Miguel Ángel Moratinos Cuyaubé[1]

GLOBAL WORLD: SYSTEM SHIFTS, CHALLENGES AND CONTOURS OF THE FUTURE

When the Berlin Wall fell on November 9, 1989, very few scholars of international relations had anticipated the events that led to the end of the Cold War and the reunification of Europe.

While some predicted the *End of History* (Fukuyama, 1989) in a world deprived of ideologies and politically based confrontations, others reaffirmed the centrality of culture wars, crafting global geopolitics around the reinvention and modern expression of ancient civilizations. Religions would be at the core of future conflicts or so called *Clash of Civilizations* (Huntington, 1993). Although seminal contributions to the understanding of contemporary international relations, none of these much debated point of views succeeded in interpreting the world of 2017.

Twenty-eight years later, unpredictability and uncertainty still govern a global scene made of contradicting trends and complex transformations. If a sharp decline in the number of wars have marked the post-Cold war era (Center for Systematic Peace, 2013), civil wars, massacres and renewed episodes of violence fueled by religious extremist discourses have nonetheless dramatically jeopardized the principles and mechanisms of a Collective security system set more than half a century ago, in the aftermath of WWII. While some have put in question the pertinence of international organizations dedicated to maintaining peace and security, unilateral superpower military interventions and failed peacekeeping operations have also weakened a multilateral regime desperately trying to reform itself. Likewise, many sectors of international cooperation have been marred by the absence of any multilateral consensus.

Every aspects of international life have decidedly entered *a prolonged period of global crisis*. Explicit in the diplomatic, economic, social, environmental or global health sectors, no dimension of global politics has been spared the undergoing crisis of Global governance.

Crisis in the Global governance weakens our capacity to identify the key players in the international arena and the core issues at stakes in the contemporary world system. In a time of *profound evolutions and transformations*, contradicting trends result in a more complex political order calling, in turn, for a renewed analytical framework. Drawing some lines in the complexity of contemporary global politics is the only way to better apprehend shifting power structures and design foreign policy objectives adapted to new and transboundary issues.

Governing the international space

World governance systems have historically been the product of negotiations directed at providing stability to a world order characterized by general insecurity and the permanent risk of war. In 1648, the Treaty of Westphalia appeared as the first attempt, among European monarchs, to adopt a shared political system based mainly on two principles: the inviolability of sovereignty along with a nascent balance of power system. Putting an end to 30 years of war fueled by catholic-protestant opposition, the Treaty signed in the German cities of Münster and Osnabrück remains as the founding event of Nation-State based political Europe.

About seventy-five years later it was not the issue of religious division that motivates the meeting of head of states

[1] Diplomat, lawyer and politician, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Spain (2004–2010), Dr. Author of a number of publications, including: "Crisis in the Middle East", "The World in the Era of Sustainable Development", "Contemporary Global Challenges and National Interests", and others. He was awarded with the orders of the Serbian flag of the 1st degree (Serbia), of the Cross of Terra Mariana of the 1st class (Estonia), Royal order of Charles III (Spain). Grand Officer of the order of the Three Stars (Latvia), Knight of the Royal Order of Isabella the Catholic, Knight of the Order of Civil Merit etc. Honorary Doctor of the universities of Granada, Malta, Ben-Gurion and Al-Quds. Honorary Doctor of SPbUHSS.

in the Vienna of 1815 but the imperious need to protect the European continent from any future hegemonic war and imperial scheme of political domination. In other words European head of states having defeated the France of Napoleon wanted to eliminate any future risk of a global territorial conquest. The Vienna Congress was a true international event with more than 200 delegations gathering great and small powers. For the first time in History, a group of states created the basic elements of an international order and tried to implement the principles of a governance system directed at maintaining security and stability. With the help of a new diplomatic instrument, the "Diplomatic Conference" and its "Follow-up meetings", the main political powers (Austria, Prussia, Russia and United Kingdom) set a diplomatic agenda to deal with specific problems of shared interests. Base on a multilateral principle, these *ad hoc* diplomatic conferences will allow for regular meetings between states' representatives (France and other European countries will be included at a later stage), giving opportunities for the resolution of a wide range of diplomatic issues even after the "Congress System" or "Concert of Europe" stopped functioning in 1822.

From this period of intense transformation, we ought to retain some key underlying facts and global evolutions that changed the principles and practice of diplomacy. First, the most powerful states of the time realized it was in their own interest to be included in a "system of nations" and take an active part to the negotiating agenda. Not necessarily sharing common values or moral principles, they understood that maintaining security in a collective manner would also help preserve their own security. Ideas of reciprocity and shared interests, common security and political space were all new concepts to the diplomats' world and directly contributed to shape its new and central role in the "governance" of international relations. Second, along with the emergence of a security system based on cooperation, a new type of organization was invented in order to deal with issues brought by new technologies, modern means of transportation, navigations or communications: the International Public Union. Third, already starting in Vienna in 1815, civil society leaders began to play a more active role, pressing for the inclusion of social and ethical norms within the emerging system of global governance.

International cooperation and collective security

Beyond limited security arrangements, the 19th century witnessed the multiplication of a new organizations designed for international technical cooperation: the International Public Unions (IPU). The Central Commission for the Navigation of the Rhine was the first to be created back in 1815 with the purpose of coordination commercial navigation all along the Rhine River. Progressively, many more followed in accordance with the progress of modern technologies: International Telegraph Union in 1865 (to be renamed International Telecommunication Union), Universal Postal Union in 1874, etc.). These Unions help illustrate the growing phenomenon of share interests over economic, social, political and international transboundary issues.

While helping organizing the modern world, these technical organizations also paved the way for political and diplomatic transformations of great importance. What appears to be a true "institutional learning process" implied the growing involvement of specialized diplomats dedicated to international technical cooperation. Furthermore IPU founding charters systematically included special jurisdiction and internal conflict settlement mechanisms to deal with disagreement among their members. This trend announced future political mobilizations for the establishment of an international set of rules focused on Peace and War that went vocal at the turn of the 20th century.

Playing by the rules: norms, values and multilateralism

Transnational civil society mobilizations appeared with so-called "rights movements" pressuring governments, elected politicians and existing international associations to act for the abolition of slavery, the advancement of women status or the recognition of citizenship to minorities. International petitions circulated already at the time of the Vienna Congress of 1815.

The progressive inclusion within international instruments and treaties of ethically based principles advocated by civil society movements clearly illustrate the type nature of interactions between Public (State) actors and Private (Association of individuals) organizations. More and more, States cannot ignore civil society but also elite mobilizations for "moral and just" causes.

The meeting of "Peace Congresses" and, later in the Century, the creation of "Inter-parliamentary Unions" sheds light both of the mobilization of an intellectual and political European transnational elite for the establishment of an international arbitration court and the pacific settlement of conflict between states.

Among their founders, were French and British pacifists Frédéric Passy and Randal Cremer, both elected members of their national parliaments. They will count among the most politically active individuals engaged in the organization of the international conferences of the The Hague (1899 and 1907) and the subsequent adoption of the *International Convention on the Pacific Settlement on Disputes*.

In 1901, Frédéric Passy will be awarded with the first Nobel Peace Prize in history. It's worth noting that he actually received half the Prize, the other half being awarded to Henry Dunant, founder of the International Committee of the Red Cross (1864). These inaugural Nobel Prize epitomized the international public recognition of two central "moral" causes of the 19th century: Peace by peaceful means and the emergence of Humanitarian international Law.

The "idea of peace", from security arrangements to the promotion of non-violence along with humanitarian preoccupations in times of war are good illustrations of an emerging set of norms, values and common ethics are the core of the Western global governance system. Abruptly interrupted by the First World War, the "idea of peace" through international law and collective security will reappear at the Peace Conference of 1919. The period from 1815 to 1914, already announced the identity of international relations key players to be fully in place during the following century and until today: The State as the central and traditional political construction, Civil Society in its organized format, namely Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), Intergovernmental organizations at the heart of an emerging

Global Governance Regime closely linked with the enunciation of norms, values, rules.

States and Groups of States: strengths and weaknesses

At the Paris Peace Conference of 1919, the victors of WWI vowed to banish secret diplomatic practices and alliance strategies held responsible for the political impasses that irresistibly led to a global, total war. With the *League of Nations,* they established a new universal organization aimed at Collective Security. Unlike limited cooperation (IPU) or agreed rules on the settlement of conflicts based on a set of instruments (conciliation, mediation, arbitration) the new security system was based on moral values articulated with a set of sanctions to be applied to potentially recalcitrant states. Collective security was meant to guarantee peace and security through collective menace of retaliation based on solidarity and reciprocity. Unfortunately, with the absence of the United States from the League core institutions (The Council, Secretariat and Assembly), the "collective" dimension of the organization was fatally flawed from the very beginning. Notwithstanding the League's failure, it remains the first multilateral organizations based on permanent institution and personnel. It embodied the role International Organizations could hold as global governance key players.

The history of the League of Nations interestingly reveals the type of interactions that continue to characterize the relationship between international organizations and States in the Global governance perspective. Obviously, from time to time, powerful nation states continue to regard intergovernmental organizations as a threat to their own national interest. They tend to undermine their legitimacy and, especially in times of crises, try to circumvent multilateral institutions.

Maintaining a veto for the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council inscribed in the 1945 San Francisco Charter or crafting parallel defense alliances like NATO reveal one of the main contradiction in contemporary global governance mechanisms. On one hand, states have realized that many political problems cannot be dealt with at the national level; transboundary issues call for multilateral solution and cooperation strategies. This is also true for security matters since the level of interdependence between states implies the collective management of international security. On the other hand, through "coalitions of the willing" (Irak, 2003) and other exclusive group of states, nation-states continue to consider that specific and top level issues need to be addressed by small clubs of directly concerned and influential countries. Contact groups (North Korea), groups of friends (El Salvador), the Quartet for the Middle East, as well as G8 meetings still convey this idea of efficiency through small gatherings of powerful states. To a certain extent these closed groups are in contradiction with the tendency to open and democratic diplomatic arenas and global governance system to the larger international society made of private actors and civil society organizations.

Reshaping the Global Order: the role of NGOs

Recognized as valuable actors by many international organizations, Non- Governmental Organizations are more and more involved in the writings of international instruments, conventions and norms put forward by multilateral instances. Present in every sector of international life, from education to human rights, from peace and security to health issues, NGOs have become an essential aspect of the World order. Officially recognized by the United Nations (art. 71 of the UN Charter) they play a variety of roles from agenda setting, providing expertise to states' administrations and international organizations, policy advocacy, humanitarian work, etc. More partners than competitors, they provide states and multilateral organizations with knowledge and expertise they often cannot access. Many foreign ministries rely on the reports of International Crisis Group, a widely recognized NGO specialized in conflict and foreign policy analysis.

NGOs have also been at the core of protest movements and mobilization against the so-called "neoliberal globalization". Anti-globalization movements (ATTAC) or Global Social Forums have embodied citizen protest against the transnational private firms and their ambiguous relationship with states.

Playing an intermediary role between States, International organizations and civil societies, NGOs have been instrumental in the creation of the International Criminal Court (NGO coalition for the ICC) as well as the negotiation process of Conferences on Climate change (Copenhagen 2009, Doha, 2012 and specifically for the success COP 21 in Paris Summit last December 2015). Contributing to a large extent to multilateral forum and mechanisms, more and more professionalized and specialized, they appear, in an official or unofficial manner to be intimate partners of States.

International Organizations: Global issues, Global crises

Active in every aspects of international life, international organizations have become key and indispensable players of the contemporary World order. Mostly within the UN system (World Bank, World Health Organization, UNESCO, etc.) but also from outside the United Nations (World Trage Organizations) multilateral instance govern many aspects of international social and economic life.

Through the UN and, more and more, through regional organizations (African Union, Arab League, ASEAN, etc.) multilateral instances are required to intervene in peace and security operations. In this regard, the growing role of the European Union (maritime security, international mediation initiatives) illustrates how International organizations have created new mechanisms to confront threats to international security in the post-Cold War era.

A trend that raises again the question of what type of actor is best suited to maintain peace and security? Protection by powerful actors, checks and balances through collective multilateral security systems? Returning to security alliances? The coexistence of competing systems of international security poses question to the nature of Global governance.

Many intergovernmental organizations created after 1945 have known a process of institutionalization whereas, for example, global UN conferences become international specialized programs and organizations (1968 International Conference on Human Rights in Teheran, 1972 Global Conference on Environment in Stockholm, HABITAT and World Population Conferences). Including a wide range of participants from state delegations to NGOs, these UN

Global conferences tend to embody the democratization of Global governance, notably authorizing the expression of civil society in the international sphere.

Since the end of the Cold War, international organizations are faced with the issue of self-reform and adaptation to a changing global landscape. Security alliances like NATO have had to dramatically expand the scope of their activities to justify their continuing existence.

The UN and especially the Security Council are confronted to an ongoing debate on efficiency, representativity, and cost effectiveness. The expansion of the G8 to a meeting of G20 countries (2008) tried to provide some response to the urgency of the Global economic and financial crisis of 2008. However, such evolutions remain limited and strong resistance from states – Western states as well as new emerged regional powers (Latin America, Asia, Africa) – tend to block any structural evolution of a global governance system put in place in 1945.

The end of the Cold War corresponded to a renewed interest in Peace and Security missions by international organizations. In 1992, the UN Secretary General Boutros Boutros Ghali created a new Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO). After a decade marred by failures (Somalia 1992, Rwanda 1994, Bosnia 1995, Kosovo 1999), UN Peacekeeping missions have surged and are now present in most conflict zones around the globe. With 16 ongoing peacekeeping operations (UNDPKO, Sept. 2014) totaling more than 100 000 uniformed personnel on the ground, the United Nations is present in many conflict zones where states are usually reluctant to send troops for a long period of time. Militarily speaking, the UN has now become a key and indispensable player.

From missions of observation (UNMOGIP in India and Pakistan) to heavily armed forces (MONUSCO in the Democratic Republic of Congo) with a hybrid mandates of maintaining security and building peace in post-conflict settings (UNAMID in Darfur, MINUSMA in Mali), UN missions cover the whole gamut of peace interventions from prevention to post-conflict reconciliation. For peacekeeping operations, challenges ahead are rapidly unfolding and concern both financing the missions and getting enough troops on the ground. Traditionally, more developed countries used to pay for the missions while countries from the "south" would send troops, that would be trained and paid by the UN. This distribution of roles is coming to an end making it more difficult for the UN to find adequate military personnel to send to conflict zones.

In regard to Global governance issues, there are two main challenges that international key players have been confronted to, especially since September 11, 2001. First, should the "international community" intervene in cases where states – voluntarily or not – fail to protect their own population? Second, what type of collective response should be opposed to transnational terrorist violence?

The first point has led to the adoption of the "Responsibility to Protect" (R2P) principle by the United Nations (2005), following a 2001 report by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS) In a provoking manner the ICISS commission introduced the concept of sovereignty as "responsibility". From now on, States viability should not be evaluated in regard to their capacity to control a territory or various resources but first and foremost on its ability and determination to protect its own population. A State failing to do so could end up losing its "right" to sovereignty and, in specific cases – including notably the perpetration of massacres – an international intervention would be launched to protect endangered populations. In several instances of violent conflict, R2P was mentioned and used to legitimate intervention by military forces directly under UN authority or under the authority a third country: Côte d'Ivoire (2011, UNSCR 1975), Lybia (2011, UNSCR 1970 and 1973), Central African Republic (2013, UNSCR 2127). Following the Lybia resolutions, accusations have been formulated has whether members of the Security Council had simply used R2P as a tool for regime change, distorting the concept and endangering its legitimacy. The international community hesitation and failure to intervene in the war in Syria that broke out in 2011 is a perfect illustration of the ambivalences of the R2P concept and the inherent obstacles to establish a functional collective security system. If several countries have unilaterally decide to intervene in Syria, helping supplying money and arms stocks to one party or the other hoping, therefore, to alter the course of the war, this type of intervention will not bring long-term peace. Only coordinated international intervention through cooperation between States, NGOs and International organizations can help civil societies survive this type of conflict and allow for reconstruction and stabilization. Fueling parties at war conveys many risks and lacks international legitimacy. Contemporary global governance is in need of more robust framework for crisis management and international intervention. In this regard, strategic interests do not always contradict ethical values; on the contrary, they tend to reinforce themselves and provide legitimacy to peace and security operations (Slaughter, 2011).

In the long run, coalition building to fight global and hyper-terrorism and more especially against Al-Qaeda and ISIS (Islamic State in Irak and Syria also known as Da'ish, ISIL, IS) will face the same type of questions. How to stabilize political systems, reconstruct societies and maintain security at bearable costs. Beyond multilateral cooperation, international organizations should be involved at earlier stages to enhance efficiency and legitimacy on the longer term.

After Wikileaks and Snowden: Media Diplomacy

Back in 19th Century Europe, emerging media were the instruments of lobbying groups looking to pressure public institutions and, later, influence multilateral instances and their political agenda. In the contemporary World order, online news media, social networks, blogs and video channels have proliferated and are definitively part of the Global governance system. The impact of news media raises the issue of their moral responsibility and questions the type of norms, values and principles that guide their action. The debate on the transparency of democratic institutions and international organizations deciding procedures has yet to be transposed within the media environment.

News media have actively contributed to the transformation of our political systems, emphasizing the interactions and interdependence of public and private actors of international political life.

While the Wikileaks (2006) and Snowden (2013) scandals have exposed many governments' secrets, public agents private communications and endangered ongoing

missions around the world, they have also forced actors of international relations to rethink their use of information and communication tools and adopt news strategies. Beyond the transparency imperative, these crises have shed a new light on the role of information in an unprecedentedly connected world.

Paradoxically Wikileaks and Snowden scandals helped reaffirmed the need for an evolution of foreign policies information strategies. In light of the emergence of alternative media requesting more transparency and immediacy in the flow of information from official to non-official actors, using the news media for the sole purpose of public policy advocacy has proven its limitations. To what extent should state diplomacy still resort to subservice tactics when they risk public exposure and humiliation? To what extent will these scandals reinforce or undermine existing alliances and mutual confidence between allies?

None of these core issues will find satisfying answers without some global initiatives and international cooperation to produce new sets of norms and procedures adapted to the omnipresence of information and communication imperatives.

The prevention and resolution of Global social crises

The League of Nations inaugurated the creation of permanent multilateral organizations dedicated to economic and social issues. With the United Nations, all public and private actors were more and more openly associated with the work of these organizations. At the core of the contemporary global governance system, international problems from Education to Food Security, Labor conditions, equality between men and women, Health, living standards, etc., epitomize the specific nature of our highly interdependent world. Environmental crises in one part of the World have direct and indirect repercussions in many other places around the globe. In regard to Global governance preoccupations, one has to realize that none of these issues can be dealt only on the national level. Global and Economic problems all require extensive forms of international cooperation and require long term confidence building procedures between a wide range of involved actors. In other words, global issues require the establishment of shared global norms.

Many international organizations created in 1945 to take care of social and economic issues are still in need to adapt their structure, decision making procedures and purpose to the mutations of contemporary international relations. The fast-growing number of states, the proliferation of non-official actors now part of global social conventions and the challenges of providing aid to an important part of the world population excluded from many basic resources have put international organizations in front of entirely new and exponential challenges.Finding ways to respond to economic and social imperatives is thE only way to preserve

and reinforce the existence of a true "international community". If this global objective is not achieved, there is an explicit risk of watching the world rearranging around distinct political and value-related sphere of interests. Beyond international gatherings meant to help make the world more sensitive to economic and social issues, political leaders and diplomats should work towards the establishment and implementation of common standards in Education, Health, Food Security, Environment, etc. Such an evolution will imply to reform existing organizations and in some areas, create new and inclusive form of international cooperation.

Afterword

In the contemporary world order, being a true global player (State, International organizations, transnational firm, NGO) means accepting the duty to contribute to the entire scope of issues requiring international cooperation. Furthermore, it leaves no room for strategic neutrality. From collective security to environmental crises, global governance always meant taking a stance, defending a point of view based on moral principles and ethical standards that could be shared by the greater public worldwide.

Global governance can be a great divider or a great instrument or unification. It can integrate and promote peaceful interdependence or incite quarrels based on identities and cultural fight. In other words, at the core of Global Governance lies a choice between anarchy vs. regulation, uncertainty vs. stability through reciprocity.

Sixty years ago, global governance meant less states, much more discrete private actors, nascent international organizations, emerging transnational firm, etc. The structure of the international system we know today was created in the aftermath on WWII and was meant to bring answers to political and social problems familiar to the political elite of the 1930s. Hence, the difficulties these institutions encounter to adapt and reform themselves. However, they still provide the essence of contemporary global shared norms and values, and this heritage should be protected and enhanced. It does not serve to criticize existing organizations for their inefficiency if no other viable option is put on the global agenda.

In line with hard and soft power strategies (Nye, 1990), Global governance has maintained a certain informality and no consensus has emerged on its exact signification. However, if it is to provide enhance security, stability and resources to civil society, Global governance needs structure, organizations and, above all, coherence, capacity to adapt and a sense of a general long-term political perspective. In conclusion, projecting a political voice on current challenges, on the future of global alliances, on peace and security issues as well as on the problems of key natural resources, and social needs is, more than ever, at the core of a serious global governance foreign policy strategy.