

Spring 5-4-2022

Global Governance or Global Government? An Examination of Anarchy vs. Hierarchy, Global Civil Society and International Governmental Organizations

Grace R. Purvis
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/honorsthesis>



Part of the [International Relations Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Purvis, Grace R., "Global Governance or Global Government? An Examination of Anarchy vs. Hierarchy, Global Civil Society and International Governmental Organizations" (2022). *University Honors Theses*. Paper 1217.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/honors.1248>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in University Honors Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Global Governance or Global Government?
An Examination of Anarchy vs. Hierarchy, Global Civil Society
and International Governmental Organizations

by

Grace Purvis

An undergraduate honors thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Bachelor of Arts

in

University Honors

and

Political Science

Thesis Adviser

Dr. Jack Miller

Portland State University

2022

In this thesis, I propose the existence of a global government rather than a system of global governance. This paper will not be an attempt to argue the morality of such a concept, but rather assert that it exists. To establish the idea that a global government has already been created, the focus will be on two areas: Whether the global system is anarchical or hierarchical, and the existence of a global society.

If the global system that has been established is anarchical, it would be correct to label it as a system of governance. However, if it is hierarchical, it would be more accurately described as a government. To substantiate the idea that there is a hierarchy within the global structure, this paper will look at the concept of the American Empire and western supremacy within global affairs. In particular, the Power Transition Theory, as well as the founding, history, and current status of international organizations such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the United Nations will be considered. When looking at these organizations, the focus will be on which nation states were significant and influential in their founding and which nations are influential in their functioning today.

While hierarchy is a significant indicator as to whether there is global governance or global government, the existence of a global civil society is of at least equal significance. A global society requires the participation and involvement of all nations and peoples, a shared economic system and culture. It places citizenship of the world above nationality. The shared economics and resources also help produce this interwoven global society. It is important to recognize that since this global society has been slotted together in a piecemeal fashion, there aren't specific requirements to denote a global society. It must be inferred. The impact of technology and travel has helped create this meshing of global culture and shared interest and the formation of a global society.

Governance vs. Government

To understand why the global order that has been created is better characterized as a global government than a system of governance, it is important to understand how global governance is currently defined. Global governance is the set of international laws that are formal rules as agreed to by countries in the treaties they sign. International norms act as soft

laws and are expectations, rather than mandates on how states should behave. International laws often started as international norms and these norms can be expressed by international organizations such as the UN's General Assembly. International organizations are created by law and those laws determine what powers they have and share, and their role. All of these factors enter into what is presently considered global governance.

Currently, in most popular academic discourse, the system of global governance is made up of the international organizations that help with the management of world affairs which includes norms, laws, and institutions. While many scholars agree that there is no global government, it is generally acknowledged that there is governance without government rather than the absence of governance globally. This means there is no hierarchy globally, and as such, we exist within an anarchical global system. In other words, a supranational government doesn't exist.

There is also the concept of a global civil society which is a complex of non-governmental entities. Civil society is not composed of nation states as members, but rather as individual groups that interact across state boundaries. This reinforces the idea that there can be an international society even without an international government.

The scholar Lawrence Finkelstein looks at this in his article, "What is Global Governance?" and notes the "inescapable ambiguity about the nature of the 'international system'" and that this "ambiguity affects not only what is meant by global but also what is meant by governance" (Lawrence, 1995). However, he concludes that "since the international system notoriously lacks hierarchy and government, the fustier word governance is used instead" (Lawrence, 1995).

Most scholars find the term governance to be more fitting because we are not at the point where we have a global society of humankind. In domestic society, there tends to be a common purpose with foundational goals. In his work, Hedley Bull often references security of the body, security of agreements, and security of possession as being the main concern. When it comes to the global spectrum, the question arises, are the goals the same in an international society? A system of states isn't necessarily a society of states. They need to share some common goals to commit to some rules and laws.

For states, security of the body equates to security of territory, the sovereignty of a state. Then there is security of agreement (*pacta sunt servanda*) without which, international law couldn't exist. Security of possessions relates to territory, specifically territorial jurisdiction/territorial principle. While these concepts seem clear-cut and reasonable, some complications arise naturally due to the complexity of global interactions. For example, the nationality principle of jurisdiction can sometimes conflict with extradition treaties. In this case, if a crime is committed by a person on foreign soil, which nation-state has jurisdiction? The nation in which the crime was committed, or the nation to which the criminal belongs? Another example is dual citizenship. On an international scale, people are the "possessions" of the state, but if a person has dual citizenship, which state has priority when it comes to determining jurisdiction?

According to Bull, these three foundational goals are important to states interacting among each other and functioning in a global capacity. It's not just a system of states, but a society of states. However, this doesn't mean we are all citizens of the world. This is because nation states are currently considered legal persons, not the individual people. As such, it is often proposed that we have not yet reached the point of a global government, but that it is a very real possibility sometime in the future.

Scholars like Alexander Wendt, Thomas Weiss, and Campbell Craig look at the concept of a world government and Wendt concludes that a world government is unavoidable in his article, "Why a World State is Inevitable". He argues that world state formation follows five stages: the system of states, the society of states, world society, collective security, and finally the world state (Wendt, 2003). The first four steps constitute, "distinct cultures of anarchy. Each culture imposes boundary conditions that increasingly constrain the interactions of the system's parts, but in so doing enable growing subjectivity and freedom at the global level" (Wendt, 2003). This would eventually lead to a world state where state sovereignty would be set aside and the system would be more focused on the individual.

While all of this makes sense logically, I would like to propose the idea that we have already reached the point of a world government. Since anarchy is so important when it comes to

the global system and differentiating between global governance and global government, I would like to argue that we have already created a hierarchy within the global system.

Global Society

When talking about a global society, it is important to factor in globalization and the widespread access to the Internet. A society is composed of an economic structure, governing body, military/enforcement, and shared culture. As such, a global society should have similar characteristics and functions. It is also significant to remember that a society has a variety of factors that contribute to its formation. This paper will focus on these aspects of society despite there being others that could be considered a part of society. Like a justice system or police force.

It is important to recognize a shift towards a global society utilizing the Internet. This allows people all over the world to connect and bond over hobbies or similarities that are not based on nationality.

David Lake notes that the global system doesn't need to be totally anarchical and that it can be somewhat hierarchical while still being a system of governance rather than a government. I would argue that both an international hierarchy and a development in global society have formed a global government rather than just a system of governance.

Bretton Woods Conference

After the economic devastation that occurred during the aftermath of WWI and WWII, it was generally agreed upon by all nations that there needed to be a way to regulate and stabilize the international monetary and financial system. The Bretton Woods Conference was a global attempt to come up with methods and institutions to do just that. The conference took place in Bretton Woods, New Hampshire, United States from July 1-22, 1944 and resulted in the establishment of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and plans for the World Bank.

The Bretton Woods Conference promoted the idea of open markets and economic interactions between all nations. There was a strong effort during the Bretton Woods Conference to steer away from economic nationalism. This was in sharp contrast to the “international financial system of the pre-1930s period [which] had been characterized by informal ‘rules of the game’ and a kind of networked financial governance involving central banks and private financiers” (Helleiner, 2010). It was the beginning of a trend of globalization and interdependence between nations.

Most of the work done throughout the conference was through three main commissions, focusing on the IMF, the IBRD and other options for international financial collaboration. Each commission had committees and some had subcommittees. Processes and agreements were generally reached through negotiations rather than voting, but when it came to major decisions, it was done by vote, and each country in attendance had one vote. However, since the United States had the world’s largest economy, it tended to have the most influence over the proposals at Bretton Woods. Both in the past and currently, the IMF and World Bank “have been guided by the governments that created and run them and in particular by their most powerful member states. They have also availed themselves of impressive resources - economists, research, data, personnel, and lendable funds - all mainly based at their headquarters in Washington D.C.” (Woods, 2006). The outcome of the Bretton Woods conference was significant because it guided the creation of Institutions that now dictate and influence the global economy.

Prior to the Bretton Woods agreement, there wasn’t really an international way of dealing with currency. The pound had the most global circulation due to the British empire. As noted in *The Globalizers*, part of the British empire's power came from their control over the economic sector and the predominance of the British pound. However there weren’t really international institutions that enforced that. Now, the US dollar has become so ingrained in its position of power because there are various international institutions to emphasize and solidify its role of significance. This is important because it slows down the process of transitioning from one powerful currency to another within the global market.

International Monetary Fund

When the IMF was founded, its primary focus was: to keep an eye on the fixed exchange rate arrangements between countries. This was important because it helped national governments regulate their exchange rates and therefore prioritize economic growth. It also allowed nations to provide short-term capital which helped with the balance of payments. All of this was meant to help avoid international economic crises which due to globalism would negatively influence the global economy. The IMF was also created to help rebuild aspects of the international economy that had been damaged after the Great Depression and World War II. The IMF was also focused on being able to provide capital investments for economic growth and projects such as infrastructure.

Currently, the IMF plays a large role in managing international financial crises, while also working to improve the economies of its member countries. The funds for the IMF are determined by a quota system and all member countries are required to provide funds. This supply of money is then set aside and can be borrowed by countries experiencing a balance of payments problems.

The structure of the IMF is important because it dictates the policies that come out of it. The IMF has a board of governors which has one governor and one alternate governor for each member country. It is also important to note that each country appoints its governor. Then there is the Executive board with 24 Executive Directors. Since there are only 24 executive directors, countries with large economies get to have an Executive Director, while most countries are grouped in constituencies with one Executive Director representing multiple countries at once.

Voting power in the IMF is done through a quota system. Each member has basic votes, but then there are also special drawing rights (votes) which are dependent upon the amount of currency a member provides to the IMF. It is also important to note that changes in the voting shares require approval by a supermajority of 85% of the voting power (Lipsky, 2015). Since it requires a supermajority of 85% to change voting shares it would require a great consensus among many members and this is highly unlikely. This greatly reduces the chance of

voting shares being changed. It should also be noted that the IMF's voting shares are relatively inflexible.

When it comes to voting shares, the United States alone has 16.5% of the total votes with a total of 831,407 votes. This is almost three times larger than the next country, Japan, which has a total of 309,670 votes. As a result, the United States wields great influence when it comes to determining the outcome of decisions that require a vote. As a result, the United States has a certain degree of influence over global economic affairs that is larger than any other nation and can disproportionately benefit the United States and its allies whether this is intentional and deliberate or not (just a result of cause and effect).

Rank	IMF Member country	Number of votes	Percentage out of total votes
1	United States	831,407	16.51
2	Japan	309,670	6.15
3	China	306,294	6.08
4	Germany	267,809	5.32
5	France	203,016	4.03
6	United Kingdom	203,016	4.03
7	Italy	152,165	3.02
8	India	132,609	2.64
9	Russia	130,502	2.59
10	Brazil	111,885	2.22

Figure 1. The table shows the quota and voting shares for IMF members from 2019

Source: <https://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/memdir/eds.aspx>

The World Bank

The World Bank (WB) was created at the 1944 Bretton Woods Conference along with the IMF. It tends to work hand in hand with the IMF with a great deal of interaction between the two institutions. When it comes to the structure of the World Bank [International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA)], there is a President of the Bank. This person is the president of the entire World Bank Group [which consists of five organizations, the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), the International Development Association (IDA), the International Finance Corporation (IFC), the Multilateral Investment Guarantee Agency (MIGA), and the International Center for Settlement of Investment Disputes (ICSID)]. The president of the World Bank Group often works closely with the IMF.

When considering the structure of the World Bank in context to the greater picture that is being made in this paper, it is important to note that the president of the World Bank has historically been American along with most of the chief/senior economists. As such most policy and economic strategy tends to be western and often push democracy and capitalism abroad. This once again ties in with the concept of the American Empire which ties in to the idea of the power transition theory which ties into the idea of a global hierarchy.

Presidents

Name	Dates	Nationality
Eugene Meyer	June 1946 – December 1946	United States
John Jay McCloy	March 1947 – June 1949	United States
Eugene Robert Black	July 1949 – December 1963	United States
George David Woods	January 1963 – March 1968	United States

Robert Strange McNamara	April 1968 – June 1981	United States
Alden Winship Clausen	July 1981 – June 1986	United States
Barber Conable	July 1986 – August 1991	United States
Lewis Preston	September 1991 – May 1995	United States
James D. Wolfensohn	June 1995 – May 2005	United States - Australia (prev.)
Paul Wolfowitz	June 2005 – June 2007	United States
Robert B. Zoellick	July 2007 – June 2012	United States
Jim Yong Kim	July 2012 – February 2019	United States - South Korea (prev.)
Kristalina Georgieva	February 2019 – April 2019 (interim)	Bulgaria
David Malpass	April 2019 – present	United States

Figure 2. This table shows the past presidents of the World Bank and highlights the fact that they are predominantly United States citizens. Source:

<http://www.worldbank.org/en/about/archives/history/past-presidents>

The GATT & WTO

The General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) is an international, legal agreement, and a byproduct of the Bretton Woods Conference which produced the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank. In 1947, the GATT was formalized and signed by 23 countries with the intent to minimize barriers to international trade via such things as the least favored nation status. Member nations agreed to eliminate or reduce quotas (depending on the

circumstances), tariffs, and subsidies while maintaining impactful regulations. This was significant because it allowed for the import and export of goods and ideas to flow easily across borders.

These new institutions and agreements were able to be put in place, in part, because the old economic order had failed (Helleiner, 2010). As the US and West wane in power and global influence, it opens the door for nations rising in power to try to dictate the global economic activity. During the Bretton Woods Conference, the US was able to ensure that its dollar would have a dominant international presence (Woods, 2006). This has helped the US maintain its prominence in the global economic world. In 1995, the World Trade Organization (WTO) followed the GATT in an even more extensive attempt to create uniformity in world trade. The WTO and GATT have led to increased globalization.

International infrastructure

There are certain recent advances in technology that have led to the easy transmission of culture across national borders. Things like planes have made it much easier for people to travel and share culture and ideas. Boats, trains and planes make it easy for there to be a transmission of goods. Then there is the Internet which makes it excessively easy for certain ideas and norms typical for large swaths of people regardless of nationality. It allows for people (typically middle to upper class) to associate and identify not by things such as locality or nationality, but more ideological and interest based things.

These things lead to the formation of a global society because it allows for people to form their bonds on shared interests rather than geographical location. It also allows for the easy transmission of goods which creates the opportunity for people to have a shared experience (in terms of items) regardless of where they are in the world location wise. It is significant to note that the barrier for these things is not location, but economics.

A global society needs shared economics, trade, a governing body, culture and a body that enforces things (like a military or police force). Things like a justice system and such are also important. A society doesn't need all of these things, after all, some societies at a national

level are either more or less effective and cohesive. However, the international sphere has enough of these things to create a society, but a fragile one. Most of it hinges on implicit agreements and understandings rather than explicit agreements or institutions to enforce things.

It is also important to take into consideration that a global society should follow the original concept of security of body, security of goods, security of etc. these things start with the individual and then are extended to the (nation) state and can also be applied to the international sphere. When it applies to the individual these things are important to protect against other people, then when it comes to nations they want these things from “exterior” threats like other nations. When it is then used in terms of the global sphere it has to be thought of a little differently. Since there is no intergalactic threat or other factors these things are not protection against an external threat, but rather an internal threat. However, the same basic principles apply.

United Nations

Although this was not the intent the UN has acted as a governing body of the global sphere it in some regards does so. When attempting to create the United Nations with the hopes of maintaining international peace and security, the nation states that met for a conference to draft the UN Charter took various things into consideration. One of these things was the League of Nations. Although there were many reasons why the League of Nations was a failure there were two big tests that the League failed to overcome. The first was when Manchuria withdrew from the League of Nations. In 1931 the League of Nations created a resolution that Japan should withdraw from Manchuria, but Japan ignored the resolution and continued to expand. The League could have economically sanctioned Japan, but instead decided to investigate the case and ask Japan to withdraw. When the conclusion was reached that Japan had violated China’s territory, the Japanese delegation also left the League of Nations. So not only did the League fail to protect one of its members, but it also failed to retain members they condemned. Then in 1935, Italy invaded Ethiopia. In response, the League put sanctions in place against Italy, but that failed to fix the situation or protect Ethiopia. Then in 1936 Ethiopia fell to the Italians.

The next test was World War II. Hitler pulled out of the League of Nations in 1933. Then in 1936, Germany reoccupied Rhineland. From 1938-1939 the Germans occupied Czechoslovakia, and the Winter War took place during November 30, 1939 - March 13, 1940. At the start of the Winter War Finland notified the League of the Soviets invasion which resulted in the League expelling the Soviet Union on December 14, 1939. At this point, the League of Nations had lost Germany, the Soviet Union, the United States, etc. and was on its last leg. Part of the reason why nations were so quick to abandon the organization was because there wasn't a veto power. However, after the failure of the League of Nations the veto began to take shape and would eventually be implemented as a part of the United Nations. It would help encourage members to remain a part of the UN even if they couldn't always get what they wanted.

A charter is a treaty between states. It establishes that members must behave in a specific manner. It also enumerates the rights and responsibilities (by international law) of all the members who have signed the charter. Bylaws are rules that lay out the functions of an organization, what the organization can do, and noting the roles of groups within the organization. Charters can sometimes be referred to as a constitution because they function similarly. A charter has the same rights of states (sovereignty).

In the UN Charter, article 1 states that the UN's purpose is to maintain international peace and security. It looks at the gap between the most developed nations and lesser developed nations. It also looks at basic human rights, not based on citizenship to a specific nation, but as a part of human society. This is important because a more individualistic stance is part of creating a world government rather than a system of global governance.

Hierarchy

In his book *Hierarchy in International Relations* David Lake makes the argument that while the global system as a whole is anarchical, the interactions between nations doesn't have to be that way.

The international system is considered to be anarchical because it doesn't appear to have an organized hierarchy, but the concept of a hierarchy in order for there to be a government is

misleading. In a democratic form of government there tends to be a more relaxed hierarchy while governments like dictatorships and authoritarian rule tend to have rigid hierarchies. So my argument is that despite there being a disorganized and rather weak hierarchy within the international system it does exist. It is weak because it is solely based on which nations are currently the most powerful and which nations were the most powerful at the time of the creation of international organizations such as the IMF, World Bank, UN etc. This disparity in nations power levels creates a pecking order/unintentional hierarchy. The concept of anarchy vs hierarchy in the international system is that we have an anarchical international because there is no clear hierarchy. However this is misleading. In reality there is no official hierarchy. Instead there is an established hierarchy that is just assumed and accepted based on the power of nations. This power stems from various places. A nation's wealth, military might, cultural influence, power at the time of the formation of these international institutions etc.

American Empire

The term American Empire is used to describe the cultural, political, military and economic influence of the United States globally rather than the historical use of empire which implies things like colonization. This idea of an American Empire is also tied to the concept of American superiority and the concept of American exceptionalism which should be spread abroad. American exceptionalism revolves around the idea that a group of people connect over shared ideals (and consider this the most significant tie between people) rather than things like race, ethnicity or shared history. Until the Spanish American War in 1898 American expansion was primarily within the United States. This “expansion” taking place was an attempt to spread the ideals and principles of the Constitution, (primarily liberty and democracy) throughout America.

After this expansion was completed within the United States there was an impulse for America to promote these concepts globally. As such, the United States set up many bases abroad and attempted to expand these ideas beyond the United States borders. This can be seen in the United States as attempts to intervene in other countries affairs whether it be to influence

Nations into moving towards democracy or aiding countries in their times of need. The United States has historically attempted to gain a foothold in as many countries as they can to exert their influence. This plays into the concept of an "American Empire" because it could be argued that US military bases abroad now function similarly to the role colonies played in days past.

The concept of an American Empire can also be linked to "American imperialism". American imperialism is a term used to describe American policy that tries to expand political, economic, and cultural control of the United States government beyond its boundaries. Some critics of contemporary imperialism use the term neocolonialism interchangeably. However, in today's day and age economic power is used rather than military power.

In the article "American Empire? Ancient Reflections on Modern American Power" by Eric W. Robinson notes that the concept of the American Empire has been increasingly popular since the fall of the Soviet Union which left the United States as the world's only "superpower". According to Robinson, "no other nation on earth comes close to matching America's combination of military power, military reach, alliances, advanced technology, and economic strength" (2005). Robinson delves into the difference between hegemony and Empire in his article eventually concluding that the idea of an American Empire is a misnomer, but that the "American hegemony will continue" (2005). Whether you quibble on the terminology of Empire or hegemony the global power of the United States is undeniable. As such it's not particularly important whether an American Empire or American hegemony exists. What is more important is whether America can exert its power and influence globally.

Power Transition Theory

The power transition theory (PTT) is an attempt to explain why nations function the way they do in regards to how power is legitimized. I will use it to show how it creates an acknowledged, but unofficial hierarchy, within the international system. A.F.K. Organski proposed the idea of the power transition theory in his book World Politics (1958). According to Organski, "An even distribution of political, economic, and military capabilities between contending groups of states is likely to increase the probability of war; peace is preserved best

when there is an imbalance of national capabilities between disadvantaged and advantaged nations; the aggressor will come from a small group of dissatisfied strong countries; and it is the weaker, rather than the stronger power that is most likely to be the aggressor” (Organski, 1958).

The power transition theory was an attempt to understand and explain patterns between warring states throughout time. Throughout history One Nation tends to achieve hegemonic power; eventually another Nation with equal economic and military power will challenge them. This usually results in the two groups clashing in war leading to a transition in power between the two groups.

However, over time this cycle has not remained unchanged. After the World Wars, no power maintained hegemony, even after the Treaty of Versailles. It is also important to note that after the Second World War, the United States had a disproportionate military capacity compared to most of the rest of the world. The US along with the Soviet Union became what was to be considered the world’s first superpowers. These superpowers were so dominant that it was very difficult for any other nation to match their might. As such it was highly unlikely that other smaller nations would become the aggressors in any conflict with these more powerful nations. After the fall of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War, the United States was left as the world's sole superpower.

The power transition theory is important in determining that there is a hierarchy at the global level. In Douglas Lemke’s “The Continuation of History: Power Transition Theory and the End of the Cold War” he notes:

“to set up a system of relations with lesser states which can be called an 'order' because the relations are stabilized. In time, everyone comes to know what kind of behavior to expect from the others, habits and patterns are established, and certain rules as to how these relations ought to be carried on grow to be accepted by all parties . . . Certain nations are recognized as leaders... Trade is conducted along recognized channels . . . Diplomatic relations also fall into recognized patterns. Certain nations are expected to support other nations...” (Lemke, 1997).

This is important when it comes to the concept of a hierarchy within the global system when looking at the actions of certain International organizations. It also helps establish the idea of how power can be recognized as legitimate. If the United States tried to exert their power and all of the smaller nations refused to fall in line then it could be argued that there is no hierarchy within the global spectrum. However, the “system of relations” that was established after World War II globally placed the United States at the peak due to its superior economic and production capability.

In Ron Tammen’s article on PTT it was noted that “Power Transition deals with the pattern of changing power relationships in world politics. It provides a probabilistic tool by which to measure these changes and it allows forecasting of likely events in future rounds of change.” It was also noted that “A number of related schools of thought now recognize Power Transition’s insight about hierarchy, but there is disagreement between Power Transition and such schools on the concept of hegemony. Interdependence advocates, for example, argue that a hegemonic actor is required for peace because it can unilaterally impose rules that secure stability (Gilpin 1981; Keohane 1984; Keohane and Nye 1990). Under this condition, at the global level, hegemony is defined as existing when one state produces more than 50% of the global total output. But this asymmetry arose in reality only once during the last 400 years for the short period following World War II when America was disproportionately powerful due to war devastation in Europe and Asia.”

It is significant to remember that it’s not just a hierarchy, but that the hierarchy results in actual global actions and decisions. Nations have to consider the global effect, not just their specific (nation) state.

Natural hierarchy creates a pathway for a global society to form.

- A global society requires economics (IMF, WB etc.)
- Trade that easily exports goods across (nation) state borders (WTO)
- Governing structure (UN)
- Military (NATO) there is even Interpol (although “INTERPOL is not a police force. It is the machinery for international police cooperation and communication. ... International

police cooperation is the coordinated action of the member countries' police forces, all of which supply and request information and services.”)

- It even has a judicial system (although vastly limited by the fact that it can't enforce the decisions it makes) in place.
- Shared culture (Internet and globalization)

All of this is also important for the formation of a global society.

The organization of these institutions is all created out of a natural need for international order. This would probably fit closest to the functionalism school of thought. However, my argument looks at the nuances of the international system and concludes that it is not on its way to creating a global government, but already there. The international organizations have already been created due to necessity and unintentionally just due to human nature or political nature the most powerful nations were able to utilize those institutions to create an unexpected and not acknowledged world government.

Washington Consensus

The Washington Consensus is a set of 10 economic policies that are the advised typical reform ideas for developing countries by Washington, D.C. institutions like the IMF and World Bank. The term Washington Consensus was first used by John Williamson and was used to reference the shared themes among most of the Washington based institutions (IMF, World Bank, US Treasury Department) when it came to policy advice for nations in need of economic help.

According to Williamson, the 10 economic policies were:

1. Budget deficits ... should be small enough to be financed without recourse to the inflation tax.
2. Public expenditure should be redirected from ... areas that receive more resources ... toward neglected fields with high economic returns and the potential to improve income distribution, such as primary education and health, and infrastructure.
3. Tax reform ... to broaden the tax base and cut marginal tax rates.

4. Financial liberalization, involving the ultimate objective of market-determined interest rates.
5. A unified exchange rate at a level sufficiently competitive to induce rapid growth in nontraditional exports.
6. Quantitative trade restrictions to be rapidly replaced by tariffs, which would be progressively reduced until a uniform low rate in the range of 10 to 20 percent was achieved.
7. Abolition of barriers impeding the entry of FDI (foreign direct investment).
8. Privatization of state enterprises.
9. Abolition of regulations that impede the entry of new firms or restrict competition.
10. The provision of secure property rights, especially to the informal sector.

(Williamson, 1990).

While the Washington Consensus was originally just a term used by Williamson to reference the ten policies that he believed most Washington based institutions thought would benefit all of the struggling Latin American countries in the 90s, it came to encompass all of the similarities of those Washington based institutions. “By the late 1990s, the IMF and World Bank were particularly focused on three different problems in the world economy. The first . . . crisis management . . . the second and sometimes overlapping role was transition [and the] third role shared by the institutions was development in the poorest, often war-torn parts of the world” (Woods, 2006). While the goals and focus of the IMF and World Bank have evolved they continue to share many traits and primary economic policy ideas. Both the Fund and the Bank worked successfully as world globalizers.

Another reason why the IMF and World Bank tend to have policies that mirror each other is because many of the economists that work in these Washington based institutions received an education within the United States or Europe. “Senior staff in both organizations share a very similar training. At the top of both institutions senior managers are overwhelmingly trained at graduate level in economics or a closely related field in a North American or anglophone university” (Woods, 2006). As such, there tends to be a similar ideology when it comes to economic policy that is produced, and it tends to be predominantly Western. Despite some

attempts and limited success for these organizations to decentralize, “powerful governments influence the agenda and activities of both the IMF and World Bank. The political preferences of the United States and other industrialized countries provide a strong bottom line or outer structural constraint within which the IMF and World Bank work” (Woods, 2006). Over time the World Bank has decentralized far more than the IMF, but both remain somewhat beholden to the will of the powerful member countries that preside over them.

For example, the Washington Consensus is also considered to sometimes subtly promote things like democracy and capitalism to countries seeking help from organizations like the IMF and World Bank. “The Bank and Fund now advocate a set of policies that emphasize good governance and the need for sound political and legal institutions as a prerequisite for effective economic policy” (Woods, 2006). While this may or may not be true, these institutions tend to promote the ideas most aligned with their beliefs and discount the concept that there might be other viable ways to ensure economic policy and stability globally. This is important because it once again plays into the idea of an American Empire. It is another avenue for the United States to spread its ideas and influence abroad.

The United Nations

The UN has a forum for all states to get together and talk. This is an important, but often overlooked role of the UN. Since poorer states might not have the money to maintain an embassy in other nations, the UN plays a significant role in providing all member nations the ability to meet in a safe place and interact with other nations.

When it comes to the structure of the United Nations there are five main organs; the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and the UN Secretariat. The General Assembly (chapter 4 of the UN Charter) works as a deliberative body for the UN member states. The General Assembly approves a budget, sets the contributions each state gives which is binding and so forth. Each member state has one vote and a $\frac{2}{3}$ vote is generally needed to pass something in the General Assembly. Most decisions made by the General Assembly are not binding but do have significant

weight. It is important to note that the General Assembly is not a legislative body. The League of Nations also had an assembly, but not much was established in terms of its power or function. The role and rules of the UN assembly are more enumerated and clear.

International Laws are treaties which are signed and ratified by the states. There are also customs/customary behavior which then becomes obligatory and then law (“customary law”). The General Assembly in their declarations can affirm customary law. In making declarations or passing resolutions the text can then be used to form treaties which are laws and binding. The assembly plays a role in providing language and aspirations which can result in treaty law. For example the UN General Assembly originally took a stance against genocide and that eventually became a treaty which is binding. The General Assembly can be thought of as the birthplace of ideas that often become treaty law.

The UN Economic and Social Council addresses global economic and social affairs. This body is responsible for ensuring collaboration between states when it comes to social and economic issues. The Economic and Social Council is made up of 54 members that are elected by the General Assembly. The UN Secretariat works as an administrative body within the UN and helps support the other bodies by doing things like organizing meetings, and drafting reports. The ICJ is able to resolve disputes between states that are willing to recognize their jurisdiction. However, it is important to note that while they may issue legal opinions on cases they have no power to enforce such decisions. As such their decisions are more of a recommendation than a mandate to the nations that they advise.

The UN Security Council addresses international security issues and its role is enumerated in Chapter 5 of the Charter. The structure of the UN Security Council is interesting, there are fifteen members, five permanent members with veto power (US, UK, France, Russia, China) and ten elected members. The permanent five are noted in Chapter 7 of the UN Charter which means it is highly unlikely that they will ever be removed from their permanent seats. As doing so would require great changes to the UN charter and the structure of the UN itself. All of the major powers that were on the victorious side of WWII ended up as part of the Permanent 5 with the ten other states serving on rotating terms. A nine vote majority is required for a UN security resolution.

The UN institutionalized the balance of power as it was after WWII. The League of Nations gave permanent seats, but no veto. As such, big powers would just leave if something they didn't like passed. The UN wouldn't have that problem because there were permanent seats and veto power. This helped ensure the longevity of the UN in contrast to the League of Nations where most nations would leave when something they didn't like got passed.

Over time the Security Council has evolved and added new aspects to their role in maintaining international security. The Security Council's first use of police action was when North Korea invaded South Korea. When the UN voted on whether or not to intervene in the Korean War the Soviet Union was not there to cast a veto vote. To abstain does not equal a veto. Since Russia decided to abstain from voting on the Korean War the UN ended up intervening in the war.

The Security Council can act freely and this is laid out in Article 25 of the UN Charter. When the Security Council passes a resolution it is equivalent to a law. States sign the charter when they join the UN so they understand that resolutions are laws and as such binding. The Security Council is responsible for recommending new member states that will be approved by the General Assembly. For example, Taiwan was recommended, but vetoed by China and Kosovo was recommended but was vetoed by Russia.

The Security Council created its first Peacekeeping force as a product of a General Assembly action in response to the Suez Canal. The creation of this peacekeeping force was debated because the General Assembly created a power for itself. The International Court of Justice gave an advisory opinion that said that certain expenses of the UN like peacekeeping forces were not used to enforce these opinions. Peacekeeping is consistent with chapter 6 of the Charter which the general assembly is involved in. Thus the UN could evolve as long as it stayed consistent with what was stated in the UN charter.

The UN's operating funds come from the member states. The UN has a two-year budget. There is a separate peacekeeping budget and the regular operating budget.

Member state	Contribution (% of UN budget)
 United States	22.000
 China	12.005
 Japan	8.564
 Germany	6.090
 United Kingdom	4.567
 France	4.427
 Italy	3.307
 Brazil	2.948
 Canada	2.734
 Russia	2.405

Figure 3. This table shows each nation state and their contribution to the UN's budget from 2019.

Source: <https://undocs.org/en/ST/ADM/SER.B/992>

When asserting whether there is a global hierarchy or not it is important to really study the UN. At its founding the UN was created with the idea that all nations should remain sovereign and distinct entities. According to the UN Charter, and from a legal standpoint, all

states are sovereign and equal (article 2.1 of the UN charter). This was an important aspect to ensuring the success of the United Nations. Article 2.4. - League covenant article 15.8. were in an attempt to assure states that they were not giving up all of their power by joining the League of Nations and also providing the option for withdrawal from the UN. The UN Charter article 2.7 also addresses states' concerns about giving up their power by joining the UN by looking at domestic jurisdiction and emphasizing the idea that conflicts that remain confined within a nation's borders will be under that nation's jurisdiction. However, historically this hasn't always been true. As time has passed and as globalization has occurred conflicts within one nation can have ripple effects. As such the UN started to get involved in other nations affairs.

UN Military Force and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)

The creation of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) occurred April 4th, 1949 in Washington, D.C., United States. It was a military alliance founded by Belgium, the US, France, Netherlands, UK, Luxembourg, Portugal, Norway, Iceland, Italy, Canada, and Denmark. The concept was of collective defense. The UN was created with the idea of collective security in mind. The UN was intended to be a group of all sovereign states that are concerned about global security. On the other hand, NATO was about collective defense, and a smaller group of states that agreed to come to each other's aid.

NATO has an international component to it as it requires the cooperation and trust of a small group of states. NATO has a bit of double logic to it, there is the intent to defend and protect against outside forces, encourage internal stability and promote democracy (and to some extent capitalism) abroad. This is an interesting aspect to NATO and it is somewhat similar to the unexpected byproduct of the IMF and World Bank which also work to sometimes subtly promote democracy and capitalism abroad.

There were a few events and influences that led to the founding of NATO. In 1947 there was the Britain and France Dunkirk Pact which was the pact between Britain and France to protect them against an attack from Germany. After that there was the 1948 Brussels Treaty or the Brussels Pact was the treaty that founded the Western Union Defense Organization (WUDO)

which was the precursor to NATO. In 1948 there was the Berlin Blockade which was the first major international crisis of the Cold War.

This led to the 1949 North Atlantic Treaty. The organizational aspects took place in the following years resulting in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). NATO wasn't just about defense, there was also an internal aspect to the organization. NATO and its members encouraged a specific type of government - democracy, and a specific economic system - free trade. NATO started with 12 member states, it now has 29 members. Each state has an ambassador.

In 1955 the NATO parliament became active. To some extent it worked to solidify the internal mission of NATO. It helped create a common sense of collective and there was a community building aspect to the NATO parliament. The structure of NATO has a similar set up to that of the League of Nations, the United Nations, and the European Union. It has a military and civilian structure along with agencies and committees. There are two broad pieces to NATO's military structure. There is the Supreme Allied Commander of Europe (SACU) and they are always American (the first was Dwight D. Eisenhower). Then there is the Allied Command Transformation (ACT). ACT's goal is to create more efficient militaries, new doctrines, and work on military effectiveness.

Over time there have been various NATO enlargements with Article 10 of the charter having provisions for NATO's growth. NATO expanded throughout the Cold War. The first enlargement was in 1952 when Greece and Turkey wanted to join. At the time Greece and Turkey did not have democratic governments and there was a great deal of tension between the two countries. The reason they were admitted was due to pragmatism. Russia was pressuring Turkey to join them and Greece was facing internal trouble which Russia was exacerbating in the attempt to destabilize the country. As such NATO thought it was the best course of action to admit both countries to ensure global stability despite both of those countries not being democracies.

The second enlargement was in 1955 in West Germany. This enlargement was accompanied by a lot of internal politics within NATO. At that time, if any fighting in Europe

was to take place it would almost certainly take place in West Germany. If that happened it would trigger the Warsaw Pact.

After the second enlargement a major event took place within NATO. On June 21st, 1996 France withdrew from the military aspect of NATO. However they didn't withdraw from the treaty which meant their promise to come to the aid of their allies if they were attacked still stood. The reason France withdrew from NATO was due to the successful launch of Sputnik in 1957. The Soviet Union was the first nation to launch something into orbit. The French doubted that the US would come to the aid of Europe if the Soviet Union could now use weapons (launched from and able to go through space) that could reach the US. France's reduced involvement in NATO takes place in roughly a decade and during this time France focuses on their autonomous weapon capability.

After the withdrawal of France from NATO there was the third enlargement. In 1982 Spain joined the organization and this inclusion was strategic. The US pushed for Spain's inclusion despite Spain being a fascist (rather than democratic) government. Thus Spain began to undergo the process of transitioning to a democracy.

At the end of the Cold War NATO had 16 members. But what about Germany? It was becoming clear that Germany would not remain divided forever. What would Germany's status be in NATO? As a result the Two and Four Pact - which involved the Two Germany's and four occupying powers was created. It was an agreement that the occupying powers would withdraw from Germany allowing it to reunite as a singular entity. After that NATO began working towards Germany being admitted to NATO with the agreement that there would be no nuclear weapons, limited military size, and no foreign military forces in former East Germany. After the German reunification all of Germany was officially part of NATO in 1990.

After that there was the fourth enlargement in 1999 which admitted the Czech Republic, Hungary and Poland into NATO. The fifth enlargement in 2004 which admitted Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia. In 2008 Georgia wanted to join NATO, but Russian intervention prevented this from happening. Russia was reluctant to let Georgia join since they were a former member of the Soviet republic. Russia also intervened in order to prevent Ukraine from joining NATO for the same reason. Then there was the sixth

enlargement in 2009 which included Albania and Croatia. In 2011 the conflict in Libya resulted in the UN military council calling for military action due to the responsibility to protect, not because of a threat to international security. This was the first use of responsibility to protect (responsibility to protect was the justification for the military intervention) by the UN. This is important because it once again sets the precedent which allows an international organization to interfere in other nations affairs. The seventh and final enlargement was in 2017 and it included Montenegro. During this time Macedonia and Bosnia were put on a Membership Action Plan (MAP) in the hopes that it would prepare them to someday join NATO.

The Korean War was the first use of UN military force. The UN outsourced the job to the US and other nations to provide/create the military force, in other words these nations had to provide the manpower and weapons. These states were deputized to carry out the Security Councils authority. This set a precedent and led to the authorization regime (enumerated in Chapter VII: Action Concerning Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace and Acts of Aggression). Then there was the UN military action in (Southern) Rhodesia in the 1960s. The Security Council allowed for non-military coercion, sanctions. This was the first use of sanctions by the UN, but the concept of sanctions was enumerated in Chapter 7 - Article 41 of the UN Charter.

After that there was the Suez crisis in 1956. The UN Security Council was immobilized by Great Britain's vote and as a result they couldn't interfere in the conflict. Eventually, the general council got involved which resulted in the Peacekeepers - neutral, lightly armed peacekeeping forces that were intended to act as a tripwire to discourage both sides from fighting again. Although there is nothing explicitly written about peacekeeping in the UN charter, it was not inconsistent with the goals of the UN. As such, it was decided that the UN was still acting within the parameters set in the UN Charter when they created these peacekeeping forces.

After the peacekeeping forces were established there were rules put in place about when and where they could act. Before a peacekeeping force can enter a country there must be a cease-fire, peacekeepers must be neutral, and UN peacekeepers must have permission from the sovereign state to be there. If permission is rescinded by a state, peacekeepers must leave immediately.

There was a conflict in Haiti in the 1990s. The UN decided to take enforcement action despite it not being a threat to international security. However, this conflict took place before the UN failures and apprehension. As such it doesn't receive as much attention, but it does raise questions over state sovereignty. This is another example of a smaller state having their sovereignty disregarded in favor of the will of larger countries like the United States and other members of the UN.

In 1991 there was the Iraqi-Kurdish conflict. The conflict began in 1990 when Iraq invaded Kuwait. The Kurds attempted to assert their independence which resulted in Saddam Hussein mobilizing his troops in response. In response to Saddam Hussein's mobilization the UN invoked chapter 7 of the UN Charter and decided this was a circumstance that required enforcement action. It was a US lead military action that was heavily supported by the US. However, at the conclusion of this crisis there was a lot of criticism and questions over the legitimacy of the UN's actions. While it was concerning that Saddam Hussein was mobilizing troops, it was a stretch to consider it a threat to international security. As such it is a possible example of a nation state's sovereignty being overridden in favor of the whims of more powerful nations. Primarily the United States as they were the main nation responsible for intervening in the Iraqi-Kurdish conflict

In 1992 there was the Somalia intervention. This was another US-led military operation which took place between 1992-93. It was part of a larger international humanitarian and peacekeeping effort in Somalia that took place from 1992-1995. The Security Council created a peacekeeping force to protect the humanitarian relief groups providing resources to people in need. The UN claimed that a threat to international security applied to Somalia, but many critics noted that the conflict was confined to the state. In response the UN claimed that it was a failed state which meant there was no government to protect the state's sovereignty. This enters dangerous territory because it helps set a precedent which allows the UN to determine arbitrarily whether a state is sovereign or not. To make matters worse, during the Battle of Mogadishu two US Black Hawk helicopters were shot down. This leads to the whole "Black Hawk Down" incident where things go very wrong. The second crash site was overrun by hostile Somlians and the fighting resulted in a high number of Somali casualties (numbering in the thousands). After

these events transpire Somalia is deemed a failure. A major outcome of this event was that President Clinton responded by withdrawing U.S. troops and developed extremely restrictive U.S. policy toward participating in future U.N. peacekeeping missions. This would have a major ripple effect in the future.

The next big conflict that drew global attention was Rwanda in 1994. After the failure in Somalia there was a lot of apprehension and reluctance to get involved in the conflict by the US and UN. Thousands of Rwandans died before UN involvement led by France. In this case, UN intervention ended up saving lots of lives and was considered morally correct. However, this is another example of the most powerful nations interjecting themselves into another nation's business.

After that, there was Yugoslavia in 1995. Operation Deny Flight was a North Atlantic Treaty Organization operation that began in 1993. It was to enforce the UN's no fly zone over Bosnia and Herzegovina. This operation had a significant impact on both the Bosnian War as well as NATO. During this conflict the UN and NATO worked closely and would continue to do so in the future. However, there were also some conflicts between the UN and NATO when the actions of one group resulted in setbacks for the other. Ultimately the no fly zones were successful in reducing the air power capabilities of either side in the conflict. The Bosnian War was the first time the UN authorized NATO to act. It was NATO's first military engagement, first military deployment and first military round mission. While the UN was mostly successful in achieving its goals this time without a major failure like Somalia, the question of state sovereignty once again comes to the forefront. During the Bosnian War, the Serb militias were not in support of the peacekeepers. This case was a complicated case because this was a circumstance where Yugoslavia was breaking up into a bunch of groups. Peacekeepers had permission to be there from some groups, but not others. Peacekeepers must have permission to be in a sovereign state - who/what was the sovereign state in this situation?

NATO intervened with its first, and probably last, use of unilateral military action in the Kosovo War, 1998-99. Its intervention was considered unlawful for two reasons: 1) The sovereign nation where it was fought had not given NATO permission to enter into the conflict and 2) The UN Security Council had no votes from China and Russia. In spite of this NATO

gained a lot of support because it was considered a morally correct decision. President Bill Clinton declared a national emergency due to the threat to national security and foreign policy due to the war.

The main reason why these three international organizations; the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the United Nations are important in establishing the idea that there is already a hierarchy at the global level is because they have clear historic examples of Western (primarily American) predominance in the global system. The IMF and World Bank work to encourage other less powerful nations to fall in line with the ideals and standards that are held by Western nations such as democracy and free trade. These more powerful nations are able to exert their power over weaker nations by either withholding or aiding nations economically depending on whether they are willing to adhere to the policies that these institutions encourage. The way the IMF and World Bank exert their power globally tends to be more subtle than the UN. The IMF and World Bank encourage global homogeneity when it comes to things like economics. The UN on the other hand has historically taken a more direct approach when influencing nations. While the UN was initially founded and structured in a way that was meant to preserve each nation's sovereignty, over time the most powerful nations within the UN have expanded their role and ability to intervene abroad.

How Power is Legitimized

If certain states are recognized as the leaders they must have power and also be able to exert this power over other states. If that's the case, there are a few questions that must be addressed. What is power? and How is power legitimized? Power can be considered economic, military or cultural capabilities or influence. It is exerted by one group and felt by others. Or in this case it is exercised by one nation state and felt by other nation states.

In politics, power is an individual's or group's ability to influence the behavior of others. The term power and authority are closely linked. While power may or may not be recognized by others the term authority is generally used when power is recognized as legitimate by society. When it comes to political power there is hard and soft power. Soft power is the ability to

influence others to your side through subtle means. In other words, it is the capacity to win people over through appealing and attracting them. Soft power tends to be done through things like culture, political values and foreign policies and tends to be more about diplomacy. The most important thing about soft power is that it is non-coercive. On the other hand, hard power is generally the term used to refer to the use of military and economic might to influence others. This form of power tends to be aggressive and is often a dynamic that takes place between two groups of varying power. Most often one group has more military and economic might and is attempting to subdue the other group through the use of hard power.

Some scholars like Ernest Gellner believe that modernity has led to three main types of power resources. “Ideological, represented by the book; military, the sword; and economic, the plough” (Haugaard, 2010, p.1050). This type of power is coercive. On the other hand, scholars like Haugaard argue that if you consider political power which is more than just coercive power which is dominated by the use of military might, there are “four sources of power: ideological, economic, political, and military” (Haugaard, 2010, p.1050). To this extent, even political influence has become a form of power. Entities that are able to influence the political spectrum have a form of power. On an international scale the United States has an extraordinary amount of political power which is tied in with their military, ideological and economic power.

The power that the United States has over global affairs is recognized as legitimate by society because they can employ both hard and soft power over other nations. When considering the American Empire, that is a great example of the United States displaying soft power around the globe. Then there is the United States’ ability to use hard power. This can be seen when looking at the IMF, World Bank and UN. The United States is able to display hard power through its superior economic and military power.

Constructivism

Under constructivist theory, there is the concept that people receive input (their surroundings) create mental structures (during this stage there is room for conceptual change) and the output becomes reality. According to this theory, if people perceive international

organizations to be functioning like a government would it become a reality. Constructivist theory is heavily based on the idea that humans construct their reality through social and historical interactions/events. In other words, if people come to understand international organizations to be the foundation of a world government it will become that. This opens the possibility for international organizations to easily evolve into a true world government.

Constructivism takes a look at international politics through a different lens than Realism and Liberalism. Instead of looking at international relations from within the field of political science it instead looks at international interactions as being historical and social constructions. Constructivism aims to show that international relations are primarily socially constructed and are a result of state interactions on the international level. These interactions are also formed and influenced by each state's social practices. Constructivism attempts to highlight the idea that international relations are influenced by things such as ideas, not just concern over the distribution of power (Liberalism believes power politics is a negative and Realism believes power consolidation is essential, however, both theories are very concerned about the concept of power within international relations).

It is also important to note that there are crossovers between these theories. Realist Constructivism might be a better theory to fit the assertion that existing international organizations work to set an underlying structure for a world government. For example, in the article "Realist Constructivism" by Wendt it is noted that "many constructivists explicitly accept that power matters in international relations. However, realism is all about power. Wendt and other constructivist theorists often part company with realists because of the belief that, at its core, realist theory sees politics as having "material rather than a social basis" (Wendt, 1999). Ultimately, while many times these theories can seem incompatible it might be more accurate to assert that they are all part of forming a complete theory seeing as there are times when they apply to events accurately and times when they fail to explain events. For my specific topic realist constructivism would work to explain things like power vacuums etc. (ex: If the US loses global authority and power realist theory asserts that another nation would inevitably end up filling that role).

According to the article “Transformation of International Relations: Between Change and Continuity: Introduction” the study of international relations is a discipline that has changed over time; it doesn’t remain stagnant. However “the concept of sovereignty is a pillar of international relations. According to realist orthodoxy, sovereignty is the organizing principle of international life. As defined by Stephen Krasner, "Sovereignty refers to both practices, such as the ability to control transborder movements or activities within a state's boundaries, and to rules and principles, such as the recognition of juridically independent territorial entities and non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states." No matter what theories are considered when it comes to international relations, the concept of sovereignty is core to all of Sovereignty forms the social norms of a state (Constructivism), creates a state capable of consolidating power (Realism) or creates states that must cooperate and work together (Liberalism).

The three main international relations theories that have essentially withstood the test of time are Realism, Liberalism and Constructivism. Realist International Relations theory tends to be centered around states attempting to consolidate power and is often compared to the more interdependent ideals of Liberalism International Relations theory. Constructivism International Relations theory acts as more of an outlier. Constructivism views aspects of international relations as being historical and social constructions rather than the inherent or innate characteristics of international politics, or as a result of human nature.

Realism International Relations is a school of thought that presumes that politics on a global scale is driven by states in the pursuit of power or an elevated stance among other states/actors. Within the field of Realism, there are diverging views in certain areas. Realism is grounded in the belief that states are the main actors in international politics rather than the international organizations that have been created. Realists also believe the international political system is anarchical as opposed to a hierarchical system with a supranational power that could exert control over the various states. It assumes that states are rational actors and as such, they tend to prioritize their self-interests over the good of everyone. The states/actors within international politics are concerned about consolidating as much power as possible to ensure their preservation and longevity. The main concern in this theory is security.

In contrast, Liberalism believes that cooperation on an international level is important and that power politics need to be downplayed as much as possible. It is important that states act in a way that is mutually beneficial to all actors and that states cooperate. Liberalism International Relations theory places greater significance on international organizations and their role within international relations than Realism, and believes that these institutions are an essential part of maintaining cooperation between states as they create a sense of interdependence.

Constructivism International Relations theory looks at international politics through a different lens. Instead of considering international relations from within the field of political science, it instead looks at international interactions as historical and social constructions. Constructivism aims to show that international relations are primarily socially constructed as a result of state interactions. These interactions are formed and influenced by each state's social practices. Constructivism attempts to highlight the view that international relations are influenced by things such as ideas, not just concern over the distribution of power. Liberalism believes power politics is negative and Realism believes power consolidation is essential. However, both theories are very concerned about the concept of power.

Constructivism includes the concept of turning thoughts into reality. In part, it is the idea that if something is agreed upon by enough people, it becomes truth. For example, consider the concept of money. It has no inherent value except for the fact that we, as a society, decide it does. It is the value we have assigned to it based on a shared understanding of currency, exchange rate, etc. If the same concept of agreed upon viewpoints were applied to the idea of global government, rather than the current global governance, it would become a reality.

Conclusion

The concept of a world government is not an unpopular theory when it comes to international relations. After World War II, the idea of a world government picked up steam. Despite the failure of the League of Nations, there was a renewed push for something stronger, something akin to a world government.

As noted, Wendt believes that a world state is inevitable and will occur through an evolution of five stages, culminating in the world state (Wendt). There are also more general theories on how a world government would form such as functionalism. David Mitrany indicates that functionalists think some of the problems involved pollution, travel/transportation, immigration telephone and mail communication are due, in part, to modernization. Functionalists believe technicians and bureaucrats should be the ones dealing with these problems that have crossed international borders. Functionalists view globalization and modernization, as well as the decline in state sovereignty, as an avenue towards a system of global government. In functionalism, authority is based on the functions and needs of the states, and a supraterritorial concept of authority. Thus, authority would extend beyond a state's borders.

Although a global society is not officially recognized by the nations, the interplay and connection between nations is irrefutable. National pride exists and tension between nations is a frequent occurrence, but the necessity of international organizations and cooperation between nations, as well as technological advancements, has led to a blurring of distinction between nations. Over the years, it has become clear that efficiency and ease is a priority that often requires streamlining and simplification. Whether it be international institutions or private companies, an effort has been made to create a singular currency such as Bitcoin. The World Bank and IMF prioritize the US dollar.

As society progresses towards a more globalized community, it becomes harder for people to extract and isolate their daily lives from those around the globe. While Western influence has long been felt in the East, the converse is also true, particularly in recent years through global influences such as Kpop, Cdramas, TikTok and Anime. All of these are niche areas with growing popularity among youth. Their effects, particularly Kpop, are felt culturally as they influence areas such as dance, music, fashion and so on.

There are also global matters such as health that have been highlighted recently with the Covid pandemic. It shows the interdependence among nations in regards to global health (World Health Organization). These things create a system that requires all nations to depend on and work together. Many nations are guided by their people, and people are becoming more and more diverse and connected than ever before.

As globalization has been inevitable and unavoidable, there have been various efforts to make the process of decision making more efficient and effective. The byproduct was a formation of shared norms and expectations around the globe. As goods and ideas flowed freely between nations it created the opportunity for people to form bonds that weren't based on nationality, but rather connect based on shared ideology or interests.

Functionalists advocate for supranational authority in a piecemeal fashion. Supranationalism is the idea that there is a power above individual nations and governments. It also means that decisions are made with loyalty to an organization rather than an individual state. It is important to note that the concept of supranationalism also means that the decisions which are made are binding on the states whether they like it or not. Functionalists are sometimes referred to as federalists because this concept of an evolution towards a world government is similar to the process that took place in Philadelphia when establishing the United States.

The process of creating a global government could occur in intervals such as these five-steps of economic integration outline:

1. Free Trade Area (FTA) allows goods and services to flow freely between nations without the barriers of borders.
2. Customs Union, FTA with added stipulation that each member state adopt a tariff for all states outside that FTA.
3. Common Market/Single Market is a Customs Union with addition of capital and labor flowing freely. Each state gives up some sovereignty in favor of labor organization.
4. Economic Union is a single monetary authority. There is significant loss of sovereignty. This is a difficult step as it includes a transition in currency.
5. Political Union, a single state. It is the complete surrender of sovereignty. At this point, a supranational authority has been created and the global system is now a global government. (Rodriguez 2020)

On a smaller scale, the European Union has gone through several of these stages including FTA, Customs Union, Common Market and a partial economic union. The Euro is the official currency for 19 of the states in the European Union. It has been in existence for 20 years, and is the second

strongest currency in the world. All of this presumes that nations must willingly give up some of their sovereignty a bit at a time. However, it is clear that throughout history nations have either willingly or unwillingly given up their states' sovereignty in times of need or crisis.

There is also the Theory of Constitutionalism in international relations. Global constitutionalism stems from the system of international organizations and seeks to address the need for regulatory practices/constitutional principles to be agreed upon globally and then implemented. Organizations like the European Union (EU), the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United Nations are each institutions to be considered when looking at a global attempt to constitutionalize. These organizations attempt to establish things like world trade, shared environmental strategies, human rights, and policies for international discourse based on constitutional principles. Constitutionalism is the idea that there is an evolution from globalized international relations to one that is based more upon a shared global system of constitutionalized international relations. Both functionalism and constitutionalism fall under the Liberalism International Relations umbrella.

The concept of hierarchy is significant because it shows that there isn't just hierarchy among the nations, but that there is also hierarchy in global decision-making, rules, etc. based on the strength of nations. It should also be noted that hierarchy is inherently tied to legitimacy. The decisions that are made by these stronger nations must be acknowledged and followed by the global world even if they are disliked. Legitimacy is found when the rules that are agreed upon are upheld consistently. In the international field, it means the rules are upheld among nations regardless of their power or status on the global stage. However, if we look at historical examples, this is clearly untrue. The most powerful nations are often provided leeway when they do something with which other nations do not agree. That doesn't mean their decisions aren't questioned or critiqued, but they are allowed a certain amount of latitude.

Some theories stress that a global government will be formed as states willingly give up more and more of their sovereignty out of necessity. However, the historical reality is that sovereignty of weaker states has often been denied or overrun by larger and more powerful ones. As such, there isn't a perfectly organized system of global government, but rather the structure for one is already in place and functioning. A clear hierarchy of weaker and more powerful states

has been established. The norms, habits and patterns of these states have also evolved and solidified over time. The nations that are recognized as leaders work to dictate the global order, thus demonstrating a clear hierarchy.

In addition to hierarchy, the second component of global government is global society. Part of creating a global society requires all people to be united under a banner of “humankind” or “citizens of the world,” but that need not negate national pride. It is similar to how city, state or provincial pride do not invalidate nationality.

There is a blending of cultures occurring all over the world. The influence of the West on the East and vice versa has resulted in some shared practices and ways of thought. The advent of the Internet and social media make it exponentially easier for the transfer of ideas, culture and hobbies. It helps build global society infrastructure. Clearly, a global society now exists.

Additionally, some international organizations are involved in establishing both hierarchy and global society. The IMF, WB and UN demonstrate a hierarchy among nations that dictates the course of global decisions. Simultaneously, their existence works to form a global society. They help homogenize and consolidate things into singular ways of functioning, whether it be in the economic sector, culture, travel, or health.

The IMF and WB help nations share an economic system at the global level. The GATT and WTO help make trade uniform among nations. The UN and NATO have a history of acting as a global governing and militaristic body. These institutions show that a global hierarchy plays a significant role in how global decision making occurs. The most powerful nations set the course for world affairs and help create uniformity among nations. The primary goal is often to help nations operate in a globalized world, yet an important byproduct is a meshing of cultures and the creation of a global society.

The pairing of a global hierarchy and global society equals a global government. This is the world in which we now live.

References

Abbott Kenneth W. and Snidal Duncan, "Why States Act Through Formal International Organizations." *Journal of Conflict Resolution* 42 (1998): 3-32.

Assessment of Member States' contributions to the United Nations regular budget for the year 2019. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://undocs.org/en/ST/ADM/SER.B/992>

Baldwin, D. (1971). Money and Power. *The Journal of Politics*,33(3), 578-614. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/2128274>

Barnett Michael, "Accountability and Global Governance: The View from Paternalism." *Regulation and Governance* 10 (2016): 134-148.

Barnett Michael and Duvall Raymond (eds.), *Power in Global Governance* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).

Barnett, Michael N. and Finnemore Martha, "The Politics, Power, and Pathologies of International Organizations." *International Organization* 53 (Autumn 1999): 699-732.

Barnett Michael and Finnemore Martha, *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics* (Cornell University Press, 2004).

Bender, T. (2006). The American Way of Empire. *World Policy Journal*, 23(1), 45-61. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/40210006>

Buchanan, A. (2002). Political Legitimacy and Democracy. *Ethics*,112(4), 689-719.
doi:10.1086/340313

Craig, C. (2008), The Resurgent Idea of World Government. *Ethics & International Affairs*, 22: 133-142. doi:[10.1111/j.1747-7093.2008.00139.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2008.00139.x)

DiCicco, J., & Levy, J. (1999). Power Shifts and Problem Shifts: The Evolution of the Power Transition Research Program. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 43(6), 675-704. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/174600>

Dingwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance*, 12(2), 185-203. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/27800609>

Eudaily Sean Patrick and Smith Steve, "Sovereign Geopolitics? – Uncovering the ‘Sovereign Paradox’." *Geopolitics* 13 (April 2008): 309-334.

Finkelstein, L. (1995). What Is Global Governance? *Global Governance*, 1(3), 367-372. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/27800120>

Franck, Thomas, "Legitimacy in the International System." *American Journal of International Law* 582 (October 1988): 705-759.

Fulcher James, "Globalisation, the Nation-state and Global Society." *Sociological Review* 48 (November 2000): 522-543.

Germain Randall D. and Kenny Michael (eds.), *The Idea of Global Civil Society: Politics and Ethics in a Globalizing Era* (Routledge, 2005).

Goldin Ian and Vogel Tiffany, "Global Governance and Systemic Risk in the 21st Century: Lessons from the Financial Crisis." *Global Policy* 1 (January 2010): 4-15.

Haugaard, M. (2010). Democracy, Political Power, and Authority. *Social Research*, 77(4), 1049-1074. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/23347119>.

Held, David “Democratic Accountability and Political Effectiveness from a Cosmopolitan Perspective.” *Government and Opposition* 39 (Spring 2004): 364-391.

Helleiner, Eric “A Bretton Woods Moment? The 2007-2008 Crisis and the Future of Global Finance.” *International Affairs* 86 (May 2010): 619-646.

Howse Robert and Teitel Ruti, “Beyond Compliance: Rethinking Why International Law Really Matters.” *Global Policy* 1 (May 2010): 127-136.

Hurd, Ian *After Anarchy: Legitimacy and Power in the UN Security Council* (Princeton University Press, 2007), chaps. 1, 5.

<https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/lib/psu/detail.action?docID=457832>

Hurrell, Andrew *On Global Order: Power, Values, and the Constitution of International Society* (Oxford University Press, 2007), chaps. 1-2.

IMF Members' Quotas and Voting Power, and IMF Board of Governors. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://www.imf.org/external/np/sec/memdir/members.aspx>

Krasner, Stephen D., “Sovereignty: An Institutional Perspective.” *Comparative Political Studies* 21 (April 1988): 66-94.

Krasner, Stephen D., *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton University Press, 1999).

Ladenson, R. (1972). Legitimate Authority. *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 9(4), 335-341.

Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/20009461>

Lake, David "Rightful Rules: Authority, Order, and the Foundations of Global Governance" *International Studies Quarterly* 54 (September 2010): 687-613.

Lemke, D. (1997). *The Continuation of History: Power Transition Theory and the End of the Cold War*. *Journal of Peace Research*,34(1), 23-36. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/424828>

Lipsky, Phillip (2015). "Explaining Institutional Change: Policy Areas, Outside Options, and the Bretton Woods Institutions" (PDF). *American Journal of Political Science*. 59 (2): 341–356. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.595.6890. doi:10.1111/ajps.12130.

Miller Lynn, "The Idea and the Reality of Collective Security." *Global Governance* 5 (July-September 1999): 303-332.

Milner, Helen "The Assumption of Anarchy in International Relations Theory: A Critique." *Review of International Studies* 17 (January 1991): 67-85.

Organski, A. F. K., 1958. *World Politics*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Pehle, J. (1946). *The Bretton Woods Institutions*. *The Yale Law Journal*, 55(5), 1127-1139. doi:10.2307/792757

Philpott, Daniel "Sovereignty: An Introduction and Brief History." *Journal of International Affairs* 48 (Winter 1995): 353-368.

Plimssoll, J., & Cabranes, J. (1973). *The Evolution of the "American Empire"*. *The American Journal of International Law*,67(5), 1-7. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/25660468>

Rathbun Brian C. , “Before Hegemony: Generalized Trust and the Creation and Design of International Security Organizations.” *International Organization* 65 (Spring 2011): 243-73.

Robinson, Eric W. (2005). *American Empire? Ancient Reflections on Modern American Power.* *The Classical World*, 99(1), 35-50. doi:10.2307/4353008

Jean-Paul Rodrigue (2020). *The Geography of Transport Systems* FIFTH EDITION New York: Routledge, 456 pages. doi.org/10.4324/9780429346323

Rosendorff and Milner Helen V., “The Optimal Design of International Trade Institutions: Uncertainty and Escape.” *International Organization* 55 (2001): 829–857.

Ruggie, John Gerard “The United Nations and Globalization: Patterns and Limits of Institutional Adaptation.” *Global Governance* 9 (July -September 2003): 301-321.

Schlesinger, Stephen C. *Act of Creation: The Founding of the United Nations* (Westview, 2003).

Scholte Jan Aart, “Civil Society and Democratically Accountable Global Governance.” *Government and Opposition* 39 (April 2004): 211-233.

Stewart, Patrick L. (1978). *The American Empire Style: Its Historical Background.* *American Art Journal*, 10(2), 97-105. doi:10.2307/1594088

Weiss, T. (2009). What Happened to the Idea of World Government. *International Studies Quarterly*, 53(2), 253-271. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.proxy.lib.pdx.edu/stable/27735096>

Wendt, A. (2003). Why a World State is Inevitable. *European Journal of International Relations*, 9(4) 491-542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135406610394001>

Williams, J. (1945). The Bretton Woods Agreements. *Proceedings of the Academy of Political Science*, 21(3), 40-50. doi:10.2307/1173058

Williamson, J. (ed.). *Latin American Adjustment: How Much Has Happened?* Washington: Institute for International Economics, 1990.

Woods, Ngaire *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers* (Cornell University Press, 2006), chaps. 1-3.

Zürn Michael, "Global Governance and Legitimacy Problems." *Government and Opposition* 39 (2004): 260-287.