INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS ARE CREATED BY STATES TO FURTHER INTEREST BUT THEY HAVE NOW ASSUMED AUTHORITY INDEPENDENT OF THE STATES THAT CREATED THEM: *THE ANALYSIS OF PROS AND CONS*

SUNDAY ORINYA, PhD
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, FEDERAL UNIVERSITY LAFIA, sundayorinya@yahoo.com

BADAMASI SAIDU, PHD
DEPARTMENT OF POLITICAL SCIENCE, FEDERAL UNIVERSITY BIRNIN KEBBI, badamasi.saidu@fubk.edu.ng

KEYWORDS
International organizations, state, conflict, management, and national interest

ABSTRACT
International organizations (IOs) are established by sovereign states to promote cooperation, address global challenges, and advance shared interests. However, over time, many IOs have evolved beyond their original mandates, exercising authority independent of their member states. This paper analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of this phenomenon. On the positive side, IOs facilitate global governance by setting norms, resolving disputes, and addressing transnational issues such as climate change, security, and human rights. Their independence allows them to act impartially, free from national interests, fostering long-term stability and cooperation. IOs also provide expertise, technical assistance, and funding to weaker states, promoting development and international peace. Conversely, the increasing autonomy of IOs raises concerns about accountability and democratic legitimacy. States may find themselves bound by decisions that conflict with national interests or policies, leading to tensions between sovereignty and global governance. Bureaucratic inefficiencies, political biases, and unequal power distribution within IOs further complicate their effectiveness. Some critics argue that IOs can be influenced by powerful states or private actors, undermining their neutrality. This paper concludes that while IOs serve as essential mechanisms for international cooperation, their authority must be balanced with accountability and responsiveness to the states that created them. Strengthening oversight, improving transparency, and ensuring equitable participation can help mitigate the downsides of their independence while preserving their role in global governance. Understanding the evolving nature of IOs is crucial for ensuring that they continue to serve the collective interests of the international community.

Introduction

Important actors in the international political arena are international organisations (IOs), which are set up by states to coordinate activities, promote shared goals, and address shared challenges. Historically, states have established these groups to further their own goals while maintaining significant control over their operations. However, new research indicates that many IOs have evolved to exercise authority and autonomy beyond the objectives of their founding nations, raising doubts about their role in managing international disputes.

Discussions on how well IOs manage international disputes have increased in tandem with this growth. Studies such as Abbott and Snidal (1998) and Barnett and Finnemore (2024) demonstrate how IOs gain credibility and authority through their expertise, objectivity, and normative frameworks. Critics counter that these same factors could result in politicisation, inefficiency, and a lack of interest in member state interests (Keohane & Martin, 1995). Despite the fact that IO autonomy has been extensively studied, numerous issues remain regarding the specific factors that affect its ability to effectively handle international conflicts.

First, whereas prior research has extensively examined the procedural and structural constraints of IOs, less attention has been paid to how these constraints interact with external geopolitical factors (Hurd, 2011). Second, the impact of member state power disparities on IOs' decision-making processes has not received adequate attention. Third, the impact of resource availability, including financial and human capital, on the operational capacity of IOs has not been thoroughly examined. Fourth, there hasn't been much empirical study on how disputing parties' perceptions of IOs' legitimacy affect their ability to mediate and resolve disputes. Finally, the growing influence of non-state actors, including multinational corporations and non-governmental organisations, on the conflict management strategies of IOs has not been adequately covered in the literature (Tallberg et al., 2013). This study aims to fill these gaps by examining five important factors that affect how international organisations function in conflict management: non-state actors, perceived legitimacy, power disparities, resource availability, and geopolitical pressures. By addressing these factors, the study seeks to provide a thorough understanding of the complexities and limitations of IOs in contemporary international conflict management.

2.0 Research Questions

This paper will provide answers to this research problem:

Do international organizations assume authority independent of the states that created them?

3.0 Conceptual Clarification

This section clarifies some concepts that are related to the demand of the paper.

3.1 International Organization

International organisations, according to Karns and Mingst (2021, p. 34), are organisations created by treaties or agreements between two or more countries to work on matters of shared interest, such as economic development, peace, security, or humanitarian help. International organisations are official institutional structures established by nations or other entities to promote coordination and collaboration on regional or global challenges, claims Pease (2018, p. 91). According to him, international organisations are treaty-established groups of member nations that work together to accomplish specific goals on a global scale. According to Hurd (2020), these organisations serve as conduits for global collaboration, bringing together governments, non-governmental organisations, and other stakeholders to tackle cross-border issues such as trade, human rights, and climate change. According to this paper, international organisations are multilateral establishments established by formal agreements that allow governments to coordinate on a variety of global challenges and manage common interests.

3.2 The Notion of State

In international relations, the term "state" refers to the state as the main actor in the system, with sovereignty, territorial limits, a permanent population, and a government that can interact with other states. The study of international politics and the relationships between countries are based on this idea

(Ochoga and Shishi, 2024). The main components of the state concept in international relations are listed below. According to the conclusions of this study, a state is deemed sovereign when it has the final say over its internal affairs and is not subject to outside intervention. A fundamental component of the contemporary international order, sovereignty was established by the Peace of Westphalia (1648).

The power of a state to implement its own laws and policies without outside permission is another argument made in this article. Geographical borders are what define states, and international law recognises that these borders are untouchable. The idea that no state should impose its will on another state's borders is one example. A political entity needs to be accepted by other states and international organisations in order to be regarded as a state in the context of international relations. Its sovereignty and diplomatic abilities are validated by this acknowledgement. According to these documents, a state is the only entity with the authority to employ or permit the use of force to uphold law and order within its borders. Statehood and governance depend on this. According to the paper's conclusion, state authority is upheld by national militaries and police forces. According to conventional views of international relations, such as realism, states are the primary actors influencing world politics while pursuing their own national interests. States pursuing their goals through alliances, treaties, or wars.

4.0 Theoretical Framework

The functionalism theory of David Mitrany is applied in this work. The functionalism theory of David Mitrany provides an engaging theoretical framework for comprehending the rationale behind the establishment of international organisations. Functionalism, which has its roots in the desire to advance world peace and stability, contends that the necessity to address particular, real-world issues that cut across national borders is what motivates the creation of international organisations. According to this approach, rather than through broad political unions, states should cooperate through specialised institutions that concentrate on technical and economic matters. According to Mitrany, functional cooperation in fields like communication, transportation, and health could promote interdependence and trust between countries, progressively lowering the risk of conflict (Mitrany, 1943).

According to the notion, states form cooperative habits that can spread to other domains as they work together to address shared issues. A fundamental idea, the "spillover effect" illustrates how accomplishments in one functional area can result in additional integration and the establishment of other international organisations to handle new demands. A practical approach to international affairs is also reflected in functionalism. It places more emphasis on problem-solving effectiveness and efficiency than on ideological or political disagreements. This strategy is demonstrated by the establishment of institutions such as the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) and the World Health Organisation (WHO), which use cooperation and technological know-how to address particular global issues. Regardless of the political complications of state sovereignty, these organisations represent the functionalist ideal of creating institutions to manage common interests.

Functionalism's detractors contend that it undervalues how national interests and power politics shape international cooperation. They argue that states frequently put their strategic objectives ahead of operational effectiveness, which can impede the formation or efficacy of international organisations. Functionalism offers important insights into the gradual and practical processes that underpin the establishment of international organisations, notwithstanding these criticisms.

In conclusion, Mitrany's functionalism theory is still a useful framework for researching the motivations for the establishment of international organisations. It emphasises how crucial it is to solve real-world problems cooperatively, promote interdependence, and establish institutions that put functioning ahead of politics. The study of international relations and the function of international organisations in global governance are still influenced by this viewpoint. Thus, if international organisations do function independently of the states that established them, this theory aids in explaining how they are established.

5.0 The Evolution of International Organizations

Over time, international organisations have changed dramatically in response to shifts in the political, economic, and social landscape of the world. Their evolution is a reflection of humanity's combined efforts to resolve international conflicts and promote collaboration. Their development through historical periods, significant turning points, and theoretical foundations is traced in this critical examination. Early civilisations devised crude forms of international collaboration, which is where international organisations got their start. The foundation for collective decision-making was established by alliances and treaties between city-states, such as the Delian League in ancient Greece. Likewise, early attempts at global government were demonstrated by religious councils such as the ecumenical councils of the Catholic Church (Buzan & Lawson, 2015). The emergence of formalised international organisations in the 19th century was a watershed. One example of an attempt to keep the peace through diplomacy was the Concert of Europe (1815), which was founded following the Napoleonic Wars. A rising understanding of the necessity of multilateral cooperation is reflected in the emergence of organisations such as the Universal Postal Union (1874) and the International Telecommunication Union (1865) to handle technological and economic issues (Claude, 1964).

Due to the damage caused by two world wars and the need for world stability, international organisations saw a remarkable expansion in the 20th century. The first international political organisation created with the goal of preserving peace was the League of Nations (1920), but its lack of success made clear the necessity for more robust institutions.

A pillar of contemporary international relations, the United Nations was founded in 1945 as a result of World War II. To address certain global concerns, specialised organisations such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Health Organisation (WHO) were established. As international collaboration became more complex, regional organisations like the African Union (AU) and the European Union (EU) also arose (Keohane & Nye, 1977). A unipolar world order emerged with the conclusion of the Cold War, and international organisations had to adjust to new issues like terrorism, environmental disasters, and globalisation. To better control international trade, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) was superseded by the World Trade Organisation (WTO) in 1995.

International organisations are criticised in the twenty-first century for their alleged inadequacies and lack of inclusivity. The calls for reform of the United Nations Security Council demonstrate the demand for more representation from emerging states. Global governance is also increasingly influenced by non-state players, such as non-governmental organisations and multinational companies (Barnett & Finnemore, 2004). International organisations' development is a reflection of humanity's persistent attempts to overcome shared difficulties. Even if they have significantly aided in the security and advancement of the world, their future rests on responding to critiques and changing with the times. Gaining knowledge of their development from theoretical and historical viewpoints helps one better understand their function in modern international relations. The purpose of international organisations is the main topic of the next section.

6.0 Why International organizations are created

In order to solve global issues, promote international collaboration, and further shared goals that cut across national borders, international organisations are essential. These organisations were founded for a number of reasons, all of which help to build a more secure, wealthy, and just world. The main justifications for its founding are listed below, along with more details:

(1) Encouraging security and peace

Maintaining world peace and security is one of the main goals of international organisations. The United Nations (UN), which was founded in the wake of World War II, emphasises the need of teamwork in averting future hostilities. By giving countries a forum for discussion, the UN promotes understanding between them and allows for diplomatic dispute resolution. The UN and related organisations aid in reducing violence, safeguarding vulnerable populations, and reconstructing war-torn areas through peacekeeping operations, disarmament

programs, and conflict resolution techniques (Barnett & Finnemore, 2024). The crucial role that international organisations play in maintaining world peace is demonstrated by the fact that UN peacekeepers have played a significant role in stabilising areas such as South Sudan and Mali.

(2) Promoting Development and Economic Cooperation:

International relations is based on economic stability, and institutions like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are leading the charge to promote economic growth and collaboration. For countries dealing with economic difficulties, these organisations offer crucial financial support, technical know-how, and policy recommendations. For example, the World Bank provides funding for major development initiatives like infrastructure upgrades and programs to reduce poverty, while the IMF assists nations in resolving balance-of-payments difficulties. International economic organisations guarantee that economic advancement benefits a wider range of society by facilitating trade agreements and promoting sustainable development in addition to providing financial support (Keohane & Nye, 1977)..

(3) Dealing with International Concerns

Global issues that frequently cut over national boundaries and call for concerted international responses include pandemics, climate change, and human rights abuses. By combining resources, knowledge, and data to fight diseases, organisations such as the World Health Organisation (WHO) are essential in addressing public health emergencies. For instance, the WHO organised global efforts to transmit important health advice and provide vaccines during the COVID-19 pandemic (Wendt, 1999). Similar to this, groups like the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) emphasise our shared responsibility to protect the earth by fighting environmental deterioration through international accords like the Paris Accord.

(4) Regulation and Standardisation

International organisations create and implement standards across a range of industries to guarantee uniformity and effectiveness in a world that is increasingly interconnected. For example, the International Civil Aviation Organisation (ICAO) develops and manages international aviation regulations, guaranteeing the dependability and safety of air transport. These uniform rules make it easier to conduct business internationally, lowering risks and promoting international confidence. Finnemore, 2024; Barnett, M. In a similar vein, institutions such as the World Trade Organisation (WTO) set rules for international trade, guaranteeing ethical behaviour and settling trade disputes to preserve financial stability.

(5) Making Humanitarian Aid Stronger

Natural disasters, armed wars, and refugee crises are examples of humanitarian crises that need for prompt, concerted international action. In order to provide afflicted communities with life-saving assistance, such as food, medical attention, and shelter, organisations such as the International Red Cross and Red Crescent Societies are crucial. Their efforts serve as an example of how crucial international cooperation is to reducing human suffering (Barnett & Finnemore, 2024). International humanitarian organisations, for instance, mobilised resources to support millions of displaced people during the Syrian refugee crisis, illustrating the crucial importance of their efforts.

(6) Encouraging Education and Cultural Exchange

Collaboration in education and culture promotes respect and understanding between countries. Global literacy is promoted, scientific research is encouraged, and cultural heritage places are protected by organisations such as the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO). UNESCO helps communities come together by supporting initiatives that celebrate variety and cross-cultural interaction. The common obligation to protect humanity's natural and cultural assets for future generations is highlighted by programs like the World Heritage Sites initiative. It is understandable why Ochoga and Shishi (2024) contend that the creation of multinational organisations is a reflection of the interdependence of the contemporary world and the necessity of teamwork in tackling common issues. These organisations are essential to building a more just, sustainable,

and cooperative global society because they do everything from upholding peace and stimulating economic growth to advancing cultural understanding and providing humanitarian aid. Their efforts highlight the value of cooperation in a world growing more interconnected by fostering international trust while advancing common objectives of peace, prosperity, and sustainability. The reason why states establish international organisations but they function freely is examined in the following section.

6.0 International Organizations: Created by States but Operating Independently

Formal entities created by agreements between governments to handle common issues and goals are known as international organisations (IOs). Despite being established by states, these organisations frequently function rather independently of their original members. Understanding the conflict between IO autonomy and state creation is essential to comprehending their function and role in global governance. This essay examines the establishment and functioning of IOs, emphasising the conflict between organisational independence and governmental authority. Through treaties or agreements that specify the organization's goals, composition, and authorities, states establish international organisations. For instance, in 1945, 51 founding member nations signed the United Nations Charter, creating the United Nations (UN) (United Nations, 2023).

Likewise, the 1994 Marrakesh Agreement gave rise to the World Trade Organisation (WTO) (World Trade Organisation, n.d.). These founding agreements, which offer a framework for collaboration and coordination, frequently represent the interests of states as a whole. IOs are set up by states to: address transboundary issues including trade, security, and climate change that call for coordinated action; provide platforms for discussion and conflict resolution; and combine resources and expertise to accomplish shared objectives. Even though they were established by nations, many IOs have enough autonomy to carry out their tasks on their own.

A number of variables help to support this independence: International Organisations' Independence: A Functional and Legal Analysis Despite being unique actors under international law, international organisations (IOs) are bodies established by governments through treaties. Their independence is derived from certain characteristics that set them apart from the states that create them, including legal personhood, functional autonomy, and treaty-based foundations. With the use of instances and court rulings, this section explains why IOs are regarded as independent of states.

(i) Personality in Law

According to international law, international organisations have legal personality, which enables them to take action apart from their member nations. In the 1949 case of Reparations for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) clearly stated this idea. According to Reparations for Injuries Suffered in the Service of the United Nations (1949), the International Court of Justice (ICJ) confirmed that the United Nations (UN) has an international legal personality apart from its members, enabling it to enter into treaties, hold property, and pursue legal claims on its own. Stated differently, a large number of IOs are endowed with legal personality under international law, which allows them to make contracts, possess property, and act independently (Schermers & Blokker, 2021). The UN's independence is demonstrated by its capacity to engage in negotiations and reach agreements with both member and non-member states. The Treaty on European Union (TEU) grants legal personality to regional organisations such as the European Union (EU), allowing them to enact laws, enforce existing ones, and engage in international legal frameworks (Consolidated Version of the Treaty on European Union, 2012, Art. 47).

(ii) Treaties of Foundation

Binding international treaties that specify their goals, composition, and methods of operation create international organisations. These agreements guarantee that member governments are unable to directly regulate the organization's daily operations. Such agreements' legal standing is strengthened by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969), which emphasises that they are governed by international law (United Nations, 1969). The World Health Organisation (WHO) functions in accordance with its Constitution, which outlines its jurisdiction to take action on global health concerns without reference to the

instructions of member states. Without requesting unanimous agreement from member nations, this autonomy has allowed the WHO to coordinate global responses and issue guidelines in response to pandemics like COVID-19.

(iii). Independence in Function

For IOs to successfully carry out their responsibilities, functional independence is necessary. Even if not specifically stated in their founding treaties, IOs are supported in exercising their autonomy in carrying out actions required for their operations by the doctrine of implied powers, which was acknowledged by the ICJ in the Certain Expenses of the United Nations case (1962) (Certain Expenses of the United Nations, 1962). By deciding which member governments should receive financial aid, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) demonstrates its operational independence. Economic evaluations, not political factors, are used to make decisions like loan conditions, guaranteeing efficiency and fairness.

(iv). Neutrality and Non-Intrusion

The fundamental ideas of impartiality and neutrality shield IOs from outside interference. To protect the organization's independence, Article 100 of the UN Charter expressly forbids the Secretary-General and employees from asking for or accepting orders from any country or outside authority (United Nations, 1945). By resolving conflicts between states only on the basis of international law, outside of the influence of individual member states, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) is a prime example of this neutrality. The legitimacy of its rulings and the confidence of the global community are strengthened by its impartiality.

(v). Financial Independence

One essential component of an IO's operational autonomy is financial independence. The potential of undue influence by any one-member state is decreased by the fact that many organisations maintain a variety of financing sources, such as assessed contributions, voluntary donations, and other revenue streams. Financial Independence: By raising money through fees, contributions, or other sources, IOs can become less dependent on member states. For instance, user fees and assessments are used to finance the International Civil Aviation Organization's (ICAO) operations (ICAO, n.d.). Funding for the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) comes from both voluntary donations from outside sources and assessed contributions from member states. The IAEA is able to independently monitor non-proliferation agreement compliance and fulfil its mission of promoting the peaceful use of nuclear energy because to its broad financing base.

(vi). State Practice and Judicial Precedents

The independence of international organisations has been strengthened by court rulings and consistent state policies. The independence of IOs has been maintained by courts and tribunals, which highlight their ability to act freely within their purview. In matters under its purview, the European Court of Justice (ECJ) has continuously maintained that EU law supersedes national laws. This legal framework emphasises the EU's sovereignty by preventing member states from unilaterally undermining its legislative and judicial processes (Case 6/64, Costa v. ENEL, 1964).

(vii) Frameworks for Institutions

IOs frequently have executive agencies that operate apart from its member states, such the European Commission or the UN Secretariat (Barnett & Finnemore, 2024).

(viii) Methods of Making Decisions

Voting procedures used by certain IOs weaken the authority of individual states. For example, both permanent and rotating members participate in the UN Security Council's decision-making process, whereas the International Monetary Fund (IMF) employs a weighted voting method. For multinational organisations to operate successfully in the global arena, their independence is essential. Their position as separate bodies under international law is established by their legal identity, treaty-based frameworks, functional autonomy, neutrality, financial independence, and judicial recognition. Because of their independence, IOs are able to carry out their mandates in an unbiased manner, guaranteeing their efficacy in tackling global issues. Therefore, whether or not there are conflicts between nations and international organisations as a result of independence is discussed in the next section.

7.0 Tensions Between States and International Organizations

Tensions with their member states are frequently brought on by IO independence, especially when organisational decisions go against national interests. These conflicts show up in a number of ways:

a. Sovereignty Concerns: When decisions are legally binding, like in the case of WTO dispute rulings, states may view IOs' independent activities as an infringement on their sovereignty (Ochoga and Shishi, 2024).

b. responsibility Concerns: Since IOs are not directly liable to national governments or citizens, their autonomy raises concerns over responsibility.

c. Resource Dependency: Although IOs strive for financial autonomy, a large number of them rely on states' voluntary contributions, which could give them power over significant contributors. Examples of Cases

   a. (a). United Nations: Without direct oversight by any one of its member states, the UN's peacekeeping operations frequently function autonomously, allocating staff and supplies. Conflicts have occasionally resulted from this operational independence, including complaints about peacekeeping shortcomings (Bellamy & Williams, 2020).

   b. (b). European Union (EU): The conflict between state sovereignty and organisational autonomy is best shown by the EU's supranational institutions, such as the European Court of Justice, which frequently render rulings that supersede national laws (Craig & de Búrca, 2020).
   (c). World Health Organisation (WHO): The WHO's directives and actions during the COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated its independence in global health governance, but they also raised objections from member nations due to alleged inefficiencies and biases (Gostin et al., 2020).

Independence and State Control in Balance. IOs must strike a balance between their independence and member state backing and legitimacy. Achieving this balance requires the use of mechanisms like stakeholder involvement, transparency initiatives, and oversight committees. The intricacy of global governance is best illustrated by international organisations. Founded by nations to tackle shared problems, they frequently have a great deal of autonomy, which allows them to carry out their mandates efficiently. But there are also conflicts with member states as a result of this independence, especially when it comes to accountability and sovereignty. Improving the legitimacy and efficacy of IOs in the twenty-first century requires an understanding of these processes.

8.0. Discussion of Findings

This section provides answers to the research questions:

Do international organizations assume authority independent of the states that created them?

A careful balance between independence and influence from the states that established them is something that international organisations (IOs) frequently have to manage. IOs should ideally be set up to deal with problems that call for cooperation, taking on the power to operate apart from the interests of individual states. But in reality, strong regimes usually use secret tactics to limit these organisations' autonomy by exerting control over them. The conflict between the theoretical ideal and the actualities of international administration is reflected in this dynamic. With authority drawn from their mandates rather than the power of individual governments, IOs are theoretically envisioned as unbiased organisations created to promote international cooperation. Because they are not influenced by the interests of any one state, they are able to coordinate international activities, manage conflicts, and enforce global rules. For example, rather than favouring one nation over another, the United Nations (UN) and its agencies are set up to serve the interests of all of its members.

However, in reality, strong nations frequently have an outsized amount of influence within IOs, which compromises their independence. For instance, research has demonstrated that in institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the financial contributions and voting strength of dominant governments frequently influence policy choices and priorities (Stone, 2011). To make sure that IOs serve their national objectives, these states may employ strategies like conditional funding, diplomatic pressure, or strategic appointments. This real-world situation deviates from the ideal of fair global governance, casting doubt on these organisations' actual independence.

This viewpoint is different from past research that primarily focused on IOs' function as impartial arbiters in the global system. The technical and apolitical character of IOs was emphasised by traditional theories, such as functionalism-based ones, which proposed that their power came only from their capacity to solve group issues (Mitrany, 1943). More recent studies, however, have turned their attention to the political economy of IOs, demonstrating how member state power imbalances influence their operations and results. According to Barnett and Finnemore (2004), these studies offer a more sophisticated understanding of how strong nations use their resources and clout to keep control over organisations that appear to be independent. The complexity of IOs' position in international politics is shown by this change in viewpoint. Even though they are intended to function autonomously, their need on government support and collaboration invariably leaves them open to outside interference. In the global arena, the interaction between the realities of power relations and the ideals of independence continues to influence how IOs operate and are seen.

9.0 Conclusion

Although international organisations (IOs) are essential to the management of international conflicts, a variety of elements that reflect the complexity of the world political environment influence how effective IOs are. Despite being intended to serve as unbiased mediators that promote communication and conflict resolution, IOs frequently encounter difficulties brought on by the conflicting national interests of member nations. Conflict management procedures are often dominated by power politics, as demonstrated by the ability of strong governments to shape agendas and results to suit their strategic objectives. These dynamics can impede decisive and fair measures, especially when conflicts cross with the interests of powerful governments, as demonstrated by the veto power possessed by permanent members of the UN Security Council.

Furthermore, governments that view outside intervention as a danger to their independence may oppose or refuse to comply with IO interference due to the principle of sovereignty. In intrastate conflicts, where governments may be hesitant to accept mediation, this opposition is particularly noticeable. Further limiting IOs' ability to adequately handle conflicts are resource limitations. Efforts like peacekeeping missions, humanitarian aid, and post-conflict rehabilitation are frequently hampered by a lack of financing, logistical difficulties, and a reliance on member states for resources, making IOs reliant on the financial and political priorities of its donors.

The impartiality and problem-solving ability of IOs were highlighted by previous theories, but current research highlights their intrinsic limitations. Their role in conflict management is complicated by power imbalances, reliance on member states, and the interaction of local and global processes. This change in viewpoints from idealistic to practical emphasises the necessity of a sophisticated comprehension of the difficulties IOs encounter when negotiating the reality of international conflict resolution. In order to improve IO interventions' ability to promote lasting peace, these findings urge a rethinking of tactics that take into consideration the political and institutional limitations that shape them.

12.0 References

Avruch, K. (2018). *Culture and conflict resolution*. United States Institute of Peace Press.p.1

Archer, C. (2015). *International organizations* (4th ed.). Routledgep.4.

Abbott, K. W., & Snidal, D. (1998). Why states act through formal international organizations. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 42*(1), 3-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/002200279804200 1001

Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2004). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics.* Cornell University Press.p.5

Barnett, M., & Finnemore, M. (2024). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics*. Cornell University Press.p.4

Bellamy, A. J., & Williams, P. D. (2020). *Understanding peacekeeping* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.p.12

Bosco, D. (2019). *The imagined security council: Analyzing power dynamics in global decision-making*. Oxford University Press.p.34

Buzan, B., & Lawson, G. (2015). *The Global Transformation: History, Modernity and the Making of International Relations*. Cambridge University Press.p14 Barnett, M. N., & Finnemore, M. (2024). *Rules for the world: International organizations in global politics*. Cornell University Press..p2

Bercovitch, J., & Jackson, R. (2009). *Conflict resolution in the twenty-first century: Principles methods, and approaches*. University of Michigan Press. P.2

Craig, P., & de Búrca, G. (2020). *EU law: Text, cases, and materials* (7th ed.). Oxford University Press. p37

Claude, I. L. (1964). *Swords into Plowshares: The Problems and Progress of International Organization*. Random House. P74

Collier, P., & Hoeffler, A. (2018). *Economic causes of civil conflict and their implications for policy*. World Bank Publications.p18

Cronin, A. K. (2019). *How terrorism ends: Understanding the decline and demise of terrorist campaigns*. Princeton University Press. P49

Howard, P. N., & Hussain, M. M. (2018). *Democracy's fourth wave? Digital media and the Arab Spring*. Oxford University Press.p.12

Hurd, I. (2020). *International organizations: Politics, law, practice* (4th ed.). Cambridge University Press. P.16

Hurd, I. (2011). *International organizations: Politics, law, practice.* Cambridge University Press.

Gostin, L. O., Friedman, E. A., & Wetter, S. A. (2020). Responding to COVID-19: How to navigate a public health emergency legally and ethically. *Hastings Center Report, 50*(2), 8-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/hast.1090

Mitrany, D. (1943). *A working peace system*. Royal Institute of International Affairs. p2

Weiss, T. G. (2016). *What's wrong with the United Nations and how to fix it* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.

Wendt, A. (1999). *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.P21

United Nations. (1945). *Charter of the United Nations*..P1

Schermers, H. G., & Blokker, N. M. (2021). *International institutional law: Unity within diversity* (5th ed.). Martinus Nijhoff Publishers. P19

Stone, R. W. (2021). *Controlling institutions: International organizations and the global economy*. Cambridge University Press.P27

Keohane, R. O., & Nye, J. S. (1977). *Power and Interdependence: World Politics in Transition*. Little, Brown and Company.P27

Karns, M. P., & Mingst, K. A. (2021). *International organizations: The politics and processes of global governance* (4th ed.). Lynne Rienner Publishers.P27

Keohane, R. O., & Martin, L. L. (1995). The promise of institutionalist theory. *International Security, 20*(1), 39-51. https://doi.org/10.2307/2539214

Tallberg, J., Sommerer, T., Squatrito, T., & Jönsson, C. (2023). *The opening up of international organizations: Transnational access in global governance.* Cambridge University Press.

Ramsbotham, O., Woodhouse, T., & Miall, H. (2016). *Contemporary conflict resolution* (4th ed.). PolityPress. P22

Zartman, I. W. (2008). *Negotiation and conflict management: Essays on theory and practice*. Routledge.P48