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Abstract
This article examines current academic thinking of the concept of ‘global governance’ and it describes some contemporary trends in the world in the building of an institutional architecture. World civil society has been confronted with the dramatic impact of global threats, including financial, rising oil prices, environmental degradation, civil wars, genocide, human rights’ violations, and the proliferation of nuclear and radiological weapons, as well as weapons of mass destruction, terrorism and, trans-national organized crime. All of these manifestations are buttressed with the complexity of existing international relations, and further supports the need to search for alternative approaches for a system of effective global governance. The necessity to investigate transformation of global governance has prompted the author to refer to ontological transformation of the above-mentioned concepts, and to attempt to connect global trends within the mechanisms of trans-national and national actors.

Introduction
The academic world is reflective of current events in the contemporary world of politics and economics. It is quite doubtful that any developed and leading individual country’s current domestic politics are not rooted in ideological and strategic research programs. Since the collapse of a bi-polar world of two opposing social-economic superpowers, international scholars have not been able to agree on a shared and viable theoretical model in the sphere of global development.

It is important to recognize that there is a tendency towards the globalization of political interactions, which involves greater intensity of politics. Such a direction presupposes collaboration among a wide range of stakeholders in addressing shared global problems.

The array of contemporary global problems requires innovative and collective global solutions. However, the lack of coherence in international economic, social and environmental decision-making that
currently exists becomes an obstacle to sustainable global development. The fragmented institutional architecture of the international economic system makes it virtually impossible to address issues of interdependence in an effective and coherent manner (COMECE, 2006). There has been an increase of civil society mobilisation in dealing with questions of global governance in recent years.

The role of ‘Civil society’ has recently moved to the central stage in any discussion of globalization, especially after the number of protests in Seattle, Davos, Washington, and Melbourne at the World Economic Forum. Rallying for closer co-operation between institutions isn’t a new phenomenon, nor is complaints about overlap and duplication of efforts. Collectively the less-than-pristine results can be interpreted as symptoms of a lack of an effective framework that would ensure coherence. One of the priorities for change at the global level is to review the mandates of existing international organizations. All efforts should be made with a view to identifying sources where conflicting objectives may overlap and barriers to coherent behavior and gaps in the institutional architecture result.

Today’s vast system of global institutional architecture includes regulation of economic, financial, human rights, environmental, labor, health, communications, criminal and other initiatives. These have traditionally been closely associated to the domain of shared governance.

However, gaps have been identified where neither domestic nor international law can be applied. Not being able to find solutions to problems has been a factor in prompting responses by state and non-state actors, either to rectify or exploit them (Aston, 2005). The consequence has stimulated new areas for international regulation and to find innovative methods for applying the rule of law and seeking new legislation.

The concept of ‘global governance’ encompasses a broader jurisdiction of political interaction that is strategically aimed at global problem-solving. It includes the United Nations system, its organs and agencies,
and the public and private legal institutions, regimes and networks governing relations among states and other actors across state borders (Woodward, 2006). Its value in contemporary discourse lies in the need for a broader and more encompassing concept. The current article reinforces an attempt to investigate the predominant theoretical approaches that are inherent to the overlaying notion. The next stage is to further investigate the primary patterns and trends within a system of global governance.

Succinct Theoretical Insight and Ontology of a Concept of “Global Governance”

Third wave paradigm debate, which originated from the transformation of the bi-polar world of confrontation, inevitably has an ideological impact on intra-state, regional, and global strategic decision-taking processes.

Theoretical and ideological incoherence, complexity, and disagreements in the sphere of political international affairs in an era of socio-economic globalization, multiplied by nuclear, ecological, biological threats and terrorism, inextricably affect human sustainable development in terms of short-term nation-state prosperity and long-term progressive democratic international cooperation.

A consensus has not been achieved, not only in terms of a new international relations system, but also in terms of its key notions’ interpretation. While the explanatory value of global governance is the subject of considerable debate, so too is its normative status. There is widespread agreement in the literature that the existing system of global governance is severely deficient in many fundamental respects. There is little consensus also as to whether more genuine global governance is either desirable, or plausible, nor agreement on what normative principles should inform its institutional design (Falk, 1995; Held, 1995; Jones, 1999; Keohane, 1998).

1 “Multi-polar”, or in accordance to the political agreements-“Washington-Madrid”, are examples of such contemporary theoretical interpretations and definitions of the new emerging system of international affairs.
The parallel methodological problems are experienced in associated fields of inquiry: for instance, in international political economy, that is bound by reorganization of authority and power relations in world politics, as well as by the rise of global multilateral institutions, and de-territorialization of political economies, - processes that draw intense debates among the scholars of globalization.²

Various distinguished coryphées have emphasized the predominance of a particular factor/force/structure in the sphere of international affairs. The idea of a centralized global political organization and a common rule of law dates back to the early philosophical works starting from the 17th century. Such a vision of a universal authority is described by Grotius, Hobbes, Rousseau and Kant.

After the First World War, simultaneously with the establishment of the League of Nations, committed to the principles of self-determination, collective security, non aggression and arms production limitation, a particular emphasis has been put on the idea of global governance—“increasingly regulated character of transnational and international relations”(Krahmann, 2003:329). Nowadays several types of global governance could be stressed, including “top-down governance”, and “mobius-web government” (governments, elites, mass public, TNCs, IGOs, NGOs, INGOs) (Rosenau, 2003).

Probably the most influential understanding of the concept given by the Commission on Global Governance in its report, Our Global Neighborhood in 1995, well expresses its enormous complexity, as follows:

“Governance is the sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs. 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.

There is no single model or form of global governance, nor is there a single structure or set of structures. It is a broad, dynamic, complex process of interactive decision-making that is constantly evolving, and responding to changing circumstances”. Global governance hence is not a new phenomenon, but its scope is expanding rapidly.

**Challenges and Threats without Boundaries**

World society has been challenged by the dramatic impact of globalization-related trends in rigorous interconnected spheres; hence processes of global integration and progress do not coincide with the processes of global fragmentation. Negative aspects of globalization have been demonstrated especially in the spheres of democracy, social participation, economic justice, health, education, peace and security.

In general, international society has been confronted with the necessity to coordinate its efforts due to the number of following crucial threats to the international security:

1. Economic and social threats, including poverty, infectious disease and environmental degradation;
2. Inter-state conflicts, internal conflict, including civil war, genocide and other large-scale atrocities;
3. Nuclear, radiological, chemical and biological weapons;
4. Terrorism and transnational organized crime.

Let’s refer to several features of the above-mentioned groups of conflicts. An increase of oil and food prices, as well as international financial crises (prompted by the US mortgage crunch and the subsequent decline of the US currency,) are among the primary examples which support the necessity of global oversight. In the number of emerging transition economies, that report relatively high GPD per person, there is still poverty and practically no middle class (Kazakhstan, for instance), as GDP does not take income distribution into account.

---

Furthermore, the vicious circle of stagnation and poverty in the poorest countries remains persistent. Despite a decline in the proportion of people living in extreme poverty since the early 1990s, approximately one fifth of the world’s population continues to live on 1 USD or less per day, and another quarter lives on less than 2 USD per day.

Global climate is changing as a consequence of the so-called “greenhouse effect” caused by the burning of fossil fuels (COMECE, 2006). The reported number of natural disasters worldwide has been rapidly increasing, from fewer than 100 in 1975 to more than 400 in 2005. A glance at the 100-year record highlights the dramatic nature of the recent upsurge (see figure 1).

**Figure 1: The Number of Natural Disasters in All Countries.**

---

4 Disaster—serious disruption of the functioning of a community or a society causing widespread human, material, economic, or environmental losses that exceed the ability of the affected community or society to cope using its own resources (UNISDR Definitions).

5 EM-DAT. The OFDA/CRED International Disaster Database: www.em-dat.net. Université Catolique de Louvain, Brussels, Belgium.
Secondly, by the 1980s, the number of states faced with crises concerning their state capacity and legitimacy was on the rise, which was reflected in the spike in the number of internal conflicts, which came to be the most prevalent dominant form of warfare in the second half of the twentieth century (figure 2).

**Figure 2:** Dynamics of Civil Wars and Peace-keeping Operations (1970-2002).

---

It has to be pointed out that in 2003, for instance, there were 19 major armed conflicts in 18 locations worldwide. Only two of the 19 conflicts
were fought between two separate states: the war in Iraq pitting the multinational coalition led by the United States and the United Kingdom against the local Iraqi insurgents and terrorist networks, and the long-standing conflict between India and Pakistan over Kashmir. Nevertheless, in a globalized world, the consequences of internal conflict are no longer confined to the immediate neighborhood of the warring state (SIPRI, 2004). This can be demonstrated with the example of current instability in Nigeria and its impacts on the oil prices.

Though since 1980, a total of 81 countries have made significant steps towards democracy. 33 military regimes have been replaced by civilian governments. Among the 81 new democracies, only 47 could be classified as being fully democratic, and many others have been backsliding into authoritarianism or reengaging in conflict (UNDP, 2002).

Kosovo’s precedent proclaimed independence that is the exception to international law, for instance, might cause further conflicts and brings changes on the global political landscape. Georgia’s and Ukraine’s relations with NATO and the West could inevitably lead to political confrontation with the Russian Federation. Moreover, color revolutions in these two countries, as well as in the number of other CIS countries (Kyrgyzstan, for instance, which was the first CIS countries to be admitted to the WTO), reflects political and democratic instability in CIS countries.

This may be a nexus with sharp increases oil prices which has prompted US authorities to reconsider the basic democratic principles (that has always been the valuable pearls of progressive social development), not only in the case of Iraq (while totally referring to a means of militaristic-political intervention), but also to the number of CIS countries (while giving a preference to the MNC’s contracts irrespective to the threatening indexes of corruption and human rights violations in the countries-recipients of the US MNC’s investments).

In general, among the primary reasons of contemporary international armed conflicts, political, geographical, economic, and ethno-religious
factors should be stressed as playing key roles in their development (Patman, 2003:176; ECE, 2002; Hegre, and Sambanis, 2005). The resolution of conflicts that run along ethnic lines and sectarian divides continue to pose incredible challenges to many states worldwide. In a number of conflict-plagued states and regions, the presence of international peacekeeping forces and the true level of commitment to international treaties and mandates between actors have also come under question due to geo-political circumstances in a changing world of struggle for power and influence. The urgency to answer these seemingly endless questions remains of vital importance for local stakeholders but they are often not the priority of the international community, which typically puts an emphasis on upholding the status-quo while focusing on stability.

Thirdly, meanwhile, world military spending in 2005 increased by about 11 percent and international military spending has reached more than $1750 billion over a two year period (SIPRI, 2004). Taking into account the major threats of terrorism and international crime that many countries have pledged a commitment to fight, it can be said that state-policies are coming into a state of contradiction with the interests and eventual consequences of the world-wide weapons-businesses. The current situation demonstrates a lack of unity for the sake of global development and, not only in terms of efforts made between nations, but within individual nations as well.

In the last, but not the least, group of international threats, it is necessary to determine the critical need to generate more accurate accounting of military information and assessments of current trends and developments, which have been underlined by different think-tanks world-wide, multilateral arms control treaty regimes did not move any closer to an agreement on how to identify violations of existing treaties and agreements, or how to respond when such violations are detected. The war in Iraq was preceded by a partial effort to develop a common approach to implement the UN Security Council resolutions related to Iraqi disarmament. In addition to the US’s war on international terrorism, the US’s fight against al-Qaeda and as well as against the group al-Qaeda in Iraq could not be agreeably assessed within scientific
and political research centers as either being a civil or an international war, although it could be said it has elements of both. PRIO specialists even offered to consider it as another 'extra-systemic' peculiarity in the dataset, in other words it has become a completely new category.

The perception of post 9/11 threats has been intensifying not only in the USA, but in Europe as well. Cultural nuances are used and projected into ethnic and religious confrontations (l’affaire foular, for instance). Following the spectacular terrorist attacks of 9/11, terrorist’s threats are among the primary issues on the global agenda, and considerable efforts have been made by the international community to combat or withstand them while preventing others from occurring.

Institutes and Instruments of Global Governance
Primary actors of international affairs, such as state groups (G-8), multilateral organizations, leading think-tanks, and MNCs are associated with the actors of global governance.

Notwithstanding setbacks inflicted on the concept of UN primacy in peace and security in 2003, the United Nations remains the primary agent in international peace-keeping. Of particular importance is the demanding field of post-conflict peace-building, as well as the special role and responsibility the UN has in determining whether or not intervention is needed, and if so how to go about coordinating and establishing international peace-building efforts.

The most evident and transparent component of global governance is the United Nations (UN) system, its organs, affiliated funds, programs and other units, and specialized agencies (UN system)(Sills,2002). The UN System includes sixteen specialized agencies, which all have important roles in establishing global norms and standards. There are three groups of specialized agencies:
(1) Eight technical specialized agencies, mandated to set international standards and regulations;
(2) Three financial specialized agencies: the World Bank Group, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD);
(3) Five specialized agencies combining research, standard-setting and assistance to developing countries.

Headquarters of the major intergovernmental organizations related to the UN are diversely located all over the world: IAEA-Austria, ILO, WHO-Switzerland, FAO-Italy, UNESCO-France, WB Group-USA, IMO-UK, ICAO-Canada, UNCHS-Kenya, EcLAC-Chili, UNU-Japan (Walden, 1998:207).


NATO, another primary actor in political international affairs, has initiated a series of visionary initiatives, which represent concrete, highly practical responses to the new security challenges and opportunities of the post-Cold War environment. These include the Partnership for Peace plan, forging new relations with Russia, a distinctive partnership with Ukraine, a dialogue with Mediterranean countries, the Membership Action Plan, which is a final step program to assist aspiring countries meet NATO standards, and effective cooperation with the European Union, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the United Nations (NATO, 2005). In addition, the proliferation of nuclear, biological and chemical weapons
and their means of delivery is a matter of serious concern, and the spread of technology could result in the greater availability of sophisticated military capabilities to potential adversaries. Hence Alliance security has assumed a number of global responsibilities such as the war and nation building challenges in Afghanistan and is now posed with challenges that run contrary to underlying principles of expansion into an uncertain eastern realm that falls closely under the specter of Russia, the alliance’s long-time enemy in the past. As recently discussed at a NATO summit in Bucharest, Romania, the wider risks of terrorism, organized crime and most importantly, the disruption of the flow of vital resources all seemed to play pivotal roles in the decision not to grant at this time Membership Action Plan Status (MAP) to two former Soviet republics of Georgia and Ukraine.

The international crises of the 1990s in a number of cases required solutions for problems that were country specific. As government addressed them and as more general problems came to the forefront, serious questions had to be answered about the overall approach to global issues (Martin, 2005). The experience of state group meetings, such as the G-8 or the G-20 have also allowed world leaders to move from a focus on crisis management to a focus on steady improvements in international stability and conflict prevention, save those pre-emptive wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, and on-going conflicts and genocide in Africa. Global Partnership against the Proliferation of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction, for instance, was set out at the 2002 Kananaskis G-8 Summit documents. Since 2002, the Global Partnership has become a large-scale international initiative that has contributed to the enhancement of international security and stability (G8, 2002). The EU has been implementing a policy of intensive dialog with countries that aspire to be new member states, which implies integration into regional system and the involvement of other actors within the sphere of international relations (EUCOM, 2004).

The number of international organizations has introduced several programs in the sphere of world-wide development using scientific knowledge. The International Initiative on Science and Technology for Sustainability (ISTS) seeks to enhance the contribution of knowledge to
environmentally sustainable human development around the world (Taylor, 2005).

Through a series of meetings and consultations at such institutes as the Development International Institution for Sustainable Development, Hoover Institute, United Nations Foundation Economic Research Council, World Policy Institute, Chatham House Conferences, Wilton Park Conferences, Montreal International Forum, Davos Forum governments, civil society and industry representatives have been given new opportunities to raise and resolve some the most pressing issues facing the world. Examples include: the Kimberley process, which devised a regulatory framework that aims at ending trade conflicts in the diamond industry (conflict diamonds); and the Kyoto Protocol on the Climate Change created under the UN Framework Convention.

It is also necessary to outline the Davos Global Governance Initiative (WEF, 2008), which monitors the efforts of governments, the private sector, international organizations and civil society towards achieving the United Nations Millennium Development Goals. These important objectives relate to poverty, conflict, health, education, the environment, human rights and hunger.

**Changing Architecture for Global Governance**

Governance involves three dimensions within any institution: legitimacy, accountability, and efficiency. Efficiency has several factors involved within this context, for an international institution depends on the “degree” to which mutual interests coincide. Intersecting interests of international actors have a predominant role over their own uniquely defined interests; and, more importantly, how this impacts the perception of leading powers and their ability to react adequately to major threats. This also includes the capacity to resist them” (Torkynov, 2004).

International organizations have a wider choice of options in responding to the above-mentioned issues and threats. Meeting contemporary challenges over various issues, the UN has initiated the Security Council Reform program so that parties can reach fair and equitable agreements.
There are various UN specialists operating within its divisions who are responsible towards the planning of future projects and programs that are aimed at implementing new models and alternative means to facilitate development between countries in major regional areas.

Efforts to meet this institutional reform challenge are realized in a number of ways, ranging from debates over enlarging the size and makeup of the UN Security Council in order to make it more representative and “democratic”, to the a proposed Assemblage of Democratic States, or for an expansion of the G8 or G-20, which would be realized both in terms of membership and its mandate. The restructuring of the Organization of African States into a more robust African Union (AU) is another example of needed reform that results from failures in: the institutional capacity and the convergence of member states. There is also a degree of dissatisfaction with the level or lack of civil society in various forms, which at times has to compete with other institutions—in this case, sub-regional organizations that claim to manifest greater coherence and overall capacity. All these factors and circumstances can lead to the emergence of a new body, such as the New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

Efforts to strengthen the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) and to transform the Southern Common Market (Mercosur) into an entity that is actually able to deal with a range of issues: human rights, democratization, and security attest to the new assertiveness of sub-regional organizations in the face of the perceived need to address problems closer to home rather than through all-encompassing global organizations that are dominated by the major powers (Forman and Segaar, 2006).

Calls for reform in the IMF and the World Bank Group, including the IFC, are perceived as a current crisis of legitimacy that primarily affects multilateral financial organizations. Major challenges now face the International Monetary Fund (Tan, 2006) which is buttressed with the inherent instability of large-scale global financial flows. Capital markets and stock exchanges are prone for uncontrolled market failures, thus a pressing rationale for multilateral discipline is created.
In spite of its shortcomings, the IMF remains the only multilateral organization that is charged with ensuring international financial and monetary stability. Reform of the IMF constitutes an integral part of any effort to reform the world’s current international financial architecture. The IMF’s managing director’s report on the Fund’s medium-term strategy, released in April 2006, recognizes the urgent need for the institution to stay universally relevant and institutionally focused in the face of its present crisis of credibility and in the face of financial uncertainty (IMF, 2006).

Yet beyond these institutional reform efforts, there are other innumerable attempts to change the way the international community conducts business at an international level. Over the past several decades, a range of innovative modalities has emerged in the form of hybrid institutional arrangements. These includes the following: the Global Environment Facility, co-managed by the World Bank, the United Nations Development Program [UNDP], and the United Nations Environment Program [UNEP]; various interagency coordinating mechanisms (e.g., the Inter-Agency Standing Committee, UNAIDS, and the Inter-Agency Internal Displacement Division); new intergovernmental coalitions (e.g., the G3); public-private partnerships (e.g., the Global Alliance for Vaccines and Immunization); and private sector initiatives (e.g., Ted Turner’s Nuclear Threat Initiative).

Another gap in the international institutional architecture is found in the obvious weakness of environmental pillars of support. As a result, there needs to be urgent attention placed on the format of comprehensive reform of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), or even better, the creation of a new World Environment Organization (WEO), that would be empowered to initiate and coordinate international efforts to deal with the emergency state of the world’s global climate, work to head-off the depletion of the ozone layer, the conservation of biodiversity, the management and protection of forests, the ongoing process of desertification and the task of supplying an adequate supply of clean water to all. Other failures or weaknesses of existing international institutions may appear in the course of further analysis,
but the above-mentioned environmental issues require immediate attention.

In institutional terms, the creation of a system of global governance requires the revision of the mandates of existing international organizations. This is necessary in order to address contradicting objectives that continue to exist as permanent barriers to coherent behavior and wide gaps in the institutional architecture. A report entitled ‘Global Governance: our responsibility to make globalization an opportunity for all’ that was presented to the Bishops’ Conferences of the European Community proposes a series of core values and principles as the foundation of a system of global governance that also considers respect for human dignity, responsibility, solidarity, coherence, transparency and accountability. A focus on all of these values would allow the global society to further facilitate steps that would lead to progress in achieving global governance reforms.

**Conclusion: Towards Democratic Global Governance**

Participants in the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting of 2008 focused on the tools needed to address the many challenges that have emerged as a result of the shifting in the balance of world power. The Power of Collaborative Innovation is arguably the last remedy to the stresses created by intense globalization that have been evident in volatile financial markets. There has been the widening of income disparities between the rich and poor, which can be especially found in the world’s conflict zones. Collaborative innovation is far from the norm in international affairs, not least because the structures of global governance have evolved for nearly three generations (WEF, 2008). Nation States, even those closely collaborating, will still not be able to address future global challenges in an environment where business and civil society are not dynamically engaged with one another from the onset.

Fostering collaborative innovation becomes all the more critical in a time of heightened uncertainty. Hence, such platforms for multiple stakeholders, as provided by the World Economic Forum to address a
range of global, regional and industry issues might become truly an effective tool in meeting some of the challenges of globalization.

It is worth mentioning a recommendation made about the creation of a Global Governance Group (COMECE, 2006). This Global Governance Group was created for the purpose of dealing with horizontal matters on the global level and to assure at least a minimum of co-ordination and coherence in the system. Its contribution in this regard is considered as essential, especially in the context of a comprehensive review of existing institutional architecture, the problem of coherence, and overall directional orientation. The system of global governance will remain an unfinished work without what can be compared to a keystone in this regard.

Democracy has been a system of governance demonstrated to be the most capable of sustaining human well-being. It gives not only the opportunity for human choices to be made, but also provides guarantees for the protecting of human rights. Democratic direction joins principles of participation and accountability to the process of human development. Democracy's strategic importance to security and stability puts political participation high on the human development agenda. The links between democratic governance and economic development are not always automatic in the long-term perspective. Still, true power of the nations under such regimes as the Nazis or other totalitarian regimes is highly questionable. Human progress could only be based on the belief of people in justice and a well established and fair judicial system, and the right to appeal to higher courts and even to international institutions as well. The Process of deepening democracy not only requires an increase in democratic institutions, but also of democratic policies. A system of democratic accountability in world politics would be one where power-players would have to be held accountable to those people whose actions are profoundly affected by them and to whom they are supposed to serve (Held 2004).

Strong adherence to democratic principles contributes to political stability. Democratic governance is central to the achievement of the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), as it provides an ‘enabling
environment’ so that primary targets in the sphere of sustainable human development can be realized. With this in mind, world leaders have been joined with a policy process under the Millennium Declaration and in “sparing no effort to promote democracy and strengthen the rule of law, as well as increase respect for all internationally recognized human rights and fundamental freedoms, including the right to development”. According to the UN strategy document on the MDGs, “the MDGs have to be situated within the broader norms and standards of the Millennium Declaration”, and which includes 'Human Rights, Democracy and Good Governance’.

International cooperation has been becoming a vital and necessary issue in international relations (both in academic and practical spheres), and it is extremely important for the implementation to be realized within institutional frameworks. Contemporary world society is undeniably faced with many challenges that have resulted from the dramatic impact of trends and reactions to globalization. At no time in history have there been so many interconnected spheres within the system of international affairs. The world and its organizations have become more complex and confusing in recent years. Recent confrontations were more often than not based on ideological differences, and even now current conflicts are tightly connected to religious differences, which are even more threatening to human development in an era of nuclear destruction. Global democratic governance within the institutional frameworks and under democratic state policy has the capacity to withstand global threats and to create a much needed bridge that can be crossed in bringing about the successful facilitation of peaceful and long-term human growth and sustainable development.

Notes
My concept and standpoint dependency of the current international affairs as expressed in this article resulted in part from having taken parting Central European University’ Summer Course on “Global Governance, Globalization and International Relations Theory”, which following the defense of my Master’s dissertation at MGIMO(Moscow State Institute of International Relations). I believe such courses are truly
important and contribute to a better understanding by participants of
the different approaches and rationales of global perspectives and
developmental theories.
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