peace, security and prosperity; Meanwhile, they recognize that in an interdependent world governments can accomplish this only through interstate coordination and cooperation. Governments often find that by themselves they can not achieve their objectives, since doing so depends upon exerting authority over actions within other states' jurisdictions. [19] It is argued that UN as a transnational organization often represents a common good that transcends the sum of individual state interests. More than simply a forum to facilitate interstate negotiation on issues of mutual concern, the UN system is also a complex network of specialized agencies, NGOs, and affiliated semi autonomous organizations that serve in a wide range of areas.[20] Thus, UN is characterized by intergovernmentalism and transnationalism, which to large extent corresponds to the major arguments of realism and liberalism respectively.

From the above all theoretical interpretation, The core nature of UN is characterized by intergovenmentalism. Meanwhile, with the globalization shaping the functions of international system and especially the emerging of non-state actors, UN is also featured by transnationalism. Accordingly, UN's role should not be purely assessed by realism or liberalism. As some scholars argue that, "An understanding of international organizations and global governance probably requires that neither view be accepted in its entirety, nor be wholly rejected. International organizations are neither irrelevant nor omnipotent in global politics. They play important roles in international relations, but their influence varies according to the issue area and situation confronted."[21] Thus, It's necessary to explore what the UN has done as well as what the UN has not fulfilled in the current global governance.

III. UN's Major Practices ----- the Gap between Expectation and Action Capability

In the previous section, we give a brief theoretical explanations to Global governance and UN's role in realism and liberalism. Then in this part, I would briefly summarize the UN's major practices in the current global governance areas, especially with cases to show that there is still an obvious gap between expectations and action capability of the UN in the global governance.

Generally speaking, as the most important multilateral institution, the UN has achieved a lot in major areas of current global governance, such as international security and development.

First, as for maintaining international peace and security, this is the the UN's central mandate and goal. Since it was created from the ashes of World War II and resurrected the cause of securing peace on the basis of the League of Nations failure, the UN has played constructive roles and made important contributions to international security. The UN Charter's preamble clearly declares that ," We the

---

[19] Bruce Cronin, The Two Faces of the United Nations: The Tension Between Intergovernmentalism and Transnationalism. Global Governance 8(2002), pp.53-71

[20] Ibid, p.56.

[21] Paul F. DiehlPaul F. Diehl eds., *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent WorldThe Politics of Global Governance*(3rd edition), Boulder：Lynne Rienner，2005. p. 3.

peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind." This high goal has expressed the international community's sincere idea of an umbrella world organization to oversee world peace and cooperation, which represents the human dream of a world governed by reason and rule of law instead of using forces. Just as some scholars argue, "Since 1945, the UN has spawned a corpus of law designed to stigmatize aggression and create a robust norm against it.Over the decades, the norm of using peaceful rather than forceful means to resolve conflicts has become firmly entrenched."[22] In this sense, UN's creation has produced a very crucial(though to much extent symbolic) step in taming the use of force as a means of settling disputes among different states in the world. In practice, Unarmed UN military observers and lightly armed peacekeepers has made a difference since their first deployment in late 1940s and mid 1950s respectively. Both continue to maintain peace in conflict-ridden parts of the globe where neutral and impartial armed forces are required. The UN continue to carry on peace operations-----from monitoring elections to humanitarian actions. For example, more than two-thirds of UN member states have contributed personnels to UN peacekeeping operations since mid 1950s,. In 2008, approximately 120,000 peacekeepers(soldiers, police officers and civilian personnels)from 118 countries were deployed in eighteen missions around the world. The UN thus has considerable experience with peacekeeping.[23] All of such actions could be regarded as elements of global governance even though their effects are often controversial.

However, these important contributions of UN could not meed the needs and expectations of the international community in global governance debates. Although the UN Charter set a very pretty goals and principles, its version of collective security has not been realized. Most importantly, the UN Charter outlawed war, but the war and conflict have never completely ended in the past decades. To disappointment of the international community, numerous interstate and internal armed conflicts are persistent reality of the world both in the cold war and after the cold war era. In other word, UN Charter provisions that outlawed the use of force is breached as frequently as it is respected in the eyes of critics or cynics of the UN. The Current UN mechanism could not ensure the end of war from humans life. For example, Before the 2003 around, United Nations had been almost sidelined in Iraq and Afghanistan.It is this gap between high expectations and action capability that really provoked heated debate about the roles of UN in global peace and security governance.

Second, besides the primary mandate of maintaining international peace and security, the UN's another major practice is economic and social development(even during the cold war). Compared with the League of Nations Covenant, the UN Charter focuses more on social and economic issues. UN 's practices in these domains are linked to global economic governance and also more successful than in security areas. Article 55 of UN Charter specified the importance of promoting the conditions

---

[22] Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010. P.63.
[23] Ibid, pp.58-59, p.67.

of economic and social progress and development and the commitment to achieve full employment. UN's efforts in the arena of trade, aid and finance have predominantly taken the form of international contributions to thinking about national development.

One of its main contributions to enhanced global governance consists of goal setting(such as the UN Millennium Development Goals) in development. Substantial progress has been made over the UN lifetime toward meeting objectives in education, health, nutrition and population. In all these areas, advances have been registered in every region and in most countries. For example, Long-term planning and forecasting key issues for economic and social development became key elements of UN First Development Decade. By the late 1990s, the World Bank and IMF had also committed to the broader notion of development that member states agreed on the Millennium Summit in 2000 when the gathered heads of state and government endorsed the elimination of poverty and promotion of sustainable development as the UN's highest priority. The Millennium Development Goals(MDGs) consist of specific goals and associated targets and indicators that guide the UN's development efforts, which is regarded as a milestone and has been commonly accepted throughout the UN system as a framework for guiding development policies and assessing progress toward poverty reduction and sustainable human development.[24] With the UN's promotion and the international community's efforts, the implementation of MDGs has truely made big progress, such as obvious reduction of poor population, improvement of universal education in developing countries, extraordinary progress in control of infectious diseases spreading around the world,etc.

Similarly, UN's efforts in promoting economic and social development also have limitations. The difficult implementation of Millennium Development Goals is a case in point. There are still large amount of population in poverty, the persisting poverty and widening inequality means that it has a long way to go to end the poverty and hunger in the world;The situation of control infectious diseases and improving universal education in developing countries are still arduous. The political wills for carrying on the MDGs are not strong enough, which is the biggest obstacle to attain the Goals. Very importantly, some countries have not shown enough and effective measures to keep their promises. Especially some developed countries have not fully kept their promises to developing countries in development aid, which directly has affected the assistance to the most under-developed countries. In short, lack of strong political wills, lack of powerful leadership and enough fund form the obstacles to the complete attainment. This reversely shows the capability of UN itself is not enough in carrying on these governance issues because UN itself rely on the member states ' resources and instruments.

Besides the above issue-areas, UN has been actively promoting the global governance in climate change in the past twenty years. Global climate change has been one of the most disputed scientific concepts of our times over the last two decades. But now the human beings are really witnessing the reality of climate change around almost every corner of the globe. Thus, it's impossible to ignore the fact that climate warming is happening and climate change is truly a looming threat that

---

[24] Ibid, pp.159-162.

requires urgent action to reverse or at least slow down human-induced environmental damage. With the enormous change of environment and growing awareness of the earth's carrying capability, the urgent task of slowing climate change is currently one of the most pressing issues on the international agenda. The UN has played important roles in bringing about consensus about global warming. [25]

Dealing seriously with climate change in the current global governance has been one of the most important priorities for the UN. Since early 1970s, the UN conferences began to devote to parsing the environment and climate change(for example, in Stockholm in 1972 and in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, in Bali in 2007, in Copenhagen in 2009). In 1988, the General Assembly adopted a resolution endorsing the establishment of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change(IPCC) and asked IPCC for a comprehensive review of and recommendations about the science of climate, climate change and possible response strategies. From 1990 to 2007, IPCC adopted four successive assessment reports on climate change, which not only concluded emissions and social economic activities impacts on climate change with strong and scientific evidence, but also concluded that adaptation and mitigation are necessary and urgent for dealing with the challenges of climate change. These work of IPCC filled both the knowledge gap and policy-choices gap of humans in climate change, which were of great importance for the global governance in this fundamental and pressing issue. Meanwhile, a series of protocols or conventions and declarations on climate change have been adopted or issued, parts of which are legally binding agreements. From Montreal Protocol (signed in 1987, in force since 1989)to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change(adopted in May 1992), and then Kyoto Protocol, the UN and its concerned agencies has made tremendous efforts to attain some kind of groundbreaking and fundamental international agreements, which form the basis for the states negotiations and actions on climate change. All of such efforts strongly show that with UN's painstaking promotion, the international community has been keeping persistent efforts to stand up to the arduous challenge----even though these efforts are often frustrated by fierce quarrels among states.

Just as in other issue areas, UN's role in dealing with climate change is also seriously limited. Although there is already a consensus on the looming threat of global climate change, and the so-called "common but differentiated responsibility" principle was put forward in the concerned protocols or conventions, Some developed countries and developing countries still couldn't come to an acceptable understanding on this principle. In other words, they are still staring at each other and blaming each other. In other word, they could not make compromise on defining their respective responsibility in this challenge. This reversely affects the UN's efforts to promote this cause. Without the member states' working together and political willingness or voluntary efforts, the UN could not further make break-through progress in climate change governance in terms of global sense. By the way, with the rise of NGO and global civil society, the UN's efforts in climate change governance are also challenged

---

[25] Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010. pp.227-258.

by those concerned NGOs or transnational networks,[26] which means the UN's action could also be chanllenged by such NGOs, and in fact, it's very easy to see this phenomenon in environment and climate change issues.This again shows the gap between expectation and action capability of UN in the global governance. Therefore, in my opinion, this concept used by professor Christopher Hill who tried to describe the EU's external action limitations in early 1990s, [27] to some extent, is also appropriate for understanding the UN's role in current global governance. UN's action capability far legs behind the expectations of international community in many cases.

IV. Conclusion

we can notice that the current profound development of globalization is strongly exerting impact on domestic governance. Humans are faced with many challenges that are beyond the capacities of states, which means we should realize that states and state-centric institutions do not have the capacity to adequately address all the challenges of an increasingly globalized world. [28] In this sense, the state-centric concept on world politics is not enough for understanding the complexity of global politics in post -cold war era, and even not enough for understanding how our world is actually governed. It is increasingly argued that nation-state is not the major or even fundamental institution in global politics, but rather co-exist and co-function with other actors which include international organizations, transnational civil society institutions, such as NGOs, and all kinds of transnational pressure groups. Under these circumstances, It is essential to develop a set of maturing global governance institutions,(including UN and its core agencies) to co-ordinate and regulate those transnational and global behaviours. [29]

Therefore, We need to acknowledge that UN could play key roles in many areas of global governance. In the current network of global governance, which is composed of states, international institutions, transnational networks or organizations, the UN, as the sole real global international organization, has played and will play increasingly important roles which mainly focus on promoting, coordinating or intervening the common issues of human being-----even if it is often controversial in some issue areas(such as human rights debate and associated humanitarian intervention).

Meanwhile, we should also be clear in mind that nation state is not out of date in. the current global governance, and even play major roles. It is natural to see that nation-states try to safeguard sovereignty in this globalized world, although they are reluctantly acknowledging other actors' challenges to them. As for global governance, nation states are still major actors and working together with all kinds of transnational

---

[26] Barbara Gemmill and Aibmbola Bamidele-Izu, "The Role of NGOs and Civil Societyin Global Environmental Governance", in Daniel C. Esty and Maria H. Ivanova eds., *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*, Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, 2002.

[27] Chiristopher Hill, "The Capability-Expectation gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, March, 1993. pp. 305-328.

[28] Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010. p.33.

[29] See Anthony McGrew, 'Liberal Internationalism: Between Realism and Cosmopolitanism', in David Held and Antony McGrew eds., *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, 2002.

actors which include UN. More obviously, as some scholars argue, with the shifting of global order, the global governance fabric set-up in the post-1945 era, is now seriously frayed. The Bretton Woods and UN institutions face fundamental crises of efficiency. Thus, the current international governance architecture is in the midst of substantial change. Rising states are engaging with the established powers. Countries that have remained on the margins of the global governance system for so long are now asking for a place at the table.[30] Therefore, UN will be faced with more arduous pressures or challenges. We can say that the explanations of realism on the UN's role in global governance are at least partly reasonable. In other word, we stress that UN could play more active roles in global governance, but we should not keep too higher expectations from the UN as long as the nation-states are the major actors and keep pursuing the maximized national interests in the world politics.

When we talk about this aspect, we still need to remember the basic principles on which the UN was founded: First, the UN is based on the notion of the sovereign equality of member states; Second is the principle that only international problems are within the jurisdiction of the UN; Thirdly, the UN is designed primarily to maintain international peace and security, consistent with the Grotian tradition.[31] As for the question of "who governs" in the global governance debate, it is argued that post-1945 international governance awarded national governments a dominant role when compared to non-governmental actors, whether private corporations or non-governmental organizations. [32] Thus, We still could not deny the primacy of national governments in the system of global governance institutions.

The striking reality of the current global governance is that there is no central authority. However, Since the UN also represents a structure of authority that rests on institutionalized practices and generally accepted norms, at least it has been more effective in filling gaps in knowledge and norms than in making decisions with teeth and acting upon them. In many instances, the UN's network of institutions and rules provides appearance of effective governance but these mechanisms do not produce the actual desired effects. [33] It's a fact that UN could play key roles in some issue areas only on the precondition that all the concerned states(especially those big powers) come to consensus with equal coordination and willing compromises. That is difficult and rare in many cases. However, since the world is increasingly globalized and closely connected, we human beings should still keep a kind of looking-ahead attitude to the world, UN's active roles in global governance should be welcome. In short, Given the university, legitimacy and mandate, the UN is an appropriate venue to discuss some global affairs and effective ways to meet the needs and challenges of the 21st century.

---

[30] Andrew F. Cooper and Alan S. Alexandroff, " Introduction", in Alan S. Alexandroff, Andrew F. Cooper, eds., *Rising States, Rising institutions*, Washinton D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010, p.1, p. 13.

[31] Karren Mingst, Essentials of International Relations, New York: W.W. Norton&Company, 1999.p.p.245-247.

[32] Miles Kahler,' Global Governance Redefined', in Andrew C. Sobel   edt., *The Challenges of Globalization*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

[33] Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010. pp.28-29

References

Andrew F. Cooper and Alan S. Alexandroff, " Introduction", in Alan S. Alexandroff, Andrew F. Cooper, eds., *Rising States, Rising institutions*, Washinton D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2010.

Anthony McGrew, 'Liberal Internationalism: Between Realism and Cosmopolitanism', in David Held and Antony McGrew eds., *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity Press, 2002

Barbara Gemmill and Aibmbola Bamidele-Izu, "The Role of NGOs and Civil Societyin Global Environmental Governance", in Daniel C. Esty and Maria H. Ivanova eds., *Global Environmental Governance: Options & Opportunities*, Yale Center for Environmental Law & Policy, 2002.

Bruce Cronin, The Two Faces of the United Nations: The Tension Between Intergovenmentalism and Transnationalism. *Global Governance* 8(2002)

Cary Coglianese, Globalization and the Design of International Institutions, in Joseph S. Nye Jr. and John D. Donahue, eds., *Governance in a Globalizing World,* Brookings Institution Press, 2000.

Chiristopher Hill, "The Capability-Expectation gap, or Conceptualizing Europe's International Role", *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 31, March, 1993.

David Held and Antony McGrew eds., Govenring Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance, Polity Press, 2002

H. and L. Lunde, *Dinosaurs or Dynamos? The United Nations and the World Bank at the Turn of the Century*, London: Earthscan, 1999.

Karen Mingst, Essentials of International Relations, New York: W.W. Norton&Company, 1999.

Lai-Ha Chan, Pak K. Lee and Gerald Chan, Rethinking global governance: a China model in the making? *Contemporary Politic*s, Vol. 14, No. 1, March 2008.

Miles Kahler,' Global Governance Redefined', in Andrew C. Sobel eds., *The Challenges of Globalization*, New York: Routledge, 2009.

Paul F. DiehlPaul F. Diehl eds., *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent WorldThe Politics of Global Governance*(3rd editon), Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, 2005.

Philipp Pattberg,What Role for Private Rule-Making in Global Environmental Governance? Analysing the Forest Stewardship Council (FSC)，International Environmental Agreements,Vol..5, 2005.

Robert Gilpin, *Global Political Economy*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.

Robert O. Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*, Boston: Little, Brown and Company(Inc.), 1977.

R Higgott, "Multilalteralism and the Limits of Global Governance", CSGR Working Paper No. 134/04, Centre for the Study of Globalisation and Regionalisation (CSGR), University of Warwick, UK, May 2004.

Thomas George Weiss, et al., *Global Governance and the UN : An Unfinished Journey,* Indiana University Press, 2010.