Table of Contents

What are international organisations?

- They participate in global governance, but so do other entities that are not IOs – e.g. large companies
- Inter-governmental organisations (IGOs) Definition- Include 3 or more countries, founded by an international agreement, typically includes representatives that get together a few times a year plus a secretariat which is supposedly above national interests and does the organisational work (it performs ongoing tasks related to a common purpose).
- Alternative definitions include international non-government organizations (INGOs) are playing and increasingly large role
- Union of International Associations (UIA), founded in 1907 in Belgium, catalogues international organisations in a year book – defines what constitutes an international organisation and tabulates how many there are each yr. UIA Yearbook is the conventional measure of what counts as an IO, recognised by the United Nations

There has been a steady increase in the number and scope of IOs and INGOs - ´Union of International Associations (2017): 37,000 active IGOs and INGOs globally across 300 countries & territories
- Approximately 1,200 are added every year

Why form international organisations?

- (Neo) Liberal-Institutionalists -International Organisations (IOs) emerge when complex interdependencies push states into international cooperation to further <u>common</u> interests (the 'problem condition' – recognition that there is a problem that cannot be solved solely by one or two state)
- Idealist/Constructivists - depends also on the realisation that these interdependencies lead to problems which can only be overcome through <u>cooperation</u> within IOs and more broadly in terms of international relations (the 'cognitive condition' - there is an awareness. We have a problem, how do we cooperate to solve). Need of cooperation between all states to change behaviour of particular states to overcome certain problems.
- Realists –IOs only emerge out of out of complex interdependencies when a hegemonic state decides to create one and is willing to bear the costs of their creation (the 'hegemonic condition')

Principal-agent debates – in week 2 readings

"Principal-Agent (PA) Analysis builds on theories of Rational Choice and Representation, through this framework IO's are understood as "agents" of states who are "principals" IOs abide in the interest of the states - To what extent to IO operate autonomously from states and to what extent do they become like states "principles" (direct states that become their "agents")

- PA analysis is concerned with whether agents are responsible delegates of their principals (the states), or whether they engage in 'mission-creep' and pursue their own preferences (their own behavious and overtime things such as UN security council is now an international law maker which was not originally its role) (e.g. World bank and IMF have been accused of following its own agenda that is not necessarily in the interest of all its members but just certain hegemonic interests such as US, EU and Jap.
- PA analysis also concerned with how principals (states) construct mechanisms to keep their agents (IOs) 'honest' – to what extent have they become actors in their own right in the international system. This depends on which IO you look at and which issue area. States done really have a lot of control.
- **The PA framework provides a means of treating (analyising) IOs as actors in their own right with their own independent interests and capabilities** – depends on the IO you look at, they are all so different.
- The problem with applying principal agent analysis to the study of IO's is that it requires a priori theoretical specifications of what IO's want. Principal- agent dynamics are fuelled by the disjuncture between what agents want and what principals want (they can't be identical" ?)
- Barnett and Finnemore 1999, p.705

Why form and delegate to IOs?

- The benefits of delegation – there is a problem condition, and you understand the need for some international organisation. States cannot necessarily agree do to many different interests usually very complex issues between many states - so you can delegate the responsibility to an IO.
- Managing policy externalities – the need for a coordination agent to resolve dilemmas (such as climate change) need to give them considerable discretion to enforce cooperation between the states control
- Facilitating collective decision making – coordinating
- Resolving disputes
- Enhancing credibility - time inconsistency problems. There are many areas where long term interests are not aligned with short-term interests. Delegating makes it easier to move policy in desired direction despite have short-term costs or not being publicly popular in short run – although has been used to shift blame from government to IO's despite their true intentions
- Creating policy bias- 'lock-in' – establish an internation regime that sets up a coordinating principle and standard of behaviour. You lock in an ideological/policy bias. E.G. Washington concensus – principles locked into certain IO's (spreading liberal democracy and free trade) – forcing people to abide by particular ideological principles – not allowing states to do what is necessary for their own country in the name of abiding by particular rules.

Democratic deficit

- To what extent are IO's representatives of the principles, to what extent do they act in their own right. Who elects them and how representative are they
- Key element of the argument (based on sociology and max weber) - "the rational-legal authority that IO's embody gives them power independent of states that created them and channels that power in particular directions".
- Bureaucracies make rules, but in doing so they create social knowledge. They define shared international tasks (like 'development'), create and define new categories of actors (like refugee, what classifies as one), create new interests for actor (like 'promoting human rights'), and transfer models of political organisation around the world (like markets and democracy)" - Barnett and Finnemore 1999, p 699
- "….for some observers, IO's appear to be institutional Frankensteins terrorizing the global countryside. (we created this institution but it is now terrorizing the states) Crated by their masters, they have slipped their restraints and now run amok. But for others, IO's seem to obey their masters all too well. Like the man behind the curtain in the Wizard of Oz, powerful Western countries use IO's to impose their will on the world while hiding behind the façade of legitimising multilateral processes. Finally, other analysts claim that many IO's once served the purposes of their creators but were subsequently hijacked by other political actors to pursue undesirable ends. IO's become double agents, betraying their original purposes in serving new masters."- Hawkins, Lake Nielson and Tierney, 2006, p.4 in your readings for next week

Week 2 Lecture: IOs as Problem Solvers In International Relations

Globalization & Sovereignty
What kind of sovereignty is threatened by globalisation and IO's, if any?
If states are unwilling to give away sovereignty, what role does this leave for IOs?

Review: Sovereignty – from readings (Stephen Krasner 1999). Four dimensions of sovereignty:
1. International Legal Sovereignty – formal recognition by community of states
2. Westphalian Sovereignty – actual and formal exclusion of outside actors in the domestic authority structures of states
3. Domestic Sovereignty – ability of state to exercise authority within borders
4. Interdependence Sovereignty – ability of states to regulate what crosses borders (people arms, pollutants etc.)

Three Views on Globalisation
1. Hyperglobalists – globalisation is inevitable, and it is changing the world, there is s steady progression of integration and eventually nation states will seize to exist – Thomas Friedman: The golden straight jacket, the electronic herd, the flat world
2. Skeptics – globalisation is nothing new, has always been around and states will continue to exist – Realists: Power determines state behaviour and it always will
3. Transformationalists – globalisation is forcing change, but the direction is indeterminate – John Ruggie: Globalisation is forcing an unbundling of the relationship between sovereignty, territoriality and state power

Globalization & Sovereignty
- Interdependence Sovereignty – globalisation makes it increasingly difficult for states to control what crosses their borders.
- International Legal Sovereignty – little evidence that globalisation is undermining this dimension of sovereignty.
- Westphalian Sovereignty – challenges come from international institutions (e.g. IMF), multinational corporations, and regional organisations (e.g. EU).
- Domestic Sovereignty – International rules and standards (IOs), creating a democratic deficit domestically.

Theories

Why Theory?
- 'Theorizing fits individual events and case into larger patterns, allowing us to generalize about global politics' (Mansbach and Taylor 2012: 3). ´
- 'A theory … is an intellectual construct that helps one to select facts and interpret them in such a way as to facilitate explanation and prediction concerning regularities and recurrences or repetitions of observed phenomena' (Viotti and Kauppi 1999: 3). ´
- 'Theory at its simplest is reflective thought' (Brown with Ainley 2005: 7). ´
- 'A theory is a picture, mentally formed of a bounded realm or domain of activity. A theory is a depiction of the organization of a domain and of the connections among it parts' (Waltz 1979: 8).

Classical realism
- Thucydides, Machiavelli, Hobbes, E. H. Carr, Morgenthau…
- Anarchy and power.
- State-centered but focused on the individual
- The statesman ('who must meet a certain problem of foreign policy under certain circumstances', Morgenthau 1948: 4).

Neorealism
- Provides system-level analysis (hence structural realism).
- Kenneth Waltz: Man, the State and War (1959) and Theory of International Politics (1979).
- From unit level to systems level.
- Balance of power. Unipolarity, bipolarity, multipolarity.

Classical Liberalism
- Human nature has a positive potential. not just self-interestedas realism would suggest
- Humans can be rational, and rationality is good but
- Self-interest is not necessarily antagonistic, and co-operation is possible.