
BEYOND BORDERS: EVALUATING THE IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN A GLOBALIZED ERA

Vrinda Gupta, USLLS, Guru Gobind Singh Indraprastha University

ABSTRACT

The increasing velocity of globalization has altered the global juristic discourse as well as political arena by elevating the international organizations to the pinnacle of global governance. International organizations like the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund and World Health Organization are now at the helm of promoting cooperation, as well as peace and seeking ways of solving transnational challenges like climate change, pandemics and economic instabilities. Nevertheless, these bodies have been being criticized anew because of structural disparities, absence of inclusiveness, and hegemony of developed countries despite their formulated universality.

This study critically analyses the role of the international organizations in ensuring equity and inclusiveness between the developed and developing countries and balancing the principle of state sovereignty and the application of international norms. The work has a doctrinal and analytical approach with the use of collegial tools like charters, treaties, and resolutions, as well as secondary tools such as scholarly literature and institutional reports.

The article suggests that, in as much as international organizations are crucial in facilitating dialogue and collaboration, they remain systemic in that they are products of power hierarchies in the world. The monopoly of power and decision-making, the conditional character of financial support, as well as the biased application of international standards, tend to destabilize the principles of sovereign equality and participatory governance. This paper concludes that to turn these institutions into indeed inclusive mechanisms of global governance, so-called meaningful reform will be needed, in form of democratization of representation, improved transparency, and equal policy frameworks.

INTRODUCTION

This is due to the fact that the world today is characterized by an unmatched interconnectedness, interdependence and cooperation between states, economies and societies. Transformed contours Globalization has broken down traditional barriers to sovereignty and changed the lines of state relations. At this, it is the development of international organizations as the greatest institutional means of encouraging cooperation, coping with conflicts, and solving other problems that are beyond the domains of nations. The agencies depict the general will of the international community to set standards, rule by law and development in a world that is becoming more organized due to shared problems and aspirations.

The development of international bodies is closely connected with the emergence of the international law and the idea that these global issues, including wars, poverty, pandemics and the environmental degradation cannot be successfully solved by the individual states acting separately. The League of Nations when it was founded following the First World War was the first institutionalized effort in multilateralism but even failed to avert the Second World War. It was a lesson learned and in 1945 this led to the creation of a universal institution, the United Nations (UN) with a mandate of ensuring peace and security throughout the international arena, promoting the social development and ensuring an understanding between countries.

Over the time, there is an increased number of specialized agencies and institutions within the United Nations, each of which deals with certain aspects of global governance. As an example, World Health Organization (WHO) organizes global action in response to health disasters; the World Bank and International Monetary Fund (IMF) deal with economic stability and financing development; and the World Trade Organization (WTO) facilitates liberation of trade and the resolution of disputes. These institutions, combined, create a complicated web of governance networks that affect virtually all the facets of international relations such as economic policy, environmental protection and human rights.

Although the operations of international organizations have noble agendas, structural inequalities and power asymmetries tend to be part of the operations. Decision making systems in these institutions are mostly dominated by the developed countries, especially those that have financial or political bargains. IMF and World Bank have voted quotas on financial contributions as an example, where the Western economies have excessive power. Equally, the composition of the UN Security Council, which consists of five permanent members (the United

States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, and China) with the veto authority, provides an imbalance in the international governance with few states taking decisions on the direction of the international operation.

Such structural disfavoritism has given rise to an increasing sense of disillusionment among the developing countries, whereby it is seen that they are policy takers and not policy makers in the world institutions. The lack of balance affects the credibility of such entities and creates doubts on the ability of such organizations to work towards inclusiveness, equality, and true multilateralism. The North-South Divide or as the term has been used to refer to the economic and political disparities between the developed and the developing countries is apparent as much in the terms on how the international organizations operate and carry out their operations, and this is what sustains the dependency and inequality patterns.

Finally, the introduction of this study preconditions a critical discussion of the role played by international organizations in the globalized world as the signs of cooperation and the arenas of conflict. The following parts will elaborate on the problem of inclusivity, representation, sovereignty, and accountability, and this will give an in-depth analysis of the promises and paradoxes that give rise to the international organizations in the twenty-first century.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Discussing the age of globalization, the role of international organizations has become focal in the organization of collective responses to transnational issues like maintaining conflict stability, economic turmoil, climate change, and humanitarian crises. The world has institutions such as the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and world health organization (WHO) which are geared towards cooperation, world development and international peace. Nevertheless, behind these noble intentions, there exists a certain lack of balance in the global governance mechanisms which place the question of inclusiveness, legitimacy and fairness of these agencies.

The unequal involvement of the developed countries in making of decisions is a key issue. The examples are the weighted voting systems of other institutions such as the IMF and the World bank or the veto power of permanent seats of the UN Security Council, which shows how power is concentrated into the hands of a few states. This is a structural inequality that marginalizes the voices of the developing countries in addition to giving rise to policies and programs which

might not be similar to socioeconomic realities of the developing nations. Accordingly, the principles of equality and common engagement are still rather dreamy.

The other aspect of the issue is a discriminatory use of international norms. The concept of humanitarian intervention, trade liberalization, climate justice, and others demonstrate some inconsistent application of vitality, in which geopolitical interests tend to be more important than the relation to laws or ethical factor. Such partiality weakens the credibility of global institutions and breeds distrust toward them by the developing countries that they are indeed committed to equality and justice. The fundamental issue that the study aims to explore, therefore, is whether the international organisations in a globalised world are really a scene of inclusion with prerequisites of equity and cooperation, or they reinforce the status quo with icy pretences of multilateralism. It also discusses the way these institutions might reconcile their enlarging mandate with the central value of state sovereignty which will see global governance move to a place of fairness, participation and legitimacy to all members states.

HYPOTHESIS

This study is based on the assumption that the international organizations, though operating on the premise of equality, inclusiveness, and coordination, have not been wholly effective in guaranteeing equal participation of the developed and developing countries. However, though these organisations have developed structures to act as collective actors and hold conversation, their operation is still characterized by structural imbalances that conform to the political and economic interests of strong states.

The hypothesis put forth is that the lack of flexibility in policies by the interests of developing countries due to the concentration of decision making powers in a small league of countries compromises the democratic legitimacy of international organizations. Moreover, it is postulated that the application of global norms and commitments often cuts into the sovereignty of the state and this is more common with the economies less powerful and more reliant on international aid or trade.

RESEARCH METHOD

Doctrinal Approach

The main method used in this research is the doctrinal approach which involves the systemic

study of the legal instruments, treaties, charters and resolutions, which rule international organizations. The doctrinal approach permits systematic study of the mandates, authorities and operational structures of organizations like the United Nations (UN), World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) and that of World Health Organization (WHO). Investigating the legal and normative texts, this method can offer a basic level of knowledge about the way these organizations are made to be and which principles they follow in the process of making the rulings.

Primary Sources

The research uses a lot of primary sources to get the doctrinal accuracy. Some of the key documents are the UN Charter, the Articles of Agreement of IMF and World Bank, the Marrakesh Agreement which created WTO and resolutions, reports, and communiqus of the Special UN agencies. Also, the international treaties like Paris Agreement (2015) and the Convention on Biological Diversity are examined to comprehend the responsibility of the member states and how these responsibilities interrelate with the issues of sovereignty and fairness.

Secondary Sources

Secondary sources supplement the main texts and give an interpretative account and a critical view. These are academic monographs, peer-reviewed journals, and legal remarks that study the history, construction, and outputs of international organizations.

The study is also informed by critical views of movements like Third World Approaches to International Law (TWAIL) which emphasizes on structural inequalities between the Global South and Global North, as well as on policy reports of think tanks like the Brookings Institution, United Nations University, and World Economic Forums.

Analytical Approach

The study is based on the analytical framework, which addresses the efficacy of international organizations into advancing equity, inclusivity, and legitimacy. The analytical method assesses the impact of institutional organizations, methods of governance, and decision-making on the outcomes of both the developed and developing countries. The focus is on the trends of

asymmetry of power, selectivity in the application of norms, and structural inequalities which can wane success of international organizations to realize their proclaimed objectives.

Comparative Analysis

The experiences of the developed and developing nations are measured by a comparative methodology in the international organizations. The study reveals inequality and structural prejudices through the comparison of the effects, involvement, and access to resources within the various member states. The given comparison also assists in assessing current reform initiatives and the best practices in various institutions, and it gives an idea of how to possibly democratize world governance.

SURVEY OF LITERATURE / LITERATURE REVIEW

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONAL THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS.

The purpose of international organizations in defining global governance has been the focus of argument even among scholars. Kofi Annan (2000)¹ points out that the roles of these institutions in promoting cooperation, conflict management and handling transnational issues that such individual states alone cannot handle, are necessary. Equally, Thomas Weiss (2013)² indicates the existence of normative frameworks at the UN and other international organizations, which encourage the advancement of peace, safety, and sustainable development. Legally, the treaties and charters by which international organizations are governed and through which they establish their rights and duties, which characterize a legal and moral relation to collective action, emphasize that international organizations are bound by the doctrine as stipulated by Ian Brownlie (2008)³ and Malcolm Shaw (2017).

SOVEREIGNTY AND NORM ENFORCEMENT.

A different significant school of thought is on the conflict between the sovereignty of states and the implementation of international norms. The fact that sovereignty is one of the fundamental pillars of the international law may prompt authors like Hedley Bull (1977) ⁴and James

¹ Kofi Annan, *Interventions: A Life in War and Peace* 112 (Penguin Books, London, 2001).

² Thomas G. Weiss, *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It* 45 (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2013).

³ Ian Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* 60 (8th edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008).

⁴ Hedley Bull, *The Anarchical Society: A Study of Order in World Politics* 23 (Macmillan, London, 1977).

Crawford (2012) to state that the member states sometimes need to forego some of the parts of autonomy in order to get in line with world standards. This tension was manifested in the conditionalities that were imposed by the IMF, application of WTO trade regulations and UN-sanctioned interventions in war-torn regions. Scholars such as Louis Henkin (1995) observe that these interventions although being quite lawful can bring about political tension and cast doubts on the legitimacy of global governing processes as well as their unfairness.

ECONOMIC AND DEVELOPMENTAL EFFECTS.

The international organizations are also studied on their role in economic growth and development. Joseph Stiglitz (2002, 2006) criticizes the IMF and World Bank policies of stressing neoliberal reforms that in most instances, are unfavorable to the developing countries⁵. In the same line, Kevin Gallagher (2014) points out that the structural adjustment programs although intended to stabilize a country have at times contributed to poverty and social inequality. Conversely, researches by Amartya Sen (1999) note that when inclusive policies are adopted by the international institutions and the local socio-economic situation of member states are taken into account, the international institutions may negatively affect development in a positive way.

ACCOUNTABILITY, TRANSPARENCY AND INSTITUTIONAL REFORM.

A great amount of literature is devoted to the necessity of transparency, accountability, and international organizational reform. According to Ramesh Thakur (2016), global governance needs to be democratized by reforming the voting rights, decision-making process, and representation. Likewise, Inge Kaul and Pedro Conceicao (2006) is of the view that accountability mechanisms play a major role in ensuring legitimacy when it is observed that the international institutions exercise a lot of power on the domestic policies of the sovereign states. Empirical studies by Jean-Marc Coicaud (2002) and Thomas G. Weiss (2009) also note that normative ideals and operational realities can be resolved through participatory reforms, increased transparency and involvement of the civil society.

GLOBAL CRISIS AND HEALTH MANAGEMENT.

The role of international organizations in the management of global crises and specifically

⁵ Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Globalization and Its Discontents* 56 (W.W. Norton & Company, New York, 2002).

health crises is a trend of literature in recent years. The research on the World Health Organization (WHO) concerning the COVID-19 pandemic, including Gostin and Friedman (2020), reveals the successes and the shortcomings of the global health governance. As WHO conglomerated, spreading the necessary information, the unequal vaccine dispensation, and assurance through voluntary collaboration revealed the structural vulnerability. Likewise, Kickbusch et al. (2021) state that the pandemic has exposed long-standing disparities in global health governance and an increasing number of inclusivity and accountability frameworks.⁶

Gaps in Existing Literature

Even though there is extensive literature on the role of international organizations, a number of gaps still occur. Most of literature is concerned with part of the views of developed countries or high-end institution interpretations of society yet they do not consider the plight and limitations of the developing countries. The number of empirical studies that evaluate the effects of structural reforms, mechanisms of participation, and policy changes on increasing inclusivity and equity is limited. Also, the interaction between sovereignty and norm enforcement has a larger theoretical literature and limited studies that have critically assessed the practical measures of how the world and nation reconcile can be achieved.

I. EVOLUTION AND ROLE OF INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

International organizations are based on the idea that some of the world problems cannot be successfully tackled by individual states in isolation. The development of the international organizations is the way of global governance due to the events of the past, economical interdependence, and the complexity of international relations.⁷

HISTORICAL EVOLUTION

The concept of multilateral collaboration began to find its place in the 19th century through the formation of the telegraph and post organizations like the International Telegraph Union (1865) and the Universal Postal Union (1874). The first of these organizations was largely technical and functional, geared towards the end of serving to establish communication and

⁶ Oran R. Young, *Governing the Environment: State and International Institutions* 89 (Routledge, London, 2002).

⁷ Kofi Annan, *Interventions: A Life in War and Peace* 112 (Penguin Books, London, 2001). ⁸ Thomas G. Weiss, *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It* 45 (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2013).

trading through international borders. By showing the advantage of transnational issues co-management, they have provided the groundwork of the present international organizations.⁸

League of Nations (1920) was the first experiment in institutionalized world government. The League was founded according to the Treaty of Versailles, which was made after the First World War, its purpose was to ensure the world peace, to stop wars, and facilitate cooperation in social and economic activities. Even though it was a breakthrough in the field of multilateralism, the League was not very effective because of the non-participation of such giants as the United States, the system of voluntary adherence, and the insufficient enforcement of obligations. A weaker international organization as observed during its failure to stop Second World War created the need to have a stronger and more legally binding international organization.

In a retaliatory move, the United Nations (UN) was founded in 1945 under the UN Charter that aimed at correcting the failure of the League of Nations and developing an all-encompassing system of governance in the world arena. The UN established a systematic framework of key bodies, the general assembly, the security council, international court of justice and specialized agencies, all having certain mandate and powers. Sovereign equality, collective security, respect of human rights, the Charter of the UN contains the principles that form the legal basis of modern-day international organizations.⁸

After the World War II, the expansion of global institutions gathered pace especially in the sectors of trade, finances, development and health. World Bank and other institutions like the international monetary fund (IMF) were established to stabilize world economies and restore economies. WTO was formed as an extension of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) in 1995 in order to control the world trade and solve controversies between the member states. The agenda of international health was organized through the World Health Organization (WHO) that was created in 1948, and development and environmental preservation were seen to be established through agendas such as UNDP and UNEP.

ROLE AND FUNCTIONS

The international organizations play several functions in the international governance system:

⁸ B. Anghie, *Imperialism, Sovereignty and the Making of International Law* 75 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2005).

a. Facilitating Peace and Security:

The primary mission of such organizations as UN Security Council is to avoid conflicts and international peace. The UN tries to offer a collective security system through peacekeeping operation, conflict mediation, and sanctioning which individual states could not have without the other three.

b. Economic Governance and Development:

Financial institutions such as IMF and World Bank have the mandate of stabilizing economies, financing development and structural adjustments. They strive to facilitate economic development, poverty and sustainable development. In the same manner, WTO determines international trade guidelines, which are designed to avoid protectionism and give rise to equitable trade practices among the member states.⁹

c. Standard-Setting and Norm Enforcement:

Norms and standards are set by international organizations in different fields. Indicatively, the WHO establishes international health standards, the International Labour Organization (ILO) the labour standards, and the UN Environment Programme organizes the environment policies. These norms tend to inform the domestic policy-making process and enforce legal or even ethical commitments of the member states.

d. Crisis Management and Humanitarian Assistance:

When it comes to natural disasters, pandemics, and refugee situations, international organizations organize how the worldwide crisis can be handled. The presence of the agencies like UNHCR and WHO that assist in humanitarian support, health services and disaster messenger speaks to the working nature of such agencies in helping to reshape the issue of the moment in the world.¹⁰

⁹ Louis Henkin, *How Nations Behave: Law and Foreign Policy* 134 (2nd edn., Columbia University Press, New York, 1995).

¹⁰ Oran R. Young, *Governing the Environment: State and International Institutions* 89 (Routledge, London, 2002).

e. Policy Coordination and Advocacy:

In addition to the functions of operations entail, various forums of dialogue, negotiation, and consensus-building, are also represented by international organizations. The UN General Assembly is an example of this opportunity, enabling states to discuss international challenges, suggest resolutions and shape agendas of the global policies, which contributes to cooperation and diplomacy.

II. INCLUSIVENESS AND REPRESENTATION

The principle of inclusiveness is the core of international cooperation in which all states regardless of their economic or political powers equal playing fields in the global decision-making processes. International organizations had initially been considered a neutral space in which sovereign states could converse and collaborate on common issues. Nonetheless, the fact of involvement and representation on the ground is usually other than this ideal. The institutional architecture of most international organizations is more likely to reflect the global power hierarchies and thus giving rise to inequalities between the developed countries and the developing countries.¹¹

MEANING OF REPRESENTATION AND INCLUSIVENESS.

The meaning of inclusiveness in international organizations is that the member states have a similar chance to engage in the governance, making of policies and other decision making processes in meaningful ways. Representation on the other hand refers to the manner in which the voice of the member states are represented in the institutional arrangements, including voting patterns, leadership positions and agenda making processes. These ideas are essential in the achievement of legitimacy, fairness, and effectiveness in the global governance.¹²

Ideally, inclusiveness and representation are different in terms of their degree given by different organizations. An example of this is the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) which is based on the concept of sovereign equality with one vote given to every member state. Conversely, organizations like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), use the quota-based form of voting power whereby the leadership of the organization is based on

¹¹ Thomas G. Weiss, *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It* 45 (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2013).

¹² Amartya Sen, *Development as Freedom* 87 (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999).

the control they have. This design is inherently biased toward the economically strong states, and at times it marginalizes the developing countries whose economic power is small in the world.

POWER INEQUALITIES AND STRUCTURES.

One of the greatest obstacles to inclusivity is that power is not distributed among relevant bodies of international organizations but is concentrated there. A good example of institutional imbalance can be mentioned to the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The five permanent members, which include the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia and China possess veto powers which enable them to unilaterally veto any substantive resolution regardless of how much the world agrees. This has created the tendency of assuming that UNSC is merely the geopolitical interests of a small group of people and not the overall will of the international community.¹³

On the same note, the voting quota set by the IMF in the case with the economically developed countries, particularly the United States, which controls more than 16 percent of the total voting quota, has been condemned to exert too much influence on important policy decisions that need over 85 percent of majority vote before passing. Third world countries, though the main beneficiaries of IMF and World Bank measure, are still underrepresented in their government systems.

Another aspect of inequality is offered by the World Trade Organization (WTO). Even with decisions being achieved based on consensus, most of the time a developed country will overpower other countries since they have more leverage economically, they are more technical and they have more access to information. The situation of unequal bargaining power has resulted in trade agreements which are skewed in favor of the developed economies and the developing countries have little space to save its own industries and policy making freedom.¹⁵

MOVEMENTS TOWARDS MORE INCLUSION.

In response to these structural imbalances, a variety of reform programs are suggested in order to make international organizations more inclusive. On the UN model, there has been a long standing argument on the Security Council reform to expand the permanent and non-permanent

¹³ Joseph E. Stiglitz, *Making Globalization Work* 44 (W.W. Norton, New York, 2006).

seats to accommodate emerging Asian, African, and Latin American powers. The G4 countries including India, Brazil, Germany and Japan have been on the forefront in pushing such reform citing that the structure isn't ¹⁴appropriate as the new structure is that of the multipolar world of the 21st century unlike the state of power in 1945.¹⁵

Little has been done in the representation in financial institutions. An example is that the IMF quota reform of 2010 slightly boosted the voting quota of emerging economies like China, India, and Brazil. Nonetheless, power distribution is still skewed and the third world countries are not well represented in decision making processes which directly impact on their economic policies.

This has been done at the WTO by introducing so-called special and differential treatment (SDT) provisions of the developing countries and least-developed countries (LDCs) to give them more time and space to adjust to their trade commitments. Although these steps are appreciative of the inequalities among the countries, they are only partial in the context of dealing with the structural inequalities that make equitable participation difficult.¹⁶

BEYOND STATE REPRESENTATION: CIVIL SOCIETY AND NON-STATE ACTORS.

There has been an increasing trend in the recent decades where international organizations are open to non-state actors, such as non-governmental organizations, civil societies, and representatives of the private sector. This movement is an indication of a wider concept of inclusivity that transcends state-centred participation. NGOs and lobby groups have gained importance in voicing the marginalized groups and communities, policy discussions as well as transparency and accountability in the international institutions.

As an example, the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) awards thousands of NGOs in the world a consultative status to take place in the global with regard to human rights, sustainable development, and environmental protection. In the same vein, the WHO has a close working relationship with non-state actors in the global health governance especially in time of emergencies like the COVID-19 pandemic. Although such a participatory manner has brought

¹⁴ Inis L. Claude Jr., *Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization* 65 (4th edn., Random House, New York, 1971).

¹⁵ Thomas Weiss, *Global Governance: Why? What? Whither?* 102 (Polity Press, Cambridge, 2013).

¹⁶ Ngaire Woods, *The Globalizers: The IMF, the World Bank, and Their Borrowers* 54 (Cornell University Press, Ithaca, 2006).

a democratization in the international governance process, this has also called the question of accountability, legitimacy and whether the corporate interests are at play in the multi-lateral decision making process.¹⁷

III. BALANCING SOVEREIGNTY AND INTERNATIONAL NORMS

The relations between state sovereignty and the implementation of international norms is one of the most problematic questions in modern international relationships. Traditionally, sovereignty is viewed as the pillar of the international legal system that bestows ultimate power to the states to govern their internal matters without the interference of external forces. However, in a more globalized and interdependent world, international organizations have been playing roles where in most cases, they would require to breach domestic jurisdictions in order to implement international norms concerning human rights, trade, environment and peace keeping. The problem of how to balance between the interests of sovereignty and the advancement of international cooperation is central to the contemporary global governance.¹⁸

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Both Westphalian understanding of sovereignty of 1648 and focuses on absolute power of the state within its limits and the right of non-intervention. Nevertheless the practices of the world after the end of the World War II, especially the establishment of the United Nations, was a gradual transition to a more qualified conception of sovereignty. Article 2(1) of the Charter reaffirms the sovereign equality of member states, but at the same time, it gives them duties in ensuring international security and in protecting human rights, which brings a balance between independence and accountability.

This development led to the concept of the "sovereignty as responsibility" according to which the validity of state sovereignty depends on its compliance with global standards and requirements. The most striking example of this change would be the doctrine of Responsibility to Protect (R2P) that was introduced by the UN in 2005 and which states that in cases when a state is incapable of averting mass atrocities in its citizens, the international community is

¹⁷ Ramesh Thakur, *The United Nations, Peace and Security: From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect* 76 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2006).

¹⁸ Ian Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* 65 (8th edn., Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2008).

entitled - indeed, obligated - to step in as one: via the UN system.¹⁹

MECHANISMS OF INSTITUTIONALIZATION OF A BALANCE.

There are various mechanisms that are used by international organizations to confer sovereignty with international norms. Chapter VII of the UN Charter permits the UN Security Council to sanction coercive actions such as military intervention when any threat seen to international peace is perceived. The international criminal court (ICC), created under the Rome statute (1998) is the court that claims the jurisdiction over any individual who has allegations of genocide, war criminality, and crimes against humanity even when other national courts are not in possession of such. These mechanisms are meant to maintain justice and accountability but at the same time they bring tension between the two states who are sensitive to foreign influence in their internal matters.

Likewise, economic institutions like World Trade Organization (WTO), International Monetary Fund (IMF) have a normative voice in that they impose trade conditions and rules, which may develop domestic economic and social policies. Though these standards enhance uniformity and stability within the global system, national policy discretion might be limited especially to the developing economies which are entirely reliant on financial aid and trade opportunities.²⁰

CHALLENGES AND CRITICISMS

The statement of international norms has been frequently criticized as an embodiment of the geopolitical interests of the strong states instead of universal values. Cases Selective intervention Rwanda (1994) Kosovo (1999) Libya (2011) Politicization of international enforcement mechanisms: Selective intervention: In Kosovo (1999) and Libya (2011), the international community chose to intervene and act. Inaction: In Rwanda (1994), the international community opted not to intervene and did nothing about the crisis. Critics believe that international organization is at times a delegation of the leading powers and therefore, is contrary to sovereignty and equality that they are supposed to maintain.²¹

¹⁹ Francis Deng, *Sovereignty as Responsibility: Conflict Management in Africa* 22 (Brookings Institution, Washington D.C., 1996).

²⁰ Thomas G. Weiss and Ramesh Thakur, *Global Governance and the UN: An Unfinished Journey* 91 (Indiana University Press, Bloomington, 2010).

²¹ Anne Orford, *Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law* 57 (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2003).

Moreover, third world countries are often heard complaining that the world rules, especially those that concern trade and finance, bind them without proper representation in the rule formulation drive. These dynamics produce a hierarchical international system because, in fact, weaker states are less sovereign than powerful ones. The resultant imbalance demands institutional changes that would provide equal representation and equal enforcement of international standards.

SUGGESTIONS

- **Enhancing Thematic Coherence.**

The article ought to show thematic linkage between sections of the paper so as to ensure a smooth flow of narration. All the aspects of the discussion, including the historical development of international organizations to such aspects as inclusiveness and sovereignty, should progressively lead to another. This can be achieved by connecting paragraphs at the conclusion of each part. As an illustration, the analysis on the development of institutions can conclude with the emphasis made on how growth has also raised pertinent issues related to the aspect of representation as well as equality. It is also a method that enables the readers to track down the argument easily and it is a sign of analytical continuity rather than a disjointed discussion.

- **The use of Illustrative Case Studies.**

The paper will be made stronger through the inclusion of the brief, illustrative case studies that will relate theory with practical implementation. The role of the global policies on the national sovereignty and development can be seen through cases like the IMF conditional lending in Ghana or Argentina, the peacekeeping operations of the UN in South Sudan or WTO dispute cases with India. These examples offer physical insight of the role that international organizations have in shaping domestic policies and international relations. Bit, point-as-you-go examples in the analysis will render argument more believable and interesting, and indicative of an appreciation of the practical consequences amidst the theoretical frameworks.

- **Theoretical Perspectives Integration.**

Embedding international relations and world governance perspectives of theory is possible in the paper to enrich it. Including constructions like Realism, Liberal Institutionalism and Constructivism, offer a theoretical base on which the actions and motivations of international

organizations are evaluated. According to realism, power imbalances and dominance by developed states can be attributed to cooperation and mutual gain to Liberal Institutionalism, and of the position of shared norms and identities by constructivism. Mentioning these theories in the analysis, even in the short term, will prove the academic richness and place the paper in the context of the existing academic debates.

- **Finding a middle ground between Critical and Positive Viewpoints.**

A moderate stance between ad-praise and ad-critique will make the argument more compound and prevent biasness. Although it is worth noting the success of such organisations as UN and WHO in keeping the peace and development going, it is also quite relevant to mention the criticism of these organisations as neo-colonial and unequal. Objectivity and maturity in research is reflected in a subtle analysis that is capable of appreciating the contributions as well as limitation of the research. This balance will also empower the validity of the conclusion and allow the recommendations to be based on a balanced consideration of the topic.

- **Extending the Methodological Framework.**

The methodology should also extend beyond being strictly doctrinal to incorporate methods of comparative and analytical methodology. A comparison between the experience of developed and developing countries to the impact of international organizations will provide a deeper insight into the meaning of inclusivity and equity. Scholarly commentary should also support the research based on primary sources like UN reports, WTO judgments, and data supplied by IMF and other sources. Such integration of the doctrinal, analytical, and comparative methods will not only contribute to the increased reliability but also represent the holistic approach towards the study of the international governance in the contemporary period.

CONCLUSION

In the era of globalization, international organizations have become indispensable instruments in shaping the political, economic, and social dynamics of the world. They act as platforms for cooperation, policy coordination, and conflict resolution, fostering a sense of interdependence among states. Institutions such as the United Nations, World Trade Organization, International Monetary Fund, and World Health Organization have contributed significantly to promoting peace, trade liberalization, and global welfare. However, their functioning also reveals

persistent challenges relating to inclusivity, equitable representation, and the delicate balance between state sovereignty and global governance.

Although these organizations were founded on principles of equality and mutual cooperation, their decision-making structures often reflect power imbalances that favor developed nations. The dominance of a few powerful states in key institutions has resulted in unequal influence and decision-making authority, which frequently undermines the principle of sovereign equality. Despite these disparities, developing nations continue to engage actively within these frameworks, using them as instruments to advocate for fairer trade policies, equitable access to resources, and sustainable development opportunities.

The study further emphasizes that the legitimacy and effectiveness of international organizations increasingly depend on their ability to adapt to the realities of a multipolar world. Sovereignty today is better understood as shared responsibility rather than absolute independence, especially in addressing global challenges such as climate change, pandemics, and transnational conflicts. Therefore, reforming governance mechanisms to ensure wider participation of developing countries has become a necessity for building trust and sustaining cooperation in the global order.

In conclusion, while international organizations have achieved remarkable progress in fostering global unity and problem-solving, they must continuously evolve to remain relevant and credible. Promoting inclusivity, transparency, and accountability will strengthen their legitimacy and capacity to respond to global crises. True global governance lies not in the dominance of a few but in the collective commitment of all nations to fairness, equality, and mutual respect. Only through such shared responsibility can international organizations effectively realize their founding vision of peace, development, and justice beyond borders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brownlie, Ian, *Principles of Public International Law* (8th edn, Oxford University Press 2008)
- Deng, Francis M., *Sovereignty as Responsibility: Conflict Management in Africa* (Brookings Institution 1996)
- Keohane, Robert O., *Power and Interdependence* (3rd edn, Longman 2001)
- Krasner, Stephen D., *Sovereignty: Organized Hypocrisy* (Princeton University Press 1999)
- Orford, Anne, *Reading Humanitarian Intervention: Human Rights and the Use of Force in International Law* (Cambridge University Press 2003)
- Rodrik, Dani, *One Economics, Many Recipes: Globalization, Institutions, and Economic Growth* (Princeton University Press 2007)
- Sen, Amartya, *Development as Freedom* (Oxford University Press 1999)
- Stiglitz, Joseph E., *Globalization and Its Discontents* (W.W. Norton 2002) United Nations. Official Website. <https://www.un.org>
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). *Human Development Reports*. <https://hdr.undp.org>
- World bank. *Global Development Reports*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/wdr>
- International Monetary Fund (IMF). *Facts and Publications*. <https://www.imf.org/en/Publications>
- World Trade Organization (WTO). Official Website. <https://www.wto.org>
- World Health Organization (WHO). *Global Health Observatory Data*. <https://www.who.int/data/gho>

- United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). Reports and Statistics.
<https://unctad.org>
- Council on Foreign Relations. International Organizations Overview.
<https://www.cfr.org/international-organizations>
- Brookings Institution. Global Governance Research.
<https://www.brookings.edu/topic/global-governance/>
- International Crisis Group. Global Conflict Reports. <https://www.crisisgroup.org/>