

WHAT IS BEHIND THE INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS? NUCLEAR POWER AND GLOBALIZATION

Mario Felade Cota

Researcher in the University of Vigo

Abstract: In a series of messages to states and peoples, the former United Nations Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon outlined the challenges and serious problems that the 21st century offers to the international communities, scholars, researchers, policymakers and laypeople all around the world. Such challenges as ever-growing inequality, unperishable poverty, skyrocketing demographic rates, climate change and other issues that spread out across the planet and affected lives of billions of people can now be conquered only with the help of a globally operating, comprehensive institutional framework that international organizations may introduce. The establishment of such institutions as WTO, UN, EU and others showcased a commonly accepted belief that international organizations stand for maintaining peace and security, be it a human, economic, food or military one, and protect and represent the interests of the whole international community and not merely the needs of the states.

Keywords: challenges, peoples, states, international communities, century.

1. INTRODUCTION

The first forum that gathered heads of states throughout the world augured a new multilateral framework of conducting negotiations and decision-making at a larger scale as in 1889, the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU) hosted 157 governments. It paved the way for the other important organization, which was the League of Nations, and in the aftermath of the First World War an alliance of countries willing to bring and secure peace and stability in the world was created. Advocates for perpetual peace became the creators of a new world order as the sovereign state as a basic entity was introduced. This legacy of the very first multilateral, international mechanisms as well as earlier alliances like the Congress of Vienna back in the beginning of the 19th century, however, served more as a forum and a panel for international discussion rather than a decision- and action-making institution and actor. Nevertheless, first steps were made to promote dialogue between states on a new level and when sharing their ideas and exchanging best practices, states felt a pronounced need to institutionalize as the shift towards the protection of the common interests began taking place (Barnett, 1999).

Since then, more and more states started getting involved in not simply multilateral agreements but giving up their sovereignty for the sake of being a part of the international alliance. It became an unspoken standard to be recognized as a state if the country is a member of the United Nations and, for the proponents of the institutionalist theory; organizations based on mutual cooperation are a key to the world's survival strategy (Deutsch, 1968).

The present essay is aimed at investigating the causes why international institutions play a crucial role in shaping the current affairs' politics and stand at the forefront of the international relations, notably in the areas of world health, security, peace, economics and education. The first section will explore trends associated with globalization as the main cause of the institutionalization push and two main principles of integration and cooperation emerged out of needs of the shrinking world will be analysed (Kerikmäe, 2001). Next, the paper will cover a case study of the UNDP institution with

which the author has been collaborating for three years to demonstrate both the critique and the effectiveness of this institution within the framework of the United Nation systems (Färber, 2017). It will be concluded that international institutions guide states' behaviour towards more responsive and peaceful scenarios through the institutional framework.

2. WHAT IS BEHIND THE ORGANIZATIONS?

The creation of international organizations in order to maintain peace was one of the theories promoted by liberalist scholars whose ideas spread during the 20s of the XX century. They wanted to find an answer how it was possible for the international system to allow the rise of a war as bloody and cruel such as World War I. They claimed that was to ascribe at the absence of international organizations and international law. These two should have the task to encourage the nations to not undertake violent actions towards other countries and to protect the latter in case of violation of their rights. From the 30s to the 50s with the diffusion of realist ideas bore the 1st Great Debate in international relations (Graziatti, 2018). The realist scholars thought that international society should be based on international politics and they wanted to explain what world leaders should do maintain the world order. From their point of view the creation of international organizations and the introduction of an international law were not able to influence the world history and could not be able to prevent the occurrence of the repetitive episodes that has been always present in history such as wars and conflicts. The realist scholars accuse the liberalist scholars to live in a utopia. The burst of World War II and the successive Cold War seemed to give the victory in this debate to realism because international organizations failed to achieve their principle goal of promotion and diffusion of peace, cooperation and democracy. However, this cannot be said nowadays, one the emblematic example could be the creation of Europe Union, thanks to that, Europe is living the most peaceful period of its history. The absence of a war status among European countries seems obvious today, but it have never been forgotten how much European history has been characterized by transnational and civil wars and how much some European countries had been aggressive toward both European and not European countries based on the concept of white man's burden or just with prospect of profit.

For the purpose of peace and for a more efficient coordination in the last century the number of IOs has been growing exponentially (Haas, 1990). The States usually turn to international organizational during critical situations; those could be contracting on economic conditions or in the case of conflict. Then international organizations should give a solution that maintain the international balance or better condition to international order of the States involved. Obviously this is in theory, not always IOs are able to find the better solution or what they think is the better solution on paper then it has controversial results in reality. Scholars disagree on the degree of independence of IOs; some of them consider them just as impersonal political machinery or as a passive entity in the hands of other actors (Hawkins, 2006). On the other hand, other scholars evaluate the OIs as autonomous institutional bodies with their own agenda taking actions independently. The fundamental thing to understand is that obviously international organizations are made of States but they do not act in the interest of their nation but in a global interest, even though in some EU institutions the members are explicitly delegates who work in the interest of the sending States, this was made for reason of balance and to not give to the supranational institutions excessive power (Kerikmäe, 2012). However, inside IOs informal power can be exercised by the most powerful countries and influence decisions in their advantages. International organizations are usually technocratic institutions; they are composed by experts and bureaucrats. This means that in theory they should know which is the best solution to overcome a problem and that they are independent from an electorate. However, it also has the consequence that the will of the people could not be taken into consideration, justifying their action as necessary according to the rules or from an objective point of view and claiming their neutrality from any political influence. UN High Commission on Refugees (UNHCR) can take decisions on the conditions of the refugees in the world without consulting them and sometimes not even the countries involved in their policies, accepting passively what has already been decided. This autonomy from other institutions is probably necessary to maintain balance and take decision that does not create advantages for particular countries. This agency receives many critics because of its legalistic approach that did not consider much the consequences of their policies on refugees and states involved (Joamets, 2016).

One of the reasons why we need international organizations is because the issues that the States have to face are global, this can be seen an effect of the one of most influential phenomena of the contemporary world: Globalization. The effects of these global issues are not located in a single country, but all States, sometimes in different magnitude, are involved. The emblematic example of the current situation is climate change; in this case all the countries are affected, especially the Pacific Island Nations whose lands are constituted by small islands located in the middle of the Ocean, vulnerable to its wrath. But at the same time all the countries are responsible for this phenomenon, particularly the biggest and most

populated countries. And here the role of international organization is fundamental (Keohane, 1972); the action for the protection of the environment and the limitation of greenhouse gas and carbon dioxide emission has to be coordinated. The effort to improve environment conditions is shown by the many agreements signed by the states such as the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement and by the many governmental and non-governmental organizations established. Being all the nations in different situations the policy that each country has to create differs but the aim they have to achieve has to be the same. The problem with programs created in order to protect the environment is that many of the results they want to achieve are not visible in the short period but they should have effects on the long-term. This means that it is not easy to judge how much those programs were effective and necessary. Furthermore, the scepticism of people toward this issue, especially in the countries where its effect are not recognizable, made the application of the plans for the prevention of climate change more problematic (Kerikmäe, 2000).

The IOs took development as one of their goal, this does not include just development in economy but it's including my aspects that are related to it: human rights, education, and human security. Many of the policies that have development as purpose are usually directed to particular areas but promoted and reached through a global effort. The Millennium Development Goals is a plan issued by UN that consists in eight goals to be achieved up to 2015. Among the goals there were to eliminate extreme poverty and hunger, improve education and gender equality, and fight HIV/AIDS and other diseases. Being this plan extremely ambitious it has not been completely fulfilled but it was crucial to improve the conditions in there the plan has been realized (Monroy Pérez, 2016).

3. NUCLEAR ENERGY AND GLOBALIZATIONS

The atom has become a major reason for the necessity of IOs in order to prevent its misuse and virtually prohibit its utilization by states since its power is an unstoppable force capable of wiping out life on Earth in general. If WWII were to occur, it would be atomic and the chances for life on the surface of Earth would come under threat of extinction. The focus of reaction to this threat came from civil community and protest-groups that called the international community and organization to act before it became too late. The eruption of international terrorism and its menacing philosophies that know little boundaries in combination with the nuclear threat are global reasons for the necessity of IOs (Tanel, 2015).

The anti-nuclear protests resulted in the international statutes and IOs that exist to prevent an unrepairable devastation. The first utilization of nuclear weapons shows the alarming need for regulation. The combined estimated casualties in Hiroshima and Nagasaki account for more than 200,000 deaths. Notably, only two bombs were necessary to reach such a disaster. The U.S. community was the first one to launch anti-nuclear protests in the 1960s. The international media helped spread the word and other nation's commenced protests. As a result, the international community has arrived at the conclusion that an international organization was necessary in order to regulate the matter. The Treaty on Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) was concluded in 1968 and entered into force in 1970. It is the only disarmament treaty that has gained so much ratification and positive responses from the states: 191 countries signed and ratified the document. However, the exit of North Korea from the treaty and the recent failure at coming to a consensus on the NPT's review in 2015 shows that the strength of the international commitment to resolve the matter has weakened. Nonetheless, there are multiple IOs that exist to prevent misuse of nuclear weapons and the research of nuclear energy for military purposes. They include the IAEA, the ATOM Project, Global Zero, and others (Troitiño, 2015). Despite the indecisiveness in the matter of total global nuclear disarmament and non-proliferation, the existing 70 years of international peace and non-usage of the weapons shows somewhat of a solidarity of states on the matter and effectiveness of IOs in trying to maintain the issue. Had there been no civic response and no intrusions of IOs in the matter, the prospective utilization of nuclear weapons would have been very likely.

In addition to the nuclear hazard, terrorism erupted as a new threat to global order and human security, which requires IOs to respond to and prevent the matter. Unfortunately, another disaster was necessary to shift the international community's gaze towards prevention of terrorism and its containment. The 9/11 catastrophe shook the entire world and resulted in the activation of international relations that focused on preventing terrorist acts and eradicating terrorism. The IO that presides over international terrorism prevention issues is the UN Security Council, which concluded a significant international statute that forces its parties to invest in the matter. Resolution 1373 incorporates broad and mandatory counterterrorism mechanisms and instruments. "1373 requires that states implement a wide range of counterterrorism measures in such areas as financial regulation, migration and customs controls, and arms transfers, while calling for cooperation in law enforcement and extradition" (Russett, 1999). These and other areas of counterterrorism matters become only possible through the activities of IOs. Notably, the CTITF currently includes more than two dozens of IOs

that are tasked with diverse functions to suppress, prevent, and counter international and national terrorist organizations (Troitiño, 2013). The hazard of terrorism lies in its radical aggressive philosophies that know no boundaries on the way to reaching its goals. Terrorism seeks out to use weapons of mass destruction, nuclear weapons included, to reach the dominance of their philosophies in a specific region or the world. Terrorist accounts of 9/11, Belgium, France, Britain, Russia, and the US reveal the alarming danger of terrorism and shows that only through IOs and international cooperation is counterterrorism possible.

Considering the aforementioned, IOs are crucial to raising the effectiveness of international cooperation to protect the human security and maintain world order. Nuclear weapons and terrorism philosophies are evil in their foundation and their utilization can only result in destruction and not prosperity (Kerikmäe, 2018). No state alone, unfortunately, is able to influence or counter these two matters. IOs have the capacity to coordinate states and their activity in diverse fields to address these two matters more effectively. Otherwise, the world would not be able to cope with these problems.

4. CONCLUSION

International organizations provide us with some possibility of co-decision in the areas of international affairs, and it is definitely beneficial for states to be part of international organizations. Some international organizations provide us with room for our own development and development of a certain part of the world, such as the European Union, there are organizations providing security states, human rights organizations, health organizations, etc. All of these organizations provide us with a room for discussion that can be attended by all member states, giving us the possibility of co-decision and achieving better results than bilateral agreements or no contracts.

But we must take into account the size of the states and their power to survive in the international system. If we look, for example, in the countries of Central and Eastern Europe after the collapse of communist regimes, these states were weak, with a low degree of opportunity to influence world affairs. They also worried about the possibility of aggression on the part of their former ally, the Russian Federation, which, during the 1990s, was in the midst of the crisis, could threaten the security and sovereignty of its former satellites. These states tried to get to the European Union as quickly as they saw a certain perspective in it, states trying to regain their place in Europe that had before the World War II (Troitiño, 2013). For example, in the case of Czechoslovakia, later in the Czech Republic, the political leaders tried to regain their place in the field of Europe under the motto "Back to Europe". On the other hand, when we look at the situation of the powers or large states capable of taking care of themselves both in economic and security, I do not think it is important for them to be part of certain international organizations. These countries, at least in my opinion, have the ability to set rules without having to be part of international organizations because their power and influence is so great that they cannot be ignored within the international system.

That is why I think it is almost imperative for small- and medium-sized states to be part of international organizations because they only have the opportunity to co-decide on important issues. Big states do not have to be part of international organizations, but if they want to act with other states on one level and take them on their own, they should be part of international organizations. An example may be the negotiated Transatlantic Trade and Investment Partnership between the United States and the European Union. This treaty aims to remove the trade barriers between these two world powers (Troitiño, 2017), and would probably not be broken down between the US and European countries unless they were unified into a transnational international organization. Moreover, in the case of bargaining, individual Member States can influence the process and thus gain the necessary position in the world hierarchy, which would not have been granted without this international organization.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (1998). Why states act through formal international organizations. *Journal of conflict resolution*, 42(1), 3-32.
- [2] Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (1999). The politics, power, and pathologies of international organizations. *International organization*, 53(4), 699-732.
- [3] Deutsch, K. W. (1968). *The analysis of international relations* (Vol. 12). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [4] Färber, K. Et al, (2017). Mitterrand and the Great European Design—From the Cold War to the European Union. *Baltic Journal of European Studies*, 7(2), 132-147.

- [5] Graziatti, L. V. (2018). The Treaty of Rome EEC and EURATOM 1957. *ABC Research Alert*, 5(3).
- [6] Haas, E. B. (1990). *When knowledge is power: Three models of change in international organizations* (Vol. 22). Univ of California Press.
- [7] Hawkins, D. G., Lake, D. A., Nielson, D. L., & Tierney, M. J. (Eds.). (2006). *Delegation and agency in international organizations*. Cambridge University Press.
- [8] Joamets, K., & Kerikmäe, T. (2016). European Dilemmas of the Biological versus Social Father: The Case of Estonia. *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics*, 9(2), 23-42.
- [9] Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1972). *Transnational relations and world politics*. Harvard University Press.
- [10] Kerikmäe, T., & Gräzin, I. (2000). *Euroopa Liit ja õigus*. Õiguskirjastus.
- [11] Kerikmäe, T. (2001). Eesti parlamendi roll pärast liitumist Euroopa Liiduga. *Riigikogu Toimetised*, 4, 128-133.
- [12] Kerikmäe, T., & Nyman-Metcalf, K. (2012). Less is more or more is more? Revisiting universality of human rights. *International and Comparative Law Review*, 12(1), 39-56.
- [13] Kerikmäe, T., Chochia, A., Troitiño, D. R., & Hrebickova, A. (2018). The First Attempts to Unify Europe for Specific Purposes and British Flexibility. In *Brexit* (pp. 21-32). Springer, Cham.
- [14] Monroy Pérez, J. C., & Troitiño, D. R. (2016). El idioma estonio y la influencia geopolítica sobre su desarrollo. *Onomázein*, (33).
- [15] Tanel, K., & Sandra, S. (2015). Legal Impediments in the EU to New Technologies in the Example of E-Residency. *Baltic Journal of Law & Politics*, 8(2), 71-90.
- [16] Russett, B. M., & Oneal, J. R. (1999). *Triangulating peace: Democracy, interdependence, and international organizations* (Vol. 9). Norton.
- [17] Troitiño, D. R. (2013). *European Integration: Building Europe* (European Political, Economic, and Security Issues). Nova Science Publishers Incorporated.
- [18] Troitino, D. (2013). European Identity the European People and the European Union. *Sociology and Anthropology*, 1(3), 135-140.
- [19] Troitiño, D. R. (2015). Europs Parlamentas: praetis, dabartis ir ateitis. *Teisės apžvalga*, (1 (11)), 5-24.
- [20] Troitiño, D. R., & Ballesteros, M. D. L. P. P. (2017). El modelo de integración europea de Churchill. *Revista de Occidente*, (433), 57-71.