# Power and Representation in Global Governance

## Bryant Edward Harden[1]

### Abstract

In the aftermath of the Second World War, international actors pursued efforts of cooperation in order to address issues of global importance. Using a Foucauldian framework, this essay examines the current representativeness of global governance and the possibility of true representation in the future. This essay highlights the universality of power and its association with hierarchy as it emanates from inequalities in social relations. This essay illustrates the inequalities and relations of power found in the structuring of the United Nations and efforts of humanitarian intervention. Despite efforts to make global governance more representativeness, this essay concludes that the omnipresence of power and inequality in social relations means that perpetuates the distinction between the powerful and less powerful; therefore, global governance can never be truly representative.

## Introduction

The idea of governance has existed throughout history serving to establish order and control amongst formal and informal relations. Through rules, norms, power, and language, governance has ordered the social and force relations of society.

Inherent in the idea of governance is a ranking, ordering, or categorizing of human relations. As a foundational dimension of society, familial relations provide a localized perspective of the inherent nature of power and hierarchy stemming from "divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums" (Foucault, 1998: 94).

[1] Department of Politics and International Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Warwick, United Kingdom, 20155 Hwy 84 E. Boston, Georgia, 31626, United States of America. Phone: (UK) 07463236614 (USA) 2294982333, Email: bryantharden@gmail.com

Power stems from inequalities of knowledge relationships present in families; as one member of the family has a greater knowledge, perceived or actual, of a subject, the unequal nature of the division forms a hierarchy based on power . This structured hierarchy and power is found throughout social relations from the family to global governance. Foucault (1998: 94) writes, "…the manifold relationships of force that take shape and come into play in the machinery of production, in families, limited groups, and institutions, are the basis for wide-ranging effects of cleavage that run through the social body as a whole". It is precisely these relationships and cleavages in global governance that fosters inequalities and divisions that enables power to flourish thereby establishing hierarchy and making global governance incapable of ever being truly representative.

Using a Foucauldian concept of power and hierarchy, this essay seeks to explore the representativeness of global governance. First, however, it is necessary to define the central terms used throughout the essay. Since the mid-20th century, global governance has gained prominence because of the increased global interconnectedness between actors. Rosenau (1995: 13) writes that "in an ever more interdependent world… what happens in one corner or at one level may have consequences for what occurs at every other corner and level". As actions, and their effects, have become globalized, actors have sought forms of governance to address the economic and political issues fostered by an interdependent world. Barnett and Duvall (2005: 1) write, "The intensifying connections between states and peoples…are now frequently presumed to create the need for governance and rule-making at the global level". Global governance, therefore, can be defined "as efforts to bring more orderly and reliable responses to social and political issues that go beyond the capacities of states to address individually" (Weiss and Gordenker, 1996: 17).

Power, another concept critical to this essay, has been studied extensively in International Relations ranging from realist conceptions of power with tangible coercive force at its core (Carr, 1939) to 'softer' concepts of power that focus on the ability to attract through persuasion (Nye, 2004). Beyond these broader conceptions, Barnett and Duvall (2005) dissect the notion of power into interactive power and constitutive power.

Interactive power is power that "works through behavioral relations or interactions, which…affect the ability of others to control the circumstances of their existence". (ibid: 45). Constitutive power, on the other hand, precedes "the social or subject positions of actors and… constitute[s] them as being social beings with their respective capacities and interests" (ibid, 46). In other words, the concept of constitutive power focuses on the affect of social relations on defining "who the actors are and [what] practices they are socially empowered to undertake" (ibid, 46). These varios notions underline the point that power is dynamic and can be applied at varying degrees through different strategies and tactics. Foucault (1998: 93) writes, "…power is not an institution, and not a structure; neither is it a certain strength we are endowed with; it is the name that one attributes to a complex strategical situation in a particular society". As this quote illustrates, power stems from the unstable social relations between actors.

This understanding of power makes obvious the innate inequalities that are present in social relations which seem naturalize a sense of societal hierarchy. In global governance, asin all of society, actors are varied in their capabilities and power. Kelsen (1944: 208) recognized this point during the formative years of the United Nations (UN) when he wrote that "States differ very much from each other with respect to their actual capacity". The varied capabilities and capacities of actors creates an unequal distribution of power and influence in global governance. According to Foucault, "…relations of power…are the immediate effects of the divisions, inequalities, and disequilibriums which occur…" in a variety of domains such as economics, knowledge relationships, and sexual relations (Foucault, 1998: 94). If military action is being considered, for example, the disparity in the military capabilities of the United States and Mongolia, or a nonstate actor such as Amnesty International, creates a state of hierarchy. This is not to say that less powerful actors are without power; on the contrary, without the resistance of less powerful actors, power relations would not exist. Foucault (1998: 95) writes, "…resistance is never in a position of exteriority in relation to power…[ the existence of power relationships] depends on a multiplicity of points of resistance". The importance of resistance suggests that the United States may diminish its power if military actions pursued are perceived as illegitimate by less powerful actors, which is a form of resistance. Another qualifying dimension of power and capability is the wealth of state and nonstate actors. However, actors with limited wealth can enhance their power through increasing their capabilities in non-monetary forms.

For example, North Korea has a nominal gross domestic product, but it increases its power through its efforts to become a nuclear weapons state and the resistance against those efforts by the powerful (see Sagan, 1996).

These elements of social relations also extend to international organizations of global gover_nance, such as the UN, where legitimacy and effectiveness in enforcing the decisions made by global actors determines the exercisable power of those institutions. In the first section, this essay explores the poststructuralist approach of Michel Foucault and his concepts of discourse and governmentality. The second section situates these ideas of power and governance within governance transitions in the mid- to late-20th century. The third section of this essay applies the theoretical concepts of Foucault to the UN in its role as "the only truly universal and inclusive multilateral forum" (UN System Task Team, 2013). The next section explores the role of humanitarian intervention in representing the interests of the powerful. Before concluding, this essay examines efforts to democratize global governance and its effect on the representativeness of global governance.

Foucault: Discourse, Knowledge, and Governmentality Michel Foucault was an influential French philosopher who studied the relationship between power and knowledge. Power, for Foucault, envelops society because it permeates all aspects of society and is emitted from all actions. Foucault (1998: 93) describes social relations as a "moving substrate of force relations which, by virtue of their inequality, constantly engender states of power [which are] always local and unstable". These states of power, generated from the inequality of societal relations, are foundation of the natural societal hierarchy referenced to in the introduction. Foucault (ibid: 93) insists on the innate and natural state of power when he writes, "Power is everywhere, not because it embraces everything, but because it comes from everywhere". Power is the core of social relations because it is transmitted from every point; therefore, this notion of power extends from the most basic familial relations to relations of global governance. Central to Foucault's concept of power is discourse, which is considered to be the "interface of power and knowledge" (Richardson, 1996: 281). Campbell (2010: 226) explains that discourse "refers to a specific series of representations and practices throughout which meanings are produced, identities constituted, social relations established, and political and ethical outcomes made more or less possible". Inclusive of representations and practices, the notion of discourse stretches beyond language to include social practices that form knowledge and produce truth, which therefore creates and sustains power.

Foucault (1980: 131) writes, "Truth is a thing of this world: it is produced only by virtue of multiple forms of constraint…Each society has its regime of truth…: that is, the types of discourse which it accepts and makes function as truth". Foucault's notion of power and discourse maintains the intrinsic nature of power in society through tactics  established within different discourses which, through representations and practices, constitutes and shapes identities of actors.

Another contribution by Foucault to the examination of power is the concept of governmentality, which involves "a range of techniques and practices, performed by different actors, aimed to shape, guide, and direct individuals' and groups' behavior and actions in particular directions" (Sending and Neumann, 2006: 656). Governmentality understands governance as an art, rather than government as an institution, and focuses on the rationale behind governmental actions. Foucault (1991:95) writes: …with government it is a question not of imposing law on men, but of disposing things; that is to say, of employing tactics rather than laws, and even using laws themselves as tactics — to arrange things in such a way that, through a certain number of means, such and such ends may be achieved.

In relation to global governance, governmentality suggests that the emergence of actors would spur a change in government rationale and strategy so that the increasing power of emerging actors would not detract from the influence of the powerful. Instead, the increased brole of emerging actors would be utilized by states to further their own power and interests.

This idea is illustrated in Sending and Neumann's examination of civil society and nonstate actors in global governance using Foucault's concept of governmentality. They write: "…new practices of government emerge whereby civil society organizations on the global level are harnessed to the tasks of governing"; therefore, "civil society and nonstate actors do not stand in opposition to the political power of the state, but are a most central feature of how power operates in late modern society" (Sending and Neumann, 2006: 656). This understanding of governance will be used in this essay as it examines the strategies employed by the UN and in efforts of humanitarian intervention.

## Governmentality Transitions

In their article, Governance to Governmentality, Sending and Neumann critique the idea that states have continued to lose power to nonstate actors. Using Foucault's notion of governance as disposing strategies rather than imposing laws, the authors illustrate that the power dichotomy between state and nonstate actors is not a zero-sum game. The increased power wielded by emerging actors in global governance does not trigger a decrease in the influence of the powerful. Sending and Neumann (2006 :658) write: "…it is an expression of a change in governmentality by which civil society is redefined from a passive object of government to be acted upon and into an entity that is both an object and a subject of government". In other words, state actors empower nonstate actors with a more active role in governing as a subject of government while remaining within power structures as objects of government regulation. Graham Burchell (1996: 29) explains this notion particularly well in his description of contractual implication:

'offering' individuals and collectivities active involvement in action to resolve the kind of issues hitherto held to be the responsibility of authorized governmental agencies… the price of this involvement is that they must assume active responsibility for these activities, both for carrying them out and, of course, for their outcomes…described as a new form of 'responsibilization' corresponding to the new forms in which the governed are encouraged, freely and rationally, to conduce themselves.

As an example of governmentality, Sending and Neumann examine international population policy in the 20th century. Their analysis of the first three decades of international population policy after World War II was characterized by a hierarchical conception of society implying that "a great number of individuals, particularly in the developing world, were specifically not seen as having fully developed the capacity to act freely and autonomously" (Sending and Neumann, 2006: 659). The last two decades of the twentieth century were marked by a transition in rationality as "civil society became conceptualized in 'horizontal' terms, and individuals were simultaneously defined as objects of government and subjects with rights and autonomy" (ibid: 661). As international population policy transitioned to empower individuals, the ownership and 'responsibilization' described by Burchell became the new rationale.

The new role of nonstate actors in international population policy was key for the conceptualization of individuals as "key actors to ensure both effectiveness in program-delivery and to confer legitimacy on governmental practices" (ibid: 661). In other words, this transition from an exclusionary hierarchal conception of society to an inclusive horizontal notion that incorporated individuals still represents hierarchy and power. The benefits of inclusion, such as effectiveness in program-delivery and legitimacy on practices, has led to a change in the rationale employed actors in global governance. Regarding international organizations (IO), Alexander Thompson (2010: 2) describes this phenomena, writing: "…[despite] rarely need[ing] IOs to achieve specific objectives, …superpowers routinely channel coercion, including the use of force, through IOs". Rita Abrahamson (2004: 1453) further evidences this trend when she writes, "…aid relationships have been recast as partnerships between donor and recipient countries, with donors attesting that they no longer seek to impose their vision of development on poor countries but instead wish to be partners in strategies determined and 'owned' by recipients themselves".

In the following section, this essay will employ the concepts of discourse and governmentality to demonstrate the usefulness of this theoretical framework in the examination of the interests of the powerful represented in the UN. Similar to the three decades after World War II, as described by Sending and Neumann, global governance today remains, and will remain, in a state of hierarchy that always benefits the powerful.

## The Organization of the United Nations

Since its establishment after World War II, the UN has been the preeminent beacon for global governance because of its truly global reach and its attempts at global cooperation and consensus. The UN is constituted of 193 member states "committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights" (United Nations, n.d. A). This commitment stems from the goal "to save succeeding generations from the source or war, which twice in [the 20th century] has brought untold sorrow to mankind" (United Nations, n.d. D: Preamble).

The term 'United Nations' was first coined by President Franklin D. Roosevelt during World War II in the Declaration by United Nations in which 26 nations at war with the Axis powers pledged their support for the Atlantic Charter (United Nations, n.d. B).

According to Hoopes and Brinkley (2000: 46), "The order in which the declaration was signed…reflected FDR's ingrained belief in the rightful primacy of the strong, combined with the moral concept of 'trusteeship of the powerful' for the well-being of the less powerful". In this sense, the original concept of the UN was founded not only upon the divide between allied powers and axis powers, but also between the powerful and less powerful. As the Sec ond World War came to its conclusion and the allied powers claimed victory, the powers assumed control of setting the agenda for an international organization that would emulate FDR's 'ingrained belief'. From this perspective, the founding of the world's foremost multilateral forum was dominated by the interests of the powerful as it set global standards after Second World War. Beyond the original conception, the interests of the powerful is evidenced by the structuring of the United Nations' principle organs. As noted previously, the concept of power is local and unstable; therefore, the idea of the powerful is also unstable as the social relations of actors, and the inequalities that stem from those relations, are constantly altered. The powerful, then, are the actors who momentarily hold a position where they are capable of exerting more control over its social relations with other actors

The Security Council is one of the six organs of the UN that is responsible for maintaining international peace and security, which highlights its importance in global governance. The UN Charter declares that "in order to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations, its members agree that…the Security Council acts on their behalf" and that the members of the UN "agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council" (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 24). The importance of the Security Council in global governance is cemented as it is charged with investigating "any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute" (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 34). These guidelines allow for the Council's directive to be broadly defined so as to be able to address any phenomena which challenges or threatens the status quo, or, in other words, the interest of the powerful.

Therefore, members of the Security Council are directed to maintain the status quo by taking effective "collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression or other breaches of the peace…" (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 1). Despite a benevolent directive of collective action, the Security Council's composition reflects the reaching influence of powerful actors.

Historians Doenecke and Stoler (2005: 62) recount President Franklin D. Roosevelt's belief that actions of global governance should be restricted to powerful actors: "Small nations must trust the great powers, not a general world parliament, for 'another League of Nations with a hundred different signatories' would simply mean 'too many nations to satisfy'". This conviction continues to affect the fifteen member composition of the Security Council, of which China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States are permanent members. The ten nonpermanent members are elected by the UN General Assembly to serve two-year terms (United Nations, n.d. C). The composition of the Council, in particular the five permanent members, clearly provides a system which is dominated by powerful actors who are able to steer international relations by defining the foundational terms of the Security Council's creed such as 'threats to peace' and 'breaches of peace'.

The role of the powerful, in this case the five permanent members who were considered world powers after World War II, is further strengthened by the voting arrangement in the Council. According to the Charter of the UN, each member of the Council shall have one vote. Procedural matters pass with nine of the fifteen members voting in the affirmative. However, it also states that "all other matters shall be made by an affirmative code of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members" (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 27). This provision in the UN Charter provides, essentially, the power to veto to each of the five permanent members. China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom, and the United States, therefore, control the action of the UN on matters concerning international peace and security. The limited fifteen member composition and veto power of the five permanent members on the Council remove the possibility of true representation in this facet of global governance.

The General Assembly, as the "main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the UN", is another of the six principle organs of the UN (n.d. E). The functions and powers of the General Assembly include discussing and considering questions and offering recommendations that fall within the scope of the UN Charter, such as the maintenance of peace and security and international cooperation. Unlike the Security Council, the structure of the General Assembly follows guidelines for basic representation as each member has one vote (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 18). Decisions regarding 'important questions', such as recommendations for the maintenance of international peace and security, the election of nonpermanent members of the Security Council and election of members to other principle organs of the UN, the admission and expulsion of members, require a two-thirds majority of the General Assembly members present and voting (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 18). Although the General Assembly is tasked with the power to decide these important questions, its capabilities are severely limited in having an effect on questions dealing with the maintenance of peace and security as Article 12 of the UN Charter restricts the General Assembly from making any recommendations regarding any disputes or situations being dealt with by the Security Council (United Nations, n.d. D: Article 12). Therefore, the UN General Assembly is structured to provide a sense of representation and power to all actors while, effectively, restricting decisions on the subject of peace and security to the Security Council, which is dominated by the five permanent member's veto power. The veto power, held by the actors that were deemed as powerful after the Second World War, is just one strategy employed to constantly reproduce the unequal social relations prevalent in the mid-20th century.

The structuring of the UN General Assembly and Security Council is a prime example of Graham Burchell's (1996) 'responsibilization'. Actors in the General Assembly are considered to be empowered to the same extent as others through guaranteed equal voting power and ability to address questions presented before the Assembly. This inclusionary structure reinforces the idea that the members of the UN are equally relevant in global governance and bolsters a perception of cooperation through a sense of active involvement. Burchell (ibid) contends that the price of active involvement is that actors assume an active responsibility for the decisions reached and actions undertaken. This active involvement and responsibility, to a lesser extent, can also be applied to the Security Council. Despite its fifteen member composition, the Security Council employs responsibilization as an approach in its decision making.

For example, it is the responsibility of the General Assembly to elect the ten non-permanent, non-veto members to two-year terms. Furthermore, the Charter of the United Nations (n.d. D, Article 32) declares that any member that "is party to a dispute under consideration by the Security Council, shall be invited to participate, without vote, in the discussion relating to the dispute". The semblance of representation in the functioning and practice of global governance is a tactic employed by the powerful in an effort to consolidate their power; in other words, it is a tactic of what could be called global governmentality.

Furthermore, the structuring of the UN is a prime example of Barnett and Duvall's notion of interactive power. Through an institutionalization of social relations in the UN, "… power nearly becomes an attribute that an actor possesses and may use knowingly as a resource to shape the action or conditions of others" (Barnett and Duvall, 2005: 45). In so far as this institutionalization limits the flow of social relations, the UN effectively limits the freedom of members. Although there remains means of resistance by less powerful actors outside of the UN, the restricting institutional rules and practices severely limit the means of effective resistance by less powerful actors. Foucault (1982: 790) writes, "Where the determining factors saturate the whole, there is no relationship of power". In this sense, the dominance of the Security Council saturates the social relations of the UN, which effectively stymies significant forms of resistance. However, since unilateral action is perceived as illegitimate, the appearance of multilateral decisions on issues of international relations becomes important for the power and legitimacy of powerful actors.

## Humanitarian Intervention

In addition to the organizational structures of the UN, the interests of the powerful are also represented by actors and organizations in global governance that reach within states' borders to spread specific agendas. These actions are under a variety of guises from development to health to humanitarian intervention. As universal human rights were solidified by the UN with the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, the anchor of state sovereignty in global relations came in to question (Reisman, 1990; Henkin, 1995). As Bellamy and Wheeler (2011: 512) point out, "Humanitarian intervention poses a hard test for an international society built on principles of sovereignty, non-intervention, and the nonuse of force".

Similar to the transition in international population policy described in the previous section, "There was a significant shift of attitudes during the 1990s…which led the way in pressing new humanitarian claims within international society" (Bellamy and Wheeler, 2011: 512). This transition was justified through a variety of legal and moral claims revolving around the civil and political rights declared in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Using Foucault's discourse, the constitutive power of a universal declaration on human rights becomes apparent. The perceived universal nature of the rights found in the Declaration constitutes these rights as innate to human beings. The universality implies a shared moral understanding of the world, regardless of religion, culture, or language. Tesón (2003: 94) writes, "Because human rights are held by individuals by virtue of their personhood, they are independent of history, culture, or national borders". It is important to keep in mind that  "The concept of human rights was derived from a Western philosophical tradition, and was shaped mainly by European historical experience" (Freeman, 2011: 336). The fact that the concept of human rights stems from Western philosophical tradition does not necessarily limit its universality; however, it does illustrate the dichotomy between knowledge and power illustrated by Foucault. The increased acceptance of universal human rights throughout society has constituted relations based less on state sovereignty and more on the civil and political rights of individuals across state borders. This strategic utilization of human rights has ignited this transition that has increased the powers of actors in global governance, specifically the UN Security Council in its responsibility regarding the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world.

This change in rationale regarding governance from sovereignty to universal human rights provides yet another example of governmentality. As cooperation and multilateralism boomed in global relations after the Second World War with the founding of the UN, the interests of the powerful, and their extensive influence, were threatened because of the dilution caused by the proliferation of actors. However, as shown in the previous section, the organizational structuring of the UN has secured the interests of the powerful. Similarly, the powerful have used humanitarian intervention and assistance to further their strategic interests using the same tactics of constitutive power and responsibilization. Legal and moral justifications, such as the failure of a states government to protect human rights (Tesón, 2003), provide flexibility in the interpretation of humanitarian crises.

Ayoob (2001: 225) describes representatives of the international community choosing "targets for intervention selectively while ignoring human rights violations of equal or greater magnitude elsewhere". These actions were "Predicated on strategic considerations…[as] humanitarianism was the new code word for old-fashioned intervention undertaken for punitive purposes that had little to do with humanitarian concerns" (ibid: 225).

## Can Global Governance Be Truly Representative?

In recognition of a continued dominance of global governance by the powerful, it is important to address the possibility of a truly representative global order. Since the end of the Cold War, a number of states have called for global institutions to be reformed so as to reflect the changing global landscape (see Hou, 2013). In a guest column titled Governance Must Reflect Global Reality, Brazil's Minister of Defense and previous Minister of Foreign Relations wrote, "The idea is simple: representativeness brings legitimacy and thus greater efficacy… Let us practice democracy not only domestically but also in the global sphere" (Amorium, 2010). In 2009, India's then Minister for External Affairs addressed the UN General Assembly on the representativeness of global governance and said, "It is of concern that, even after more than six decades of existence, our international governance structures are neither inclusive nor participatory" (Krishna, 2009: 27). The concerns raised by the governments of Brazil and India are echoed throughout the world among emerging powers that have taken notice to the inequalities in global governance and have spurred limited efforts to address the issue. The UN Security Council increased the number of nonpermanent members from six to ten in 1965 (Weiss, 2003: 147). Additionally, President Obama announced his support for extending a permanent seat on the Security Council to India (Stolberg and Yardley, 2010). Efforts to reform the International Monetary Fund using a fairer quota system was agreed to at a G20 meeting in 2010, but the United States has continued to block the decision using its quota which is equivalent to a veto power (Katasonov, 2014). Despite calls for reform by emerging actors, the powerful, thus far, have impeded any progress. Using the framework of governmentality, this essay asserts that powerful actors will eventually recognize that the democratization of global governance could be employed as a tactic to further their power relating to legitimacy.

Additionally, this essay contends that any efforts to increase the representativeness of global governance, such as eliminating veto powers for permanent members on the Security Council, may be effective in diluting the influence of the powerful, but will fall short in achieving a level of true representativeness. Global governance will never be truly representative because of the innate nature of power and hierarchy in society.

## Conclusion

At the conclusion of the Second World War, the allied powers sought to establish a global order that would organize international relations based on cooperation and multilateralism. As the world has become more interconnected and relations have become globalized, the number of global governance actors has increased and played a larger role in global relations. Global governance proponents have touted better representation and cooperation as a benefit. However, the interests of the powerful continue to dominate global governance. An examination of Foucault's conception of power and hierarchy reveals the dynamism of power as it permeates all of society and ranges in degree form. As the interface between knowledge and power, discourse embodies the hierarchy present throughout social relations by constituting actors, shaping their capabilities, and guiding their actions. Using governmentality as a framework, this essay examined the techniques and practices employed in global governance, such as responsibilization.

Despite inclusionary efforts, the analysis of the UN and humanitarian intervention has revealed that powerful actors continue to exercise control in global governance. For example, the creation of the UN was approved and constructed by the allied powers and China; the UN Security Council, which embodies significant power and poten-tial, allows less powerful actors to take part in discussions, but reserves the power of veto for the five permanent members; the UN General Assembly masterfully employs the technique of responsibilization for legitimation as states are equally represented with regard to voting power, while severely limited in the affect that that less powerful states can have on 'important questions' of international relations. Beyond multilateral institutions, humanitarian intervention and assistance, based on the notion of universal human rights, has been manipulated by the powerful for the pursuance of their interests.

The discourse of universality binds the civil and political rights to the idea of being human; but, more importantly, the specific civil and political rights in the Declaration were heavily influenced by the Western actors claiming victory at the conclusion of the Second World War. Despite limiting the scope of the examination of global governance to the UN and efforts of humanitarian intervention, this essay contends that the interests of the powerful will continue to be represented in global governance because of the innate nature of power and, therefore, hierarchy.

## Bibliography

Abrahamson, R. (2004) 'The Power of Partnerships in Global Governance', Third WorldQuarterly, 25:8, pp. 1453-1467.

Amorium, C. (2010) 'Guest Column: Governance Must Reflect Global Reality', Financial Times [online] Available at:<http://www.ft.com/cms/s/0/7f056b92-edfe-11df-8616-00144feab49a. html?siteedition=uk#axzz2ymTpIIsG> [Accessed 19 April 2014].

Ayoob, M. (2001) 'Humanitarian Intervention and International Society', Global Governance, 7, pp. 225-230.

Barnett, M. and Duvall, R. (2005) 'Power in International Politics,' International Organization, 59: 1, pp. 39-75.

Bellamy, A. and Wheeler, N. (2011) 'Humanitarian Intervention in World Politics', in: John Baylis, Steve Smith, and Patricia Owens, eds., The Globalization of World Politics. Fifth Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 510-527.

Burchell, G. (1996) 'Liberal Government and Techniques of Self,' in: Barry, A., Osborne, T., and Rose, N. (eds) Foucault and Political Reason. London: University College London.

Campbell, D. (2010) 'Poststructuralism,' in: Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, and Steve Smith (eds) International Relations Theories: Discipline and Diversity. Second Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 213-237.

Carr, E. H. (1939) Twenty Years' Crisis, 1919-1939. London: Macmillan and Company Limited.

Doenneske, J.and Stoler, M. (2005) Debating Franklin D. Roosevelt's Foreign Policies, 1933-1945. Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers.

Freeman, M. (2011) 'Human Rights', in: Peter Burnell, Vicky Randall, and Lise Rakner, eds., Politics in the Developing World. Third Edition. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 335-352.

Foucault, M. (1998) The History of Sexuality. Volume 1: an Introduction, trans. R. Hurley. London: Penguin.

—- (1991) 'Governmentality', in: Graham Burchell, Colin Gordon, and Pete Miller, eds., The Foucault Effect: Studies in Governmentality. Sydney: Harvester Wheatsheaf, pp. 87-104.

—- (1982) 'The Subject and Power', Critical Inquiry, 8:4, pp. 777-795.

—- (1980) Power/Knowledge:Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977. Gordon, C. (ed) New York ; London : Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Henkin, L. (1995) 'Human Rights and State Sovereignty, Georgia Journal of International and Comparative Law, 25, pp. 31-46.

Hoopes, T. and Brinkley, D. (2000) FDR and the Creation of the UN. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Hou, Z. (2013) 'The BRICs Lead By Example in Global Governance Reforms', OverseasDevelopment Insitute [online] Available at: <http://www.odi.org.uk/opinion/7631-brics-candidates-global-governance-wto-unido> [Accessed 24 April 2014]. !

Katasonov, V. (2014) 'Reform of the Bretton Woods Institutions: The IMF Might Not Live to See Its Anniversary', Global Research: Centre for Research on Globalization [online] Available at:<http://www.globalresearch.ca/reform-of-the-bretton-woods-institutions-the-imfmight- not-live-to-see-its-anniversary/5378544> [Accessed 24 April 2014]. !

Kelsen, H. (1944) 'The Principle of Sovereign Equality of States as a Basis for International Organization', The Yale Law Journal, 53:2, pp. 207-220.

Krishna, S. M. (2009) 'United Nations General Assembly Sixty-Fourth Session 10th PlenaryMeeting', United Nations General Assembly (A/64/PV.10) [online] Available at:<http://documents. un.org> [Accessed 17 April 2014].

Nye, J. (2004) Soft Power: The Means to Success in World Politics. New York, Public Affairs.

Reisman, W. M. (1990) 'Sovereignty and Human Rights in Contemporary International Law', The American Journal of International Law, 84:4, pp. 866-876.

Richardson, T. (1996) 'Foucauldian Discourse: Power and Truth in Urban and Regional Policy Making,' European Planning Studies, 4:3, pp. 279-292.

Rosenau, J. (1995) 'Governance in the Twenty-first Century', Global Governance, 1, pp. 13-43.

Sagan, S. (1996) 'Why Do States Build Nuclear Weapons?: Three Models in Search of a Bomb', International Security, 21:3, pp. 54-86.

Sending, O. and Neumann, I. (2006) 'Governance to Governmentality: Analyzing NGOs, States, and Power,' International Studies Quarterly, 50, pp. 651-672.

Stolberg, S. G. and Yardley, J. (2010) 'Countering China, Obama Back India for UN Council', The New York Times [online] Available at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/11/09/world/asia/09prexy.html?_r=0> [Accessed 17 April 2014].

Tesón, F. (2003) 'The Liberal Case for Humanitarian Intervention', in: J. L. Holzgrefe and Robert O. Keohane, eds, Humanitarian Intervention: Ethical, Legal and Political Dilemmas. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 93-129.

Thompson, A. (2010) Channels of Power: The UN Security Council and US Statecraft in Iraq. Ithaca:Cornell University Press.

UN System Task Team (2013) 'UN System Task Team on the Post-2015 UN Development Agenda', United Nations [pdf] Available at: <http://www.un.org/en/development/desa/policy/ untaskteam_undf/thinkpieces/24_thinkpiece_global_governance.pdf> [Accessed 22 April 2014].

United Nations (n.d. A) 'UN at a Glance', United Nations [online] Available at:
        <http:// www.un.org/en/aboutun/index.shtml> [Accessed 19 April 2014].
United Nations (n.d. B) 'UN Multimedia', United Nations[online] Available at:
        <http:// www.unmultimedia.org/s/photo/detail/313/0031319.html> [Accessed 19
        April 2014].
United Nations (n.d. C) 'United Nations Security Council', United Nations [online] Available
        at: <http://www.un.org/en/sc/members/> [Accessed 19 April 2014].
United Nations (n.d. D) 'Charter of the United Nations', United Nations [online] Available
        at:<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter5.shtml> [Accessed 19 April
        2014].
United Nations (n.d. E) 'General Assembly of the United Nations', United Nations [online]
        Available at:<http://www.un.org/en/ga/about/index.shtml> [Accessed 19 April
        2014].
Weiss, T. (2003) 'The Illusion of UN Security Council Reform', The Washington Quarterly,
        26:4, pp. 147-161.
Weiss, T. and Gordenker, T. (1996) 'Pluralizing Global Governance: Analytical Approaches
        and Dimensions', in: Thomas G. Weiss and Leon Gordenker (eds) NGOs, the UN,
        and Global Governance. Boulder: Lynne Rienner Publishers, pp. 17-47.