

Prof. dr hab.

Faculty of Political Science and International Studies

University of Warsaw

## **Review of the doctoral dissertation**

**Ms. Marguerite A. Peeters - „The Emergence of Global Governance as a Political Revolution. New Political Paradigms and the Shift to Postmodern Politics (1945 – 1996)”.**

**Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University Department of Political Science and Public Administration, Warsaw 2022.**

Pursuant to Art. 13. sec. 1 of the Act on academic degrees and academic title as well as degrees and title in the field of art (Journal of Laws 2017, item 1789), the doctoral dissertation should be assessed in three main aspects:

- a) whether it is an original solution to a scientific problem,
- b) whether the Author has general theoretical knowledge in a given scientific discipline,
- c) whether She has the ability to independently conduct scientific work.

In the light of the reviewed doctoral dissertation, I am giving a positive answer to all these questions. In my opinion, this means that the dissertation of a candidate for the academic title of doctor meets the statutory criteria and therefore I recommend continuing the procedure related to obtaining this title.

## ASSESSMENT OF PHD DISSERTATION

1. The purpose of the thesis was to investigate the extent to which the transformation of the UN into global governance has been a revolution, a sudden, complete and radical change within the organization (p. 10).

The main research problem was not formulated directly in the paper. Nevertheless, it can be guessed that such a problem is the question of analyzing and understanding the reasons that led to the transformation of the United Nations system from intergovernmental towards a new management paradigm defined in the work of, inter alia, as "global governance". An interesting problem is in particular how the system, which after the collapse of the Cold War order (1989) was to regain respect for democracy and national sovereignty, was aimed at limiting this democracy and sovereignty. Another important research problem is the attempt to explain why left-wing ideas and Marxist ideology gained such a dominant importance in the work of the UN, despite the collapse of the so-called Eastern Bloc and the Soviet Union, which, after all, were based on Marxism. The announced end of ideology after 1989 turned out to be - in the UN edition - a period of increasing influence of radical ideology (p. 251).

2. The main research questions of the thesis (pp. 11-12):
  - (1) How the novel partnerships system, in other words global governance, was set to function and exercise its power?
  - (2) Which political mechanisms it set in place; whether it had a "hard", enforcing capacity?
  - (3) The extent to which it has redistributed political roles and responsibilities among states, non-state actors and "the people"?
  - (4) The extent to which its operational mechanisms have transferred effective power from sovereign governments to non-state actors?
  - (5) What effects the emergence of global governance and of its postmodern political paradigms has had on the international order as established in 1945, and on democracy?

(6) What kind of “regime” global governance was constructed to be, and whether or not it has been under the control of a transparent and legitimate authority, that of sovereign governments?

Ms. Marguerite A. Peeters did not present in the conclusions from the work (p. 344-351) an orderly answer to these questions, although in these conclusions and in the work itself there were answers to the research questions posed.

3. The Authoress has put forward the following research hypotheses (p. 14):

(H1) The emergence of global governance through the UN conference process has been a revolution, led by a minority of experts and non-state actors, transgressing the nature of international cooperation and that of universal human rights: it was a sudden and radical change in the way the UN institution functions.

(H2) That operated impressive power transfers away from sovereign governments to a global non-state elite.

(H3) This revolution happened within the UN institution and through the UN conference process as its main battlefield.

(H4) The revolution had accomplished its major objectives by 1996 (the end of the UN’s post-Cold War conference process).

(H5) Non-state agents were ideologically-driven and their ideological drive sprang from the West’s New Left and postmodern perspective.

(H6) They have used soft power to subdue the UN as an intergovernmentally-governed institution and to globally spread their new political paradigms.

(H7) The revolution ushered, not in the institution of a global government, but in a coexistence regime that is dangerously transformative, ambivalent, destabilizing and weakening for the sovereignty of peoples and their governments, and could represent a stage in a great transition towards some kind of “global governance with teeth”.

Ms. Peeters did not present in the conclusions from the work (p. 344-351) an orderly answer on how She verified these research hypotheses in her doctoral dissertation.

Nevertheless, these conclusions and the work itself contain answers to the research hypotheses.

4. The Authoress presented in the introduction the methodology of her doctoral dissertation (pp. 16-17).

First, it was the historical approach, identifying the major historical steps along the emergence of global governance. Ms. Peeters focused on the analysis of two wave of UN conferences (1968-1985 and 1990-1996).

Second, the Authoress analyzed the primary documents that She found her study upon to evaluate research questions and hypotheses. Ms. Peeters has collected and analyzed over 300 reports monitoring post-Cold War developments at the United Nations (the majority written between 1995 and 2002). These reports include a number of interviews conducted in the 1990s with some of the leading players in the global governance process.

Thirdly, Ms. Peeters focused on semantic analysis, on the study of evolution of language in the primary documents - and in particular, on the historical appearance of terms that were absent from the UN Charter and UDHR - as an indicator of radical change. She observed the interconnections of the novel terms so as to determine the extent to which they constitute a semantic system expressing a new synthesis.

Fourth, Ms. Peeters identified the authors of the new language's few key terms and how they define (or do not define) them. She looked at these authors' ideological perspective and examine whether they coined the new language in order to name reality as it is, or for postmodern deconstructionist or manipulative purposes.

The research methods presented in the introduction were then successfully applied in the doctoral dissertation.

The literature on the subject and the source materials used in the work are very rich and indicate extensive and long-term research work on the dissertation.

5. A drawback of the doctoral dissertation is the lack of an appropriate theoretical basis and failure to use the empirical material and the analysis carried out in the doctoral dissertation to present conclusions of a theoretical nature. In her dissertation, Ms.

Peeters demonstrates general theoretical knowledge within a scientific discipline. For example, in many places of her dissertation She uses the reflections of other researchers, as well as scientists and intellectuals presenting their own theoretical or philosophical concepts regarding the international order. Nevertheless, the Authoress herself does not sufficiently define her own theoretical perspective, nor does She formulate any conclusions about theoretical specificity. In particular, there is a lack of theoretical reflection at the beginning and end of the entire dissertation.

Nevertheless, the work is a successful attempt at presenting the original scientific problem related to the transformation of the United Nations system, the transformation of which Ms. Peeters describes in detail and shows its qualitative (and systemic) characteristics.

One theoretical aspect of the dissertation is to show how the revolutionary change taking place in the semantic space (the language of documents) becomes an instrument of power and leads to effects in the system of power (p. 337). It is a pity that this thread was not dealt with in any of the theories of international relations, e.g. constructivism or other theoretical concepts relating to the relationship between the sphere of ideas and power. In this context, the remarks about deconstructionism on page 191 are particularly unsatisfactory, that is, it is to be regretted that they were not further developed and used as a theoretical basis.

Another theoretical aspect is to show the methodology of the operation of supranational elites in the sphere of organization and political marketing, creating by this elite "accomplished facts" that change the political system and the distribution of power between actors but without a formal change of treaties (UN Charter) or by reinterpreting treaty law, which changed the power relations between actors participating in the political process (pp. 281, 285-287). Here, the rich achievements of institutional theory could be used.

6. The advantage of the doctoral dissertation is the presentation of the political transformation within the UN system, in which it is increasingly losing the characteristics of a classic international organization, i.e. one whose decisive entities are the member states. The new system thus violates national sovereignty, as well as national democracy

(p. 292, 308), as non-sovereign and undemocratic entities have an increasing influence on decisions made. Power is gained by a supranational elite composed of supranational officials, lobbyists, philanthropists, representatives of NGOs, but also influential scientists and politicians, sometimes also representatives of financiers or big business (eg pharmaceuticals [p. 143, 235]). All these people to an increasing extent shaped the agenda of the UN institution system, created the content of documents, guidelines or conclusions that should be disseminated and implemented in the member states of this organization. In this way, the supranational elite carried out a "revolutionary" seizure of power, or at least to a significant extent gained a share of power. The Authoress describes *"the global governance revolution – (transforming) from the peoples as nations to the people as transnational non-governmental actors and good global citizens"* (p. 312). *"Even if not democratically elected, even if not institutionally or juridically established, even if operating only informally or by stealth, the primary partners have proven to wield decision-making and executing power within the global governance new political regime. Their power-grab constituted the essence of the revolution"* (p. 229).

7. The advantage of the doctoral dissertation is also to show how - ie according to what methodology - sovereign states shared power with other entities, including the supranational elite and supranational NGOs. The partnership with "global civil society" was seen as a manifestation of human progress (p. 166). The imposed values and ideas were given an ethical and moral dimension, and they were also directly related to the superior and universal human rights (pp. 233, 277).

The mechanisms of the imposition of agenda, values and ideas by the supranational elites, which in this way have gained a huge influence in the symbolic and ideological sphere, are shown in dissertation. The mechanism of normative pressure exerted on all potential opponents of the ideological revolution introduced into the UN (p. 161) was also explained. At the same time, the semantic manipulation of the concepts used led to the fact that noble ideas, for example concerning increasing the democratization of the system - led to opposite effects, and thus the actual limitation of democracy. It was not the majority rule within legitimate democratic communities, but the enlightened elites that were to define the values and standards of the global scale (p. 305). Notions such as

"democracy" were given new content, which was to mean fidelity to universal left-wing values, and not to the earlier standards of democratic political system (eg related to political pluralism and the diversity of political values). The inclusion of NGOs in the decision-making process, as representatives of the "global society", as a "partners" equal to sovereign states - was aimed at legitimizing the values and narratives promoted by the relatively small supranational elite and their new participation in power at the UN forum.

8. An important conclusion from the doctoral dissertation is the leftist lineage of a large number of actors contributing to the transformation of the UN system (eg p. 79). Ms. Peeters also pointed out that it was leftist and even Marxist ideas that had the greatest impact on the directions of substantive activity of the entire organization (e.g. p. 249). Thus, the revolution had not only a systemic dimension (sharing power by states with other, non-sovereign and undemocratic actors), but also had the dimension of a left-wing offensive in the ideological dimension. A particular example of the methodology used by the left-wing elite was a holistic approach to the sphere of values and new areas of interest of the UN. In this way, the fight to reduce the number of people (depopulation) was combined with the promotion of contraception, abortion, sexual education, abandonment of the traditional family model, and diversity in terms of sexual identity (gender) - all under the banner of defending women's rights or human rights. In other words, a new catalog of universal human rights was gradually being built. They were in line with leftist values and were to apply on a global scale. Thus, they were constitutional for the new order on a global scale, so they should also take precedence over local national law (p. 141). The depopulation policy was related in a similar way with environmental protection and sustainable development (p. 155), which perceived a threat to the planet in the excessive growth of humanity (pp. 67-69).
9. Ms. Peeters pictured the process of transition from voluntary acceptance of UN recommendations to more and more compulsory forms of enforcing them as legally binding norms of international law (pp. 160, 257). One of the ways was to put emphasis on the monitoring of implementation by NGOs and their participation in the implementation of UN recommendations in individual member states. Another was the emphasis on introducing the content developed by successive UN conferences into the

education systems of the member states (p. 255) and involving youth representatives in the consultation and implementation process. Efforts were also made to build "global sovereignty" and a "global demos" that would justify the supremacy of international law over national law, even constitutional law. Another way was to strive for a consensus at subsequent UN conferences, which, because they were universally accepted, were then to be implemented in individual member states.

10. An interesting theme of the doctoral dissertation concerns the role of the supranational representatives of the USA and Western Europe in the supranational elites, who thus continued the traditional Eurocentric behavior. These elites had a missionary approach to promoting civilized values among less civilized or even barbaric cultures and nations outside of Western Europe and North America.

Regarding this aspect, it is a pity that the Authoress has not devoted more space to attempts to justify how the geopolitical interests of Washington (USA) and Brussels (i.e. the European Union) coincided with the transformation of the UN system. It would also be interesting to consider why this direction of transformation was approved by China and Russia (one of the key conferences described in the paper took place in Beijing).

11. The doctoral dissertation has great cognitive and documentation values. It shows how the system of organizations was changing in international assumptions, which had consequences for sovereignty and democracy in the member states. The dissertation points to the growing authoritarian and even totalitarian tendencies in the international system after 1989 (p. 334), which is reflected in the restriction of national democracy by international organizations, supranational elites and international law. Moreover, the dissertation shows how the relatively narrow supranational elite, drawn mainly from leftist circles in Western Europe and the USA, imposes its own ideas on a global scale.

The dissertation presents a new knowledge about the functioning of the UN institutional system and globalization at the beginning of the 21st century. This work has a great advantage not only from the point of view of the functioning of the UN and other global organizations, but also regional ones. The processes and phenomena described in the dissertation are particularly similar in the European Union.



Tomasz Grzegorz Grosse

Warsaw, 27.10.2022