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ABSTRACT

This Thesis considers the concept of World Government from historical and theoretical perspectives and tests its salience through in-depth interviews with Global South scholars in Central Asia (N=12). The first three chapters describe the contemporary global governance system, and examine World Government models through international relations (IR) theories. Chapter Four aims to present Central Asian perspectives on the viability of a future World Government. Three hypotheses are tested by this Thesis. H₁: the infeasibility of World Government, H₂: the intermediacy of global governance system, and H₃: the United Nations as a model for a future World Government. From among the three hypotheses, H₁ failed to be disproven given responses by Central Asian scholars interviewed, the majority of whom claimed that entrenched sovereignty and national interests of states are the main obstacles for the creation of a World Government for the foreseeable future. H₂ and H₃ were also, in turn, fully to partially disproven given the interview data, as the Central Asian scholars considered the current global governance system as being in crisis, and thus incapable of evolving into a more centralized form of government. Although opinions were partially positive about the UN, many of the Central Asian interlocutors also considered the UN in its present format as a weak institution, one which is in need of being reformed or even replaced by a new intergovernmental organization.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Full Form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO</td>
<td>International organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IR</td>
<td>International relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Nongovernmental organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TNC</td>
<td>Transnational corporation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UK</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNESCO</td>
<td>United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNGA</td>
<td>United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSC</td>
<td>United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S.</td>
<td>United States (of America)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USSR</td>
<td>Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (The Soviet Union)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWI</td>
<td>First World War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWII</td>
<td>Second World War</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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WHY A FOCUS ON WORLD GOVERNMENT?

It is Tuesday, the 25th of September 2018. Event: 73rd Session of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA). Place: New York City. The American President Donald Trump, while giving the keynote speech, proclaims:

American independence … is under threat. Not from Russia or China, nor from al Qaeda or ISIS, but from “global governance.” (Hurlburt 2018)

James Rosenau (1992) defines “governance” as a “system of rule that is as dependent on intersubjective meanings as on formally sanctioned constitutions and charters” (4). Finkelstein (1995), in turn, argues that governance is called so because scholars are not aware of “what to call what is going on [vis-à-vis the existing world order]” (368). All in all, the notion of “global governance” addresses the character of the present world system with the absence of centralized government and yet existence of a complex relationships of state and non-state actors.

Although the above-mentioned political narrative by the current U.S. President is explicit in terms of his policy for American nationalism, his supposed presumed threat facing his country from “global governance” induces a series of questions as to whether the contemporary international system imposes too much or too little constrains on sovereignty of nations. That said, in line with Alexander Wendt’s (1992) statement that “Anarchy is what states make of it,” global governance can also be perceived to rest on states’ actions and inactions (395). For Wendt (2003) and a number of other scholars, what can be considered as global governance or “world order” will invariably move from “a system of states, a society of states, world
society, collective security,” and finally to what Wendt calls “the world state” (491)—what I refer to in this Thesis as “World Government.”

Background and history

The term World Government indicates a theoretical concept meaning “government for and over the world” (Cook 1950, 20). If global governance is recognized to be in effect practiced at the time-being, World Government is considered as more of a centralized form of global authority and anticipated by some scholars and ordinary people to emerge sometime in the future. World Government is also defined by several definitions given the diverse theories and models proposed by scholars. According to a rather universal description by Cook (1950), World Government refers to an “order or institution which shall have ultimate authority throughout the whole world” (20). Catherine Lu (2016), in turn, defines the concept as a condition in international affairs where “one common political authority” is designated over its members. The term World Government is also non-permanent because scholars have created alternative terms such as “world state” (Wendt 2003), “federation of free states” (Kant 2008 [1795]), and “federal union” (Yunker 2000), among others.

Throughout decades, the concept of World Government has been slowly gaining its relevance among increasing numbers of academic scholars and non-profit organizations. The number of World Government studies, for example, has significantly increased. The partially positive tendency towards the concept may be explained by two reasons: Firstly, the worldwide spread of cosmopolitan movements—e.g. “One World” (Fox 2013)—which have been arguing for the idea or ideal of “world citizenship,” have induced a range of studies on cosmopolitanism as a new civic identity. Second, the rapid growth of neoliberal economic globalization and related global issues have served as a major foundation for cooperation among states
on the international stage. Contemporary global threats do not only encompass traditional ones, but also “non-traditional threats,” varying “from climate change to cyber security” (Tanner 2012, 9). States affect and are affected by a globalized world and are thus socialized or find it expedient to often negotiate and cooperate on common ground.

The notion and idea of World Government originated from the Age of Enlightenment, starting in the mid-17th century. International relations (IR) scholars distinguish among three key stages in its ideational development: Holy Alliance (1815-1856), the era of the League of Nations (1920-1946) and the period since the formation of the United Nations (UN) in 1945 (Zolo 1997, 8). At the beginning of the 19th century, Napoleonic wars provoked the creation of an alliance amongst some European imperial rulers (Russia, Austria, and Prussia), what became known as the Holy Alliance, all adopting a special “congressional government” (3). This Alliance signified the first international effort to establish a “peaceful alternative to anarchy and war.” It indicated an “international federation” of sovereign states in Europe, albeit by the hegemony of the great powers (3-4).

The period after the First World War I (WWI, 1914-1918), in turn, was depicted by the establishment of the League of Nations (10 January 1920), which had significant “provisions against aggressive wars” and prospects towards “peaceful change.” However, its consensus decision-making and the post-war “territorial status quo” served as a deterrent to the efficacy of the organization (Hoffmann 2003, 27). The creation of the UN (24 October 1945), in turn, aimed to address issues remaining from the Second World War (WWII, 1939-1945) and stabilize interstate relations, whilst doling more authority than the former League of Nations to a new international body. The UN General Assembly was, thus, authorized to form “recommendations,”
and the UN Security Council was founded on the “veto” power of five permanent members (U.S., USSR, Britain, France, and China) (Zolo 1997, 7). Danilo Zolo claims that the UN Security Council became the de facto “Holy Alliance of the 20th century,” in which great powers advance their authority over the rest of the member states (8).

Contemporary IR theory entails various perspectives on the creation of World Government. For instance, according to Lu (2016), when it comes to the discussion of World Government, liberalism argues that there is a need for the “multi-layered scheme in which ultimate political authority is vertically dispersed,” and which does not constrain states’ sovereignty in some spheres, but is also able to employ “central coercive mechanisms.”

Realism, in turn, contests the feasibility of World Government due to the “egoistic human nature,” “international anarchy,” the unsustainability of inter-state cooperation and the unfeasibility of appointing the “authoritative hierarchies” at the global level. Marxism, on the other hand, writes Lu, declares the eventual world order of “peace and freedom,” in which states will “fall along with the fall of classes,” and the capitalist system will be replaced by a global “communist social order.” Constructivist scholar Wendt (2003), in his part, proposes a “teleological” approach to a future World Government, which anticipates the eventual but inevitable emergence of a world state from the contemporary anarchy (491).

**Research question**

The area known as “Central Asia” has been said to be “imprecise” and justified by its identifier not by its “physical geography,” but as a “distinct cultural … historical [and political] entity (Bregel 1996, 3). This Thesis considers the term to refer to post-Soviet Central Asia, a region encompassing the five countries of Kazakhstan,
Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan, and Uzbekistan with a geostrategic location between the major powers of Russia and China. Since the breakup of the Soviet Union in 1991, the five Central Asian states have had increasingly diverging political, economic, and social developments. The region has also served as a “buffer zone” against “expansion of the Islamic movements” from Afghanistan and the Middle East for Russia (Rahmani 2003, 127).

Central Asia has a multiethnic character with highly diverse ethnic groups spread across national borders (Aydin 2001). Politically, the region is dominated by “secular authoritarianism” with variations of “free market philosophy” (182). Besides Kyrgyzstan, which has developed the “greatest amount of democratic political reforms” (Jones Luong 2002, 3) and which some have referred to as a possible “democratic outlier” (Foroughi 2018), Central Asian states have preferred to sustain authoritarian governments rather than to transit to liberal democracies. In terms of economic development, Central Asia represents a resource-rich region (hydrocarbons, gold, silver, various minerals, cotton, wheat) though with such critical problems as “extreme poverty,” “personal corruption,” and “drug trafficking” (Aydin 2001, 182). Central Asia is hence a demonstrative example of the post-communist developing world with economic and geopolitical importance and yet significant problems in its political system and social and economic justice.

Central Asia has also gone from having been part of one country—the Soviet Union—under a central communist rule for seven decades to independent nations and polities today. The concept of World Government, on the other hand, is founded largely on the complex of Western liberal values and principles. According to Duncan Bell (2014), liberalism as a political theory proposes a comprehensive perspective on the creation of World Government and can be considered as a
“metacategory of Western political discourse” (683). Western liberal principles presume “civic, political, social, economic, and cultural standards” for human beings (Clark 2010, 7-8). Civil liberty, equality, economic self-interest, respect for all ethnic and religious groups are recognized to be core elements of the anticipated liberal version of a future World Government. It is fair to posit that currently the number of Western scholars, experts, and policy-makers who are proponents of the concept of World Government prevails over the representatives from the Global South.

This Thesis attempts to examine the concept of World Government and its salience to scholars and policy makers of the Global South, in general, while using the case study of Central Asian perspectives on the concept, in particular. Central Asia can also serve as an example of the developing world, aka “Global South” (Wolvers et al. 2015). The end creation of World Government assumes the inclusive membership for all states, including the Global South. However, attitudes of developing states or Global South on the concept of World Government remain largely obscure. Accordingly, the main question of this Thesis is: How does the concept of World Government resonate with Central Asian scholars? This main research question is followed by two sub-questions: How do Central Asia scholars and experts evaluate the contemporary global governance system? In view of Central Asian interlocutors for this study, what model/s of World Government, if any, is most plausible to emerge?

Hypotheses

This Thesis will test the following three hypotheses:

H₁ (Infeasibility of World Government): World Government is perceived as an infeasible model of world order in the near future among Central Asian scholars with the general argument of the insurmountable obstacles of sovereignty and national interests of states.
\( \text{H}_2 \) (Intermediacy of global governance): While most Central Asian scholars view the current system of global governance as merely useful for enhancing national interests, there is some concurrence as to the existing system of global governance potentially serving as an intermediary step towards an eventual World Government in the long-term.

\( \text{H}_3 \) (UN model of future World Government): There is consensus among Central Asian scholars that if a World Government were to emerge, a strengthened UN system serves as the most plausible model for it.

**Theoretical framework**

This Thesis comprises the complex of theoretical and quasi-empirical studies on the concept of World Government. By theoretical component, mainstream IR theories of realism, liberalism, Marxism, and constructivism are explored vis-à-vis their perception of the concept of World Government. Quasi-empirical studies are presented by democratic, legal, economic, and cosmopolitan models of World Government.

Political realism elaborates on the notions of anarchy and self-help of the international system. States are presumed to be “engaged in a struggle to increase their capabilities” (Griffiths 2007, 12), while anarchy signifies “lack of an overarching authority” in the international system (13). Realist theory on the whole anticipates the establishment of a stable world order in two perspectives: polarity and hegemony. Polarity indicates the “relative distribution of capabilities” of nation-states and distinguishes between “multipolar,” “bipolar” and “unipolar” systems (Weiss and Wilkinson 2014, 95). The realist theory of hegemonic stability, on the other hand, emphasizes a “predominant state” or “hegemon,” expected to expand its authority over the rest of the state actors in the international arena (96).

Liberalism considers human rights principles such as “equality before the law,” free speech, and free trade as fundamental laws of world order (Doyle 1986,
The liberal school of thought has two overarching “legacies” vis-à-vis the international system: the “pacification” of international affairs and “international imprudence” (1155-1156). Pacification views liberal states as implementing a “separate peace” (1152) among themselves, while international imprudence considers that liberal states may wage war with imprudent “non-liberal states” but not among each other (aka the “democratic peace theory”) (1156). Theoretically and practically, the two conditions are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Classic liberalism grounds itself on the Kantian notion of “Perpetual Peace.” Kant declared that the liberal world order is to be in the form of a “pacific federation” based on the “republican civil constitution” and “cosmopolitan law” (1158). Liberalism considers the “rule of law” as a crucial part of the “peaceful world.” Some liberals favor forms of “soft law” based on the “moral suasion,” while others argue for the “articulated sets of rules” (Weiss and Wilkinson 2014, 114).

Marxism refers to political economy and historical materialism in studying IR. Scholars describe the Marxist approach as “materialist,” because it relies on the “mode of production of material life” (171). Marxism designates the class struggle between the “minority bourgeoisie” and the “majority proletariat,” and concludes that capitalism will expire in the future, which will in turn induce the creation of the “communist society,” where “private property” will be demolished (172).

Constructivism, a critical IR theory, defines power as a “social relationship” because it is to embrace “social understandings and practices” (146). States’ “interests” and “identities” are hence “socially constructed” under constructivism and can change over time (Griffiths 2007, 60). As mentioned earlier, Wendt (2003) elaborates on the “world state” model as an “end-state” in international relations (493). According to Wendt, a world state will be developed in three stages: A
“universal security community” is to be followed by the creation of the “universal collective security,” which eventually induces the “universal supranational authority” (505).

**Research design**

This Thesis will apply qualitative methods to test the three above-mentioned hypotheses through initially employing a broad range of literature review to observe previous studies on World Government within given theoretical frameworks. Later, **expert interviews** with primarily Central Asia scholars will serve as the primary data component of the qualitative methodology.

In the literature review, World Government will be examined in three main dimensions. Historical perspective is to designate past models of World Government propagated in the Western world. Theoretical studies describe Liberal, Realist, Marxist, and Constructivist prospects on World Government. Review of semblances of empirical or quasi-empirical studies (as there has never been a World Government to observe) will serve to represent practical considerations, criticisms and discontents of the concept World Government; existing practices in global governance; and necessary factors and conditions for creation (or avoidance) of a World Government. In-depth expert interviews will, in turn, be conducted with Central Asian scholars and regional experts (N=12) to gauge their perspectives on the concept of World Government. Questions will be divided into three parts: contemporary IR and global governance, World Government, and discontents of the concept.

**Research significance**

There are two basic reasoning on the significance of this Thesis: **First**, contemporary tendencies in the international system such as increasing globalization and destructive
effects of global economic and environmental problems demonstrate the relevance of
closer cooperation for solving the present chaotic global issues. The prevailing
Western discourse in World Government studies, however, reveals a lack of non-
Western Global South scholars who may favorably consider or critique the concept.
The Central Asia example can thus serve as an alternative outlook of the Global South
on the concept of World Government.

Second, the deficiency or weaknesses of the current global governance system
serve as a prerequisite for considering alternative concepts of international system.
The development of World Government studies, if not to induce an actual world state
any time soon, can nonetheless generate ideas that can assist in the evolution of
existing and future policies of global governance and order.

Research limitations
This Thesis assumes several limitations during its research work. First, it has a
limited theoretical scope considering four major IR theories, and does not cover IR
theories of Feminism, Post-modernism, or Green Theory, among others. The second; limitation relates to the implementation of qualitative methods in that the expert
interviews will be limited in numbers (N=12) and places where scholars are located
(primarily Kyrgyzstan and Kazakhstan). Thus, there can be legitimate criticisms of
how representative such views may be of the totality of Central Asian scholars, policy
makers, government officials and the public-at-large. That said, this Thesis aims to
integrate both positive and negative perspectives on World Government and strive to
serve as an objective report on the topic.
Conclusion

The Thesis will encompass three chapters in its main body. After this introductory chapter, Chapter II will describe the development of the current global governance in “voluntarist,” “institutionalist,” and “civil society” periods, and the contemporary global governance will be considered in terms of its actors, and the UN system. Chapter III is devoted to the World Government and is divided into three parts of history, theory, and quasi-empiricism. After an historical outlook of the evolution of the concept of World Government, the theory section serves to represent perspectives of classical and mainstream IR theories on the concept, while the quasi-empirical section will demonstrate different opinions of scholarly literatures on the practicality of the idea of World Government. Finally, Chapter IV is to represent the findings from the series of interviews with Central Asian scholars, which will serve as data to test the above-mentioned hypotheses.
II

THE CONCEPT OF GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

“For relations among states the only reasonable way (…) is for them to behave like individual men, that is give up their savage (lawless) freedom, get used to the constraints of public law, and in this way establish a continuously growing superstate to which, eventually all the nations of the world will belong.”—Immanuel Kant, 1795

A relatively new concept and term introduced in the latter part of the 20th century, “global governance” describes the wide range of activities and cooperation brought about via the intergovernmental organizations emerging since the 19th century. Weiss and Thakur (2010) define global governance as the “sum of laws, norms, policies, and institutions that define, constitute, and mediate relations among cities, society, markets, and the state in the international arena” (6). While the “global” component of the term refers to the international presence, “governance” represents the series of regulations and mechanisms responsible for the sustainment of the international system. Still, it is fair to posit that the term continues to be vague. In this chapter, I take a step back, and consider the history of emergence of global governance as divided in to “voluntarist,” “institutionalist,” and “civil society” eras. I will also briefly review the literature on the contemporary global governance system.

Peace of Westphalia of 1648 and the “voluntarist period”

Global governance originates from the historical development of international organizations. One of the first signs of emerging world order was the so-called “Peace of Westphalia” of 1648, which was signed after the devastating Thirty Years’ War
among European monarchies. The document behind the Peace of Westphalia proclaimed the concept of states being “sovereign with their own territories” and “equal” to each other. Ku (2001) refers to the Peace of Westphalia as the starting point for the emerging “voluntarist period” in global governance.

In this era, as the term implies, sovereign states were not obliged to follow certain rules or regulations of the international system, and they were independent in the creation and dissolution of coalitions. In addition, war played a legitimate and crucial role in interstate relations. The voluntarist period of global governance experienced many pitfalls such as the absence of international law. States enjoyed their sovereignty, but were not subjects of global legitimation or full external sovereignty. Another weakness of this period refers to the limited number of sovereign states, which came under the Peace of Westphalia, “limited to a number of European states only” (Knight 2000).

The new turn in the voluntarist period took place through the pursuing work of German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1917 [1795]), “Toward Perpetual Peace,” wherein he describes the idea of creation of a “federation of free states.” According to Kant’s definition, the state “isn’t a piece of ‘property’, but a society of human beings over whom no one but itself has a right to rule and to dispose” (109). Kant had a critical stance on the voluntarist system of states, in which war had a legitimate status. The “federal union” (135) of states that he refers to was to emerge based on the “republican constitution” (56). The proposed constitution embraced principles of “freedom,” (34) “common place of law” (65) and the “equality” among (most) citizens (66). The republican form of government was to ensure the division between legislative and executive branches. For Kant, democracy was considered as a form of “despotism,” in which decision-making was conducted by “all,” but which “doesn’t
include everyone” (8). However, the republican form of government was to be representative in its essence, and thus prevent a despotic form of leadership.

Kant indicated the weaknesses of “peace treaties” between states, which are required to end each war separately. He emphasized the eventual creation of a “league of peace,” which would eliminate the practice of war among member states (10). As a result, states would leave their “savage freedom,” follow “public law,” and establish a “superstate,” to which all states would join (11). Although Kant’s “Perpetual Peace” treatise did not lead to the creation of a World Government, it may have contributed to the development of the global governance system, whereby states began to apply bilateral and limited multilateral cooperation as a form of resolution of conflicts and prevention of war.

In 1815, the European states made a significant step in the establishment of a form of global governance system. The Napoleonic wars on the continent enticed the major powers to create a diplomatic alliance to deter the common enemy of the time: France. The Congress of Vienna, held between September 1814 and June 1815, was to introduce a new system of international relations. To that end, the so-called “Quadruple Alliance” was created in Vienna between the United Kingdom, Russia, Austria, and Prussia (Wallerstein 2013, 15). The difference from the previous temporary coalitions of powers was the fact that this new Alliance was far more official. The Alliance of powers was eventually able to defeat Napoleon from his conquests in Europe.

On 15 September 1815, Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed a separate multilateral treaty with the purpose of maintaining peace in Europe. This treaty later became known as a “Holy Alliance” of three powers (Langhorne 1986, 317). The “status quo” of regained peace was considered as a main factor for the creation of this
coalition (315). By 1818, the Quadruple Alliance was transformed in to the “Quintuple Alliance” or “Pentarchy of Great Powers” with for former common enemy France joining the coalition (Wallerstein 2013, 15).

The Holy Alliance did not transform to an official body. It was mostly maintained by the organization of international congresses between participating powers, though its conception contributed to the emerging system of global governance. The Napoleonic wars had revealed weaknesses in the voluntarist system, in which states did not possess united international laws. It became apparent that unilateral actions of states could not provide peace, and cooperative action was a necessary measure for enforcement of an intergovernmental regime. The voluntarist system of states was to evolve into a new order soon. This transition was characterized by the creation of first international organizations such as the 1865 “International Telegraph Union” and the 1874 “Universal Postal Union” (Weiss 2015).

The Hague Conference of 1899 and the “institutionalist period”

The “institutionalist” era of global governance began in 1899, when the First Hague Conference was held among the European powers (Ku 2001). The conference aimed to constrain a number of interstate wars by “outlawing particular kinds of weapons” and “limiting [the] arms race.” The Conference, however, did not set up a permanent international body devoted to the implementation of provisions it raised. Two worldwide cataclysms had to take place to convince states to set up multilateral intergovernmental organizations. As the term implies, the institutionalist period faced the process of institutionalization of the world system.

The League of Nations, created after WWI, was the “first permanent international organization,” which embraced nearly all sovereign states at that time.
The League was anticipated to become an effective structure due to its statements against wars and “procedures for peaceful change” (Hoffmann 2003, 27). Though largely ineffective, the organization officially existed in the interwar period and through WWII, between its creation in 1920 and dissolution in 1946. Given its failure to impose sanctions against Italy’s campaign to annex Ethiopia in 1935-1936, the League of Nations was “for all practical purposes [already] dead” (Northedge and Grieve 1971, 140). The League did not succeed in its goals because most of its provisions had a recommendatory and voluntary character. War was not outlawed as an illegal instrument in interstate relations; colonial territories were not given sovereignty, and stayed under the authority of their colonial powers. Still, the League served as one of the first permanent models of global governance system, despite its incapability to prevent the outbreak and horrors of WWII.

Shortly after the end of WWII, the UN was created on 24 October 1945 to replace the authority of the League of Nations. The structure of this new organization significantly differed from the former. The “United Nations Charter model” introduced a set of legally-binding rules to all its member states (Zolo 1997, 96). The United States of America, as a part of the winning coalition in WWII chose to join the UN, what it had not done with the League of Nations when the U.S. Congress had refused to ratify membership in that body. The Soviet Union, as well, which had joined the League of Nations in 1934 (but forced out in 1939 due to its invasion of Finland) was now a founding and permanent member of the UN (Gardner 1964). The UN’s formation is considered as the highest point in the institutionalist period of history of global governance.
The UN has promulgated a number of unprecedented provisions via its Charter: The first is that international organizations are recognized as “subjects of international law.” Second, the “general principles” of the system are mandatory for all member states. And third, states are allowed to go to war only with the purpose of “self-defense,” while the UN Security Council is authorized to order the use of force when voted by the majority of its rotating and permanent members (Zolo 1997, 96). Needless to say that despite the formation of the UN, many of its provisions are not regularly enforced in international affairs where global and regional powers have often been waging “offensive” wars with devastating results. The “stagnant, nuclear, and bipolar” period of the Cold War prevented the effectiveness of the UN system, while, among other things, the “Bretton Woods system,” the economic dimension of the UN system, was partially renounced by the U.S. in 1973 when the country announced its decision to leave the gold standard of backing its currency, the dollar, and abandoning the Bretton Woods fixed exchange rate system (Soederberg 2006, 7).

The process of decolonization in the second half of the 20th century where most Asian and African states gained their sovereignty coincides with the end of the institutionalist era of global governance. The UN system, still in place today, as did the former League, possesses pitfalls in its structure. Among other things, the UN Security Council has been compared to the Holy Alliance of the 20th century given its five permanent members and their veto power.

“Civil society” era and contemporary global governance
By 1975, the global governance system turned to embrace not only state actors, but also non-state actors. “Civil society” represents a general concept, which “networks of individuals,” “nongovernmental organizations” (NGOs) and (some claim) even “multinational corporations” (Ku 2001). The increasing role of non-state actors in
global governance was partially determined by the emerging process of globalization. And though states have retained their primary significance in the international realm, civil society has been accepted an “essential analytical place” in the system (Ozgercin and Weiss 2009, 139).

The UN gradually recognized the involvement of NGOs in international conferences and meetings. For example, the 1972 UN Environment Conference in Stockholm hosted about 300 NGOs from around the world. While in 1992, this number increased to 1,400 during the UN Environment Conference in Rio. NGOs have been relatively efficient in promoting the women’s agenda and in the establishment of such treaties as the Landmines Convention and the Statute for an International Criminal Court. The UN, however, represents a highly political structure, which is depended on the willingness of its member states to contribute to world order. Although the civil society period on the whole has experienced a rise of new non-state actors in global governance, the role of NGOs and other forms of civil society are constrained as state actors largely retain their dominance in international politics.

The contemporary global governance system represents a complex mechanism of state and non-state actors which mutually reinforce the maintenance of the international system. Applying the official definition of the Commission on Global Governance, the present system is the “sum of the many ways individuals and institutions, public and private, manage their common affairs” (Weiss 2005, 70). However, global governance is a general concept and, interpreted by scholars and experts in various contradictory ways.

For the liberal scholar Thomas Kratochwill (2011), “governance” implies a system of “public management,” which promotes “accountability” by “local
involvement” and “introduction of managerial and market-based methods” in the public sphere (269). Tanner (2012), on the other hand, describes the system as “cooperative arrangements” among international actors “in the absence of a World Government” (1). Global governance takes place in various international dimensions, including policy, security, economy, social development, culture, and diplomacy. The concept signifies two extremes: While governance determines the inclusive character of the system as it equally embraces all international actors, it also reveals the lack of world authority in form of government. In this regard, some scholars point out that the “governance” component of the term should be considered as a transitional period to a World Government. Another opinion is that governance is a suitable model of the system between two alternatives, “anarchy” and “government.”

In the international realm, the contemporary global governance system mostly appeals to the UN system, a multilateral world organization with 193 member states. Ideally, the UN is to maintain and enhance the general principles of peace, cooperation and security around the world. One of the main crises in global governance is often explained by problems in the UN structure. For instance, the UN has represented a political mechanism, which plays a stronger role when states are the main actors in international relations. In recent years, however, with the rise of non-state actors, NGOs, and transnational corporations (TNCs), the UN has become “only a part of the full picture” (Rosenau 2005, 45). Therefore, global governance does not constrained its agenda by the intergovernmental UN system. Still, the UN is recognized as the most significant chamber of the system, but not the only one.

Another significant aspect, which has had an impact on the global governance system, is the process of accelerated globalization. Starting from the last decades of the 20th century, globalization has developed in three main ways: “material,”
“ideological,” and “cognitive.” In the materialist term, globalization causes free movement of capital, technology, goods,” and “labour,” while in the ideological sense it has been propagated by its “efficiency, competition and profit[s].” And, finally, the cognitive development of globalization implies the reference to “social innovation” and “reorganization” of people (Lipschutz 2004, 205).

Dingwerth and Pattberg (2006) claim that global governance comprises of four elements of: rules, human activity, set of goals, and “transnational repercussions” (189). While the set of rules and goals are to create the normative basis of global governance, human rights and transnational dimensions indicate the significance of non-state and particularly individual actors in the system. In terms of functioning, global governance implements a wide range of objectives. See Table 1.

Table 1: Functions of global governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Actors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Diplomacy and politics</td>
<td>IOs, states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Alliances and coalitions</td>
<td>IOs, states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Wield influence whether because of position, status, or power of ideas</td>
<td>Individuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Consensual knowledge</td>
<td>State and non-state actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Propaganda and communication</td>
<td>IOs, states</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Feedback loops between</td>
<td>International, national, and subnational actors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Institutional procedures and methods</td>
<td>IOs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Examine relevant power and means of its exercise</td>
<td>State and non-state actors (Finkelstein 1995, 368-369)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Provide a measure of international order in absence of World Government</td>
<td>States and non-state actors (Weiss and Thakur 2010, 35-36)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Wang and French (2013), global governance functions through a set of mechanisms, which are perceived as institutionalized frameworks for the implementation of certain goals. There are two main mechanisms involved:
“international organizations” and “transnational networks” (987). While the first comprises of state actors, the second appeals to non-state actors. State actors within the global governance system are the governmental entities with determined territory and recognized sovereignty. States play a dominant role in intergovernmental or international organizations (IOs) as they usually hold official membership. They participate in international conferences and forums and implement the legally-binding decisions of organizations.

Wang and French argue that contributions made by states to the global governance system can be divided into three types: (i) “Personnel,” i.e. states delegate national staff to work in the structure of international organizations such as the UN during peacekeeping operations; (ii) “financial,” whereby states provide funds to different organizations to tackle global issues of their choice; and (iii) “ideational,” indicating that states present their ideas and proposals on the development of organizations (987). Though states can be efficient in maintaining the substantial (even bloated) UN structure on the intergovernmental level, they can also serve as the main obstacle for the creation of a future World Government by adherence to strict preservation of sovereignty and national interests.

The term “non-state actors” may apply to a wide range of individual and collective, profit and non-profit organizations, unions, groups, and entities—many include terrorist groups as part of non-state actors as well. These actors may be seeking one or many goals. For example, there are various NGOs specialized in political, social, environmental, and cultural issues. Thus, the only distinction of non-state organizations from state ones is that the former are not established (but are often partially funded) by the states. Overall, non-state actors can be distinguished as being non-profit “civil society,” entities, “profit-making organizations,” and “social
movements” (Rosenau 2005, 52).

Civil society generally designates “political space where voluntary associations deliberately seek to shape the rules that govern one or the other aspect of social life” (Scholte 2001, 283). Civil society may implement important roles on the national as well as on the international level. In the historical perspective, civil society was often designated in controversial ways. John Locke, for example, perceived civil society as being “in opposition to the state.” While de Tocqueville emphasized it as a “process of self-management” by people separately from state. Gramsci, in turn, found civil society as an “intermediate space” between state and people (quoted in Castells 2005, 14). Traditionally, civil society has functioned only in relation to a nation-state structure. However, with the increasing process of globalization and technological advancements, it has become possible for civil society to be part of tackling global problems beyond one’s nations-state. Therefore, the new concept of “global civil society” and international NGOs signifies the “global space of communication,” reinforced, among other things, by “interdependent media” and forums (13).

Global civil society involves local, national, regional, and international NGOs operating worldwide. States’ reaction on the operation of these organizations vary. Some, normally in the case of authoritarian or totalitarian governments, (depending on the topic) negatively react on the work of NGOs in global governance. This is despite the fact that NGOs may often participate in such areas to which states would not want “to be involved due to lack of finances or lack of expertise”; thus, NGOs may in essence be complementing the state. NGOs, such as the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), for example, often actively produce and distribute “relief supplies in disaster situations” worldwide and propagate “norms of
conduct” (Rosenau 2005, 53). Still, global governance system maintains the status quo of state actors as the main players, while constraining NGOs to a supplementary role only.

Profit-making organizations, mostly applied to TNCs, operate in somewhat similar way as civil society as non-state actors. Increasing globalization has enhanced the role of TNCs. In this regard, the statement made by a chairman of the Coca-Cola company that in the future “institutions with the most influence by-and-large will be businesses” seems relevant (53). Australian Greens Party politician, Bob Brown, is known to have said that: “Exxon, Coca-Cola, BHP Billiton and News Corporation have much more say in organizing the global agenda than the planet’s 5 billion mature-age voters without a ballot box” (Brown 2012).

“Social movements,” in turn, mostly have inclusive and voluntary character. They may be not well organized or structured, as they may not possess any location and clear membership. However, social movements can effectively unite on the “salient set of issues” such as feminism and environmentalism. They are based on the willingness of its members to initiate some activities for tackling certain national and global problems (Rosenau 2005, 54).

The UN system
The major structure in global governance, as mentioned previously, is the United Nations system. The UN performs the function of a “complex permanent social system” in global governance. It contains a large bureaucratic and “hierarchical division of labour” in its structural institutions (Knight 2000, 63). The distinction between the three periods of “institutionalist development” of global governance indicates the UN Security Council as a model of “diplomacy by conference,” and the UN General Assembly as an example of “universal membership conference system.”
while the third period refers to various long-standing UN institutions (Weiss and Thakur 2010, 36).

The UN implements a wide range of normative objectives. It “manages knowledge” (40), “develops norms” (42), “formulates policy recommendations” (43), and “institutionalizes ideas” (47). The UN implements its capacity to determine and discuss certain themes and issues within its institutions such as the General Assembly. The organization may then transform the discussed problems into norms for member-states. This function has a dual significance both for overcoming global problems and crises, and for obligating states to follow established norms of international law. Policy recommendations serve as supplementary tool for the previous function. The UN prepares advisory provisions for states regarding “specific policies,” “institutional arrangements,” and “regimes” (43). However, member-states are, in general, not obliged to adopt proposed recommendations as in the case of mere international norms (as opposed to laws). Finally, institutionalization of ideas refers to the monitoring and observation of the practical implementation of norms with both states and non-state actors playing roles in the creation and realization of norms.

The UN functions in the global governance system also correlates with its main pitfalls in maintaining the present system. Weiss and Thakur (2010) propose five “gaps in global governance,” which are constituted in accordance with four functions of the UN: First is the “knowledge gap” (8). States tend not to agree on the formulation and resolution of many problems or crises proposed in the UN. Second is the “normative gap,” whereby establishment of “universally acceptable” norms is at long and complex process (9). Third is the “policy gap,” in that discrepancy can take place between defined global problems and one-sided implementation by state actors, while civil society often remains outside the realm of empirical involvement (12).
Fourth is the “institutional gap,” where the UN system has a deficiency of “resources and autonomy” (15). Presently, the UN is not authorized to violate or overcome sovereignty of its member-states, and this norm deteriorates the efficiency of the organization and system itself. The fifth gap is that of “compliance,” one which appeals to all previous gaps in the UN system, as at each stage states prefer to disregard proposed resolutions and agreements due to political tensions or regime character (20).

Conclusion
This chapter demonstrated that global governance is a multilayered system with its state and non-state actors, significant functions, and gaps in authority. Global governance can also be evaluated as a transit period to a less or more governed world. The transitional character of this system may be underlined in its deficiencies and pitfalls to succeed in the interstate system. Non-binding and recommendatory decision-making processes do not necessarily constrain states from preservation of status-quo, which means that the whole global governance structure may be in need of reinvention to encounter ongoing and newly-found political, environmental, and economic challenges facing the planet.
III

WORLD GOVERNMENT: HISTORY, THEORY, QUASI-EMPIRICISM

“There is no salvation for civilization, or even the human race, other than the creation of a World Government.” —Albert Einstein (World Federalist Movement 2018)

“Nobody can be a citizen of the world as he is a citizen of his country. … No matter what form a world government with centralized power over the whole globe might assume, the very notion of one sovereign force ruling the whole earth, holding the monopoly of all means of violence, unchecked and uncontrolled by other sovereign powers, is not only forbidding nightmare of tyranny, it would be the end of all political life as we know it.” —Hannah Arendt (quoted in Achcar 2013, 99)

The idea of World Government applies to the broad range of concepts from Immanuel Kant’s 1795 “Perpetual Peace” proposal where he refers to a “[world] federation of free states” to Alexander Wendt’s (2003) “world state.” Yunker (2012) defines the concept in two ways: as “omnipotent” and “limited” government (95). An omnipotent or “unlimited” World Government represents a “very strong state entity,” which would imply functions of national governments on the global level. For instance, this would imply the inclusion of all nation-states; sanctions for the withdrawal of the state; monopolization of military dimension; and the “democratic control” over governments (95).

“Limited” government, on the other hand, presumes an intermediate authority between the current UN system and the unlimited form of government. It would serve as the “secure foundation” for the gradual strengthening of the system in the future.
(96). The authority of the limited World Government is also constrained in terms of the law enforcement and executive power. However, in both definitions, World Government is emphasized as an “international regime” with certain “sets of rules,” “decision-making procedures,” and “programs to social practices” (Young 1999, 5). The term “government” signifies the complex of legislative, executive, and judicial branches within a global system. Under a World Government, states are hence required to transmit part of their sovereignty to a global authority. This provision usually becomes one of the most disputable problems for states, as they attempt to preserve all or most of their sovereignty. As follows, there are many discontents on the policy and academic levels as to whether such a global system is both feasible and required. In this section, the concept of World Government will be considered through three perspectives of: historical outlook, theoretical discourse, and quasi-empirical studies.

**Historical outlook**

The idea of World Government is rather ancient. The Greek philosopher Zeno Citium, founder of Stoicism in the 3rd century B.C., emphasized the ideal of “oneness of the universe” (Lu 2016), while another philosopher, Diogenes (420-323 B.C.), renounced political borders, and famously proclaimed: “I am a citizen of the world.” These philosophical sketches though stayed on their initial stage, nonetheless continued during the middle ages in Europe. Italian poet Dante (2016) proposed the creation of a world monarchy, “one government under one ruler.” This work was relevant to the course of time, when emerging monarchies in Europe were the dominant form of rule. The so-called “Leviathan” type of state encouraged a single hegemonic political authority unchallenged by opposition. In the 17th century, philosopher Hugo Grotius anticipated the emergence of a “world government to enforce [international law]”
In the era of enlightenment, the development of the concept of World Government was closely related to that of Kant’s. In the 20th century, which was characterized by the advancement of industrial countries and international organizations, academic interest on the creation of a World Government rapidly increased. IR scholars began publishing articles with proposals for the establishment of a future World Government. American scholar George W. Hoss (1905) derives from the example of the U.S., a federal “union of states,” and foresees the creation of a “world federation.” He describes three main branches of the federated world government (legislative, judiciary, and executive), while a “world-police force” was to implement executive power among member states (40). The proposed world federation was built on Kant’s idea about federal union of republics. However, Hoss conceptualized a more united form of government, with one single authority above states.

Hamilton Holt (1911), on his part, developed the concept of a “League of Peace,” which could later be compared to the League of Nations, created some years later (129). He also discussed two ways for the creation of a World Government. The first was the bottom-up approach presuming an “education of the public opinion” on the topic by which citizens of nation-states could encourage the creation of a global authority. And second was the top-down approach, indicating the coalition between “more enlightened nations” that would also enforce other states to join the projected World Government (130). Holt’s League of Peace was anticipated to encompass the “Hague Court” as its judiciary body for the peaceful resolution of conflicts and a “convention or assembly” as a legislative body (131).
The end of the WWI and the newly created League of Nations contributed to an acceptable scenario for some that World Government was the next stage in the development of the international system. In this regard, Frederick Blachly and Miriam Oatman (1919) considered the main pitfalls in the concept of World Government. They expressed concerns with the “system of organization,” developing a plan for a World Government, provisions for the acceptance of the plan, and “operation of a [world] government” (80). In accordance with Hoss, Blachly and Oatman also considered a “federated empire” to be an effective model for World Government. The “federal constitution” would replace national legislatures of states on the global level and the anticipated World Government was to obtain military power to ensure world security and oppose enemies (89). Blachly and Oatman noticed, however, that there are many other obstacles that may emerge during the operation of World Government. See Table 2.

As follows, proponents of World Government have had to address the above-described challenges. Legally-binding laws and sanctions could play an effective role in this regard. And while proponents’ inclusion of a future global legislature as part of the World Government has been an inevitable part of the process, the idea of a World Government and associated sanctions for implementing international law is expected to conjure negative reactions by states, in particular the great powers (Potter 1922, 303).

In the late 1930s, while the League of Nations had practically ceased its functioning, the future Axis bloc (Germany, Italy, and Japan) was preparing for their first aggressive wars. At that time, Clarence Streit called for the creation of “political union of the democracies” (quoted in Bartel 2015, 278). The proposed union primarily encompassed the Western powers, but excluded colonial territories. Streit asserted that such a union would deter the Axis powers from aggressive actions. States were ex-
### Table 2: Problems in the operation of World Government

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Obstacle</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National ambitions</td>
<td>One or more member states may “cherish the dream of wresting power from the federal government” and create their hegemonic power in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Struggle of race against race</td>
<td>World Government will be destroyed, and different groups will fight against each other until one will be recognized as winner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Economic forces</td>
<td>The unequal distribution of wealth, lack of “social justice” may induce a “bitter struggle between a world-wide organization of capital and a world-wide organization of labor.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Food deficiency</td>
<td>The world population may encounter the deficiency of food supply, and if the World Government will not resolve this problem peacefully, it may persuade people “to better its condition by force.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Blachley and Oatman 1919, 98-99).

expected to unite under five spheres of governance: “citizenship,” “defense,” “customs-free economy,” “currency,” and “postal and communications systems” (279). The proposed union was to implement the role of a centralized World Government. Western powers, however, neglected this proposal just a few years prior to start of WWII.

In post-WWII, the concept of World Government gained the attention of political scientists (and also a segment of the public), who anticipated its creation to become an inevitable process due to the creation of the UN. The Bretton Woods system of economic institutions and the UN structure served as the starting point for some liberal scholars supporting the concept of World Government. Emery Reves’ “Anatomy of Peace” marked the end of the World War and emphasized the significance of the creation of a global authority. Reves indicated the emergence of a World Government as part of a “revolution against political systems” (quoted in Bartel 2015, 282). The conflict between “industrialism” and “nationalism” was foreseen to prevent the process of the integration of states (283). In this regard, the
subsequent Cold War between two rival communist and capitalist blocs deteriorated academic inquiries on the concept of World Government.

Eventually, however, the first negotiations on the disarmament between rival blocs, which took place in 1960, contributed to the new academic interest in the sphere of the World Government. Lincoln Bloomfield’s (1962) revealed two objectives of disarmament: “universally accepted rules of law” and “disarmament itself” (634). He perceived arms control and disarmament to be the core elements of a future World Government. In this regard, he supported previous concepts of a federal system with separation of powers of the legislative, executive, and judiciary branches. According to Bloomfield, the legislative body of the World Government is “to make decisions within the scope of the organization’s powers for peace-keeping,” while the executive is to be appointed by member-states, and the “Executive Council” would have special power over powerful members. The judiciary, in turn, is to create a “World Court” that would serve to resolve legal and political disputes (635-636).

Bloomfield’s model of global authority presumed the significance of constraining member states from gaining military power, which could ensure their “effective control” within the global community (639). He also held that communism as an ideology would be overcome by either “evolutionary process” or “war” (642). At the time, Bloomfield’s work may have had a role in understanding the character of the Cold War, and ways to overcome it. In the 1960s, arms control and ideological gap were perceived as the main obstacles for the emergence of a global authority.

Fast-forward 30 years when the U.S. President George H. W. Bush introduced a “new scheme for lasting and universal peace” in the U.S. National Security Strategy (Zolo 1997, 22). The crucial transition from the rival relations to a peaceful order was explained by the end of Cold War. The collapse of the Soviet Union led Bush and
many in Washington to claim that the “international system [was now] based on the [W]estern values of freedom and democracy.” For instance, global security was required to become the founding basis for the emergence of “New World Order” (22). NATO would play a significant role in this scenario. However, Bush’s anticipated world order never came to be. Western powers under U.S. leadership retained NATO as the political-military bloc with new member states from the ex-communist bloc, what Bush’s negotiators had supposedly promised their Soviet counterparts not to do towards the end of the Cold War (Itzkowitz Shifrinson 2016).\(^1\) The concept of the world hegemony regained its significance among scholars because they presumed the U.S. was to establish a unipolar system as part of an ongoing global governance. Today, however, IR scholars agree that the contemporary global governance system is perceived as part of a multipolar system of competing states and non-state actors.

The historical perspectives on the concept of World Government indicates the diversity of theoretical frameworks and models of global authority. The time frame from the ancient philosopher Zeno Citium to today’s Bloomfield reveals the evolutionary thinking of the concept of World Government. While in the Middle Ages, the emergence of a potential World Government was associated with a world monarchy, the establishment of democratic states provided new concepts such as a world federation or world union of republics. Below, I will elaborate on contemporary IR theories vis-à-vis the idea of World Government.

**World Government and IR theory**

World Government does not attract much theoretical attention in academia. If anything, however, it remains largely within the theoretical discourse of international

---

\(^1\) Joshua Itzkowitz Shifrinson (2016) writes: “Scholars agree ... that [U.S Secretary of State James] Baker told Gorbachev and Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze on February 9, 1990, that there will be no extension of NATO’s jurisdiction or NATO’s forces one inch to the East, if Gorbachev
relations. By theory, I mean studies based on hypothetical and predictive knowledge, while empirical studies involve experience-based knowledge. Theoretical discourse hence prevails in studying the concept of World Government given that empirical data on the topic has yet to exist. Below I will bring insights into theoretical models and explanations of the idea of World Government through the IR prisms of: realism, liberalism, Marxism, and constructivism.

**Realism**

Realism represents the major school of IR. Realist scholars primarily emphasize the role of states as the main actors in the international area. Under realism, interstate relations are based on notions of “anarchy” and “self-interest.” As follows, the concept of World Government counters classic realist perspectives as it is considered as “infeasible” or “utterly impractical” to be created (Lu 2016). For nearly all realists, states will indefinitely retain their anarchic character of bilateral and multilateral relations given their innate selfish nature.

Realism signifies power largely as a concept with “strong military component” (Buzan et al. 1998, 388). States are assumed to distinguish between internal and external types of power. For instance, a state’s internal power may change and transform over time, while its external power will remain unchanged. Sovereignty serves as the dividing point between the internal and external spheres of relations. However, the concept of World Government and associated idea of “cosmopolitanism” indicate power as being a “multidimensional account” with “political,” “social,” “technological,” and “cultural” dimensions (389). States may retain their status quo in the interstate relations, but there are many other dimensions in which power relations may be evolved. In this regard, the main contradiction consented to German reunification” (15).
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between the idea of World Government and realism is on the role of the state in international relations.

In *Cosmopolis: Prospects for World Government*, Zolo (1997) describes three schools in the “European philosophy of internationalism,” those of: “Hobbesian-Machiavellian,” “Grotian,” and “Kantian” (15). Zolo refers to the Hobbesian school as the standing point for his proposal whereby World Government is primarily perceived as the “despotic” and “totalitarian Leviathan” with one objective to preserve the high authority by any means, including violence (166). Meanwhile, states retain their dominance in the international area, providing “self-organization of international law” (106). Under realism, war serves as one of the main obstacles for the creation of World Government, as it is rooted in the “human evolutionary trend” and a part of human nature (147).

Among contemporary realist scholars, John Mearsheimer (2004) applies the concept of “hegemony” to explain the unified form of international system. In his definition, hegemony, in theory, implies a “domination of the [entire] system.” Mearsheimer distinguishes two types of hegemons: “global” and “regional,” claiming that there have been no global hegemons in history, while regional hegemons are always placed in the system. To achieve permanent global hegemony in the international system is also assumed to be “virtually impossible.” The U.S. is hence to represent a regional hegemon in the “Western Hemisphere,” without any “intention” or chances to become a global hegemon (185).

For realists like Mearsheimer, the so-called “world order” is renounced as a unfeasible scenario in interstate relations because of “great powers” seeking to “maximize [their] own share of world power” (192). Mearsheimer proposes two reasons for the improbability of the “peaceful” world order: States will never agree on
a “general formula” of anticipated order, nor will they leave “power considerations” under a risk of failure of new world order (194). In this regard, the concept of World Government is considered through realist concepts of states’ survival and rational choice. The cooperation among states is to be limited due to the “dominating logic of security competition” (Mearsheimer 1995, 9). Thus, states are to act mindfully due to the uncertainty of other states’ actions. Therefore, the realist school presents the most critical overview on the concept of World Government appealing to the anarchic international system and the improbability of the global hegemony by any authority.

Liberalism

Compared to realism, liberalism indicates an opposite insight into international relations. Liberal scholars derive their ideas from moral ethics, presumed peacefulness of human nature, and benefits of economic interests. Classic liberalism advocates that states should establish “liberal peace” based on “open diplomacy,” “free trade,” and the “peaceful settlement of disputes” (Griffiths 2007, 21). Under liberalism, global governance is considered as a multilayered peaceful system, in which liberal states interact and cooperate with each other. Liberal states are themselves defined as political entities based on respect for “civil liberties,” “private property,” and “elected representation,” among other norms (Doyle 1986, 1151). War between states is outlawed under an order of international liberal peace, and states are expected to resolve conflicts by peaceful means of negotiations and arbitration.

Some liberal scholars appeal to the idea of World Government as a concept derived from the states’ willingness to unite under a single authority. However, there are also liberals such as John Rawls, and his followers Charles Beitz and Thomas Pogge who renounce the concept as not being a part of “liberal ideal for world order” (Lu 2016). Liberals supporting the concept of World Government vary among each
other on which model of global authority as being most desirable. “Functionalism” anticipates the “New World Order,” in which states are obliged to transmit their sovereignty to the centralized power (Brown and Ainley 2009, 122). “Federalism” or neofunctionalism derives from the European model of integration whereby world order is to be a “result of a politically driven process of spillover” (124). The federal form of World Government assumes the power of high authority to make decisions with an authorization from the lower levels, and vice versa.

Liberalism stands on fundamental principles of “political rationalism,” “tolerance,” and “individualism” (Bell 2014, 684). The concept of individualism induces a wide range of human rights principles such as equality; non-discrimination; and the right to participate in political, social, cultural, and economic life of a country. The individual represents an independent actor in the liberal perspective, while “international civil society” encompasses “networks of domestic and transnational … associations” (Beitz 1999, 517). For Beitz, “cosmopolitan liberalism” introduces the individual approach to World Government. It defines a “doctrine about the basis on which institutions and practices should be justified or criticized,” but it does not elaborate on the form of global authority that should gradually emerge (519). In the liberal discourse, cosmopolitan liberalism applies to the human being as a primary source of every political organization, while the principle of “distributive justice” is considered as the significant requirement for a world society (520). In this regard, cosmopolitan liberalism creates a new realm of World Government studies, in which global authority is feasible if the principles of human rights and justice are enforced.

Another group of liberal scholars present their insights for the “international community” model, with the chief foci of “peacekeeping, development, humanitarian work, and disease eradication.” Under this model, the international community is to
serve as a step towards World Government. States and non-state actors, in turn, are expected to understand the interdependence of the world, and the need for developed states to “contribute directly toward the maintenance costs” of the international community (Griffiths 2007, 33).

All in all, the liberal school has not a unified vision on the concept of World Government, however it elaborates on its fundamental principles of international peace, human rights, and economic interdependence. World Government models under liberalism also serve to address contemporary problems related, among other things, to globalization and the rise of non-state actors.

**Marxism**

Among major IR theories, Marxism derives from critical works on capitalism produced by the German philosopher Karl Marx. He has often been criticized by modern scholars as being “totally wrong in his predictions” (Wolfe 1958, 472), but also distinguished as a proponent of a “fresh vision of the Last Things” (480). Marx and Engels’ “scientific socialism” involved a critical stance on capitalism and class inequality, and a need for fundamental reforms (Yunker 2012, 104).

In terms of economic classes, Marx considers the rich bourgeoisie as being “ideological accompaniment” of the capitalist world and the proletariat as the “universal class” of workers (Achcar 2013, 81). The economic and social inequalities between the two classes in the capitalist system serve as a central problem for Marx. The proletariat is to have a “universal character by its universal suffering” (78). To overcome the inequality and socioeconomic misery, Marx argues for “perpetual world peace” achieved by the “worldwide victory of the proletarian revolution” (86).

The proposed scenario has never come true, however, but many political regimes in the 20th century were nonetheless inspired by the Marxist ideology.
Despite its utopian character, Marx anticipated the creation of a world “Communist society,” which could become a “free association of completely free men [sic.], where no separation between “private and common interest” existed. Under Marxism, capitalism is to be replaced by socialism in given societies. Marx considers three stages of communism. In a “raw communist” society, the proletariat is placed in a primitive “labour community with equality of wages paid by the common capital.” “Democratic or despotic” communism introduces “abolition of human self-alienation,” though having an “anarchist character.” On the other hand, “perfect humanism” implies a “positive abolition of private property” and “real appropriation of human entity by and for man” (Norman 1955). The communist society, which many Marxists hope to eventually encompass the world, is to evolve stage by stage, incorporating social equality and freedom for its members.

The above is understood as a Marxist model of World Government, though with a lack of “details” and “specifics” of how it would function (Wolfe 1958). The state serves as “one aspect of the social relations” in a capitalist system, and is to be removed upon the anticipated communism (Gamble 1999, 130). However, the role of institutions and type of governance in such a society are uncertain under classic Marxist theory, which reaffirms a general utopian character. In this regard, Marxism is often considered as a “creed … where the intellect questions and rebels” (Wolfe 1958, 480). It also refers to political ideology present both in Western and Eastern countries. Among others, Hilferding, Luxemburg, Lenin, Bukharin, and Sternberg are known as famous proponents of Marxist ideology.

The collapse of the Soviet Union was a turning point in the development of Marxism, because the failure of the communist ideology was assumed to make a theory “rudderless,” and thus irrelevant to the transformed system of international
affairs (Gamble 1999, 127). The gradual renovation of Marxism has though indicated a new wave of neo-Marxist studies, recognizing, *inter alia*, that the renunciation of capitalist market “was flawed” (132). The creation of the communist society is also rarely discussed among neo-Marxists. Although some, such as Andrew Linklater, underline the significance of the emergence of a “universal society” with all peoples involved (quoted in Gamble 1999, 133). Overall, Marxism represents a utopian vision of World Government through the lens of overcoming class inequality present in the capitalist system.

**Constructivism**

The end of the Cold War led to the emergence of an array of critical IR theories, which had to address new challenges encountered by states. Among the chief critical schools has been “constructivism” and its proponents who perceive states’ behavior to be “norm-driven,” and founded on their social “identities” and “interests,” which may change as a result of interaction with other states and entities (Griffiths 2007, 63). Constructivists disagree with realist perspectives that anarchy is an eternal condition for states. Wendt’s (2003) article “Why a World State is Inevitable” presents one of the first contemporary constructivist insights into a World Government model. He wrote the piece to be “deliberately provocative,” with a purpose to induce debate on the probability of a “world state” (Yunker 2012, 110).

Wendt’s (2003) idea of arriving at a “world state” is based on a “teleological approach,” and the intension to encompass both “forward-looking” as well as “backward-looking accounts” of the concept (496). The state for him is defined in the Weberian model as embracing “monopoly of force,” “legitimacy,” “sovereignty,” and being a “corporate actor, while in the international system … [and its associated] states are expected to evolve into more cooperative and peaceful … [form of]
organization” (504-505). For Wendt, the changes to the current system are to occur gradually.

First, states will integrate into a “universal security community,” which will attempt to eliminate the eternal threat of war and seek peaceful means of conflict resolution; second, the “universal collective security” will ensure peace and stability for all member states. Akin to NATO’s article 5, if one state were to encounter aggression on its territory, it is to be a “threat to all” member states. And three, the “universal supranational authority” will serve as an international body with legal authority to adopt “binding” and “legitimate decisions” (505). For Wendt, the creation of the world state indicates both “cosmopolitan” and “communitarian processes” (516).

Aside from the three broad changes to the international system noted above, Wendt sees five stages for the development of the world state/World Government—see Table 3.

Wendt’s proposed world state is considered as the single political entity with legally-binding laws and legitimate right for violence. It is not to represent a “utopian” structure but daily functions as a high authority over states and individuals (528). In this model, states partially maintain their “individuality” by the principle of “particularism within universalism” (525). Wendt reveals three problems in way of arriving at a world state: “democratic deficit,” “nationalism,” and issues of “mutual recognition” by others (526-527). While democracy is expected to be reinforced in the world state in the same manner as in individual states, nationalism is to be encompassed within the world state. Moreover, the recognition of a world state will be provided by its constituting members, citizens and states. Therefore, Wendt’s proposal for a potential world state/World Government begins with the constructivist notions of individuality and social identity of community of states.
Table 3: Wendt’s five stages to a “World State”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№</th>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>Actors</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>System of States</td>
<td>Hobbesian anarchy</td>
<td>“Multiple interacting states”</td>
<td>• Anarchy (absence of centralized power);</td>
<td>• If there is one strong state, it will conquer weaker ones, and become enlarged;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• States are “enemies with no rights” and “social constraints.”</td>
<td>• If there are two strong states, one will eventually conquer another, or they may come to agreement and recognize each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Society of States</td>
<td>Lockean culture of anarchy</td>
<td>Sovereign states</td>
<td>• War is a legitimate instrument;</td>
<td>• Cost of war will rise over time;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Citizens are not recognized.</td>
<td>• Citizens will demand the elimination of war from states, which will enforce states to seek non-violent forms of conflict resolution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>World Society</td>
<td>Cosmopolitan society</td>
<td>• Individuals</td>
<td>• “Universal pluralistic security community”;</td>
<td>• If one “criminal” state attempts to conquer other states in the system, it will be deterred by “centralized coercion” or “collective security” of member states;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• States</td>
<td>• “Thick form of solidarity.”</td>
<td>• Solidarity to the system will gradually expand, as states will have “better chance of survival” in a system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Collective Security</td>
<td>Kantian culture</td>
<td>• Individuals</td>
<td>• “Non-violent dispute resolution”;</td>
<td>• Member states always can withdraw from the system and regain its arm forces;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sovereign states</td>
<td>• “All for one, one for all” principle;</td>
<td>• System may not “satisfy desires for recognition.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Voluntary system.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>World State</td>
<td>Constructivism</td>
<td>• Individuals</td>
<td>• Not static, always “in process” and “vulnerable to disruptions”;</td>
<td>• Conflicts and disputes are “domesticated” by legislation;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Non-sovereign states</td>
<td>• “Enforceable law.”</td>
<td>• Basis for a “just world order.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: (Wendt 2003, 517-529).
Quasi-empirical studies

In line with IR theories, there are various quasi-empirical proposals on the creation of World Government, primarily by scholars who largely differ from classic IR theorists such as realists and liberals due to a more free interpretation of concepts and being unconstrained by traditional notions of anarchy or peace. Among them is the democratic model of World Government whereby the principles of human rights, equality, and representative government serve as the common ground for scholars. For instance, the concept of “globalized democracy” implies two processes of “democratization of separate states” and creation of global democratic institutions such as a “global parliament” representing world citizens’ rights (Ulaş 2016, 114).

Yunker’s (2000) “Federal Union of Democratic Nations” envisions a democratic world order. In reference to the Cold War era as compared to today, Yunker notes that the ideology difference has been replaced by the problem of “global economic gap,” aka the “North-South” divide (10). However, the economic gap between developed and developing states may be breached, while the ideological gap between capitalist and communist nations prevents any form of serious inter-state cooperation. In this regard, one of the crucial objectives of the proposed Federal Union is to induce what Yunker calls the “World Economic Equalization Program” (WEEP) with the goal of tackling the problem of economic gap by equalizing “living standards” of rich and poor nations (19-20).

The political structure of the Federal Union of Democratic Nations indicates the “legitimate,” “full-fledged state entity” with all state obligations such as official legislation, collection of taxes, and military capability (21). The representatives to the government will be sustained by direct elections among all union citizens. The united form of the federal union will be demonstrated by official symbols such as “flag,”
“anthem,” and “emblems.” The federal government presumes the status quo of 
“sovereignty” and “autonomy” of states (21), though balancing between unitary 
political institutions and autonomous state regions is to be tough because states would 
require more authority from the central government.

The Federal Union is to be established by a formal Constitution and will 
embrace three main governmental bodies, legislative, by way of the “Union 
Chamber of Representatives,” executive or “Union Chief Executive,” and judiciary or 
the “Union High Court.” Each body presumes limited terms for elected 
representatives such as five years in legislative body, and 10 for executive. The 
executive branch consists of nine authorized ministries of finance, justice, and 
security, among others. “World Development Authority” is also to be a part of the 
executive branch and to concentrate on global issues (22). In terms of nationalism, 
Yunker introduces the concept of “supernational patriotism.” This proposed form of 
nationalism embraces two factors: “real,” meaning the “physical substance” of the 
Union, its active involvement into social life, and “psychological,” i.e. understanding 
of the Union to be an effective body in comparison with nation-states (25).

In terms of discontents, two main counter-arguments exist to an anticipated 
World Government. First, the realist concern is that the Federal Union may transform 
to a “horrific totalitarian nightmare,” instead. The world is a diverse and complex 
system, which means that to govern the world’s population with different political, 
economic, cultural, social and military components may turn to violent forms of rule. 
On the other hand, the reason for why there is no World Government could be that 
states have yet to need it because they are able to maintain non-war status quo with 
the “intelligence” and “good sense of national leaders” (Yunker 2012, 118). However, 
the question would arise on how to justify interstate wars, civil wars, and counter-
terrorism wars, which are continuing today. Both arguments reveal the states’ concerns on the matter of “sovereignty” as to whether it will be severely constrained or mostly eliminated in favor of a centralized power.

There are also models of World Government recognized as more realistic and probable. This group of scholars renounce the feasibility of a united form of world state, and consider the concept in form of an international organization or society. For instance, Stanley Hoffmann (1998) addresses the concept of “beyond utopia” when looking at the idea of World Government. Following certain preconditions for the emergence of such an authority, Hoffmann applies to the creation of “global society of sovereign nation-states,” which could serve as an effective form of global governance. Global society is to primarily preserve the “protection of human rights” and the “use of force.” Hoffmann assumes that the “world commission” and “court” to be constituted as institutions for the enforcement of laws on human rights, while the use of force would be provided by the “supranational military power” of UN through the authority of the Security Council and General Assembly (31-32). In the economic dimension, the model of the European Union is preferred. In addition, the UN’s Educational, Scientific, and Social Organization is to be employed as an instrument against “fanaticism” and “intolerance” (33). Various obstacles though may prevent the emergence of such a global society. One of the primary concerns refers to the role of the nation-state, which is not yet “obsolete” (34).

The legal concepts of World Government play a significant role in quasi-empirical studies given that most discontents with a contemporary global governance appeals to the lack of international legislation and legally-binding decisions. In this regard, Rafael Domingo’s (2010) concept on the “New Global Law” proposes the legal point of view on World Government (1), whereby legislation is primarily
distinguished in to three types: “law of nations,” “international law,” and “global law” (3). As follows, national law is implemented within nation-state borders, while international law refers to the present legislation in the UN system.

Global law presents a theoretical concept having its “normative foundation in the person” and targeted to use “legal metalanguage” in encountering global challenges (5). In this regard, “antroparchy” from “anthropos” (“human”) and “archy” (“legitimacy of rule”) emerges as a “government for humanity,” an entity close to European models. The major principle of Domingo’s antroparchy is that “what affects all must be approved by all.” Moreover, the institutionalized form of antroparchy evolves into the “United Humanity” based on global law (11). The proposed United Humanity is founded on the legislative body, i.e. a “global parliament,” while the new global order is to constitute seven major principles: “justice, reasonableness, coercion, universality, solidarity, subsidiarity,” and “horizontality” (12).

One of the controversial aspects of World Government is the economic component. The economic benefits from free trade and the world financial system are considered in most models as positive impacts of united economic system, and yet in terms of Global North-South division, poor states are perceived by critics to ultimately be disregarded by rich nations under a potential World Government, despite promises that Global North countries (aka “developed economies”) would be obliged to sustain the less developed countries/Global South financially. Richard Sutch’s (2017) remarks on the “new global economic order” tells of two major tendencies: the predominance of powerful nations and TNCs in setting “macroeconomic policy” vs. the so-called “coalitions” of developing nations (115). According to a report be Credit Suisse, in 2017, the richest one percent of the world’s population owns just over half of the global wealth, equivalent to US$140 trillion
The question would therefore be the means to arrive at an equitable global economic order.

For Luke Ulaş (2016), the idea of World Government is a “direct implication of cosmopolitan principles” (106). April Carter (2001) defines “cosmopolitanism” as:

[a] model of global politics in which relations between individuals transcend state boundaries, and in which an order based on relations between states is giving way to an order based at least partly on universal laws and institutions (2).

World Government is understood as an institutionalized form of cosmopolitanism and associated with the notion of “world citizenship.” Cosmopolitan scholars emphasize the role of individuals as “members of a global community” who are to be the core elements of a future World Government and protected by “international human rights law” (Clark 2010, 7). Moreover, cosmopolitanism can be understood as a civic identity, which incorporates people “adopting languages or life ways or modes of political belonging that affiliate them with the distant rather than the near, the unfamiliar rather than the customary” (Pollock 2013, 60). Although both concepts of World Government and cosmopolitanism are interlinked, the latter mostly appeals to a global human community rather than the institutionalized form of government. As such, one could already be a ‘cosmopolitan’ (by way of mindset) and yet live under the existing nation-state system.

What could be labeled as ‘non-utopian’ scholars presume various issues contradictory to the creation of a global authority. As partially discussed in the previous chapter, some argue against the creation of World Government because it may lead to human oppression on a global scale. Campbell Craig (2008) organizes counter-arguments against the idea of World Government into three general statements: It is “unnecessary” and “undesirable”; it is de facto another term for “Pax Americana” (U.S. hegemony); and it inadvertently or even by design leads to a
“tyrannical state” (141).

Anne-Marie Slaughter (2004) argues that the “size and scope” (7) of a potential World Government would “present an unavoidable and dangerous threat to individual liberty.” She further claims that a World Government is improbable due to the maintenance of “political authority at the national level” (8). Slaughter appeals to the primary problem that nation-states will not transmit their sovereignty to a central authority. As a compromise, she sides with the new “world order” by way of a “system of global governance that institutionalizes cooperation and sufficiently contains conflict” (15). Slaughter’s anticipated world order crucially differs from the current system by its five founding principles of: “global deliberative equality,” “legitimate differences,” “positive comity,” “checks and balances,” and “subsidiarity” (30). Her world order will simultaneously preserve national sovereignty while promoting international cooperation among states.

Conclusion

In this chapter, the idea of World Government was described from four IR theoretical prisms, while quasi-empirical studies served as an alternative mode to examine the practical aspects of the creation of a potential World Government and substantial discontents for the concept, as well. In the next chapter, I will test the three proposed hypotheses of this Thesis, while relying on existing literature and in-depth interviews with Central Asian scholars.
IV

ANALYSIS AND HYPOTHESES TESTING

“Analysis is the art of creation through
destruction.”—P. S. Baber (2010)

This chapter is divided into three parts corresponding the testing of the three hypotheses of this Thesis, $H_1$: The infeasibility of World Government; $H_2$: The intermediacy of global governance; and $H_3$: UN as model for a future World Government. The said hypotheses will be examined based on both existing literature and a series of in-depth expert interviews ($N=12$) with Central Asian scholars.

Hypothesis 1: Infeasibility of World Government

$H_1$: World Government is perceived as an infeasible model of world order in the near future among Central Asian scholars with the general argument of the insurmountable obstacles of sovereignty and national interests of states.

To test $H_1$ on the feasibility of World Government, a range of interview questions were devoted to understanding the concept of World Government on part of the Central Asian interviewees. While defining World Government, Central Asian scholars primarily pointed out the weaknesses in the concept, itself. For example, according to an American University of Central Asia Professor, Farhad Kerimov, World Government generally indicates a “centralized power … that has legislative, executive, and judicial powers.” It is also a unipolar system of “political institutions, which are accountable and have an authority over all states in the world.” On the other hand, World Government also implies “one state [that] would dominate over the
World Government was also perceived by another Central Asian scholar as a “certain institution … which reestablishes itself on regular basis through … universally understood mechanisms.” One scholar even referred to the concept as part of “conspiracy theories.” While defining the concept, another scholar emphasized that World Government will not emerge “unless nation-states completely disappear from the surface of the Earth.”

In terms of the specific pros and cons of the creation of a World Government, Central Asian scholars presumed different advantages and problems that such a global authority would have if it were to emerge. For instance, World Government was recognized to potentially be able to implement a “good coordination of resource use,” “better redistribution of global wealth,” and “bring peace [on Earth].” Among other potential positive implications of the creation of World Government, responses included the elimination of conflicts and wars, the provision of international laws, and the resolution of global issues such as “climate change” and “poverty.” The EU model was said to serve as an example of economic benefits gained by a World Government, with advantages such as simplifying the “freedom of movement [and] labor,” and free “movement of capital and services.”

---
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4 Interview with Medet Tiulegenov, Assistant Professor, Chair of International and Comparative Politics Department, American University of Central Asia, Kyrgyzstan, Personal interview, 12 November 2018, Bishkek.
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Regarding the current global problems, Central Asian scholars agree that fixing the increasing inequality and wealth distribution and environmental problems should be among the primarily objectives of a potential World Government. At the same time, the place of the individual seems to be privileged over states under a World Government for Central Asian scholars in that ideally such a system should address socioeconomic issues such as “healthcare” and “education.” Individuals are thus thought to benefit from any emerging, if improbable, World Government for Central Asian scholars.

Nearly all thought, however, that the provision of such policies and reforms under a World Government is too costly given the status quo system of nation-states and associated economic inequalities. The major argument against the creation of World Government was thought to be the forces of national sovereignty. Since the creation of the Westphalian system, sovereignty has been presented as a core principle for states’ legitimacy to act within their national borders. A number of interlocutors stated that in the contemporary global governance system, states are still perceived to play a crucial role, while the role of wide-ranging NGOs are thought to still be minimal. One scholar correlated the issue of sovereignty to state “leadership,” which will prefer to preserve itself as “being a leader of very small country” than a “second [or third] commander” under a World Government.10

Another factor against the creation of World Government is thought to rest on the concept of “national interests.” While states seek to promote their national interests by promoting themselves in international relations as an “influential actor” in the system, an idealistic World Government presumes the elimination of the state-centric system. One scholar argued that states represent differing political, economic,
social, and cultural developments in the world, but that a World Government will “make societies standardized,” leaving diverse cultures as having “secondary” roles in what was labeled as a “universal corporate culture.”

World Government was also anticipated to fail in terms of various other factors. One scholar explains the cons for the creation of a global authority from a realist argument that human nature relies on a principle that “someone wants to exercise more power and the other is coerced [by] this power.” World Government is hence to imply a system, in which “attempts to gain leadership” will prevail among member-states. It was also argued that a potential World Government serves as a powerful instrument for the existing great powers to exploit the weaker developing and poor states (Global South) in the international system. Another problem is that a World Government is not only incapable to enforce states to transfer their sovereignty, but also to promote “democratic principles” such as “justice” and “fairness” in its institutions. This relates to the previous argument that a group of powerful states will attempt to coerce small states, thus renouncing the democratic potential of the World Government.

One scholar assumes a major problem in the concept itself, designating it as “ambiguous,” and “slippery.” An anticipated World Government is also thought to experience problems with “incorporating” various “non-state actors” in its system. The alternative to World Government it was agreed by a number of scholars to be “global governance,” which “creates institutions, regimes, agencies,” and “seeks ways

10 Interview with Talant Sultanov, Director, Internet Society Kyrgyzstan Chapter, Kyrgyzstan, Skype interview, 27 September 2018.
11 Interview with Akchurina, op. cit.
12 Interview with Vakulchuk, op. cit.
13 Interview with Bakhtyug Tuleuova, Professor, Chair of the World History and International Relations Department, History Faculty, Y. A. Buketov Karaganda State University, Kazakhstan, Skype interview, 13 November 2018.
14 Interview with Kerimov, op. cit.
for collective solutions to global problems.”

A strengthened global governance system is hence foreseen to bring more advantages to states and non-state actors rather than a unified form of centralized World Government with coercive powers and monopoly over resources.

Despite the overall pessimism on the possibility of a World Government in the near future, Central Asian scholars were nonetheless asked about “major factors that could force states to transmit part of their sovereignty to a World Government.”

Among other issues, for many of the interlocutors, worsening “global warming” or “natural disasters” were foreseen to be “number one” problem for states to join a potential World Government. In addition, problems associated with the “global financial system,” issues of “inequality,” “epidemics,” and “migration” were described as potential precursors to entice ceding all or parts of one’s state sovereignty to a global authority. In apocalyptic vision, states are to join a World Government in the case of “real security threat” or “economic collapse.”

Apart from global problems, a few scholars described the scenario, in which “most powerful” nations are to negotiate and agree on the creation of World Government. The coalition of great powers would thus represent a core foundation of a future World Government, and later all other states would be expected to become members. In another example, states may give up their sovereignty to a centralized government in the form of “social contract,” a protection of “interests” in exchange for transmission of sovereignty. States may also agree to join a centralized government if they were to find “some benefits” from being part of a global authority.

---
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16 Interview with Kulnazarova, op. cit.
17 Interview with Nargiza Muratalieva, Editor, Central Asian Bureau of Analytical Reporting (CABAR.asia), Institute for War and Peace Reporting, Kyrgyzstan, Email interview, 22 October 2018.
18 Interview with Sultanov, op. cit.
Still, such described factors are presumed to have one major obstacle: the unwillingness to give up sovereignty.

The interviewed Central Asian scholars appealed to different reasons as to why states would not be willing to transmit their sovereignty to a centralized government. One interlocutor explained it by a novelty of sovereignty for some parts of the world and that it is vital for new sovereign nations such as those in the post-Soviet space to preserve their sovereignty because they still have post-colonial sentiments towards their former empire. Developed states, on their part, it was argued with the example of the EU member states, would also oppose a World Government given problems with excessive transmitting of their sovereignty during an integration process as it happened with Brexit. What follows with this argument is that there is no need for states to give up their sovereignty to a centralized power, and an alternative discourse to “create new agreements,” “new ways [to] organize economy, society, and politics” would be preferable. At the same time, what is understood by states, such as the EU members, is that problems associated with the “the commons” (Hardin 1968) or “collective goods problems cannot be solved by an individual nation,” and thus states’ willingness to collectively tackle global problems may increasingly take place but still sans the formation of a World Government with sovereignty over states.

In response to the question on “contemporary factors preventing the creation of World Government,” Central Asian scholars referred to political, economic, legal, and cultural problems that remain in its way. For instance, one scholar pointed out that to create a World Government, states should primarily have a “shared normative ground,” which is not present in the current system of nation-states. The continuing
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“rivalry” among “major powers” is to prevent the feasibility of World Government as well. States are assumed to preserve a “struggle for leadership” instead of promoting cooperation on global issues.

In terms of culture, the formation of a World Government implies a “huge reconciliation of historical disputes,” and the “deeply embedded moral disputes” between states. For now, said one scholar, it is not very probable that states are to leave their “distrust … towards each other” to be united under a single authority. A major factor preventing the creation of a centralized World Government, per one interlocutor, is the “way the world system is set up.” The contemporary system represents the “Westphalian” system of “nation-states,” which signify “political manifestation of nationalism.” As is, therefore, state sovereignty and national interests force the retention of the status quo in the international system.

Non-state actors are also thought to have only an insignificant impact for the creation of a potential World Government. According to one scholar, NGOs have acquired only a small amount of “power” in the current global governance system, and are not “likely to be soon dictating the agenda for states.” The issue is also about the willingness of non-state actors to join the World Government as some are as “strong and capable” as individual nation-states and would not necessarily need the presence of a global authority to resolve issues of concern to them. Thus, whether weak or strong, non-state actors in opinion of the scholars interviewed, are anticipated to play a minor role in the promotion of a future World Government.
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All in all, Central Asian scholars interviewed referred to the concept of a future World Government as a negative scenario for the future due to its impracticality, perilous monopoly, and limited framework. Nine out of 12 scholars, or three-quarters (75%), renounced the potential role of a World Government in the international arena, arguing that it is not “on agenda” of the global community of states and “there is [no] trend” towards such a system. Eight of twelve scholars (around 67%) outright disregarded with the feasibility of the World Government at any time, while four others did not find it to emerge in a near future. The infeasibility of the concept was underlined by its general impracticality and unnecessary requirements for state actors. One scholar took the position of the whole notion of World Government as being “theoretically possible, but [practically] not very probable” under current conditions.

Scholars were generally of the opinion that while the globalized and interconnected world requires states to cooperate and jointly address global problems such as climate change, economic crisis, and global poverty, the fact that states strive to preserve their sovereignty and individual interests indicates the tendency towards a multipolar system rather than the unified unipolar World Government. According to Central Asian scholars, the creation of the World Government, is thus not probable without an absolute elimination of states’ sovereignty. World Government is thus anticipated to remain mainly in the realm of theory and as an undesirable scenario for states to emerge in reality. We can thus infer from our sample of in-depth interviews that Central Asian scholars are pessimistic about the feasibility of formation of a World Government in the short-term and possibly foreseeable future. Given the
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responses of subjects with general argument of sovereignty of states and national interests, it can be concluded that $H_1$ on “the infeasibility of the World Government,” strongly holds (or that its null hypothesis fails).

**Hypothesis 2: Intermediacy of global governance**

$H_2$: While most Central Asian scholars view the current system of global governance as merely useful for enhancing national interests, there is some concurrence as to the existing system of global governance potentially serving as an intermediary step towards an eventual World Government in the long-term.

The contemporary system of international relations is generally designated by a form of global governance system, whether through the UN agencies, international financial institutions, or regional organizations. Some scholars may argue that most of the present global governance system does not really have a visible form such as clear-cut organization with associated set of institutions, and hence largely represents a theoretical concept.

Without referring to the term “global governance” directly, during the series of in-depth interviews ($N=12$), Central Asian scholars were primarily asked to share their description of the contemporary international relations system. All the interlocutors agreed that the contemporary system has encountered certain changes as compared to decades past in terms of its agenda, actors, and validity. Ten out of twelve scholars (over 80%) claimed that the contemporary international relations system is experiencing a “very challenging times.” One scholar explained it by the fact that the “liberal world order” led by the UN is “coming to an end” and that the world is thus “heading towards disorder,” and more regional or great “powers” are attempting to take the lead over the system.\(^{30}\) International norms “perceived as world order” are
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countered in the contemporary system. The present system is characterized by a “lack of political will,” “growing multipolarity,” and “rise of nationalism.” Though multipolarity implies the variety of international actors involved in the system, the absence of political will and increasing nationalism are the negative consequences of the same system of multipolarity.

For a number of Central Asian scholars interviewed, therefore the contemporary international system represents a transitional period to a total disorder or new system. The Central Asian scholars described the current world order as “conflict-prone,” “divided,” and being “in crisis.” They also noted that international law, promoted since the end of WWII, has not had the capacity to enforce laws among state actors. This is also perceived as a “failure of international institutions” and “humanitarian actions” to maintain the effectiveness of world order, while the “instability” in the international system is also increasing, encouraging states “to ignore generally accepted principles of international order.”

The example of the ongoing Ukraine crisis including the annexation of Crimea by Russia was referred to by one of the interlocutors as one of the biggest current violations of international principles. As such, it was argued that the system is “under chaos,” where “everyone is challenging” and “challenged by the system” with the question being whether the system will transfer to a newly effective world order or turn to absolute disorder. Some emphasized the need to search for a new convenient system of international relations, while others argued for a multipolar and disordered system.
international system. Overall, there was concurrence that the contemporary international relations is characterized by the labels “anarchic,” “transforming,” and “complex.”

Assuming that in terms of the contemporary international relations the concepts of global governance and anarchy serve as two major extremes for the description of current system, opinions on both global governance and anarchy can thus be good representations of perspectives of Central Asian scholars on the relevance of the concepts to the present world order. Regarding the adequacy of using the term global governance for the current international system, those interviewed proposed different opinions on whether the system today should be called “global governance.”

Contemporary political and economic tendencies such as an accelerated globalization indicate that states require political “consolidation of efforts,” to be implemented by global governance. As to the definition of global governance, Central Asian scholars described it simply as a set of “regimes, networks,” and “rules of the game,” out of which “governance” is to “emerge out of cooperation” and “collaboration” among states and other entities. According to another definition, global governance is a “complex set of institutions, norms, and behavior that collectively produce stability and peace in the world.”

Global governance was also applied to the present UN system. Although there were many discontents to the role of the UN in global governance among the interlocutors, one scholar pointed out that the UN plays a crucial role in
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“establish[ing] trust” and “opportunity” for member states to have a common ground for negotiations, and present new initiatives for the resolution of global problems.\textsuperscript{43} Global governance was thought to presume the inclusive mechanism for “international organizations, transnational corporations, and global civil society.”\textsuperscript{44}

Scholars concurred that the contemporary international system cannot be characterized with a strong or even any global governance system. One even assumed global governance is an “obsolete term” due to various state and non-state actors challenging the system independently.\textsuperscript{45} Global governance was also explained as being an overly ambitious goal given the contemporary international relations system being “driven by double standards” and “hypocrisy,” and only “partially by cooperation,”\textsuperscript{46} while global governance requires “interaction of state and non-state actors, primarily through the multilateral structures and mechanisms they have created.”\textsuperscript{47} The dialogue between states and non-state actors, in view of a number of scholars interviewed, is undermined in the current status quo system of nation-states, and the effectiveness of the multilateral UN structure is under question. Global governance was thought to thus be only partially implemented in the current system by “global principles,”\textsuperscript{48} and “maintenance of relative order and peace.”\textsuperscript{49}

On the question of the adequacy of using the concept of anarchy for the description of the current international system, the interviewed scholars can be divided into two groups, those supporting the significance of anarchy as a major principle of international relations and those who do not recognize its dominance in
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the contemporary system. As to the definition of “anarchy,” scholars told of it being characterized by “lack of centralized government,” principle of “non-interference,” and presumed “equity between sovereign states.” A few Central Asian scholars interviewed argue that there is a certain form of anarchy present in the international system, which can be differentiated from the classic Realist perspective, separating it from understanding of “chaos,” “disorder,” and “absolute freedom.”

One scholar specified that anarchy implies the absence of “single body that governs the international system,” and preserves the principles of equality and non-intervention in interstate relations, and that anarchy represents a “fundamental” concept in international relations of states. Another appealed to Postmodernism, which emphasizes anarchy as being the “elimination of any kind of forced order.” Under this approach, “power” is to be avoided in interstate relations, and thus anarchy is a crucial principle for the status quo of equity between states.

Another group of scholars (a total of six or 50% of total) claimed the absence or presence of moderate forms of anarchy, only. According to one scholar, anarchy also implies that states attempt to “get more benefits out of the system for themselves,” and protect their “national interests.” They are also keen to employ “any mechanism and institution to increase [their] dominance” in the international system. In this regard, anarchy does not describe the present international system, despite the existence of “certain challenges” to the “international order.” There was also an approach that anarchy may be understood by the Constructivist theory, which
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assumes that it may evolve over time, and the present system is “much less anarchic that it used to be.” Some agreed that the deficiency of “common unified rules” in anarchy induces “security risks” and “abruptness” of international relations. And thus the present international system is to be termed as “mature” or “ruled” form of anarchy. Mature anarchy is to represent a concept of the English School of IR that indicates the presence of “institutions with certain order,” but “absence of central government.”58 In terms of ruled anarchy, states act according to a common “agenda” that is in force, although some actors regularly violate it.59

Diverse understandings of global governance and anarchy lead to the question of whether these concepts are mutually inclusive in the international system. Some of the Central Asian scholars interviewed did not renounce the presence of both anarchy and global governance in international relations due to their limited capacity to represent the current system. It was argued by some that global governance is not to be recognized as a centralized government and thus that anarchy may still be in force in the contemporary global governance system.

H2 was setup to examine the Central Asian scholars’ perspectives on the role of the current presumed global governance system in the international relations of states, and the feasibility of the global governance to serve as an “intermediary step towards an eventual World Government.” Regarding the first part of the hypothesis on whether Central Asian scholars find the “current system of global governance as merely useful for enhancing national interests,” the interlocutors confirmed that the contemporary system is encountering challenging times and that it represents a transition from a unipolar order to a less orderly multipolar and more chaotic system with emerging regional and great powers and even to one of absolute disorder.

58 Interview with Kassenova, op. cit.
While the “old” system of global governance with the leading role of UN was perceived by the interlocutors of this study to be in “crisis,” it was also acknowledged that there is no alternative order for it yet. The rise of new regional powers such as China, Russia, India, or even Brazil and South Africa, contesting the established world order, the negative consequences of the globalization such as rise of hypernationalism and right-wing movements have also led to the current complex and even “chaotic” system of nation-states, per the Central Asian interlocutors. The preservation of national interests, in turn, serves as a primary principle for all states involved in the international relations. Most of the interviewed scholars affirmed that the current system is “undergoing major changes” in terms of weakening and failure of institutions to constrain states’ actions by international law, and that the current international system enforces states to promote their national agenda in the international relations rather than automatic cooperation.

The second part of H2 was to test whether Central Asian scholars agree that the current global governance represents a potential “intermediary step” towards a future World Government. In this regard, the interviewed scholars differed on their theoretical stances but on the whole argued that the current international system cannot even be defined as entailing a strong (some arguing any) form of global governance as it also encompasses elements of anarchy and disorder in interstate relations. On the other hand, the global governance system is understood to be under crisis now, which means that it is in need of being reformed or replaced by a new system. Although a potential World Government is not considered to be a solution or a feasible scenario, the reformation of the UN system, or creation of new effective institutions are critical objectives for many states. All in all, Central Asian scholars
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did not confirm that the current global governance system—if it exists at all—is a transitory phase to a World Government. It can thus be concluded that H₂ is rejected—i.e., its null hypothesis of no relationship was confirmed.

**Hypothesis 3: UN as model for a future World Government**

H₃: There is consensus among Central Asian scholars that if a World Government were to emerge, a strengthened UN system serves as the most plausible model for it.

There was general concurrence among the interlocutors that the UN system plays an “integral part” in the current management of global issues but that the UN’s weaknesses and incapability to enforce many legally-binding decisions on its member states raises a set of questions as to its specific role and efficacy in the international relations of states. The UN, established to “promote peace” and “prevent ... large-scale conflict,” has evolved into a gigantic multilateral and bureaucratic international organization. It is, however, also perceived as “one of the viable models” for the creation of World Government. Its mandate for legally-binding decisions is assumed to be performed in the UN Security Council (SC). Some interviewed scholars pointed out that the UNSC has a significant role in the “security sphere,” and produces “resolutions” that are legally binding and every member state “needs to comply.” However, the UNSC was also perceived to be “not as effective as it can be” due to the veto power of permanent members to deflect adoption of certain resolutions.

One scholar stated that the UN today primarily introduces a platform, where “all countries on an equal footing are able to speak” and “interact” with each other.

The UN was also understood as an international body for nation-states to present new
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initiatives “to the attention of … [the] world [at large].”\textsuperscript{64} However, others also recognized that the UN’s “power is in … decline” because it has become a “more adaptive structure,” reacting, rather than being proactive, to international events and crises.\textsuperscript{65} The UN is often ignored by rising powers “when its activity becomes contrary to their own interests,”\textsuperscript{66} and because of this, claimed one scholar, the UN has become an “ineffective international organization,” the norms and resolutions of which are violated by many member states.\textsuperscript{67} International problems or crises are assumed to be negotiated “bilaterally” or “in blocs” rather than to be put on the UN agenda.\textsuperscript{68} As follows, Central Asian scholars agreed that the UN needs to be “reformed” and “strengthened”\textsuperscript{69} in order to be able to address global issues and enforce international law.

The majority of the Central Asian scholars interviewed were of the opinion that the effectiveness of the UN system depends on the states’ behavior in international arena. One of the mentioned issues was that the contemporary global governance still preserves the Westphalian system, in which the “state is the primary actor,” but that the UN system should be reformed to have an equal representation of non-state actors in its core institutions.\textsuperscript{70} There was also the opinion that there exists the scenario that the UN may be replaced by a “new institution with a [better] understanding of current world order.”\textsuperscript{71}

Considering the plausibility of the UN becoming a predecessor of the World Government, five out of 12 or 42\% of scholars interviewed argue that if such a global
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authority would emerge then most probably the UN model would serve as a foundation for the World Government. One scholar anticipated that the UN could evolve into a “collective” World Government, but one in which “great powers [would] have more security [and dominance].”\textsuperscript{72} The importance of the UN model was also said to be underlined by the absence of any “alternative” to it, and the need for states to “coordinate with the rest of the world.”\textsuperscript{73}

According to Central Asian scholars, the lack of political authority and states’ preservation of sovereignty undermine the effectiveness of the UN system. Thus, a World Government based on the UN model can be created only under certain conditions such as the elimination of state sovereignty and national interests of states. According to this scenario, as told by one of the Central Asian scholars, if a World Government is to emerge, it should encompass “representatives of different regions” rather than individual “state representatives” with separate national interests.\textsuperscript{74} There was, however, no clear understanding among scholars on how the UN would evolve into the global entity with a centralized power and legislation given that the UN system is marked by pitfalls in its current structure.

Others interviewed proposed a negative scenario on anticipating the UN model as a predecessor for World Government. According to one scholar, the UN model, as well as the EU, “have hit their ceilings” and “cannot be expected to grow stronger anytime soon.” In this regard, the UN model was said to represent a “Western agenda,” which currently induces “resistance” from the developing world.\textsuperscript{75} If the World Government would derive from the UN system, it would thus introduce a Western-oriented entity, to which many of the sovereign states of the Global South or

\textsuperscript{72} Interview with Kassenova, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{73} Interview with Sultanov, \textit{op. cit.}
\textsuperscript{74} Interview with Vakulchuk, \textit{op. cit.}
even Great Powers competing with the U.S. and the EU (such as Russia and China) would not be inclined to join. Therefore, the issue of legitimacy prevents the creation of the World Government based on the UN model. The UN is also not to precede the World Government because, as is, it has a deficiency of “power” and “mandate”\textsuperscript{76} to act on behalf of its member states.

$H_3$ served to test that if a World Government were to ever come about, whether Central Asian scholars find the UN model as a predecessor to it or not. In terms of the contemporary global governance, the scholars interviewed considered the UN system as being a significant platform for states’ negotiations and multilateral actions. However, they also were of the opinion that the UN is experiencing a crisis in its legitimacy over states. Therefore, consideration of the UN model as a predecessor of the World Government was two-sided, i.e. divided, on part of the interviewed scholars, with one group (composed of five scholars or 42% of the whole) of scholars tending to support the UN idea for the World Government due to its potential to evolve into a bigger entity with centralized power.

However, given that the development of the UN system to a World Government would condition the elimination of much of the existing national sovereignty, and imposition of authority over all states, a number of scholars (also 42% of total) expressed their opposition to the UN model, anticipating that the current problems encountered by the UN system will not allow it to be able to transfer itself to a global authority with full legitimacy and rule over its member states. A more plausible scenario, it was said by a few scholars, is that the UN will gradually decline in its power and even be eliminated over a time. Given that the interviewed scholars were divided on the UN serving as a model for a future World Government, with a
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significant number refuting the UN model to evolve into any global entity whatsoever, H_3 was thus also rejected (or its null hypothesis of no relationship confirmed).

76 Interview with Burkhanov, *op. cit.*
“Once one concedes that a single world government is not necessary, then where does one logically stop at the permissibility of separate states? If Canada and the United States can be separate nations without being denounced as in a state of impermissible ‘anarchy’, why may not the South secede from the United States? New York State from the Union? New York City from the state? Why may not Manhattan secede? Each neighbourhood? Each block? Each house? Each person?” —Murray N. Rothbard (2009, 1051)

The salience and feasibility of the concept of World Government vis-à-vis Global South scholars from Central Asia may be perceived as precarious by many IR academics. The concept is still in the realm of theory and idealism, and has not, does not, and likely will not exist as reality any time soon. Thus, the question is why is there a need to consider an idealistic concept anticipating the creation of centralized global government with legal authority over all states and non-state actors? The answer may have been obvious to some readers from the very beginning, and was reaffirmed during the series of interviews with Central Asian scholars.

Answering the question on the contemporary international relations, the scholars interviewed argued about the crisis in the existing global governance and the need for fundamental changes in the system, though they also did not foresee movements to be taking place towards a World Government. My own opinion, however, is that the current system of international relations may and will eventually transform to a more united and peaceful model of the World Government,
encompassing state and non-state actors as well as addressing pressing national, regional, and global problems.

As I, too, am a citizen of the Global South, living in a developing Central Asian country, the purpose of writing this Thesis was to shed new light on the World Government studies from the Central Asian perspective. The background of this region reveals that being a part of the Soviet Union for 70 years, the Central Asian republics were expected to promote the ideology of communism among their population with an ideal of an eventual creation of a world communist state. Twenty seven years after the collapse of the Soviet Union, the interviews conducted here with Central Asian scholars were to examine the attitudes of Central Asians towards the creation of not a communist, but a liberal, global authority sometime in the future.

This Thesis was divided into three major parts: Global governance, World Government, and Analysis and Hypotheses testing. Chapters II and III served as a theoretical background of the World Government studies. They focused on the history of formation of the global governance system, and continued with description of the current global governance with the international actors involved. The World Government chapter began with a historical outlook on the evolvement of the concept over time and proceeded with theoretical and quasi-empirical studies on the concept of World Government. In particular, IR theories of realism, liberalism, Marxism, and constructivism represented theoretical insights into the concept. Quasi-empirical studies, in turn, incorporated democratic, legal, and cosmopolitan models of global authority.

Finally, in the analysis section (Chapter IV), I tested three hypotheses on World Government. Twelve in-depth interviews with Central Asian scholars (mostly from Kazakhstan and Kyrgyzstan) were to generate the qualitative primary data for
hypotheses testing. The first hypothesis (H₁) on the attitudes towards the infeasibility of the World Government was confirmed, given that the Central Asia scholars argued that sovereignty and national interests of states will prevent the emergence of such a government any time in the foreseeable future. The second hypothesis (H₂), on the global governance system being an intermediary step towards World Government, was renounced by the interviewees, mostly holding the opinion that the global governance is in crisis, and may not evolve in a more centralized form.

And the last hypothesis (H₃) on the UN’s role in serving as a model towards the creation of a World Government was also disapproved due to a diversity of opinions on the weakness and ineffectiveness of the UN itself. Therefore, Central Asian scholars interviewed perceive the concept of World Government in a negative light, undermining its viability in the current system. It can be concluded that skepticism on the creation of World Government prevail among Central Asian scholars—at least for the time being.

In the same manner as Michael Walzer (2018) who wrote: “The great advantage of today’s world order is its pluralism; [but] it is only very late at night that I think about its replacement by a single all-encompassing state” (116), pluralism or a multipolar system is what we basically have today, but will it last long or will it eventually transit to a more anarchic or centralized system is questioned by IR scholars. This Thesis serves to contribute to a variety of political studies examining the viability of different scenarios for a new system or world order. On the other hand, throughout the work, I have tried to avoid any speculative or biased approaches on the topic at hand, attempting, instead, to equally present arguments for and against the creation of World Government as part of an imagined scenario for the future of international affairs.
The underlined crisis in the present global governance system is also complemented by increasing global problems in political, economic, security, and environmental spheres. In this regard, as Central Asian scholars interviewed for this study agreed, the exacerbating climate change, the ongoing consequences of the global economic crisis, and the rise of hypernationalism, among other ills, may equally enforce or discourage the feasibility of a future World Government. State actors are currently experiencing the plurality of choices in midst of disorder, and thus appeal to nationalistic sentiments to enforce their role in domestic and international affairs.

Problems such as climate change and economic stagnation present a common ground for state actors to cooperate with each other. Although the recent factors such as the rise of right-wing movements in Europe and U.S. President Trump’s nationalist policies renounce the cooperative potential of the current system. As one scholar interviewed pointed out, there is no World Government until sovereign states will remain in the system. Therefore, for the World Government to emerge, the contemporary emphasis on the nationalism and sovereignty must be largely weakened, if not eliminated, which does not seem to be the case in the near future.

In conclusion, this Thesis aimed to propose an alternative vision to the mainstream Western discourse on the World Government. The Central Asian example was to demonstrate perspectives from the Global South, the developing world (versus the developed West/the Global North). The in-depth interviews with Central Asian scholars of politics and international affairs were to serve as a representative sample for the renovation of debate on the concept of World Government by the Global South.
Despite its certain research limitations, this research is hoped to serve as a starting point for the development of World Government studies in the region. I am not keen to argue for the eventual creation of a specific model of the World Government, as the future is not predictable in many ways. What I and other similar-minded scholars can do is to further study and encourage debate on the topic and thus contribute to the future research on World Government, in an attempt to increase the number of scholars in cosmopolitanism and World Government studies in the Global South.
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