

Global Governance as an Independent Analytical Perspective for Studying International Relations: a presentation of the most important theoretical assumptions



Ahlam FOUGHALI

Badji Mokhtar Annaba University, Algeria, ahlem.foughali@univ-batna.dz

PhD Student, University of Batna 1

Received date: 22/10/2023

Accepted date: 28/11/2023

Publication date: 10/01/2024

Abstract:

This research paper aims to explore global governance as a new theoretical perspective for studying international relations, and an alternative to the current international relations perspectives, in response to the emergence of various theoretical paradigms challenging existing viewpoints. It investigates whether global governance could serve as a post-state theoretical model that facilitates the understanding, analysis and even an orientation of global politics. The paper delves into the concept of global governance, examines pivotal practical and theoretical shifts, supporting its emergence, highlights its foundational assumptions, and concludes with an assessment. It concludes that the descriptive value of global governance holds substantial importance in grasping changes in global politics, and offers a novel theoretical framework that enriches the field's insights into politics and the global system.

Keywords: Global Governance; International Relations; analytical perspective;

*Submitted author: Ahlam Foughali, e-mail: ahlem.foughali@univ-batna.dz .

Introduction:

The study of global governance is closely linked to examining the developments that have occurred in the post-Cold War world as a process that reflects a state of change in international relations and the international system. It is also associated with the new trends in the study of international relations, which, in their theoretical orientations, seek to change the international reality rather than just interpreting it, as interpretive theories used to do. This is reflected in constructivist, normative, and critical theories. It can be said that global governance aligns with criticism directed towards positivist philosophy and the emergence of post-positivist philosophy as an epistemological basis that provides support for theories that better understand the world and its interactions. It also introduces values and standards in guiding international practices, especially as many international issues and concerns now carry ethical dimensions.

Furthermore, there have been significant changes in the field of international relations as an academic discipline. It has shifted from studying relations between states (inter-state) to studying global relations that cover all types of interactions and relations among various actors that influence each other within and across national borders, including states. This applies even to activities beyond Earth, such as space stations and satellites, which are considered "exceptions," at least for now, according to Atsushi Shibasaki (2014, pp. 22-24).

In light of these changes, researchers in the field of international relations, following the end of the Cold War and amidst the expansion of globalization, began searching for an alternative to the international system based on the centrality of sovereign nation-states. They developed their conceptualizations and assumptions about global governance as a new analytical concept that could describe global politics and the process of power fragmentation and diffusion within it. Moreover, some scholars regarded it as a theoretical alternative to existing perspectives in international relations, which is what this paper aims to study through the following problem:

Can global governance constitute a theoretical and independent framework for the study of international relations?

To address this problem, we will start from the assumption that the theoretical foundations and assumptions of global governance are able to analyze international relations and accommodating the variables of the international system. The more this is true, the greater the opportunity for adopting it as an analytical perspective for studying international relations. We will attempt to test this hypothesis in order to answer the problem through the following points:

- 1- The concept of global governance.
- 2- Factors that enhance the global governance perspective.

3- The theoretical assumptions underlying global governance.

4- Evaluating global governance as a perspective for studying international relations.

1- Concept of Global Governance:

Global governance is one of the key terms that have gained widespread usage among researchers and scholars in the field of international relations after the Cold War. However, it is shrouded in some ambiguity due to the multiple ways it is used and the varying perspectives of scholars and researchers on the matter. Global governance, like many other phenomena post-Cold War, has not yet been fully conceptualized, much like many other phenomena that emerged after the Cold War.

Despite the numerous definitions provided for the concept of global governance, which have complicated the understanding derived from its usage and made it difficult to formulate a single theoretical framework, it is possible to trace the concept in its usage by international organizations and contributions from prominent theorists aimed at gathering its common features and attempting to define its main elements.

The first attempt to define global governance can be traced back to the Commission on Global Governance, established in 1992 with the support of the United Nations and the endorsement of its former Secretary-General, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, for the purpose of "studying and analyzing the driving forces of the global economy, assessing the developments in globalization processes, presenting alternative models for the structure of the global system in line with contemporary global developments, and making recommendations for improving the global system" (Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood*, 1995, p. 9).

This commission considered global governance as a global phenomenon being solidified in world politics. In their definition of global governance, they referred to it as: "The sum of ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. It is a continuing process through which conflicting or diverse interests may be accommodated and cooperative action may be taken. It includes formal institutions and regimes empowered to enforce compliance, as well as informal arrangements that people and institutions either have agreed to or perceive to be in their interest."

Therefore, the Commission on Global Governance viewed global governance not merely as relations among governments of states but as a process involving a multitude of actors and entities on a global scale, such as non-governmental organizations, citizen movements, multinational corporations, the

global capital market, and the immensely influential global media, all interacting with each other. (Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood*, 1994, p. 14).

The concept of global governance has been defined in various ways by different experts and scholars in the field of international relations. The United Nations Committee of Experts on Public Administration adopted the definition of Thomas G. Weiss, who defined global governance as: "Collective efforts to identify, understand, or address worldwide problems that nations cannot solve individually." Weiss emphasizes that global governance encompasses a wide range of institutions, mechanisms, relationships, official and non-official entities that connect states, markets, citizens, international governmental organizations, and non-governmental organizations. It is used to articulate common interests, define rights and responsibilities, and resolve disputes (United Nations, Committee of Experts on Public Administration, 2006, p. 4).

According to Weiss, global governance includes a diverse array of arrangements and practices aimed at managing and regulating global issues and solving global problems. These arrangements and practices can range from informal practices and standard-setting guidelines to more formal rules such as laws and treaties or the activities carried out by international institutions and organizations in managing global collective affairs.

James N. Rosenau offers another perspective, defining global governance as "a system of rules accepted by the majority consisting of key elements: rules, roles, responsibilities, accountability, and processes" (James N. Rosenau, 1992, p. 10). According to Rosenau, this system operates across multiple levels and actors, both formal and informal. Global governance, in his view, encompasses not only governmental activities but also involves various actors and entities that use organizational mechanisms to set goals and establish standards.

As for Robert Keohane, he sees global governance as the establishment of rules and the exercise of power, within a specific domain of activity, on a global scale, by multiple actors, both formal and informal. He argues that global governance includes strategic interactions among entities (actors) arranged in a hierarchical sequence at the global level because there is no global government or global constitution. Therefore, entities exercising power and making rules are often considered unauthorized to do so without general agreement (Joseph S. Nye Jr, John D. Donahue, 2000, p. 12).

In light of these various definitions, it becomes clear that the concept of global governance has been defined in diverse and sometimes partial ways. Generally, a procedural definition can be provided by focusing on three key points: the actors and parties involved in, the main characteristics of global governance, and its objectives. Thus, global governance can be defined as the process of

managing and regulating the global system based on the capabilities and capacities of states and non-state actors through various forms of multi-level coordination and cooperation. It involves establishing global institutions, systems, and rules to organize global affairs and address the world's challenges while adhering to democratic principles and accountability.

In a contrasting context, both "Hoffmann" and "Pa" distinguish between three major conceptions of the concept of global governance:

A. Global Governance as a Phenomenon Concerned with Managing Global Issues: This perspective is adopted by a broad sector of literature that treats global governance as a collection of conscious activities carried out by organizations and institutions. It emphasizes the global nature of governance by considering the increasingly globalized nature of a growing set of issues and social affairs.

B. Global Governance as a Project (Liberal World Order): Proponents of this view believe that the end of the Cold War provided an opportunity for the establishment of global governance based on a liberal political and economic system. They consider it an additional "hegemonic instrument" (both economically and politically) in the hands of the global capitalist system.

C. Global Governance as a Comprehensive Worldview (New Analytical Approach): This perspective considers global governance primarily as a transformation in our understanding of global politics and the field of international relations. F. Pattberg defines it as a vital analytical tool for monitoring the major shifts in contemporary global politics and processes. This tool allows for a more serious consideration of non-state actors and their political activities, analyzing different spatial and functional levels of politics. It also focuses on new mechanisms for producing and maintaining global public goods and highlights the emergence and establishment of new and independent spaces of power beyond the state (Philipp Pattberg, 2004, p. 189).

2- The Factors Enhancing the Global Governance Perspective:

Global Governance has evolved beyond being merely a descriptive concept related to the management and resolution of global issues. It has become a new field for scholarly inquiry, driven by the growing awareness of the impacts and transformations brought about by globalization. Dissatisfaction with traditional models that fail to accommodate shifts in the relationships between the public and private sectors in general, and state and market power at the global level in particular, has also contributed to the emergence of global governance as a "new school of thought" in international relations (Richard Higgott, 2005, p. 4).

The end of the Cold War marked a historical turning point in international politics, and globalization created a structural shift in the international system, which was traditionally centered on the nation-state. This highlighted the need for a theoretical framework and conceptualization that describe practices in the

international realm. Global governance emerged as an "analytical vision" that responds to the political and practical challenges associated with determining how legitimacy is conferred on political action in a post-national world. In this context, a wave of academic studies addressed the concept of global governance as a new way of understanding politics and the global system.

This academic community supports global governance as a new analytical perspective for studying international relations through the following:

A. Many scholars of international relations view global governance as a global phenomenon and practice, representing a new vision of politics and the global system.

B. There has been a proliferation of books, studies, and scientific articles that have contributed to establishing the foundations of the concept and theory of global governance. The statistical indicators show an increase in specialized contributions employing the term "global governance" since the end of the Cold War, as it became more suitable for understanding political actions in a post-international world, according to James N. Rosenau. For example, by 2008, there were around 500,000 references to the concept "global governance" on the internet, indicating its increasing prominence as a subject of academic inquiry.

C. Specialized journals on the topic of global governance have emerged, with one of the most notable being the "Global Governance: A Review of Multilateralism and International Organizations," published by Lynne Rienner Publishers in collaboration with the Academic Council on the United Nations System (ACUNS). Additionally, academic departments and seats dedicated to the study of global governance have been established at universities and academic institutions in the Western world.

In summary, the concept of global governance has transitioned from a mere descriptive term to a robust field of academic inquiry, marked by a growing body of literature, specialized journals, and academic departments dedicated to its study. It has become a critical perspective for understanding the changing dynamics of international relations in a globalized world.

In addition, three input variables have formed an important task to support and enhance global governance as a new analytical perspective of world politics, which we present as follows:

A- Cognitive/Theoretical Change: Through;

- The significant upheaval that the theoretical field of international relations has experienced since the end of the Cold War, where it has come to live, as Mohamed Saadi put it in his thesis on the future of international relations, "the era of the actual exhaustion of major systems, theories, and comprehensive conceptual frameworks, and the disintegration of the sources of meaning

production, which has toppled many constants governing the course of international politics at all levels." This has created a kind of disruption in strategic thinking and a near void in theory since classical paradigms no longer have the explanatory capacity to understand and frame the current state of affairs, characterized by profound ambiguity and complexity. This is what Mohamed Saadi referred to as the "era of the explosion of cognitive paradigms and their crisis."

- The inclination of some researchers to believe in the need to change the field of international relations to global relations under the influence of two variables: the first relates to the changing subject matter of the field of international relations as an inevitable result of the emergence of the multiplicity of actors and influential parties in world politics, including states. The second relates to the need to study all relations at the global level (official and unofficial, at all levels of the global system), with the aim of creating new institutions and organizations to regulate, manage, and monitor global relations, and proposing an agenda for building a theory in the future (Atsushi Shibasaki, 2015, p. 13).

B- Realistic Change: It manifests in;

- The increase in global interconnectivity as a result of developments imposed by globalization as a comprehensive change process. There is now a global need to develop comprehensive policies to address and regulate global issues and problems that exceed the capabilities of states, in addition to international institutions designed to address separate issues.

- The growth and expansion of the role of actors and parties in influencing the political process and the performance of governance functions (national, transnational and global).

C-The Decline of the Ability of Traditional Theories to Analyze International Relations:

According to Thomas G. Weiss, a professor of international relations and global governance at New York University, the emergence of global governance "can be attributed to the increasing dissatisfaction among international relations students with the realistic, liberal, and institutional theories that dominated the field's study during the 1970s and 1980s. These theories failed to accommodate the increase in the number and influence of non-governmental actors and the consequences of globalization and technological developments." Thus, global governance can be seen as a "guiding tool that reveals and frames the rapid confusion in the transformations of the international system" (Thomas G. Weiss, 2000, p. 808).

3- Basic Assumptions of Global Governance:

Post-positivism, which includes many theoretical approaches, represents the epistemology behind global governance as an analytical perspective. Its

proponents adhere to an analytical approach that emphasizes understanding global changes and their nature without providing interpretive frameworks, as interpretive theories did within the positivist philosophy. Additionally, the normative, evaluative, and ethical aspects are considered crucial in the study of global governance, aspects that were lacking in the study of international relations under positivist philosophy and interpretive theories.

Regarding the ontological aspect, every perspective consists of a set of assumptions about the world that focus the researcher's attention on a specific type of phenomenon, which is then explained through concepts. Therefore, a perspective can be viewed as "the central assumptions held by a group of researchers around the world who study it."

In light of this, we will discuss global governance as an analytical perspective for the study of international relations through its basic assumptions and concepts as follows:

A- The Worldview from the Perspective of Global Governance:

Defining the worldview for any perspective in the field of international relations requires answering the following questions: What are the central units that make up the world, and who are the main actors? How do these actors interact, and what are the main issues that form the core of interactions and processes in global politics?

Advocates of global governance attempt to present their vision of the world in answering these questions as follows:

- The units that constitute the world (main actors): Although the global governance perspective aligns with proponents of liberal pluralism in emphasizing the increasing importance of non-state actors in world politics, it tries to go further by proposing a new ontology for the current world order. The reality of global politics indicates the existence of many actors and parties in global governance, which cannot be counted as tools of states and governments, including transnational pressure groups, epistemic communities, social movements, and more. Thus, despite maintaining the state as one of the key actors in world politics, it argues that the state is not a single or even a primary actor in the process of global governance (Klaus Dingwerth and Philipp Pattberg, 2006, p. 191).

The global governance perspective presents two positions regarding the status of the state. One anticipates that the state will gradually dissolve over time in favor of separate and functionally distinct parts. These parts will create dense networks of cross-border relations. Another view asserts that the state remains important and indispensable. It theoretically "claims" to perform its functions and duties, but in practice, it may not be able to maintain this authority in the future,

especially as it continues to cede some of its powers and functions to global institutions.

- **Interactions between Units:** In contrast to the traditional pattern of interactions in international relations, global governance presents a vision of world politics as a multi-level system. Political processes encompass local, national, regional, and global domains, which are interconnected rather than separate. The global governance perspective replaces the traditional model of interactions based on the centrality of the nation-state (international politics) with a model of global politics characterized by the participation of various governmental and non-governmental actors. It shifts the focus from international institutions (between states) to both formal and informal institutions and networks (public and private sectors). Studies in global governance reveal the complexity of international interactions among different actors and at all levels.

Moreover, the concept of international relations and the pattern of interactions traditionally associated with power relations and interest-based negotiations among states have become increasingly linked to the role of non-state actors and networks shaping politics beyond the state. The global governance concept starts with the assumption that there is a diverse array of governance forms coexisting and that it is difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish a hierarchical sequence among these different mechanisms. There is no single organizing principle for global governance, and there is no emerging system that societies and states are likely to converge around. Global governance is a collection of countless governance mechanisms, driven by diverse goals, structures, and processes (Joseph S. Nye and John D. Donahue, 2002, p. 223).

- **Global Governance Agenda:** Globalization, with its various dimensions, has contributed to the emergence and internationalization of numerous issues that have gained significant prominence on the political agendas of states and international organizations alike. These issues include the environment, terrorism, the international spread of diseases and global pandemics, organized crime, drug trafficking, illegal migration, poverty, and more. Additionally, topics related to global economic and financial aspects have also gained importance. Consequently, the concept of security has been redefined to encompass all threats facing humanity rather than just states. These issues have highlighted the need for global governance on one hand, and on the other hand, they have shaped the subject matter of research within the framework of global governance studies, which no longer exclusively focuses on new global risks and threats but also on redefining the assumptions of international security.

In general, the global governance agenda differs in its concerns and description of the issues that constitute global political priorities from traditional theories. The research in global governance goes beyond the state's priorities and national security for realism or economic development and human rights for

liberalism. Instead, it focuses on issues and threats facing the world and humanity as a whole, rather than those that concern individual states as separate geographic entities.

These issues are characterized by their global nature, arising from systemic flaws (systemic risks) and the interconnectedness of the global society (global society risks). These problems are not determined by states; instead, they are shaped and "prioritized" by various governmental and non-governmental actors at multiple levels. In addition to material issues, these problems also include ethical and normative dimensions.

The research in global governance aims to create a world system capable of responding to the global challenges brought about by globalization

B- Theoretical Elements of Global Governance:

The perception of the world, as explained earlier, gives rise to a set of assumptions and concepts that constitute the theoretical elements of global governance. The most prominent of these are defined as follows:

- **Structure of the Global System:** It is not a chaotic structure, as described by neorealism and new liberalism. The latter even suggests the possibility of mitigating and reducing the effects of chaos through international organizations. The structure of the system is shaped by the meanings, perceptions, and common interests of the multiple actors and parties involved, spanning various layers and levels. It forms a complex system of interconnected and independent institutions that perform governance functions in administration, organization, guidance, and oversight. This complexity makes chaos an impractical outcome.

In this context, the literature on global governance introduces the concept of "architecture" (or engineering) of global governance to describe the institutional complexity at the global level. This concept is broader than that of international systems because it allows for the analysis of situations within the framework of collaborative efforts and conflicts between different systems. (Frank Bierman, Philipp Pattberg, 2009, p15)

In light of this, global governance theorists assume that the structure of the world system is neither chaotic nor a fully integrated organizational structure. Instead, it resembles architecture or fragmented engineering of global governance with the possibility of creating an organized engineering for it. They also describe the structure of the world system as an evolved form of global governance, which is a practical description applicable to world politics in the absence of a world government. In other words, the structure of global governance represents a middle ground between the hierarchical structure of a world government and the anarchical structure of international disorder. Both Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nye describe what exists at the global level as "not a world government, but

systems, rules, and institutions governing a wide range of global policy issues" (Robert Keohane and Joseph S. Nye, 2002, p. 34).

- **The role of the state:** The state is no longer the sole actor in global politics, as it is accompanied by various governmental and non-governmental actors. Their interactions create a multi-level system of global governance aimed at establishing arrangements and institutions for managing global issues, solving problems, and addressing global risks. Although the state's centrality is not as dominant as it used to be and will continue to change over time, it will remain an important player in international relations as one of the multiple levels of global governance. (Victoria Lennox, 2008, p. 7)

- **Power fragmentation:** Global governance is characterized by an increase and diversification of levels of global policy-making and implementation. Power is fragmented vertically between sub-national, national, and supranational levels, as well as horizontally between governmental networks and non-governmental actors. Thus, a key feature of global governance is the division of state authority into multiple levels. This phenomenon has been described as "fragmentation" by scholars like Rosenau, signifying the contradictions between forces promoting the spread of people, goods, and ideas globally and those working to confine people, goods, and ideas within narrow geographic boundaries. This fragmentation is seen as a driver of the post-state model of global governance, characterized by the fragmentation and decentralization of state authority across multiple actors and levels. (Frank Biermann, Philipp Pattberg, 2009, pp. 16-24)

- **Emergence of global governance agencies:** The global governance system manifests in three distinct layers, or what is known as the infrastructure of global governance: above the state, beneath the state, and transnational. The national government is situated between these layers. All these layers, whether individually or collectively, form the framework through which governments and peoples seek to deal with global and local circumstances that shape their fate, while also serving as a means of holding power accountable.

- **Accountability and legitimacy:** Global governance theorists assume that what can be observed in world politics is an evolving and changing global governance system. Accountability and legitimacy are achieved through the accountability and participation of active actors in decision-making. (Victoria Lennox, 2008, p. 7) This is evident in the increased influence of non-governmental actors, especially global civil society, in official international institutions. Additionally, states and international institutions are increasingly inclined to interact and consult with non-governmental actors. There is also a growing global demand for the reform of international institutions and their accountability to democratic principles. (Victoria Lennox, 2008, p. 8)

4. Evaluation of Global Governance as a Perspective to the Study of International Relations:

Despite proponents of global governance emphasizing its ability to challenge perspectives in international relations and offer a new viewpoint in the increasingly complex and ambiguous world of global politics, the prevailing stance in the study of international relations asserts that global governance lacks the capacity to become a new analytical perspective that threatens the traditional state-centered approach .

On the other hand, critics of this perspective have emerged within the global governance discourse. Klaus Dingwerth and Philipp Pattberg, for example, identified three neglected areas in the theoretical establishment of the concept of global governance:

- Skepticism about Globality: They argue that global governance assumes globality as a theoretical premise, which may not necessarily align with the real-world dynamics of globalization.
- Overemphasis on Governance Structures: Critics contend that global governance literature tends to overstate the degree to which the world operates under specific rules, institutions, and arrangements, neglecting the fact that governance is absent in many realms of global interactions.
- Lack of Clarity on Political Position: There's a concern that global governance discourse does not provide clear political direction and sometimes appears as a technical managerial approach to global issues.

Additionally, from a critical theory perspective, some view global governance as an ideological concept associated with neoliberalism, representing the political agenda of globalization or American hegemony. Others take a more moderate stance, suggesting that global governance is still in its early stages and serves primarily as a vision rather than a comprehensive description of the international system.

Conclusion:

Based on the preceding discussion, it can be concluded that global governance offers a new perspective for the study of international relations, characterized both methodologically and epistemologically as a post-state theory that emphasizes the shift toward global politics and international relations. It presents a model for understanding global power and governance beyond the traditional paradigms of hierarchical and centralized governance models (such as world government and empire) on one hand and the models of dispersion, fragmentation, and state dissolution (such as medievalism and international anarchy) on the other hand.

In practical terms, the perspective of global governance provides insights into structural changes in the international system and imbues it with meaning and purpose. However, proponents of global governance have been more focused on understanding rather than explaining, and they have introduced normative and ethical dimensions into their analysis, making it a more interventionist theoretical framework than a neutral explanatory one.

Furthermore, global governance still faces practical challenges and theoretical criticisms that weaken its ability to represent a comprehensive perspective in analysis. Additionally, it is not the sole competing model, as new models and branches emerging from traditional paradigms are vigorously adapting to the changing international reality. The field of international relations is currently in a transitional and highly pluralistic phase in terms of theory, which can be perplexing.

Nevertheless, the descriptive value of global governance remains significant in understanding the changes in global politics, contributing to new insights into politics and the international system. Given the unique complexity of contemporary politics, no single approach can encompass it fully. Therefore, the field of international relations is open to the development of various competing perspectives that both enhance our understanding of the international reality and enrich theoretical debates among different theories.

Bibliography:

- 1- Frank Biermann, Philipp Pattberg, Harro van Asselt, and Fariborz Zelli,(2009)," The Fragmentation of Global Governance Architectures: A Framework for Analysis " , Global Environmental Politics 9(4),US: the Massachusetts Institute of Technology
- 2- Campbell Craig, (2008),"The Resurgent Idea of World Government", Ethics & International Affairs,Volume 22.2.
- 3- THOMAS G. WEISS,(2000), "Governance, good governance and global governance: conceptual and actual challenges", Third World Quarterly, Vol 21, No 5.
- 4- Richard Higgott,(2005),"The Theory and Practice of Global and Regional Governance: Accommodating American Exceptionalism and European Pluralism", University of Warwick, GARNET Working Paper No 01/05 .
- 5- James N.Rosenau and ernest-otto Czempiel,(1992),governance without government order and change in world politics, Combridge, Combredge university press.
- 6- Joseph S. Nye Jr, John D. Donahue,(2000), Governance in a Globalizing World, visions of Governance for the 21st Century, Washington D.C, Cambridge,Massachusetts ,Brookings Institution Press.

- 7- Lennox Victoria,(2008), "Conceptualising Global Governance in International Relations", E-International Relations, University of Ottawa,in : <https://www.e-ir.info/2008/10/03/conceptualising-global-governance-in-international-relations>.
- 8- Philipp Pattberg ,(2004), "The Institutionalisation of Private Governance: Conceptualising an Emerging Trend Global Environmental Politics ". In : <http://www.glogov.org/images/doc/WP9.pdf>
- 9- Philipp Pattberg and Klaus Dingwerth,(2006), "Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics",Global Governance .In: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/260121396>
- 10- Shibasaki Atsushi,(2005), "The Future of the Study of International Relations: From the Study of International Relations to the Study of Global Relations", Annuals of Japanese Political Science Association.
- 11- United Nation,Commission on Global Governance,(1995), Our Global Neighborhood. In : <http://web.archive.org/web/20000621111134>.