

Impact of international organizations



The formation of international organizations in the 20th century brought about the requirement for governance, without governance you don't have the organizations. A formal organization uses governance as its governing body; whereas an informal organization uses governance as a guide to the types of rules and regulations that are relevant to their activities. Regardless of the status of an organization, whether it is geo-political entity, socio-political entity or corporate, its governance will always be based on their actions and how the rules and regulations are fashioned, sustained and regulated.

Any international organization can have an impact on world governance, there should be no defined positive or negative impacts as all organizations have differing agendas and policies and they are all out for achieve the best possible results, whereas one organization could see a positive impact on an organizations actions another organization may see this differently maybe as a negative impact, It is all down to perception.

United Nations

The United Nations role in world governance is very limited; they are only there in an advisory capacity. They have no authority to exert any powers on world governance, they are simply there to foster co-operation between national governments.

Global terrorism became at its most prevalent in the 1960's, whilst the United Nations condemned the Hijacking of El-Al-Israel flight 426, they didn't intervene in the events, and took no further actions against the terrorists.

The reason why United Nations has a lack of support and is failing to assert its influence on national politics, is because their whole mission for international peace and security is totally undermined by the fact that their own Counter Terrorism Chief Jean Paul Laborde was quoted as saying “ Hamas is not a terrorist organization in the United Nations...we should talk to Hamas because once the Israeli-Palestinian issue is resolved, the threat of terrorism will diminish” (Greenfield, 2013). If your own Counter Terrorism Chief can't see what the rest of the world can see then, why would anyone want to put their faith in the United Nations?

Economically for the United Nations to have a chance at surviving they need to ensure that they are fighting the causes from within and all singing from the same song sheet, having internal squabbles and disagreements bring resentment from within and this isn't an acceptable way to run an organization, they also need to have stronger and more manageable international policies, a focus should be made on improving the recovery of failing member states, and boosting economic trade agreements, thus alleviating the financial stresses on the smaller member states by improving their financial stability.

The United Nations advisory capacity has no real effect on national policies as they cannot enforce rules and regulations, suggestions and recommendations can be put forward but they don't have to be abided by. For the United Nations to be taken seriously they must work together with governments and create a stable and workable multilateral system, and the government must become accountable for their decisions in the international and domestic fields. If the United Nations can overcome their social and

economic issues then they will find that their peace keeping efforts will become easier to manage as they won't have the dilemma of sovereignty versus human security, if the United Nations cannot be granted permission to intervene by the member state that needs assistance then the dilemma of sovereignty comes into play, because despite human security being a high priority the United Nations are still powerless to intervene.

European Union

The European Union partakes in a wide range of policies, be it economic, social, regulatory or financial, they take action when its actions are beneficial to its member states.

The formation of the European Union has shifted the balance of political power in favor of their European states, they have unified the value of money and Euro is now the second mostly commonly held currency with the dollar being the most. The creation of a single free market has pushed the quality of products up and the overall costs down and travel between European counties is at an all-time high due to the availability of cheap air travel.

The European Union were hit with their biggest economic threat so far, in 2011 the Greek debt crisis spiraled out of control; it was triggered by the 2008 economic recession and was directly linked to the collapse of the Greek economy. Greece required be bailed out from this situation and turned to the European Union for assistance. However rising debts from Portugal, Italy, Ireland, Greece and Spain made people think that the EU's economic model may not be working and that bailing out these countries may not be in the

<https://assignbuster.com/impact-of-international-organizations/>

best interests of the European Union, people questioned why the EU was continuing to bail out countries that constantly spent their money recklessly and increased their own debts to unsustainable levels.

“ There should never again be war in Europe” (Malmström, 2008). The EU has forged greater co-operation and better communication from all EU members and has brought peace and prosperity to its members, most are no longer living in a war torn world. The EU security policy has broadened over the years and security policy today incorporates everything from traditional military power to vigorous climate change and environmental efforts.

Over all despite the economic crisis that the EU suffered, they seem to be having a positive effect on national politics, granted not all governments agree on how things should be done but the EU has a diplomatic approach to resolving any disagreements. It is a progressive organization and like most has had teething trouble, some of their own making and some not. I think a review of some of their strategies and policies may further strengthen their standing in the political field.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NATO's role in world politics is dominated by their quest to prevent conflict, using democratic values, they push for greater communication and cooperation from member states to enable a sustained growth in resolving defense and security related issues.

NATO's influence in security issues is now on the decline, peacekeeping has been made easier by the many alliances that have now been forged. The war

in Afghanistan has raged on for too long with little impact from NATO, they have been unable to defeat the Taliban, and when they pull out from Afghanistan, the Taliban will retake the areas that have been secured by NATO, undermining their whole effort.

NATO is far from economically sound, if they were to forge better economic relations better and more secure transatlantic relationships between Europe and the United states, it would strengthen the global economic climate for all involved. A more economic NATO would enable better relations and aid NATO in securing better allies with Asia Pacific, whom are crucial to the world economy.

NATO needs to expand their organization globally, as a regional organization they appear ineffective, If NATO can foster better relations in the Middle East it will not only boost them economically but also politically and will enhance their security efforts to a more global field.

NATO need to be more economically viable to ensure they have the full support and backing of its members, they are losing people's confidence as they seem ineffective in Afghanistan, they may have succeeded in other wars but this war is still raging and the people want to see an end, if there is no end then NATO will be seen as a failure.

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies (OPEC)

The Organization of Petroleum Exporting Companies (OPEC) plays a major role in the influence of world politics, they have the ability to control the production of oil and how the prices can fluctuate. OPEC must use its political

diplomacy to maximize its revenue, alienating a country based on political differences can mean the difference between oil prices rising and slower and less economic sales.

OPEC has had issues in the past with supply and demand, and this is destabilizing them as an organization, people are losing faith in them and seeking alternative options. The countries that participate in OPEC have complete sovereignty over their natural resources and policies and OPEC needs to work with the participating countries to safeguard the interests of the social and economic developments of prices. Whilst most of OPEC's commodities come from developing countries there is an issue with those countries being able to consistently supply oil and petroleum, OPEC must attract buyers and these buyers will be concerned as to the overall safety of the products due to issues like war and political battles.

In 1973 an oil embargo was put in place and lasted until 1974, this had a massive economic impact on OPEC, they forced companies to increase payment for oil and this pushed the price of oil up to \$12 a barrel, this impacted negatively on the United States and forced them to readdress the economic threat posed to the U. S. energies security.

OPEC needs to develop better legal and regulatory policies so that countries can continue to develop and work on improving their efficiency and affectability whilst reducing overall costs. They need to look long term at the risk analysis of developing countries, and ensure future projects are more economically and socially profitable. If OPEC can address jurisdictional

border policies then this will enable them to have more conclusive trade market opportunities. Without this they are vulnerable.

Organization of American States (OAS)

The Organization of American States (OAS) role in world politics is very turbulent whilst they promote initiatives and oversee human rights and security in the Americas, they have shown weakness for political power and their decision making has been questioned, they require a unanimous vote to make any decisions and this voting method leads to many hold up and deliberations that are deemed unnecessary and delay any action that can be taken. This prompts distrust and allows its member to question their affectability in world politics.

OAS's ability to manage security and sovereignty issues was tested in 2009 when Honduras had a leadership crisis; OAS was forced to suspend Honduras from the organization after an issued ultimatum to reinstate exiled president Zelaya was dismissed by Zelayas opponents. OAS sent monitors to Honduras to oversee the constitutional referendum, this was done at Zelayas request and the referendum was seen as unconstitutional by congress, OAS systematically failed in their attempts to resolve the Honduras situation and proved that they are very limited to what they can actually do in a crisis management situation.

The economic outlook for OAS is very poor; In 2011 Republican David Rivera was quoted as saying " The [Organization of American States] is an enemy of the U. S. and an enemy to the interests of freedom and security," (Isacson, 2012)as he joined a majority vote to sever U. S funding of OAS. OAS has

<https://assignbuster.com/impact-of-international-organizations/>

failed to prove conclusively its affectability in situations it has been faced with, it is held back by governmental policy constraints and without major changes could cease to function as an effective organization.

Whilst OAS is effective in certain areas they have proved on numerous occasions to be ineffective in security, sovereignty and economic issues, they were threatened with having their funding removed, congress has ruled that some of the decisions they have made have been unconstitutional, and this has had a wide ranging effect on future political issue, as it has alienated some of the countries that are members of OAS. To prove effective OAS needs to show that they have full solidarity within member countries, so far they have failed to do this.

Conclusion

International organizations have a hard job of juggling what is expected of them versus what they can legally do, people want interventions from these organizations but don't fully understand some of the constrains that hold them back. Most organizations don't have the legal authority to enforce rules and regulations, they can make recommendations but if they aren't followed there is no way of enforcing there disregard of the recommendations.

Governments can remove financial backing from the countries that don't follow the recommendations, this serves as a warning to other countries that failure to comply will result in further sanctions being imposed.

International organizations have a varied impact on the world; the organizations need to have better multilateral government backing, because

despite the entirely positive things they try to achieve there is always a negative aspect that is stopping them from fully achieving this.

Citations

Greenfield, D. (2013, July 01). *New UN counterterror chief doesn't believe Hamas is a terrorist group* . Retrieved from [http://www. frontpagemag. com/2013/dgreenfield/new-un-counterterror-chief-doesnt-believe-hamas-is-a-terrorist-group/](http://www.frontpagemag.com/2013/dgreenfield/new-un-counterterror-chief-doesnt-believe-hamas-is-a-terrorist-group/)

Malmström, C. (2008, March 12). *The role of the EU in world politics* . Retrieved from [http://www. government. se/sb/d/7973/a/100668](http://www.government.se/sb/d/7973/a/100668)

Isacson, A. (2012, May 22). *Conflict resolution in the Americas: The decline of the OAS* . Retrieved from [http://www. worldpoliticsreview. com/articles/11979/conflict-resolution-in-the-americas-the-decline-of-the-OAS](http://www.worldpoliticsreview.com/articles/11979/conflict-resolution-in-the-americas-the-decline-of-the-OAS)