International Organisations

As Elements of the Operating Environment
CONTENDING PERSPECTIVES

- Classical/Realist: Low expectations or critical
  Liberal: High expectations and positive

- Constructivist: Normative criticism
Representative Liberal View

- States use IOs to manage their interactions, including armed conflicts

IOs are functional in terms of national interests – they enable States to attain their objectives, including with regard to armed conflicts

IOs allow States to enforce international commitments
NEW (LIBERAL) INSTITUTIONALISM

• COMPONENT OF THE DEMOCRATIC PEACE THEORY
REAL-WORLD EXAMPLES

• Why did U.S. not act unilaterally in first Gulf War (1990-1991)?

Why did UNSC use IAEA inspectors and not U.S. personnel to ascertain CBN capacity of Iraq (2003)?

Why, in Bosnia (1993-1995) were UN and NATO used for PK and peace enforcement?
REALIST REJECTION OF LIBERAL INSTITUTIONALISM

• LACK OF EMPIRICAL SUPPORT

DOES NOT PROVIDE A SOUND BASIS FOR MANAGING INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS AND PROMOTING STABILITY

FOR ADVOCATES OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY, INSTITUTIONS ARE THE KEY TO MANAGING POWER SUCCESSFULLY – THIS EXPECTS TOO MUCH OF STATE DECISION-MAKERS
INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

- POST-COLD WAR WESTERN HEGEMONY - PROJECTION INTERNATIONALLY OF DOMESTIC NORMS, VALUES AND BELIEF SYSTEMS (1990-2011)

INCREASED USE OF IOs (and State-supported NGOs) TO EXTEND GLOBAL SCOPE OF WESTERN LIBERAL POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC VALUES

HAS RESULTED, IN A NUMBER OF SIGNIFICANT INSTANCES, IN THE PHENOMENON OF PUSH-BACK ON THE PART OF TRADITIONAL NON-LIBERAL SOCIETIES OR ILLIBERAL POLITIES

EXPLANATORY VARIABLE FOR CONFLICT OUTCOMES IS THE DISTRIBUTION OF RELATIVE POWER AMONG POLARIZING STATES (REGIONALLY AND GLOBALLY)

PRESENTLY, THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM IS EXPERIENCING THE EFFECTS OF THE LIMITATIONS OF WESTERN-LIBERAL RELATIVE POWER AND THE NON-RECOGNITION BY WESTERN GOVERNMENTS OF THAT SITUATION : THIS HAS LED TO PROLONGED ARMED CONFLICTS, OFTEN THROUGH RE COURSE TO PROXIES
“HYBRID (NEW)” WAR CONDITIONS

• State weakness or State failure
• Extremist identity politics
• Transnational criminality/Domestic corruption
• Economic and fiscal distress/dependence
Governments tend to protect their capabilities for fighting conventional wars and not invest significantly, if at all, in capabilities suited for contesting hybrid or new wars: this, in turn, leads to dependence on interventions by third parties, INCLUDING INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS.
CRISIS MANAGEMENT
INSTITUTIONS

UNITED NATIONS
OSCE
EUROPEAN UNION
NATO
AD HOC DIPLOMACY: MULTI- & BI-LATERAL
UNITED NATIONS: SHORTFALLS OF EXISTING COLLECTIVE-SECURITY

• UN Overload and Dysfunction (UNSC) Delegation to Regional Institutions and sub-regional organizations

UNSC P5 IN CONFLICT ON UKRAINE

• CONTESTED MISSIONS in 21st Century Humanitarianism in Crisis Strategic Conjunctures
OPERATING ENVIRONMENT AND REGIONAL ORGANISATIONS

• Evaluation of vital national interests variable within EU and NATO

global power shift, plus Asian Pivot mindset of euro-Atlantic hegemon

normative change – challenges to ‘Liberal Peace’
sanction regimes problematic in best-case scenarios

secondary effects of the financial and economic crisis
OSCE

• Special Military Mission to Ukraine (SMM)

Border Monitoring, Unexploded ordnance Clean-up in Eastern Ukraine

Election Monitoring

However, similar to UNSC with States in conflict as Members of a consensual IO (57 Member States)
OVERARCHING GLOBAL STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT

- Humanitarianism in Crisis
- Emergent illiberal or authoritarian States
- Lack of public support in Western polities for protracted armed conflict
  Differing threat evaluations, within NATO and EU
  Prolonged economic slow growth in developed world
- Need to strictly prioritize: competing crises and threats
CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS

• Western-State Doctrines for Extended Operations involve Comprehensive Approaches (3D within COIN doctrines) – however, the strategic and operational constraints on rigorous application of doctrinal precepts are significant under current and near-term operating environments. There are a range of challenges of a high-order in carrying out successful operations in the current context – including engaging IOs as functional components of the Operating Environment.
CONCEPTUAL OVERVIEW

• As Abbott & Snidal observed, States do indeed continue to Act in myriad ways through formal International Organizations (IOs).

However, as Mearsheimer pointed out, their representatives and leaderships should not expect IOs to offer solutions and assured favorable outcomes to their engagement in the great issues of war and peace of the early 21st Century.
IT IS STILL A REALIST WORLD

• The object of the game is to keep the game going, and relative power is how you keep score.