

# The Development of the International Organization (IO) and Organizational Sociology Theories and Perspectives.

## Part 3 - Definitions and Types of IO

Medani P. Bhandari <sup>1</sup>,

<sup>1</sup> Akamai University, Hilo, Hawaii, USA

**Abstract**— This paper provides a pedagogical overview of how international organizations were formed, for what purposes and how their structure has been changed. The distinction between formal organizational studies and studies of international organizations is minimal, because both help to widen the idea of creating an original position for better combinations of favorable circumstances or situations in human affairs. The chapter will explain, the origin of the term international organization (OR); historical roots of or studies; and define or; analyze the types of ORs in the contemporary world; reveals the relationship between the international relation (IR) and regime theories application in the OR's studies; and the impact of the globalization. The chapter also unveils the relationships between organizational sociology and OR and finally it gives a general outline on the application institution theory in the study of OR following a brief summary. Organizations have the ability of inspiring and bringing people in concert to achieve combined goals. They are accountable for determining the intelligence needed to meet their goals. This chapter provides a glimmer of international organizations theory, origin, historical account, definitions and utilization of contemporary academic world intertwined with the international relations, regime and globalization as well as the organizational sociological theories and perspectives can be utilized to study of international organizations. This chapter will help to understand the historical account of international organization, pedagogical development and contemporary theories and practices of international organizations and organizational sociology.

**Index Terms**— international organizations, international relation, organizational sociology, organizations theory, globalization, regime theory.

### I. INTERNATIONAL RELATION (IR) THEORY AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

Political scientists' study political philosophy and

governmental forms as well as the political behaviors and social interactions involved in the process of government. In this context of a globalized world order, the study of inter-governmental relations has been the most important subject matter for the discipline since the 1st World War. Stephen Walt (1998), states that we need International Relation theories, because "there is an inescapable link between the abstract world of theory and the real world of policy". Furthermore, he notes that "We need theories to make sense of the blizzard of information that bombards us daily" and that "It is hard to make good policy if one's basic organizing principles are flawed, just as it is hard to construct good theories without knowing a lot about the real world" (Watt 1998, p. 29). Robert Cox (1981) states that IR studies foreign affairs and global issues among states within the international system. Furthermore, IR theorists try to understand why war occurs—due to nationalism? Due to ideological class? And due to lack of government? Due to misperception among states? - and why there is inequality between different regions of the world (Viotti and Kauppi 1999). It covers the roles of states, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and multinational corporations (MNCs). It is both an academic and public policy field and can be either positivist or normativist as it both seeks to analyze and formulate the foreign policy of particular states. There are many perspectives and theories to studying international relations. Different perspectives on international relations have been developed according to changes in the global political environment. In the 1930s, realist and idealist perspectives were in focus, with attention paid to the nature of international politics and the prospect of peaceful change. In the 1960s, traditionalists and behaviorists had debates about the application of appropriate methods to studying international relations (Viotti and Kauppi 1999). In this era, IR theorists began to apply dialectical



approaches drawing from the historical epistemology of dialectical materialism coined by Hegel and applied by Marx, followed by positivism, realism, Neo-realism, constructivism, critical, Marxism, neo-Marxian, Gramscian, feminism, post-colonialism, relativism, etc. As Robert Cox (1981) notes in terms of social forces of world order, dialectic materialism examines three categories of forces such as ideas, material capabilities, and institutions, which interacts each other. Likewise, international relations concepts have been developed on the grounds of power dynamics (Clifford 2005; Cooley and Ron 2002; Risse and Ropp and Sikkink 1999; Keck and Sikkink 1998; Barnett and Finnemore 2004). However, in the contemporary world most authors analyze IR from the perspectives of realism, pluralism and globalism. According to Viotti and Kauppi (1999), realism has four key assumptions: (1) states are the principal or most important actors; (2) states are viewed as unitary actors; (3) the state is essentially a rational actor (game theory, deterrence theory); and (4) using military force for national security can attain international stability. Further realist approaches consider the consistency with power dynamism (world must be perceived as interwoven, with establish notion of power) as universally applicable policy sustainability (policy must command support from public opinion and international community) and contextuality (action must take account of socio-cultural historical contexts) (Kissinger 2001).

Likewise, pluralism (also referred to as liberalism) has different assumptions, wherein (1) non-state actors are important entities in international relations and cannot be ignored. Pluralists assume that international organizations can be independent actors in their own right and can act to maintain the world order. Another challenge pluralist pose to realists is that for them (2) the state is not a unitary actor; (3) they also challenge the realist notion “the state is essentially a rational actor.” They believe that individual actors, and international and national organizations, are more influential in maintaining the law and order of any single state to the globe. The last point in the pluralists’ argument is (4) the agenda of international politics is extensive. Pluralists focus more on welfare than warfare. Furthermore, the neoliberal approach takes into account of proportionality (wise use of force), complementarity (consideration of both national and international interests), and clarity in terms and restraint (Nye 1999).

Another mostly used IR approach is constructivism. Realism and liberalism focus on the material factor of power and trade, constructivism gives attention the impact of ideas. Ted Hopf (1998) states that constructivism offers alternative understandings of a number of the central themes in international relations theory, including: the meaning of anarchy and balance of power, the relationship between state identity and interest, an elaboration of power, and the prospects for change in world politics. Constructivism itself should be understood in its conventional and critical variants, the latter being more closely tied to critical social theory” (Hopf, 1998: 172). This approach considers IR policy as depending on

historical, cultural, political, and social context.

Likewise, globalism is another comparatively new phenomenon in IR theory. “Globalists typically assume that the starting point of analysis for international relations is the global context within which states and other entities interact.” Globalists (1) emphasize the overall structure of the international system or, more colloquially, the “big picture” (Viotti and Kauppi 1999, p. 9). Globalists (2) view international relations from a historical perspective. They analyze international relations through Marxist and neo-Marxist perspectives and hold that the defining characteristic of the international system is that it is capitalist. Globalists (3) emphasize how international organizations, transnational actors, and coalitions work in the mechanism of domination by which some states, classes, or elites manage to benefit from this capitalist system at the expense of others. “More specifically, globalists are typically concerned with the development and maintenance of dependency relations among northern, industrialized states (in North America, Europe and Japan) and the poor, underdeveloped, or industrially backward Third World or less developed countries (LDCs) of Latin America, Africa, and Asia” (9). Globalists (4) emphasize the importance of economic factors, when it comes to explaining the dynamics of the international system (Viotti and Kauppi 1999, pp. 6-12).

In addition to major realism, neo-realism, constructivism, liberal and neo-liberal or pluralism perspectives; International Relations theory also apply multidisciplinary approaches such as behavioralism (psychological), world system (sociological), critical (sociological based on Marxist and Neo-Marxist notion), feminism (which mostly criticizes the realist approach: it is seen as a male-dominated theory about the aggressive world of states controlled by aggressive men) (Tickner 1992). These various approaches of International Relations examine how organizational processes and bureaucratic politics are associated. It draws on the Weber notion of bureaucracy to create a world view of international organizations (pluralist paradigm). Its focus is on transnationalism, which emphasizes ties between societies that include much more than state to state relations. Transnationalism can be understood as an extension of pluralist politics beyond the borders of any states. “Transnationalism is the processes whereby international relations conducted by governments have been supplemented by relations among private individuals, groups and societies that can and do have important consequences for the course of events” (James Rosenau, 1969, as cited by Viotti and Kauppi, 1999, p. 211). The transition to transnationalism occurs through modernization, integration (regional integration downplays the state as the unit of analysis; decision making and power makes a big difference and allow other forms of political organization aside from territoriality based national states to become possible), interdependence, regime and multilateralism (Viotti and Kauppi 1999, p. 212-215). Social science scholars need to understand the fuzziness of global social and political environments. Walt (2005) examines complexities of current world politics and explains the importance of IR theories for the

policy making.

There are overlaps of theories and paradigms among international relations theory, sociological theory, organizational theory, and international organization theory. Literature is silent on bridging such gaps. Ness and Bechin (1988) have initiated studies to bridge this gap, but there has been no continuation of this effort from the sociological point of view. In contrast, political scientists have been engaged in developing several paradigms based on this notion (Young 1989; Barnett and Finnemore 2004). I think sociological theories can offer more to the study of international relations, particularly through contingency, networks, and systems and agency theories, because the purposes of those theories match with international relations theory-building. Equally, organizational sociologists can learn from IR, particularly through the epistemologies of pluralism and globalism. However, to examine the common ground of epistemology, extensive multidisciplinary research is needed. Another major approach of the study of international organizations is highly influenced by the international regime theory (Bhandari 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). There is an established notion that international organizations create their own niches and standards and diffuse those through their programs, networks, and program implementation procedures.

## II. REGIME THEORY AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

As international relations theories are closely interlinked with the IOs, IOs actually create regimes. "Regime is sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations" (Krasner, 1983; Krasner's approach to international regimes defines them as: (1) principles and values; (2) norms; (3) rules; and (4) enforcement mechanisms; as cited by Cogburn 2003, p. 136). Keohane and Nye (1983) state that regimes are sets of governing arrangements [that include] networks of rules, norms, and procedures that regularize behavior and control its effects. Viotti and Kauppi (1999) clarify, stating that regimes are sets of rules which may have international and nongovernmental organizations associated with them (215). International regimes are structures designed to foster international co-operation among participants' countries. Every country needs help to solve transnational problems. Examples to be seen in the current environment are global terrorism and the fight against the transnational drug problem, and the fight to minimize HIV and AIDS, which cannot be resolved by the single state. International organizations can create powerful tools to solve a particular problem, which helps to increase their power, access, and authority through collaborative efforts, mutual agreements and policy formation. This situation creates a favorable environment for formulating new regimes, where solutions can be contemplated. This is one aspect of international regimes. The second aspect focuses on implementation of formulated policy through institutionalization of rules and international

agreements that devise and control solutions to the initial problem(s) (Krasner 1983; Young 1989; Rittberger 1993; Cogburn 2003).

Power-based realist theorists give emphasis to the role of anarchy and the impact of the relative distribution of capabilities. In this type of realist regime, the guiding ideal is hegemonic stability; the argument is that regimes are established and maintained when a state holds a preponderance of power resources, as the United States did after the Second World War and still continues to do. Another type of regime is interest-based, which makes the claim that international regimes can play a role in helping states to realize their common interests. Similarly, knowledge-base theorists argue that state interests are not given but created. Knowledge can be shared by decision makers through the influence of transnational epistemic communities. A knowledge-base regime can be formed through social construction (Viotti & Kauppi 1999). This knowledge of regime can equally be applied to the study of international organizations from an organizational sociological approach to examine the effectiveness and contribution to social wellbeing.

Regime studies use similar epistemology to International Relations. The major approaches of regime studies are liberal and neo-liberal, realist, (classical realism, defensive realism), neo-realist and Marxist, neo-Marxist (Western or Hegelian Marxism, such as neo-Gramscian theory), and postmodernist (Cogburn 2003). However, there are several other approaches in use embedded within these epistemologies, such as balance of power (Paul, Wirtz, and Fortmann 2004), behavioralism (Viotti and Kauppi, 1987), complex interdependence (Keohane and Nye, 1977), constitutive theory and constructivism (Wendt, 1992), cosmopolitanism (Cheah and Robbins 1998), dependency, feminism, game theory (Viotti and Kauppi, 1987), globalization (Gill, 1998), globalism developed through Marxist and dependency theory (Viotti and Kauppi 1987; Cogburn 2003), conflict prevention (Friedman 2000), hegemony (Gramsci 1971; DuBoff 2003; Chomsky 2003), imperialism (Morgenthau 1948), inter-govern mentalism (Moravcsik, 1993), normative theory (Viotti and Kauppi 1987) and so on. These approaches are equally important and commonly used approaches of the organizational sociologist. The only difference is that political scientists examine these approaches as political power dynamics. They put the state first and social dynamism comes later. On the other side for the sociologist is that society or social environment is given first priority. Both regime and international relations theories follow the same basic theories and principles, equally support the importance of international organizations, and are equally influenced by development theory and globalization. Except for Ness and Brechin, sociologists have mostly not examined how international relations and the regime concept can be applied to study social problems. Ness and Brechin (1988:258) state that "international relations can be enhanced if we pay greater attention to how modern international organizations emerged and what they do in action - in short, if we pay greater attention

to organizational performance". They argue that technology is the prime factor in organizational change. I see a clear link between technology organization and international regime as proposed by Ness and Brechin. Technology produced both world consensus and conflict (in the case of the Condom distribution) however external technology has greatly benefited the organization (Ness and Brechin 1988:258). This account can be related to contemporary regime formation through technology. Another example is the expansion of information technology to regime generated by the McDonalds fast food corporation. However, the incremental formation of such regimes will not necessarily solve associated political or social problems.

Social problems have been increasing on a global scale (HIVAID, inequality, transnational migration, terrorism, environmental problems), and these problems themselves create certain types of regime and format their own networks and relationships (Bhandari 2010, 2011, 2012, 2014). In this context, sociologists can inform international relations theorists and regime theorists about how knowledge forms in local contexts (social collaboration) and how this knowledge can be transferred to the international context.

### III. CONCLUSION

According to political science literature, international organizations form to attain certain goals of the governments and have specified rules and regulations formulated by the governments. In this regard, IOs are closely associated with international relations theory, regime theory and globalization theory. There are various perspectives for analysis of political environment which includes positivism, constructivism, realism, neo-realism, liberalism, neo-liberalism, and globalism and so on.

The present paper is a following part of a cycle of papers devoted to the topic on development of the International Organization and Organizational Sociology Theories and Perspectives. The next part will be featured in the following paper of the Scientific Journal.

### IV. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

I acknowledge the input of Mrs. Prajita Bhandari, for creating a peaceful environment to complete this chapter and insightful comments and language editing. I would also like to thank to Prameya, Kelsey, Manaslu, Abhi for their insightful comments. I would also thank to Neena (our granddaughter who brought the joy in the family so, I was able to concentrate on my job). Especial thanks go to Professors Steven R. Brechin, Peter Ibarra, Marjory I would also like to thank the reviewer panel for their input and comments.

### V. REFERENCES

Archer, A. (1983) *Methods of Multilateral Management: The Interrelationship of International Organizations and NGOs, in the US, the UN, and the Management of Global Change*; Toby Trister Gati, United Nations, p.303, p.309

Archer, C. (1992). *International Organizations* (2nd Edition), Routledge, USA.

The complete list of references will be featured in the final paper of this Scientific Journal.