

---

## **Global Governance and the Role of Intergovernmental Organisations in Promoting Global Peace and Security**

---

Jackson A. ALUEDE<sup>1</sup>  
Matthew O. AGBAWN<sup>2</sup>

### **Abstract**

This paper examines the role of intergovernmental organisations (IGOs) in promoting international peace and security in different parts of the world. The paper reveals that the post-World War II international system ushered in a new era that witnessed not only the proliferation of IGOs driven by the desire to promote peace and security in their respective regions, but also, engaged in peacekeeping missions in restoring stability in conflict zones. The paper affirms that the provision of Chapter VIII of the United Nations (UN) Charter is instrumental in the increase in the number of IGOs across different regions of the world. The paper establishes that one of the fundamental achievements arising from the establishment of IGOs is that it has enabled the respective regions of the world to respond to the outbreak of violent conflicts through peacekeeping and other conflict resolution mechanisms. The paper examines the role of IGOs in promoting international peace and security through the lenses of global governance. Global governance is both a phenomenon and theory that provides explanations on the factors that influenced the nature, pattern, and processes of international organisations, especially IGOs since the post-Cold War period. The paper admonishes world leaders to embrace the propositions of global governance, as it would enable them to achieve their objectives. It utilises both primary and secondary sources to analyse and interpret the subject matter.

**Keywords:** Cold War, Global Governance, Intergovernmental Organisations (IGOs), United Nations.

---

<sup>1</sup> **Jackson A. Aluede** holds a Ph.D. in History and Strategic Studies, from the University of Lagos, Nigeria. He is presently engaged as a Resident Researcher for Wits Institute for Social and Economic Research (WISER), University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa. He is of the Department of History & International Studies, Anchor University, Lagos, Nigeria. **Corresponding author's e-mail:** [jaluede@aul.edu.ng](mailto:jaluede@aul.edu.ng)

<sup>2</sup> **Matthew Onalo Agbawn** holds a Ph.D. degree in Economics from the University of Abuja, Nigeria. He teaches Economics at Anchor University, Lagos, Nigeria.

## Introduction

The Versailles Peace Treaty of 1919, despite some of its flaws, was instrumental in the establishment of the first global IGO, known as the League of Nations in 1920. The formation of the League of Nations is considered one of the landmarks of the peace treaty, reached at the Peace Conference in Versailles, France in 1919, to restore order in the international system after the First World War (Oltean, 2016).). The League of Nations was established to promote international peace and security across the world. Unfortunately, the organisation's failure to fulfil its mandate not only led to its untimely collapse in 1939 (after twenty years in existence), it likewise led to the formation of another IGO known as the United Nations (UN) after another destructive world war, the Second World War (Chandra, 2004). The UN replaced the League of Nations in 1945, and like its predecessor, the League of Nations, UN maintains the status of being the only universal and global intergovernmental international organisation in the world. The UN accommodates every country of the world as its member as it seeks to provide direction and leadership to members, as well as serve as the bastion of international peace and security, human rights, women's rights and empowerment, global health care, democracy, and good governance (United Nations, 2022). Furthermore, the UN has served as a veritable vehicle for promoting global governance since the last decades of the twentieth century.

The UN in its operation differs from its predecessor, especially in dealing with the issues of security among its members. To this effect, the framers of the UN structure created the UN Security Council as one of the organs of the world body. UN Security Council is the principal crisis management organ of the body, and it is empowered to impose binding obligations on the 193 UN member-states to maintain peace and security. The Council has five permanent members (United States, China, Russia, France, and Britain) and ten elected members that meet regularly to assess threats to international security, including civil wars, natural disasters, arms proliferation, and terrorism (Council on Foreign Relations, 2021). The Council is empowered to decide, investigate, access, and determine the resolution of issues that threaten peace or are capable of resulting in conflicts in different parts of the world. The creation of UN Security Council made the UN distinct from the League of Nations in responding to issues that affect global peace and security. This notwithstanding, it is imperative to note that UN Security Council has had challenges among its five permanent members; challenges which to some extent have hindered the world body from responding promptly or preventing the outbreak of conflicts in some parts of the world, owing to a conflicting interest among the permanent members. This development has made some observers of the workings of the UN to demand the reform of the Security Council (Wellensteen and Johansson, 2004).

Despite the impasse among the five permanent members of UN Security Council, it has not prevented the world body from pursuing its mandate to promote global peace and security. In an attempt to address the issue of peace and security, the UN made provision in its Charter for the creation of regional arrangements to respond to and tackle the outbreak of violent conflicts and other issues that threaten peace and security in different regions of the world. To this effect, Chapter VIII of the Charter of the UN provides the constitutional basis for the involvement of regional organisations in the maintenance of international peace and security for which the Security Council is primarily responsible. Article 52 provides for the involvement of regional arrangements or agencies in the peaceful settlement of disputes. Article 53 allows such arrangements to take enforcement action, but only with the explicit authorisation by the Security Council. Article 53, therefore, creates a mechanism that allows the Council to utilise regional arrangements to implement its enforcement measures. Finally, Article 54 stipulates that regional arrangements or agencies shall inform the Council of their activities for the maintenance of international peace and security at all times (United Nations, 2022).

In line with the provision of Chapter VIII, Articles 52, 53, and 54 of the UN Charter encourage the establishment of regional intergovernmental organisations in different parts of the world; some with the objectives to address issues of peace and security in their respective regions as well as conflict prevention (Tavares, 2010). Since the UN Charter became operational in the 1940s, several IGOs have been established to respond to issues of peace and security in different regions. They include the European Union (EU), North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), African Union (AU), Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), South African Development Community (SADC), among others (Aluede and Nzemeka, 2020). Some of these regional institutions have been able to achieve their mandate, while others have struggled. Based on the foregoing, the paper examines the concept of global governance and its propositions in contemporary global politics; and the extent it has influenced the course of IGOs in the contemporary period through the lenses of global governance.

### **The Cold War International System and the Quest for Alternative Theory**

The Cold War era witnessed the polarisation of the international system into two rival ideological blocs of East/West led by the defunct Soviet Union, and the United States, respectively (Gaddis, 1990). During the Cold War era, states dominated international politics following the Westphalian model (Kramer, 2005). The state system influenced, if not determined, the structure and working of the international system as well as IGOs, such as the UN. This was evident in the composition of the world body and similar intergovernmental institutions, whereby it admitted only independent sovereign states as members (Kissinger, 1994). However, the post-Cold War era brought about greater prospects for expanding

the roles, functions, and powers of IGOs owing to the respective activities they were engaged in across the world.

However, as the Cold War era was gradually drawing to a close, following the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991, the international system began to witness the emergence of new actors that were later referred to as ‘non-state actors’ manifesting in the form of civil society institutions, multinational corporations, non-governmental organisations, as well as terrorist groups (Bennett, 1995). These actors differ significantly from the state actors. However, as events revealed in the post-Cold War era, the activities of non-state actors impacted significantly on the trajectory of the international system. Even though some of them had been in existence for years, it was not until the end of the Cold War that their impact became pronounced in the global arena, especially terrorist groups (Dershowitz, 2002; Chaliand and Arnaud, 2007).

Until the end of the Cold War, non-state actors were not recognised as critical players to promote order and stability in the international arena. The non-recognition of non-state actors and their role in enhancing order in contemporary global politics necessitated the likes of James Rosenau ‘to query existing theories of international relations, especially realism, and proffered an alternative theory that would accommodate both state and non-state actors in promoting world order in contemporary global politics’ (Rosenau, 1992: 7). This led him to propound the theory of global governance. Some scholars share Rosenau's view that state behaviour and the analysis of actors in the international system should not rely exclusively on the propositions of realism. These scholars feel that the state lacks the strength and capacity to singlehandedly resolve the increasing number of contemporary global challenges, likewise, IGOs; and international nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) should complement the effort of the states and IGOs. The emergence of global governance is linked to the quest to find a melting point that would accommodate the state, IGOs, and NGOs toward ensuring order in the international arena (Diehl and Frederking, 2010).

### **Global Governance: History, Theory and Discourse**

Global governance is one theory that has gained acceptance globally owing to its liberal interpretations among scholars, with regard to global finance institutions, civil society institutions, IGOs, and NGOs since the late twentieth century (Biersteker, 2009). Similarly, an analysis of the concept of global governance has revolutionised and broadened insight into the study of international relations, international organisations, and world politics, unlike any other theory in contemporary global politics. However, the theory is not without its controversy, it must be said. This is because the concept has been a subject of intense bickering among academics and public analysts globally. The controversy has been on what global governance is, and how the theory guarantees world order in an international

system in which anarchy is the order of the day. Nevertheless, the inroad made by global governance on world politics in recent times raises interest in the subject-matter, and its propositions for promoting order in the international system, especially, through the IGOs.

The concept of global governance is associated with Rosenau, who propounded the theory in the 1990s. However, Murphy (2015) links global governance to the beginning of the contemporary state system, which he dates to the era of the Napoleonic Wars and Congress of Vienna of 1815. However, since the 1990s, several scholars have tried to expand the scope of global governance. Some of these scholars argue that the concept identifies other actors beyond the states as major players in the international system. This was the submission of Weiss (2000: 796), who avers that:

global governance can be traced to a growing dissatisfaction among students of international relations with the realist and liberal-institutionalist theories that dominated the study of international organisations in the 1970s and 1980s. In particular, these failed to capture adequately the vast increase, in both numbers and influence, of non-state actors and the implications of technology in an age of globalisation.

Global governance since Rosenau conceived the concept has received different interpretations and meanings from different scholars based on their understanding of the theory. For many, the concept is vague, broad, and narrowly defined by its advocates. On the other hand, proponents of the theory adduce that it captures and is the most appropriate in managing contemporary global challenges confronting the world. According to Rosenau (1995: 13), global governance refers ‘to more than the formal institutions and organisations through which the management of international affairs is or is not sustained’. He went further to affirm, ‘the United Nations system and national government are surely central to the conduct of global governance, but they are only part of the full picture’ (Rosenau, 1995:15). Furthermore, Wang and Rosenau (2009:5) argue that global governance refers to ‘the complex institutions and processes that govern how things happen in the world.’ In other words, global governance is a system of governance that recognises the role of IGOs and NGOs as well as how state and non-state actors can exert influence on the international system in addressing contemporary global challenges affecting the world. The concept emphasises the legitimisation of power and authority beyond the state system to other institutions.

Global governance transcends national boundaries. The scope addresses socio-cultural, economic, environmental, security, health, and political issues at the national, regional, and global levels. It emphasises resolution by institutions through collective efforts. However, the United Nations Intellectual History Project (UNIHP) provides a more comprehensive overview of global governance:

The sum of laws, norms, policies, and institutions that define, constitute, and mediate trans-border relations between states, cultures, citizens, intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, and the market. It embraces the totality of institutions, policies, rules, practices, norms, procedures, and initiatives by which states and their citizens (indeed, humanity as a whole) try to bring more predictability, stability, and order to their responses to transnational challenges—such as climate change and environmental degradation, nuclear proliferation, and terrorism—which go beyond the capacity of a single state to solve. (UN, 2009: 2)

From the above overview, some distinctive features or propositions of global governance are recognisable, one of which is that global governance is a system of rule. In other words, global governance operates as a decentralised system sharing control or authority among the organisations or institutions involved in global politics. Furthermore, systems of rule exist where several mechanisms are in place that relate to each other and regulate or have an impact on the norms, expectations, and behaviour of the relevant actors within the regulated area. It is pertinent to state that established legal or political authority is not a prerequisite for the effectiveness of a system of rule (Dingwerth, and Pattberg, 2006). Another feature is that they speak of systems of rule at all levels of human activity. This shows that global governance's impacts transcend national boundaries in responding to global issues as they occur and that the decentralisation of authority to some international organisations can hasten the solution of global politics. To this effect, Rosenau (2006: 572) is of the view that, 'global governance involves interactions among the global actors and that the interactions should be collective and purpose-driven'.

Global governance as understood covers broad areas. First, the term highlights the global scale of many of the world's pressing issues, such as economic interdependence, migration, financial crises, drug trafficking, environmental degradation, and various health pandemics. Second, it emphasises that while governments continue to perform important functions, non-state entities have become significant actors in making demands, framing goals, issuing directives, and pursuing policies, thus shaping how the world is governed. Third, it presumes the validity of several norms of 'good governance' rooted in western experiences, such as market competition, human rights, democracy, transparency, accountability, and rule of law. While the idea of a world government has lost its appeal, the notion of global governance has gained a great deal of currency in recent years (Hongying and Rosenau, 2009).

Developments in global politics in the last two decades have validated the theory of global governance. Global governance has achieved many safeguards to the merits of democracy and deliberative governance around the world. For instance, United Nations, with its monitoring mechanisms, as well as NGOs such



as Doctors Without Borders, Amnesty International, and Human Rights Watch have been active in Africa and the Middle East. These organisations draw the world's attention to the challenges confronting communities in these parts of the world, where devastating post-conflict conditions, electoral fraud, poverty, and disease are widespread and some states lack the means to deal with them. Likewise, the UN Security Council plays a decisive role in resolving armed conflicts and promoting transitional peace in some parts of the world engulfed in civil and religious wars, such as the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Lebanon, Liberia, Sierra Leone, Kosovo and Cyprus (Rapidis, 2018).

However, global governance has been subjected to criticisms from different scholars. One of such critics is Lawrence S. Finkelstein. In his article, titled "What is Global Governance?" (1995), Finkelstein criticises Rosenau's definition of global governance. He argues:

Does it clarify matters, however, or facilitate the research enterprise, to toss them in a hopper along with states, intergovernmental organizations, non-government organizations, and Moody's Investor's Service? Global governance appears to be virtually anything. It should be possible to define global governance in a way that gives greater direction to the research enterprise without abandoning concern for or sacrificing access to an expanding universe of actors, issues, and activities. (Finkelstein, 1995: 368).

Apart from Finkelstein, some other scholars have equally raised concerns about the actualisation of global peace and security through the trajectory of global governance. Keohane (2011: 101-103) questions the legitimacy of the UN Security Council, when its activities over the years, especially with regard to member countries of the UN, are devoid of the following six criteria: minimal moral acceptability, inclusiveness, epistemic quality, accountability, compatible with democratic governance and comparative benefit. In the same vein, the future of global governance has equally received attention in what some describe as the inevitable fragmentation of global governance organisations. Acharya (2016: 454) makes the following remarks on the inevitable fragmentation of global governance:

The world today is culturally and politically diverse, yet more interconnected and interdependent. Its main players - both the makers and breakers of order - are not just states and the great powers but also international and regional bodies, non-state groups, corporations, and people's movements and networks.

The criticisms aside, challenges confronting the international system since the end of the Cold War have been collectively addressed by both the states, IGOs, and NGOs. This is, the decentralisation of control and responsibility beyond the

state to other actors that are addressing contemporary global issues. The emergence of global governance has produced some breakthroughs, aimed at managing global problems through voluntary and ad hoc cooperation of a diverse range of international actors (Rapidis, 2018).

Global governance has gradually strengthened the idea of justice as a common feature of contemporary societies, thanks to the activities of civil society organisations such as Amnesty International, Greenpeace, Friends of the Earth, OXFAM, and the Red Cross/Crescent Society to mention a few. The success story recorded by global governance since its conception in the early 1990s attests to Rosenau's claims that the study of international relations should look beyond the existing theories that have explained the dynamics of state relations and behaviours in the international system before the end of Cold War. Global governance has come to fill the gap that once existed between the states and other actors in the international system.

### Intergovernmental Organisations (IGOs)

One remarkable phenomenon of the twentieth century is the emergence of international organisations as major actors in the international system (Chandra, 2004). Until this period, states dominated events in the international system. However, developments in Europe in the late 1890s and the first decade of the twentieth century led to the outbreak of the First World War. Many were of the view that the national interest of states and their secret alliances among others precipitated the war. Therefore, there was a need to shift from the old order that had dominated the international system since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648 (Kennedy, 1989). The Paris Peace Conference of 1919, shortly after World War I, set the stage for the radical exit of the state system. One of the leading advocates for a shift from the old order to a new one was Woodrow Wilson, President of the United States of America at that time. The new order proposed by President Wilson and his group sought to provide a forum for states to collectively discuss world issues, thereby preventing any issue that might lead to war among states. Wilson called this the new order:

a universal association of nations to maintain the inviolability and security of the world, to prevent any war begun either contrary to treaty covenants or without warning and full submission of the causes to the opinion of the world - a virtual guarantee of territorial integrity and political independence (Kissinger, 1994: 224).

The Paris Peace Conference ended with the establishment of the League of Nations in 1920, the first IGOs formed by states with membership across the world; and the only one to serve as a universal multi-purpose intergovernmental organisation. The UN replaced the League of Nations in 1945. IGOs share the



following characteristics, Namely: permanent organisations to carry on a continuing set of functions, voluntary membership of eligible parties, a basic instrument stating goals, structure, and methods of operation, a broad representative consultative conference organ, and a permanent secretariat to carry on continuous administrative, research, and information functions (Bennett, 1995). Similarly, IGOs have been defined as entities created by a treaty involving two or more nations to work in good faith on issues of common interest (Harvard Law School, 2013). Following the emergence of IGOs starting with the League of Nations and its successor, United Nations (UN), many other IGOs have emerged in all the continents of the world. These IGOs differ in their operations, geographical reach, power configuration, objectives and mission. However, the UN is the only universal multi-purpose intergovernmental organisations with a global mandate to:

...save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime, has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, ... and for these ends to practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbours, and to unite our strength to maintain international peace and security, and to ensure, by the acceptance of principles and the institution of methods, that armed force shall not be used, save in the common interest, and to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples (Department of Public Information, 2008: 4).

Other IGOs operating at the regional and sub-regional levels, as well as specialised IGOs, have been created to serve different purposes. The table below shows some categories of IGOs.

Table 1: Some Categories of IGOs

<b>Regional Intergovernmental Organisations</b>	<b>Sub-regional Intergovernmental Organisations</b>	<b>Security Alliance Intergovernmental Organisations</b>	<b>Specialised Intergovernmental Organisations</b>
Organisation of American States (OAS)	Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS)	North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO)	Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC)
African Union (AU)	North America Free Trade Area (NAFTA)	Organisation for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE)	Organisation of Islamic States (OIC)

European Union (EU)	Southern Africa Development Community (SADC)	The defunct Warsaw Pact	World Trade Organisation (WTO)
Association of Southeast Asia Nations (ASEAN)	Economic Community of Central African States (ECCAS)		International Monetary Fund (IMF)
League of Arab States (Arab League)			World Bank

Source: Tavares (2010).

### IGOs and Global Security: Achievements and Obstacles

IGOs operating at the regional and sub-regional levels, security alliances, and others in specialised areas have recorded significant successes in addressing fundamental issues affecting the collective interests of member states since inception. For instance, regional and sub-regional IGOs such as the EU, ASEAN, AU, ECOWAS, and the League of Arab States among others have been instrumental in promoting economic integration along the neo-functional model (Ogbeide, 2003). The success story of the EU is a major catalyst that led to the proliferation of regional IGOs across the world. These organisations have equally been active in conflict resolution, humanitarian intervention, peacekeeping, peacebuilding, and peace enforcement. In Africa, the AU and ECOWAS have played a major role in managing conflicts across the continent. Following the transformation of Organisation of African Unity (OAU) to African Union (AU) in 2002, the continent's regional body has concentrated on military conflict management through peacekeeping, and peace enforcement. AU has deployed missions in Burundi (2003–2004), Sudan/Darfur (2004–2007), Somalia (since 2007), and Comoros in 2006 (Akinyeye, 2003, Adekeye, 2008). Apart from carrying out peacekeeping and peace enforcement in these countries, the missions equally supervised, observed, monitored, and verified the implementation of ceasefire agreements or helped broker ceasefire between warring groups.

In West Africa, ECOWAS established a Monitoring Group (ECOMOG) in 1990 to intervene in the Liberian civil war. This represented the first attempt at a sub-regional security initiative since the OAU tried to establish an inter-African Force to intervene in Chad in 1981 (Stremmlau, 2000). Following ECOMOG's successes in Liberia, it also intervened in Sierra Leone and Guinea Bissau civil wars through peacekeeping and peacebuilding. NATO and OSCE have made significant progress in Eastern Europe in conflict intervention, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. OSCE focuses on preventive diplomacy and peacebuilding operations. The organisation has demonstrated these capacities in Georgia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Moldova, and Latvia (Hopmann, 1999). NATO, in

addition, was instrumental in ending ethnic cleansing in Kosovo in 1999 (Rearden, 2001).

IGOs have witnessed significant changes since the end of the Cold War era. It must be said that the rivalry of that time between the United States-led western blocs and the Soviet leaning socialist states hampered the effectiveness of IGOs in addressing fundamental issues in their regions. However, the end of the Cold War in 1991 led to a drastic transformation in the operation and activities of IGOs, especially the UN. The end of Cold War brought about greater prospects for expanding the roles, functions, and powers of IGOs to promote global governance (1999). For instance, the EU has transformed from an economic bloc to both political and economic bloc regarded by many as the state of Europe. Likewise, there have been calls for the UN to expand its functions and equally increase the number of its permanent members from five to ten to promote global governance.

The UN has been at the forefront of addressing contemporary global challenges in addition to providing global governance in contemporary world politics (Diehl and Frederking, 2010). Despite some shortcomings, the world body has had to live up to its core objective of saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war. In actualising its objectives, the UN has not acted alone. Instead, it has collaborated with other regional IGOs in reaching ceasefire agreements to end conflicts, institute peacekeeping, peace enforcement, and peace building mechanisms as well as pressuring warring parties to seek diplomatic solutions to end conflicts. In 1992 and 1995 due to the rising number of conflicts across different regions of the world, and in view of the inability of UN to respond effectively to these conflicts simultaneously, the organisation launched *The Agenda for Peace and Supplement to an Agenda for Peace* (Malone, 2004). Both programmes called for greater involvement of regional IGOs in UN activities. Furthermore, the Peace Agenda highlighted the advantages and potentials for the division of labour in preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping, peace-making, and post-conflict building (Tavares, 2010).

However, despite some of the achievements recorded by IGOs, they have equally been confronted with several obstacles, which if addressed would significantly impact positively on the activities of IGOs across the world. One of such obstacles is the repeated violation of the UN Charter, especially by the permanent members of UN Security Council. For instance, in 2002 and 2003 respectively, the United States invaded and occupied Afghanistan and Iraq under the guise of fighting terrorism (Gordon, 2007). In addition, in 2022, Russia, driven by security and national interest, invaded Ukraine. This development, which the Secretary General of the UN, António Guterres, describes as a violation of Ukraine's territorial integrity and of the Charter of the United Nations (UNSDG, 2022). UN's failure to prevent members of its Security Council from invading fellow members of the world body has led observers and member countries of the

UN to criticise the organisation for its inability to assert authority over countries such as the United States and Russia.

Funding is another obstacle that has confronted IGOs, including UN. The role of funding is critical if IGOs at the global, regional, and sub-regional levels would be able to fulfill their mandate. IGOs are funded through contributions from member states, and a country's contribution is conventionally determined by its Gross Domestic Product (GDP), (Archer 2014, Rannenyeni 2009). Therefore, countries with low or poor GDP would not be able to contribute their quota to the UN. The underfunding of UN by its member countries has hindered the world body from addressing a wide range of issues on health, environment, security, and development among others. Thus, UN is often compelled to plead with member nations to redeem their pledges to the world body to enable it function optimally. The ugly scenario is not peculiar to UN as other IGOs also suffer similar fate, may be with the exception of EU.

Other obstacles that continue to hinder IGOs from fulfilling their mandate include the debate on the legitimacy of IGOs to act or take necessary action, especially on issues of intervention and peacekeeping missions, as well as the extent to which the UN Security Council can exercise power over other member countries (Hurd, 2014). There is also the challenge of structure, mandate, and capacity (Tavares, 2010). It is imperative to note that not all IGOs operate at the same level, in particular, the ones that are situated in developing countries. Some IGOs such as AU and ECOWAS rely on technical and logistics assistance from NATO, UN, and EU in deploying their peacekeepers to trouble spots. There is also the argument that some countries use IGOs to advance their foreign policy and national interest to the detriment of the collective mandate of members as well as the objectives of the IGOs they belong to. Some powerful nations, including the United States, have been accused of using the UN platform to promote their national ideas and values.

## Conclusion

All stakeholders can only achieve the creation of a lasting peace in the international system through concerted efforts. Therefore, every actor in the international arena has a role to play in seeing this goal through. IGOs in the last two decades have not shied away from this goal. Many regional and sub-regional IGOs have actively responded to issues that threaten peace and security as well as good governance in their separate regions. Global governance seeks collaboration between the state and key actors in the international system in resolving global challenges of various kinds. IGOs at the global, regional, and sub-regional levels have demonstrated without doubt that beyond the state, international organisations can resolve issues affecting world peace, security, and other related issues. IGOs, since the post-Cold War era,

have been a major factor in resolving conflict across the world, thereby promoting global governance and world peace.

## References

- Acharya, A. (2016). The Future of Global Governance: Fragmentation May Be Inevitable and Creative. *Global Governance*, 22(4), 453-460.
- Adekeye, A. (2008). Mad Dogs and Glory: Nigeria's Interventions in Liberia and Sierra Leone. In Abdul Rufus Mustapha (Ed.) *Gulliver's Troubles: Nigeria's Foreign Policy after the Cold War* (pp. 177 - 202). University of Kwazulu-Natal Press
- Akinyeye, Y. (2003). Nigeria and Peacekeeping in the 20th Century. In Yomi Akinyeye (Ed.) *Nigeria and the Wider World in the Twentieth Century: Essay in Honour of Jide Osuntokun* (pp. 190 -220). Davidson Press
- Aluede, J.A. and Nzemeka, J.A. (2020). Governance and the Processes of Regional Integration: An Analysis of the Contrasting Experience in Europe and Africa. *AIPGG Journal of Humanities and Peace Studies*, 1(1), 48-79.
- Archer, C. (2014). *International organisations*, 4th edn. Routledge
- Bennett L.A. (1995). *International Organisation: Principles and Issues*. Prentice Hall
- Biersteker, T. J. (2009). Global Governance. In Myriam Dunn Cavelty and Victor Mauer (Eds.) *Routledge Companion to Security* (pp.1-27), Routledge Publishers
- Chaliand, G. and Arnaud, B. (2007). *The History of Terrorism from Antiquity to Al Qaeda*. (Eds.), University of California Press
- Chandra, P. (2004). *Theories of International Relations*. Vilas Publishing House PVT LTD
- Council on Foreign Relation (2021). The UN Security Council [www.cfr.org-backgroundunder](http://www.cfr.org-backgroundunder) (Retrieved February 24, 2023)
- Department of Public Information, (2008). *The United Nations Today*. United Nations Department of Public Information
- Dershowitz, A.M. (2002). *Why Terrorism Works: Understanding the Threat, Responding to the Challenge*. Yale University Press,

- Diehl, P.F. and Frederking, B. (2010). *The Politics of Global Governance: International Organizations in an Interdependent World* Fourth Edition. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Dingwerth, K. and Pattberg, P. (2006). Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics. *Global Governance*, 12(2), 185 - 203
- Finkelstein, S. L. (1995). What Is Global Governance? *Global Governance*, 1(3), 367-372
- Gaddis, J.L. (1990). *Russia, The Soviet Union and The United States: An Interpretative History*. (pp.1-384). Boston: Mc Graw-Hill
- Gordon, P.H. (2007). Can the War on Terror be Won? How to Fight the Right War. *Foreign Affairs*, 86(6), 53-66
- Harvard Law School: Bernard Koteen Office of Public Advising. <https://hls.harvard.edu/bernard-koteen-office-of-public-interest-advising/> (Retrieved February 8, 2023)
- Hopmann, P.T. (1999). *Building Security in Post-Cold War Eurasia: The OSCE and U.S. Foreign Policy*. United States Institute of Peace
- Human Rights in the Middle East and North Africa. <https://www.amnesty.org/en/location/middle-east-and-north-africa/report-middle-east-and-north-africa/> (Retrieved March 6, 2023)
- Hurd I. (2014). The UN Security Council and the International Rule of Law. *The Chinese Journal of International Politics*, 7(3), 361- 379.
- Kennedy, P. (1989). *The Rise & Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500-2000*. Harper Collins Publishers
- Keohane, R.O. (2011). Global governance and legitimacy. *Review of International Political Economy*, 18(1), 99-109
- Kissinger, H. (1994) *Diplomacy*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Kramer M. (2005). Power, politics, and the long duration of the Cold War. In *Reinterpreting the End of the Cold War: Issues, interpretations, periodizations*, Silvio Pons and Federico Romero (Eds.) (pp. 21-38). Frank Cass.
- Murphy, C.N. (2015). The Last Two Centuries of Global Governance. *Global Governance*, 21(2), 189- 196



- Nicholson, M. (2002). *International Relations: A Concise Introduction*. Palgrave Macmillan
- Ogbeide, M. M. (2003). Regional Integration: A Theoretical Analysis. In Ayodeji Olukoju, A.A. Lawal and Kehinde Faluyi (Eds.), *Fundamentals of Economic History*, (pp. 368 - 382). First Academic Publishers.
- Oltean, A. (2016). The creation of the League of Nations. In M. Brie, A. Stoica, & F. Chirodea (Eds.), *The European Space: Borders and Issues In Honour of Professor Ioan Horga* (pp. 477-488). Oradea Univ. Press.
- Rannenyeni, M.S. (2009). *Regionalising Peacekeeping Operations in Africa*, Royal B. Foundation.
- Rapidis, D (2018). Global Governance: Achievements, Prospects, and Crucial Problems *Journal of Global Policy* <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/brookings-audit/global-governance-achievements-prospects-and-crucial-problems> (Retrieved February 2, 2023)
- Rearden, S.L. (2001). NATO's Post-Cold War Strategy: The Role of Combined Joint Task Force. In S. Victor Papacosma, Sean Kay and Mark R. Rubin (Eds.) *NATO After Fifty Years*, (pp.75 - 85). Scholarly Resources Inc.
- Rosenau, J. (1992). Governance, Order, and Change in World Politics. In James N. Rosenau. and Ernst-Otto Czempiel (Eds). *Governance without Government: Order and Change in World Politics* (pp. 2-311). Cambridge University Press.
- Rosenau, J.N. (1995). Governance in the Twenty-first Century. *Global Governance* 1(1), 13-43
- Rosenau, J.N. (2006). Governance in Fragmeegrative Spaces. In Phil Wiliams, Donald H. Goldstein and Jay M. Shafritz (Eds.) *Classic Readings and Contemporary Debates in International Relations* (pp.571-580). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Stremlau, J. (2000). Ending Africa's Wars. *Journal of Foreign Affairs*, 117 - 132.
- Tavares, R. (2010). *Regional Security: The Capacity of International Organisations*. Routledge
- The UN's Role in Global Governance in United Nations Intellectual History Project, Ralph Bunche Institute for International Studies. The CUNY Graduate Center. *The United Nations*.

United Nations (2022). Regional Arrangements (Chapter VIII of UN Charter) [www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/regional-arrangements-chapter-viii-un-charter](http://www.un.org/securitycouncil/content/regional-arrangements-chapter-viii-un-charter) (Retrieved February 11, 2023)

United Nations (2022). United Nations: Peace, Dignity, and Equality on a Healthy Planet [www.un.org/en/global-issues/democracy](http://www.un.org/en/global-issues/democracy) (Retrieved February 11, 2023)

UNSDG, 2022. Russia's invasion of Ukraine is a violation of the UN Charter, UN Chief tells Security Council [unsdg.un.org/](http://unsdg.un.org/) (Retrieved March 31, 2023)

Wallenstein, P. and Johansson, P. (2004). Security Council Decision in Perspective. In David M. Malone (Ed.) *The Security Council: from the Cold War to the 21st Century* (pp.17-36), Lynne Rienner Publisher

Wang, H and Rosenau, J.N. (2009). China and Global Governance. *Asian Perspective*, 33(3), 5-39.

Weiss.T.G. (2000). Governance, Good Governance and Global Governance: Conceptual and Actual Challenges. *Third World Quarterly* 21(5) 795-814.