DOI: 10.71317/jgst.2.11.2026.984
Journal of Global Social Transformation
Journal homepage: https://rjsaonline.org/index.php/JGST

The Crisis of Global Governance and the Future of International Peace: Rethinking Multilateral Diplomacy in a Fragmented World Order

Dr. Shakeel Ahmad Shahid[1], Mubashra[2], Dr. Ghazala Kaukab[3], Dr. Muhammad Riaz[4]

[1] Assistant Professor; Ambassador for Peace; Fellow of International Diplomacy, Sports and Global Events, International Olympic Academy, Olympia, Greece; Best Teacher Award Holder under the Government of Punjab Higher Education Department KPI System, Faisalabad Division, Pakistan; International Writer and Speaker; Divisional Sports Focal Person, Higher Education Department, Government of Punjab, Directorate of Colleges, Faisalabad Division, Pakistan.

[2] Lecturer, Faculty of Social Sciences, Pioneer College of Advance Studies, Fawara Chowk, Faisalabad, Pakistan; EB Board Member, Sports for Peace and Education Society Pakistan.

[3] Associate Professor, Head of the Faculty of Zoology Department, Govt. Graduate College for Women, Karkhana Bazar, Faisalabad, Pakistan; EB Board Member, Sports for Peace and Education Society Pakistan.

[4] Assistant Professor, Faculty of Education, Government Graduate College Khurianwala, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

Email: Drshakeelahmadshahid@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Submission:
October 05, 2026
Revised:
October 19, 2026
Accepted:
October 28, 2026
Available Online:
November 06, 2026

Keywords:
Global Governance; Multilateral Diplomacy; International Peacebuilding; Geopolitical Fragmentation.

Corresponding author:
Dr. Muhammad Riaz
Email:
Drshakeelahmadshahid@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The contemporary international system is experiencing a profound transformation in which traditional mechanisms of global governance are increasingly challenged by geopolitical rivalries, institutional fragmentation, competing national interests, armed conflicts, economic inequalities, and declining confidence in multilateral cooperation. These developments raise fundamental questions about the capacity of existing international institutions to maintain global stability, prevent conflicts, and establish sustainable foundations for international peace. This study critically examines the crisis of global governance and its implications for the future of international peace, with particular emphasis on rethinking multilateral diplomacy within an increasingly fragmented world order. It explores how changing power dynamics, strategic competition among major international actors, institutional limitations, and the growing complexity of transnational challenges influence diplomatic cooperation and the effectiveness of international peacebuilding mechanisms. The central objective of this research is to evaluate the relationship between institutional legitimacy, multilateral diplomatic engagement, international political accountability, and sustainable peace. It investigates the extent to which existing global institutions, particularly the United Nations and associated multilateral frameworks, can respond effectively to contemporary security challenges while maintaining principles of sovereignty, international law, collective responsibility, and peaceful conflict resolution. Furthermore, the study examines the limitations of conventional diplomatic approaches and highlights the importance of inclusive dialogue, preventive diplomacy, institutional transparency, equitable representation, and stronger international partnerships in addressing emerging global challenges. The research adopts a qualitative analytical approach based on a critical review of international relations literature, global governance frameworks, institutional policy documents, and selected international case studies. It draws upon liberal institutionalism, constructivist perspectives, and contemporary theories of global governance to develop a multidimensional understanding of international cooperation and peacebuilding. Particular attention is given to the role of middle powers, regional organisations, civil society networks, and emerging diplomatic partnerships in complementing traditional multilateral institutions. The study also considers how diplomacy beyond formal governmental channels can contribute to confidence-building, intercultural understanding, and the prevention of political and social conflicts. The study proposes that the future effectiveness of global governance requires a transition from predominantly state-centred diplomatic practices towards a more inclusive, accountable, representative, and cooperative international architecture. Strengthening institutional credibility, reforming decision-making structures, improving compliance with international commitments, and expanding meaningful participation in peace processes are identified as important policy priorities. It further argues that sustainable international peace cannot be secured exclusively through military deterrence or temporary political agreements; rather, it requires institutional trust, diplomatic consistency, social justice, international solidarity, and a shared commitment to peaceful coexistence. The research contributes to contemporary debates in international political science and peace studies by proposing an integrated conceptual perspective on multilateral diplomacy, institutional accountability, and global peacebuilding. It concludes that reimagining global governance is not merely an institutional reform agenda but a strategic necessity for building a more peaceful, stable, legitimate, and cooperative international order in the twenty-first century.

Introduction

The international system is undergoing a profound transformation marked by geopolitical competition, shifting power relations, armed conflicts, economic inequality, institutional fragmentation, and uncertainty about multilateral cooperation. The post-1945 order was designed to promote collective security, sovereign equality, international law, and peaceful coexistence. Yet contemporary crises expose a widening gap between these principles and the capacity of institutions to implement them. The United Nations remains the central multilateral institution for peace and security. Its Charter commits members to peaceful settlement of disputes and collective action (United Nations, 1945). However, disagreements among powerful states—especially within the Security Council—can constrain collective responses. Institutional authority therefore does not automatically produce effective action; outcomes also depend on political commitment and compliance. Global governance extends beyond formal intergovernmental organizations. It comprises rules, norms, institutions, partnerships, and networks through which states and non-state actors address shared problems. International institutions can reduce uncertainty, facilitate information exchange, and support cooperation even without a central world authority (Keohane, 1984). Their credibility is weakened when states apply rules selectively or privilege unilateral interests. The changing distribution of power has produced a more plural international system. Emerging economies, middle powers, regional organizations, civil society, and transnational networks increasingly shape international agendas. This pluralism offers wider participation but makes coordination more difficult. Developing countries continue to seek fairer representation in institutions whose structures reflect earlier geopolitical realities (Acharya, 2014). The governance crisis also extends to climate change, public health, cyber insecurity, forced displacement, technological change, and economic instability. These cross-border challenges require coordinated responses. The UN's Our Common Agenda and the 2024 Pact for the Future reaffirm the need for effective, inclusive multilateralism (United Nations, 2021; United Nations General Assembly, 2024). This study examines how geopolitical fragmentation, institutional legitimacy, accountability, and diplomatic cooperation shape the prospects for sustainable peace. It argues that multilateral diplomacy must combine state-led negotiation with preventive diplomacy, regional partnerships, and meaningful participation by civil society and educational networks. The central proposition is that durable peace depends on credible institutions, equitable participation, international law, trust, and shared responsibility—not military deterrence or temporary agreements alone.

Research objectives and questions

The study aims to: **(a)** assess how geopolitical competition and institutional fragmentation affect global governance; **(b)** examine the relationship between institutional legitimacy, accountability, and cooperation; **(c)** evaluate the contributions of middle powers, regional organizations, and non-state actors; and **(d)** identify priorities for more inclusive diplomacy and sustainable peace.

The guiding questions are: How does geopolitical fragmentation constrain multilateral action? Which institutional weaknesses most affect legitimacy and accountability? How can middle powers, regional bodies, and civil society complement the UN? What reforms and diplomatic practices can strengthen preventive diplomacy and sustainable peace?

Literature Review and Theoretical Framework

Global governance and institutional fragmentation

Global governance describes the institutions, rules, processes, and cooperative arrangements through which international actors manage issues beyond national borders. Rosenau and Czempiel (1992) emphasize that governance can operate without a single overarching government, while Keohane (1984) explains how institutions facilitate cooperation by reducing uncertainty and establishing expectations. These perspectives remain useful as global politics becomes more institutionally diverse.

Fragmentation arises when numerous international organizations, treaties, regional bodies, and specialized partnerships operate with overlapping mandates or inconsistent priorities. Such complexity may create policy gaps, duplication, and coordination costs, but it can also permit experimentation and issue-specific cooperation. The key problem is not institutional diversity itself; it is the absence of effective coordination, information-sharing, and accountability across institutional networks.

Legitimacy, representation, and accountability

International organizations depend on acceptance by member states and affected communities. Legitimacy is shaped by institutional authority, decision-making procedures, and performance (Tallberg & Zürn, 2019). Perceptions of unequal representation, opacity, or selective application of rules can weaken confidence and reduce willingness to cooperate. The Security Council illustrates the tension between sovereign equality and the privileged position of its five permanent members.

Accountability requires transparent decisions, clear responsibilities, monitoring of commitments, and consistent application of international principles. The General Assembly's veto-initiative mechanism (Resolution 76/262) creates an opportunity for scrutiny after a veto, although it does not remove the veto or resolve the political disagreements that produce deadlock (United Nations General Assembly, 2022).

Multilateral diplomacy and peacebuilding

Multilateral diplomacy uses negotiation, consultation, and collective decision-making to address shared problems. Ruggie (1992) associates multilateralism with generalized principles of conduct among states rather than ad hoc bargains. Its effectiveness declines when strategic competition prevents consensus. Sustainable peace, however, requires more than formal agreements: it depends on conflict prevention, trust-building, inclusion, respect for international law, and attention to structural drivers of violence. Regional organizations can contribute local knowledge and diplomatic access, while middle powers may facilitate mediation and coalition-building. Civil society, universities, humanitarian networks, and professional associations create channels for dialogue beyond official negotiations. Educational and sports diplomacy can foster contact and mutual understanding, but should complement—not replace—formal conflict-resolution mechanisms.

Theoretical framework

The analysis integrates three perspectives. Liberal institutionalism explains how international organizations, rules, and repeated interactions enable cooperation despite competing interests (Keohane, 1984). It directs attention to institutional design, compliance, and the capacity to overcome uncertainty.

Constructivism emphasizes the role of shared norms, identities, values, and social interaction in shaping international behaviour (Wendt, 1992). It helps explain why trust, mutual recognition, and commitments to peaceful coexistence matter alongside material power. Diplomatic engagement can alter relationships and strengthen norms against violence(Ayaz Khan J, Wali Ahmed F, Shaikh N, et al. July 13, 2025).

Contemporary global governance theory recognizes the multiple actors and interconnected networks involved in international coordination (Rosenau & Czempiel, 1992). It highlights the contributions of regional organizations, middle powers, civil society, and transnational partnerships. Together, these theories frame peace as the product of institutional credibility, normative commitment, inclusive participation, and practical cooperation.

Research Methodology

Design and approach

The study uses a qualitative, descriptive-analytical design based on secondary documentary evidence. This approach is appropriate for interpreting institutional relationships, diplomatic practices, and political developments that cannot be adequately understood through numerical measurement alone. Document analysis enables systematic review and interpretation of written materials relevant to the research questions (Bowen, 2009).

Sources and selection

Materials comprise peer-reviewed books and articles, UN reports and resolutions, international agreements, policy documents, and selected accounts of institutional and diplomatic developments. Sources were considered for relevance to global governance, geopolitical fragmentation, legitimacy, accountability, multilateral diplomacy, and peacebuilding. Foundational theoretical works were read alongside contemporary institutional documents.

Analysis and credibility

The documents were interpreted thematically. Five connected themes guided analysis: (1) geopolitical fragmentation and competition; (2) institutional legitimacy and accountability; (3) multilateral diplomacy and cooperation; (4) conflict prevention and peacebuilding; and (5) institutional reform and emerging partnerships. The themes were interpreted through liberal institutionalism, constructivism, and global governance theory.

Credibility was strengthened by comparing academic scholarship with official institutional materials and policy documents. This source triangulation helped distinguish documented developments from scholarly interpretations and the authors' analysis. The study follows academic integrity principles and acknowledges sources using APA conventions. As it uses public secondary materials and no human participants, it does not involve participant recruitment or personal data collection.

Limitations

The findings depend on the availability and quality of published documents and do not represent original interviews, surveys, or field observations. International positions evolve, and different actors may interpret institutional effectiveness differently. The analysis should therefore be understood as a documentary assessment rather than a definitive measurement of diplomatic outcomes.

Analysis and Discussion

The United Nations and the limits of collective security

The UN remains the principal institutional framework for international peace and security, but its capacity is constrained when major powers disagree. The Security Council's permanent-member veto can block collective action, producing tension between great-power interests and the wider responsibility to maintain peace. The source paper notes repeated veto use and deadlock in relation to major conflicts. Such episodes demonstrate that formal authority cannot substitute for political consensus. From a liberal institutionalist perspective, institutions provide forums, rules, and procedures for cooperation, but their effectiveness depends on member-state participation and compliance. Practical reforms should therefore improve transparency, consultation, responsiveness, and the ability to sustain diplomatic engagement during periods of disagreement.

Geopolitical competition and institutional complexity

Competition over security, technology, trade, energy, and strategic influence encourages states to prioritize autonomy and national interests. Cooperation may consequently become selective, issue-specific, or dependent on temporary alignments. At the same time, the growth of regional and specialized institutions has made global governance more complex. Overlapping mandates can weaken coherence, but plural institutions can also offer alternative routes for cooperation.

The appropriate response is institutional coordination rather than the elimination of diversity. Clearer mandates, regular information exchange, joint planning, and complementary responsibilities can reduce fragmentation. Constructivism adds that cooperation also depends on how states understand fairness, identity, and international responsibility; dialogue is therefore necessary alongside structural reform.

Legitimacy, representation, and accountability

Institutional legitimacy is weakened when decision-making structures appear unrepresentative or when international rules are applied inconsistently. The Security Council's composition reflects the political settlement of 1945 more than present-day demographic and geopolitical realities. Calls for reform reflect concerns about equitable geographical representation and the voice of developing countries. Accountability mechanisms should make decisions more transparent, clarify responsibility for implementation, and enable scrutiny of institutional performance. Resolution 76/262 provides an additional forum for debate after a veto, but deeper reform requires sustained political agreement. Legitimacy depends on both fair procedures and credible results.

Middle powers and regional organizations

Middle powers can support diplomacy through mediation, coalition-building, consultation, and confidence-building. Their influence generally relies less on coercive resources than on diplomatic credibility and the ability to connect actors. Their initiatives are not automatically neutral; effectiveness depends on consistency, acceptance by parties, and a willingness to uphold international law. Regional organizations can complement the UN through local expertise, proximity to conflict parties, and established political relationships. Cooperation between global and regional bodies can support early warning, mediation, humanitarian action, and peace operations. These contributions remain conditional on adequate resources, institutional capacity, impartiality, and coordination.

Civil society, education, and sports diplomacy

Universities, civil society organizations, humanitarian networks, youth groups, and professional associations can strengthen the social foundations of peace. Academic exchange, intercultural education, and people-to-people programmes create opportunities to challenge stereotypes and build trust. Sports diplomacy can bring people from different societies together through shared activities and the values of respect, solidarity, and fair play. The Olympic Movement and international sporting organizations provide platforms for international contact, but sport cannot resolve political disputes independently. Its value is greatest when programmes

are inclusive, sustained, connected to peace education, and supported by institutions. These initiatives complement formal diplomacy by strengthening relationships among communities.

Preventive diplomacy and sustainable peace

Preventive diplomacy seeks to address tensions before they escalate into violence through early engagement, negotiation, mediation, and confidence-building. It also requires attention to structural causes such as exclusion, inequality, weak institutions, and competition over resources. Military deterrence and post-conflict intervention may remain necessary in particular situations, but they cannot independently resolve these underlying conditions. Sustainable peace should be treated as a continuing process involving political participation, social inclusion, institutional resilience, economic opportunity, and respect for international law. The UN peacebuilding agenda and the 2025 review of its architecture emphasize coordinated national and international efforts. The 2026 review of peace operations, as discussed in the source paper, similarly underscores prevention, national ownership, accountability, and regional partnerships.

The Pact for the Future and implementation

The 2024 Pact for the Future offers a policy framework for strengthening multilateral cooperation across peace and security, sustainable development, technology, and future generations (United Nations General Assembly, 2024). It recognizes that shared challenges cannot be managed effectively by states acting alone. Nevertheless, adoption of an agreement does not guarantee implementation. Progress depends on political commitment, resources, coordination, monitoring, and compliance.

Integrated interpretation

The analysis indicates that geopolitical competition, institutional fragmentation, legitimacy deficits, and weak accountability reinforce one another. No single reform can address these challenges. Institutional rules and cooperation mechanisms remain essential; shared norms and trust shape whether actors use them constructively; and wider networks provide additional channels for diplomatic action. The UN should remain central, while becoming more representative, transparent, coordinated, and responsive. The study's central argument is that multilateral diplomacy must evolve from a predominantly state-centred and reactive model towards an inclusive and preventive architecture. Such a model retains state responsibility while involving middle powers, regional organizations, civil society, educational institutions, and professional networks in appropriate complementary roles.

Findings

The qualitative analysis identifies eight interconnected findings:

- Geopolitical competition weakens collective action when national security and strategic interests prevent consensus.
- Institutional fragmentation creates coordination costs and inconsistent implementation, although institutional pluralism can also create new opportunities.
- Institutional legitimacy depends on fair representation, transparent procedures, accountability, and credible performance.
- Traditional state-centred diplomacy is insufficient on its own; wider participation can improve communication and cooperation.
- Middle powers and regional organizations can complement global institutions through mediation, local knowledge, and confidence-building.
- Preventive diplomacy is essential because early engagement can address tensions before they escalate into armed conflict.
- Civil society, education, youth engagement, and sports diplomacy can strengthen people-to-people understanding as complementary peacebuilding tools.
- Global governance reform must focus on implementation, monitoring, and shared responsibility rather than declarations alone.
- Taken together, these findings support an integrated view of peacebuilding. Institutional effectiveness requires political commitment; legitimacy requires fair procedures and performance; and sustainable peace requires both formal diplomacy and constructive social relationships.

Policy Recommendations and Strategic Framework

Reforming multilateral institutions

The UN and its member states should pursue meaningful Security Council reform to improve geographical representation, transparency, consultation, and institutional effectiveness. Veto-related accountability should be strengthened, and affected states and regional organizations should have meaningful opportunities to contribute to deliberations. Reform should reinforce, rather than undermine, the UN's central role.

Strengthening diplomatic cooperation and middle-power engagement

States should maintain regular dialogue even when strategic interests differ, expand mediation and negotiation capacity, and support credible initiatives led by middle powers. Cross-regional partnerships can diversify diplomatic channels. Middle-power initiatives should be assessed against credibility, consistency, impartiality, and respect for international law.

Improving global-regional coordination

The UN should strengthen coordination with regional organizations through joint conflict-prevention initiatives, information-sharing, peacebuilding programmes, training, and technical assistance. Clear division of responsibilities can reduce duplication and make responses more coherent.

Prioritizing prevention and accountability

International institutions should invest in early-warning systems, conflict assessment, inclusive negotiations, mediation, and local peacebuilding capacity. They should also publish clearer implementation reports, monitor commitments, explain decisions, and apply international legal principles consistently. Accountability must not depend on a state's political or economic influence.

Expanding people-to-people diplomacy

Governments and international organizations should support academic exchanges, peace education, youth leadership, intercultural dialogue, and partnerships between universities and peacebuilding organizations. Sports-for-peace initiatives should promote inclusive participation, gender equality, cross-border youth exchange, and collaboration between sports and educational institutions. These initiatives should be linked to sustained educational objectives and should complement formal diplomacy.

An integrated strategic framework

The study proposes five mutually reinforcing priorities for a future-oriented governance framework:

- Institutional reform: improve legitimacy, representation, transparency, and accountability.
- Diplomatic cooperation: expand multilateral dialogue, mediation, preventive diplomacy, and partnerships.
- Inclusive participation: engage middle powers, regional bodies, civil society, universities, and youth networks.
- Sustainable peacebuilding: connect conflict prevention with social justice, international law, intercultural understanding, and peaceful coexistence.
- Implementation and accountability: assign measurable responsibilities, monitor commitments, and evaluate practical outcomes.
- These priorities should operate as a coordinated system. Their success depends on sustained cooperation among states, international institutions, regional organizations, and non-state actors.

Contribution, Limitations, and Future Research

The study contributes an integrated analytical perspective linking geopolitical fragmentation, institutional legitimacy, multilateral diplomacy, and sustainable peace. By combining liberal institutionalism, constructivism, and global governance theory, it explains why institutional structures, shared norms, and multi-actor partnerships must be considered together. It also highlights the complementary contribution of education and sports diplomacy to people-to-people engagement. The study is limited by its reliance on secondary documentary sources and does not claim original interview, survey, or fieldwork findings. Future research could compare diplomatic initiatives across regions, examine middle-power mediation in specific conflicts, assess the relationship

between institutional reform and accountability, and investigate the measurable contribution of sports and educational diplomacy. Interviews with diplomats, policymakers, scholars, and civil society representatives could deepen understanding of implementation barriers.

Conclusion.

The crisis of global governance is a multidimensional challenge shaped by geopolitical rivalry, institutional fragmentation, unequal representation, accountability limitations, and declining confidence in multilateral cooperation. The United Nations remains indispensable, but its effectiveness is constrained when political disagreements prevent collective decisions. Institutional reform is therefore necessary to strengthen transparency, representation, responsiveness, and trust. The analysis demonstrates that fragmentation does not mean the end of multilateralism. It signals a more complex environment in which middle powers, regional organizations, civil society, educational institutions, and transnational networks can complement established institutions. Their contributions are most effective when coordinated with formal diplomacy and grounded in international law. Sustainable peace cannot be achieved through military deterrence, temporary agreements, or institutional declarations alone. It requires preventive diplomacy, political inclusion, social justice, institutional accountability, mutual respect, and practical implementation of international commitments. Education, intercultural exchange, and sports diplomacy can reinforce the social foundations of peace, while remaining complementary to political negotiation. Ultimately, the future of international peace depends on transforming global governance into a more inclusive, representative, accountable, and cooperative system. The measure of multilateralism should be its ability to prevent conflict, deliver justice, strengthen international cooperation, and sustain peaceful coexistence for present and future generations.

References.

1. Abbott, K. W., Genschel, P., Snidal, D., & Zangl, B. (Eds.). (2015). International organizations as orchestrators. Cambridge University Press.
2. Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (1998). Why states act through formal international organizations. The Journal of Conflict Resolution, 42(1), 3–32.
3. Acharya, A. (2014). The end of American world order. Polity Press.
4. Avant, D. D., Finnemore, M., & Sell, S. K. (Eds.). (2010). Who governs the globe? Cambridge University Press.
5. Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics. Cornell University Press.
6. Baylis, J., Smith, S., & Owens, P. (Eds.). (2020). The globalization of world politics: An introduction to international relations (8th ed.). Oxford University Press.
7. Bodansky, D. (1999). The legitimacy of international governance: A coming challenge for international environmental law? American Journal of International Law, 93(3), 596–624.
8. Buchanan, A., & Keohane, R. O. (2006). The legitimacy of global governance institutions. Ethics & International Affairs, 20(4), 405–437. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00043.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-7093.2006.00043.x?utm_source=chatgpt.com)
9. 9\. Bull, H. (1977). The anarchical society: A study of order in world politics. Macmillan.
10. Buzan, B. (2014). An introduction to the English School of international relations: The societal approach. Polity Press.
11. Cooper, A. F. (Ed.). (1997). Niche diplomacy: Middle powers after the Cold War. Macmillan.
12. Cooper, A. F. (2011). Middle powers: Squeezed out or adaptive? Palgrave Macmillan.
13. Cooper, A. F., Higgott, R. A., & Nossal, K. R. (1993). Relocating middle powers: Australia and Canada in a changing world order. University of British Columbia Press.
14. Cox, R. W. (1996). Approaches to world order. Cambridge University Press.

15. Dingwerth, K., & Pattberg, P. (2006). Global governance as a perspective on world politics. Global Governance, 12(2), 185–203.

16. Doyle, M. W., & Sambanis, N. (2006). Making war and building peace: United Nations peace operations. Princeton University Press.

17. Fawcett, L. (2004). Exploring regional domains: A comparative history of regionalism. International Affairs, 80(3), 429–446.

18. Finnemore, M., & Sikkink, K. (1998). International norm dynamics and political change. International Organization, 52(4), 887–917.

19. Finkelstein, L. S. (1995). What is global governance? Global Governance, 1(3), 367–372.

20. Franck, T. M. (1990). The power of legitimacy among nations. Oxford University Press.

21. Galtung, J. (1969). Violence, peace, and peace research. Journal of Peace Research, 6(3), 167–191.

22. Gould, M., & Rablen, M. D. (2017). Reform of the United Nations Security Council: Equity and efficiency. Public Choice, 173, 145–168. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-017-0468-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11127-017-0468-2?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

23. Held, D., & McGrew, A. (Eds.). (2002). Governing globalization: Power, authority and global governance. Polity Press.

24. Hurd, I. (1999). Legitimacy and authority in international politics. International Organization, 53(2), 379–408.

25. Hurd, I. (2007). After anarchy: Legitimacy and power in the United Nations Security Council. Princeton University Press.

26. Ikenberry, G. J. (2011). Liberal leviathan: The origins, crisis, and transformation of the American world order. Princeton University Press.

27. Imber, M. (2006). The reform of the UN Security Council. International Relations, 20(3), 328–334. [https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117806066710](https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117806066710?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

28. Jordaan, E. (2003). The concept of a middle power in international relations: Distinguishing between emerging and traditional middle powers. Politikon, 30(2), 165–181.

29. Karns, M. P., Mingst, K. A., & Stiles, K. W. (2015). International organizations: The politics and processes of global governance (3rd ed.). Lynne Rienner Publishers.

30. Keohane, R. O. (1984). After hegemony: Cooperation and discord in the world political economy. Princeton University Press.

31. Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (2012). Power and interdependence (4th ed.). Longman.

32. Lättilä, V., & Ylönen, A. (2019). United Nations Security Council reform revisited: A proposal. Diplomacy & Statecraft, 30(1), 164–186. [https://doi.org/10.1080/09592296.2019.1557423](https://doi.org/10.1080/09592296.2019.1557423?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

33. Lederach, J. P. (1997). Building peace: Sustainable reconciliation in divided societies. United States Institute of Peace Press.

34. Luck, E. C. (2006). UN Security Council: Practice and promise. Routledge.

Lund, M. S. (1996). Preventing violent conflicts: A strategy for preventive diplomacy. United States Institute of Peace Press.

35. ingst, K. A., & Karns, M. P. (2011). The United Nations in the 21st century (4th ed.). Westview Press.

36. Nye, J. S. (2004). Soft power: The means to success in world politics. PublicAffairs.

37. Paris, R. (2004). At war's end: Building peace after civil conflict. Cambridge University Press.

38. Rosenau, J. N., & Czempiel, E.-O. (Eds.). (1992). Governance without government: Order and change in world politics. Cambridge University Press.

39. Ruggie, J. G. (Ed.). (1992). Multilateralism matters: The theory and praxis of an institutional form. Columbia University Press.

40. Söderbaum, F. (2016). Rethinking regionalism. Palgrave Macmillan.

41. Tallberg, J., Bäckstrand, K., & Scholte, J. A. (Eds.). (2018). Legitimacy in global governance: Sources, processes, and consequences. Oxford University Press. [https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198826873.001.0001](https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198826873.001.0001?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

42. Tallberg, J., & Zürn, M. (2019). The legitimacy and legitimation of international organizations: Introduction and framework. The Review of International Organizations, 14, 581–606. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-018-9330-7](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11558-018-9330-7?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

43. United Nations. (1945). Charter of the United Nations. [https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter](https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

44. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development (A/RES/70/1). [https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda](https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

45. United Nations. (2021). Our common agenda: Report of the Secretary-General. [https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/](https://www.un.org/en/content/common-agenda-report/?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

46. United Nations General Assembly. (2022). Standing mandate for a General Assembly debate when a veto is cast in the Security Council (A/RES/76/262). [https://undocs.org/A/RES/76/262](https://undocs.org/A/RES/76/262?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

47. United Nations General Assembly. (2024). The Pact for the Future (A/RES/79/1). [https://undocs.org/A/RES/79/1](https://undocs.org/A/RES/79/1?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

48. United Nations Security Council. (2000). Resolution 1325 (2000) (S/RES/1325). [https://undocs.org/S/RES/1325(2000](https://undocs.org/S/RES/1325\(2000?utm_source=chatgpt.com))

49. Wendt, A. (1992). Anarchy is what states make of it: The social construction of power politics. International Organization, 46(2), 391–425. [https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764](https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818300027764?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

50. Ayaz Khan J, Wali Ahmed F, Shaikh N, et al. (July 13, 2025) Relationship Between Perceived Stress and Blood Pressure Control in Young Adults. With a Family History of Hypertension. Cureus 17(7): e87821. DOI 10.7759/cureus.87821



2026 by the authors; Journal of Global Social Transformation (JGST). This is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC-BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).