

IR COMMITTEE

Study Guide

1. The impact of the global arms race and emerging technologies on international security
2. The effects of cybersecurity threats on international peace and state sovereignty
3. The effectiveness and legitimacy of economic sanctions imposed by the United Nations
4. The role and limitations of global organizations (e.g., World Health Organization, International Monetary Fund) in crisis management

BELX TFL



Table of Contents

Letters from Moderators.....1

1-The impact of the global arms race and emerging technologies on international security Introduction.....3

2-The effects of cybersecurity threats on international peace and state sovereignty12

3 - The Effectiveness and Legitimacy of Economic Sanctions Imposed by the United Nations.....17

4 - The Role and Limitations of Global Organizations in Crisis Management...25

Letter from Moderators

Dear Delegates,

It is a great pleasure to welcome you to our committee. My name is Osman and I will be serving as your moderator throughout this conference. I am truly excited to meet all of you and witness the discussions, ideas, and solutions that you will bring to the committee. Throughout the conference, do not hesitate to ask questions or seek assistance whenever needed. Every delegate starts somewhere, and making mistakes is a natural part of learning and improving. What matters most is your willingness to engage, contribute, and grow. I hope this committee will provide an environment where everyone feels comfortable expressing their ideas while respecting the opinions of others. Through diplomacy, cooperation, and constructive debate, I am confident that we can create meaningful discussions and produce innovative resolutions. As your moderator, I will do my best to ensure that the committee remains both productive and enjoyable. I encourage you to prepare thoroughly, research the agenda items carefully, and come ready to share your thoughts with confidence. I look forward to meeting each of you and working together to make this conference a memorable experience. I wish you the best of luck in your preparations and cannot wait to see what we will achieve together.

Kind regards,

Osman ilker Türkmen

Dear delegates,

It is my pleasure to welcome you to this committee. I will have the honor of serving as your moderator throughout this conference. My purpose is to help you with the academic part of the committee. We worked really hard to make this conference unforgettable. There can be things that you don't like about or things that you couldn't understand properly but that's okay every delegate experiences at least one. So if you come up to me I will try to make things right. I think this committee will provide an opportunity for delegates to engage in meaningful debate, exchange ideas, and work collaboratively to develop innovative and practical solutions. I encourage all delegates to participate actively, respect differing viewpoints, and approach discussions with an open mind and a spirit of diplomacy. Nobody was born as an expert so the important thing is to always grow even if you know nothing. I am confident that your dedication, preparation will contribute to a productive and memorable committee experience. I look forward to meeting all of you. I hope we can make this conference enjoyable and special in your hearts. I wish you the best of luck in your preparations and look forward to seeing you at the conference. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

gulcigucci13@gmail.com

+905524801610

Sincerely,

Gülçeray Kaya

1-The impact of the global arms race and emerging technologies on international security Introduction

The global arms race is a rapid, competitive increase in the quantity and quality of military resources between two or more rival nations, driven by mutual distrust and the desire for geopolitical dominance. It started as a mechanism built upon security concerns around the world. At the beginning, the arms race was about security, but it expanded significantly over time and this led major powers into a highly competitive race. Technology improved rapidly as countries continuously tried to strengthen their military capabilities and actions accelerated and increased over time. These actions brought concepts like the security dilemma because actions were taken by only the already developed countries such as Russian Federation, United States of America and China and that caused other states to feel less secure and respond by enhancing their own military capabilities correlated to their resources but the other states weren't strong opponents to Russian Federation, United States of America or China. So less developed countries often chose to cooperate with one another as a means of strengthening their position. Nevertheless, such cooperation sometimes led to further conflicts and disagreements between states. As a result, competition escalates even when the original purpose was defense rather than aggression.

Analogies in the Arms Race

Prisoner's Dilemma

Prisoner's Dilemma holds a crucial role to understand the continuous actions of the countries. It is a basic chart for interdependent countries that shows the best responses to the actions made by the other country. For example, let's have Country A and Country B. Country A will look up to Country B to choose what path to choose. Since the future cannot be predicted Country A will consider both paths that Country B may follow which are increasing their military capabilities or not to increase their military capabilities. If they choose not to increase their military capacities they can save resources and reduce tensions. However, each country fears that the other might choose to arm itself. Because being defended is a better option for the states rather than taking risks and expecting rival states to do the same and not increasing their military capacities. As a result, both countries often decide to strengthen their militaries to create a safer environment for the civilians. As a result both countries become heavily armed for their beneficial outcomes. This dilemma shows why arms races are always increasing and continuing despite the risks and costs.

The Red Queen Hypothesis:

It provides a framework for understanding why technological competition in the field of the global arms race increases at an increasing rate. This hypothesis originally developed in evolutionary

biology; the theory suggests that everything must continuously adapt to maintain their existing position on earth to compete with other species. When we change the concept to international security the concept says that states must constantly develop new military technologies in order to keep their strategic advantages and maintain their current level of security. As technological innovation advances, military powers cannot afford to remain stagnant. Developments in artificial intelligence, cyber capabilities, autonomous weapon systems, hypersonic missiles, and space technologies compel states to invest in further research and modernization efforts. If one state achieves a significant technological achievement, other states may perceive a strategic disadvantage and respond by developing more efficient military development programs on their own. Consequently, technological competition becomes a self-reinforcing cycle in which states must continuously innovate to avoid falling behind. This dynamic has become a defining feature of the contemporary arms race and presents significant challenges for international security and strategic stability.

Different Perspectives

The United States

Primary Threat

The United States perceives the simultaneous rise of China as a competitor and Russia's revisionist military modernization as primary strategic threats. China's military-civil fusion model, rapid AI advancements, and expansion into the Asia-Pacific are seen as long-term systemic challenges, while Russia's asymmetric nuclear modernization and hybrid warfare capabilities pose immediate Euro-Atlantic security concerns. The U.S. National Security Commission on AI warned that the American competitive military-technical advantage could be lost within a decade without accelerated AI adoption.

Strategic Position

The U.S. is the ruling power that aims to preserve the existing liberal international order. Its strategic doctrine is rooted in a decades-long pursuit of technological superiority through successive "Offset Strategies": the First Offset (1950s, nuclear deterrence), the Second Offset (1970s-1990s, precision guidance, stealth, ISR), and the Third Offset (2016-present, AI and autonomy). The core assumption is that information technological superiority equals military superiority, and the military-industrial-academic complex remains the primary engine of innovation.

Priority Technology

The U.S. prioritizes integrated battlefield vision: AI-powered command, control, communications, computers, and intelligence (C4I) sensor grids, autonomous systems, quantum computing, and space-based platforms. The "Golden Dome for America" missile defense initiative (announced May 2025)

represents a multi-layered shield against ballistic, hypersonic, and cruise missiles. AI is treated as "the technological sauce of the Third Offset Strategy" — a force multiplier that allows the U.S. to avoid matching adversaries "tank for tank, plane for plane".

Deterrence Model

The U.S. relies on technology-based deterrence through dominance: maintaining such a qualitative technological edge that adversaries are deterred from challenging. This includes nuclear deterrence (modernized triad with W76-2 low-yield warheads), conventional precision strike, cyber deterrence through "defend forward" operations, and missile defense. However, there is a deepening capability-vulnerability paradox: networked technologies improve military efficiency but simultaneously broaden the attack surface and increase vulnerability to cyberattacks.

Cyber Doctrine

The U.S. operates under the "persistent engagement" and "defend forward" doctrine articulated by US Cyber Command. This means conducting operations outside U.S. military networks to proactively disrupt adversary cyber operations before they reach American systems. The NSA dominates cyber decision-making through the Vulnerabilities Equities Process (VEP), which has historically prioritized intelligence collection (stockpiling zero-day exploits) over defensive disclosure. Three dynamics shape U.S. cyber posture: the perceived dominance of offense over defense, the institutional power of intelligence agencies, and a grey-market ecosystem for zero-day exploit

R&D Spending

The U.S. remains the world's largest military spender. The FY2024 defense budget prioritized hypersonic, space, quantum, and AI technologies. According to SIPRI, 2024 saw the highest year-on-year rise in global military expenditure since 1988 (9.4%), driven substantially by U.S. investment. The U.S. also leverages an unparalleled private-sector ecosystem (DARPA, JAIC, Silicon Valley partnerships) to sustain its technological edge.

Russian Federation

Primary Threat

Russia views NATO enlargement and U.S. missile defense systems as existential strategic threats. American missile defense is perceived as a direct challenge to Russia's nuclear deterrent, potentially neutralizing its second-strike capability and thereby undermining mutually assured destruction. The Ukraine war has intensified this perception and accelerated Russia's investment in asymmetric technological counters.

Strategic Position

Russia is a revisionist power seeking to disrupt the U.S.-led security architecture and restore strategic parity. Emerging technologies are treated as a double-edged sword: they offer the potential to maintain parity with the United States, but they also risk lowering the nuclear threshold and enabling more effective counterforce strategies that could increase the likelihood of conflict escalation. Russia is a first-mover in several hypersonic weapons systems, having already deployed operational systems.

Priority Technology

Russia prioritizes hypersonic weapons as its asymmetric answer to U.S. missile defense superiority. Key systems include the Avangard hypersonic glide vehicle (Mach 20, nuclear-capable, already deployed), the Kinzhal air-launched hypersonic missile, and low-yield tactical nuclear warheads designed to widen Russia's escalation options. Russia also invests heavily in AI for nuclear command and control, autonomous systems, and anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons, although it lags behind the U.S. and China in general-purpose AI.

Deterrence Model

Russia relies on asymmetric escalation deterrence — compensating for conventional inferiority by lowering the nuclear threshold and developing weapons that can penetrate any missile defense system. Hypersonic weapons reinforce this model by compressing decision-making timelines and creating preemptive strike incentives. The deployment of low-yield nuclear weapons is meant to create "escalation dominance" — credible options for limited nuclear use that complicate NATO's defense planning without triggering full-scale strategic retaliation.

Cyber Doctrine

Russia's cyber doctrine is characterized by advanced persistent threat (APT) operations conducted by state-linked groups such as APT28 (Fancy Bear) and APT29 (Cozy Bear). These capabilities target defense sectors, critical infrastructure, and increasingly, nuclear command and control systems of adversaries. Russian cyber operations are integrated with broader hybrid warfare strategies, combining disinformation, electoral interference, and critical infrastructure penetration. The strategic aim is to weaken adversaries from within while remaining below the threshold of conventional conflict.

R&D Spending

Despite severe economic constraints from sanctions and the Ukraine war, Russia allocates a remarkable portion of its available resources to innovative military technologies. SIPRI noted that Russia's military spending continued to rise in 2024, driven by the imperative to continue the war and keep pace with the military advancements of competitors. Russia prioritizes niche areas (hypersonics,

nuclear modernization, electronic warfare) where it can achieve asymmetric impact rather than competing across the full technological spectrum.

China

Primary Threat

China perceives the United States and its Asia-Pacific alliance network (AUKUS, QUAD, bilateral treaties with Japan, South Korea, the Philippines) as the primary constraint on its regional ambitions and national resurgence. U.S. missile defense systems, aircraft carrier battle groups, and space-based surveillance capabilities are viewed as tools designed to contain China's rise and deny it regional hegemony, particularly in the South China Sea and Taiwan Strait.

Strategic Position

China is a rising power seeking to reshape the regional and ultimately global order to reflect its growing strength. Its military modernization is driven by the "military-civil fusion" (军民融合) strategy, which directs the resources of its commercial AI sector — Baidu, Alibaba, Tencent, Huawei — toward defense applications with an intensity unmatched by any other nation. China has narrowed the technological gap with the U.S. substantially and is now considered a "near-peer competitor" across multiple domains including space, cyber, and electronic warfare.

Priority Technology

China's priority technology spectrum is the broadest of the three powers. Key areas include: hypersonic weapons (DF-ZF glide vehicle, Starry Sky-2 cruise missile), space-based anti-satellite (ASAT) systems, AI for command and control, quantum computing for secure communications and decryption, and advanced missile systems. China is also rapidly expanding its nuclear arsenal, including developing low-yield warheads — a departure from its long-standing minimum deterrence posture.

Cyber Doctrine

China's cyber strategy is built on the principle of "cyber sovereignty" — the doctrine that state authority extends from the physical realm into digital space, legitimizing censorship, data localization, and surveillance. Internationally, China promotes this model as an alternative to the Western multistakeholder internet governance approach, exporting it through the Digital Silk Road. Operationally, Chinese state-linked groups such as APT10 (Stone Panda), APT41 (Barium), and Volt Typhoon conduct sophisticated cyber espionage targeting military systems, critical infrastructure, and supply chains. China has reportedly pre-positioned malware in U.S. critical infrastructure networks for potential activation during a crisis.

R&D Spending

China is the world's second-largest military spender, with defense expenditure continuing its upward trend amid intensifying geopolitical competition. However, analysts note that China remains "more of a follower than a leader in military technology advancements" in certain domains. China's advantage lies not in spending levels alone but in its ability to direct massive state resources, domestic datasets (including surveillance data), and a large AI talent pool toward military applications, free of the cultural or ethical inhibitions that constrain Western countries.

Alternative Perspectives Beyond the Triad

The U.S.-Russia-China framework captures the central dynamic of the emerging-technology arms race, but several other perspectives offer important correctives.

The European Union

Europe positions itself as a "norm entrepreneur" for trustworthy and ethical AI, having pioneered regulatory frameworks like the EU AI Act. However, it faces a stark strategic dilemma: it risks being technologically outpaced by both the U.S. and China. European Commission President von der Leyen has declared "the era of the peace dividend is long gone" and launched the InvestAI initiative (a "CERN for AI") to close the defense technology gap. Europe's challenge is not imminent invasion but strategic dependency. By the early 2030s, Europe may have no sovereign AI-native military capabilities and be forced to rely on American technology on American terms.

Small and Medium Powers (SMPs)

Nations such as India, Pakistan, Israel, Iran, and Turkey represent a distinct category. India and Pakistan, for instance, engage in an intense cyber rivalry that blurs conventional and nuclear escalation pathways. Unlike the great powers, SMPs cannot compete across the full technological spectrum. However, some scholars argue that cyber capabilities provide SMPs with a previously unavailable asymmetric strategic weapon, a "minimum cyber deterrence" posture that, like the small nuclear arsenals of France or the UK, can inflict unacceptable retaliatory punishment on a larger aggressor. The number of nations that can credibly threaten a major power in cyberspace is historically unprecedented.

The BRICS / Global South Perspective

The BRICS bloc (Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa, and expanded membership) converges around the ideology of "digital sovereignty." While a formal military cyber alliance akin to NATO is unlikely due to internal rivalries (particularly India-China tensions), BRICS members collectively work to reshape global internet governance norms, counter Western financial sanctions, and construct alternatives to Western-dominated technological infrastructure such as the BRICS Pay system. This is contributing to a "splinternet" the fragmentation of the global digital ecosystem into two distinct spheres: one based on multistakeholder and open principles, the other centered on state sovereignty and control.

The Non-Nuclear Weapon States and the NPT Regime

Countries such as Japan, South Korea, Saudi Arabia, and Turkey face a fundamentally different calculus. Perceiving rising regional threats and the deterioration of great-power arms control, voices in these countries have shown growing interest in developing their own nuclear deterrent capabilities. While their governments remain formally committed to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the perceived security value of nuclear weapons continues to challenge the nonproliferation regime. Cyber threats to critical infrastructure add an extra layer of vulnerability that these states are often poorly equipped to manage.

Impact on International Security and Problems in the Field of Arms Race

The global arms race has had a profound impact on international security. On one hand, military capabilities can serve as a deterrent against potential aggression and help states protect their sovereignty. On the other hand, the continuous accumulation of weapons and military technologies often increases tensions between states and creates an atmosphere of mistrust. As countries seek to strengthen their security, their actions may be perceived as threats by others, leading to further military build-ups and regional instability.

Security Dilemma: One of the most significant problems associated with the arms race is the security dilemma. States often increase their military capabilities for their own security. However, other states may understand these actions as potential threats. When they see the threats they respond by strengthening their own military forces. This cycle of suspicion can lead to continuous military competition even though there isn't direct conflict. The continuous follow up and military superiority can weaken diplomatic relations and damage the trust between nations. As states become more suspicious of one state, being a part of cooperations and making peaceful conflict resolution becomes more difficult.

Rapid Development of Emerging Technologies: The advancement of technologies such as artificial intelligence, autonomous weapon systems, cyber capabilities, hypersonic missiles, and space-based technologies has transformed modern warfare. Although these innovations may improve military effectiveness, they also create uncertainty to their regulation, ethical use, and long-term outcomes. The lack of international standards may increase the risk of misuse and being unstable.

Risk of Miscalculation and Accidental Conflict: As military technologies become more advanced and response times become shorter, the possibility of miscalculation increases. States may incorrectly interpret military exercises, technological developments, or cyber activities as hostile actions. Such misunderstandings can escalate tensions and potentially trigger unintended conflicts.

Nuclear Proliferation: The spread and modernization of nuclear weapons remain major concerns for international security. As states seek stronger deterrence capabilities, the risk of nuclear proliferation grows. The existence of larger and more advanced nuclear arsenals increases the potential consequences of military confrontations and threatens global stability.

Economic Burden: Maintaining and modernizing military forces requires substantial financial resources. Excessive military spending can place a significant burden on national economies and divert resources away from sectors such as education, healthcare, infrastructure, and sustainable development. This challenge is particularly severe for developing countries. Regional Instability and

Alliance Formation: Arms races often encourage states to form military alliances in response to perceived threats. While alliances may strengthen collective security, they can also deepen geopolitical divisions and increase tensions between opposing blocs. This dynamic may contribute to instability in already fragile regions.

Lack of International Regulation: Many emerging military technologies are developing faster than international laws and regulations. Existing arms control agreements often fail to address new technologies adequately. The absence of comprehensive international frameworks creates legal and ethical uncertainties regarding the use of advanced weapons systems.

Declining Trust Between States: The continuous pursuit of military superiority can weaken diplomatic relations and reduce trust between nations. As states become increasingly suspicious of one another's intentions, opportunities for cooperation diminish, making peaceful conflict resolution more difficult.

Threats to International Peace and Stability: Ultimately, the arms race can undermine international peace and stability. The pursuit of military superiority may intensify rivalries, increase the likelihood of conflicts, and create long-term security challenges for both regional and global actors.

Must Answer Questions

1. How can international cooperation be strengthened?
2. Should the global arms race be reduced, and if so, through what measures?
3. How can trust and transparency between states be increased?
4. How should emerging military technologies be regulated?

2-The effects of cybersecurity threats on international peace and state sovereignty

Introduction

The digital transformation of global politics has introduced a domain of conflict that challenges the Westphalian foundations of the international system. Cyberspace, as a domain of warfare formally recognised by NATO since 2016, operates without the territorial boundaries, clear attribution mechanisms, or legal clarity that have historically structured inter-state relations. Cybersecurity threats ranging from state-sponsored sabotage of critical infrastructure to election interference and ransomware attacks with transnational spillover effects now sit at the centre of contemporary international security discourse.

This section examines how malicious cyber operations affect two pillars of the international order: the maintenance of international peace and the principle of state sovereignty. It begins by framing the conceptual terrain, then analyses specific mechanisms through which cyber threats erode sovereignty, before turning to their implications for international peace and the existing legal-normative responses.

The Sovereignty Gap in Cyberspace

The principle of state sovereignty, rooted in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), rests on territorial integrity, sovereign equality, non-intervention, and exclusive jurisdictional authority. Cyberspace challenges each of these premises simultaneously.

The Deterritorialised Nature of Cyber Operations

Data flows across borders instantaneously; a server hosting malware may be located in one state, the command-and-control infrastructure in another, and the targeted systems in a third. Cloud computing further decouples government functions from physical territory. Kello (2017) argues that cyberspace creates a "sovereignty gap" in which both state and non-state actors can project power across borders without crossing a single soldier.

The Attribution Problem and Accountability

A central challenge for sovereignty is the difficulty of attributing cyber operations to a responsible state actor with the legal certainty required for countermeasures or self-defence. Anonymity, the use of proxies, and false-flag operations enable states to conduct hostile operations while maintaining plausible deniability. This attribution gap erodes the deterrent function of sovereignty: a state whose territory is penetrated by a foreign cyber operation may lack the evidence to name the perpetrator, let alone to invoke state responsibility under international law.

The Transformation, Not the End, of Sovereignty

The scholarly consensus is not that sovereignty dissolves in cyberspace, but that it transforms. The Adaptive Sovereignty framework explains that states increasingly shift from territorial control to functional control, from jurisdictional claims based on geography to effects-based principles, and from unilateral responses to coordinated multilateral attribution mechanisms. Sovereignty persists as an institution, but its operational modalities are being reshaped by the structural characteristics of the cyber domain.

How Cyber Threats Erode State Sovereignty

State sovereignty is violated through cyber operations in two principal ways: infringement upon territorial integrity and interference with inherently governmental functions.

Physical Damage and Loss of Functionality

The most unambiguous violations occur when cyber operations cause physical damage or sustained loss of functionality to a state's infrastructure. Stuxnet (2010) physically destroyed approximately 1,000 centrifuges at Iran's Natanz nuclear facility. Shamoon (2012) corrupted the Master Boot Record of over 30,000 Saudi Aramco computers, requiring physical replacement of hard drives. The BlackEnergy attack on Ukraine's power grid (2015) caused the first documented cyber-induced blackout, leaving approximately 230,000 civilians without electricity.

Interference with Inherently Governmental Functions

Cyber operations that do not cause physical damage may still violate sovereignty if they interfere with functions that fall within the exclusive competency of the state. Election interference, such as the Russian operations targeting the 2016 US presidential election, exemplifies this category: altering electronic ballots, disseminating stolen communications to influence voters, and undermining public confidence in democratic processes constitute intervention in the internal affairs of a sovereign state.

The Question of Cyber Espionage

The status of cyber espionage under the sovereignty principle remains contested. The Tallinn Manual 2.0 notes that cyber espionage alone, when it involves only data-gathering without physical damage or functional disruption, does not necessarily breach territorial sovereignty. However, once malware penetrates governmental systems, the latent threat to system integrity blurs the line between passive intelligence collection and active interference. A growing number of states, including France and Costa Rica, have asserted that certain forms of cyber espionage may amount to sovereignty violations.

Cyber Threats to International Peace and Security

The UN Charter confers upon the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. Cyber operations raise difficult questions about when, and how, the Council's Chapter VII powers should be invoked in response to hostile cyber activity.

The Threshold Problem

Article 2(4) of the UN Charter prohibits the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. Applying this prohibition to cyber operations is notoriously difficult. The Schmitt Analysis proposes seven criteria (severity, immediacy, directness, invasiveness, measurability, presumptive legitimacy, and responsibility) to assess whether a cyber operation constitutes a use of force. However, the Tallinn Manual acknowledges that below the threshold of armed attack, states operate in a grey zone where the law is unsettled.

A key distinction: the Security Council can determine that a cyber operation constitutes a "threat to the peace" under Article 39 even if it does not reach the level of armed attack or use of force. This grants the Council broad discretion to authorise measures in response to cyber operations

Critical Infrastructure and Civilian Harm

Cyber attacks targeting critical national infrastructure (CNI) pose a direct threat to international peace through their potential to cause cascading humanitarian crises. NotPetya (2017), attributed to Russian military intelligence, caused over USD 10 billion in global damages, paralysed 20% of global shipping through Maersk, disrupted the Ukrainian financial and energy sectors, and spilled over to affect healthcare, government, and transport systems worldwide. WannaCry (2017), attributed to North Korea, forced the cancellation of routine and non-emergency surgeries across England's National Health Service, with an estimated direct cost of £92 million.

The UNIDIR 2025 report warns that cyberattacks on CNI, combined with the rise of cybercrime-as-a-service and the increasing sophistication of non-state actors, may create a security dilemma in which the lowering of barriers to entry for malicious activities generates persistent low-intensity conflict beneath the threshold of traditional armed conflict.

Grey Zone Conflict and Strategic Instability

Cyberspace is the paradigmatic domain for grey zone conflict: operations that are hostile and consequential but fall below the threshold that would trigger a formal military response. As Lt Gen Graeme Lamb describes, "we are neither in a state of peace nor are we in a state of war, but we are sitting in this very dangerous place between". This persistent condition of "unpeace" creates strategic instability, as states cannot reliably distinguish between exploration, espionage, and preparation for offensive action, fuelling a digital security dilemma.

The International Legal and Normative Framework

The international community has pursued two parallel tracks to address cyber threats: the application of existing international law and the development of voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour.

The Tallinn Manuals

The Tallinn Manuals (2013 and 2017), produced by an international group of experts at the invitation of the NATO CCDCOE (Cooperative Cyber Defence Centre of Excellence), represent the most comprehensive attempt to apply existing international law to cyber operations. Tallinn Manual 2.0 explicitly provides that "the physical, logical and social layers of cyberspace are encompassed in the principle of sovereignty" and affirms that cyber operations causing physical damage, loss of functionality, or interference with inherently governmental functions violate sovereignty. However, the Manuals are not binding, and significant disagreements remain among states regarding key thresholds and interpretations.

The UN Framework: GGE and OEWG

The UN Group of Governmental Experts (GGE) on Information Security, in its 2013 and 2015 reports, affirmed that international law applies to cyberspace and proposed 11 voluntary norms of responsible state behaviour. These include prohibitions on attacking critical infrastructure and on knowingly allowing one's territory to be used for internationally wrongful cyber acts. The Open-Ended Working Group (OEWG), which concluded its 2021-2025 cycle, reaffirmed state sovereignty and sovereign equality as applying to state ICT-related activities and reaffirmed Article 2(4) of the UN Charter.

Chronic Enforcement Gaps

Despite normative progress, enforcement remains the critical weakness. Voluntary norms lack binding force. The law of state responsibility, with its high threshold for attribution and its control tests requiring proof that a state issued specific directions for an attack, leaves many harmful cyber operations without legal remedy. There is no international cyber court, no mandatory reporting mechanism, and no consensus on what constitutes a proportionate response to a cyber operation that falls short of armed attack.

The Disproportionate Impact on Developing States

The current legal architecture disproportionately disadvantages developing states, which often lack the cyber defence infrastructure, technical capacity for attribution, and geopolitical leverage to respond effectively to cyber operations against them. Garcia argues that the international legal framework should expand the use of force doctrine to account for the targeting of critical infrastructure and relax state responsibility tests to capture less obvious forms of state involvement in cyber operations.

The Emerging Concept of Cyber Peacekeeping

A growing body of scholarship argues that if cyber warfare can threaten international peace and security, the UN must develop peacekeeping capabilities adapted to the cyber domain. Cyber peacekeeping would involve the application of UN peacekeeping methods — observation, monitoring, reporting, and civilian protection — to cyberspace.

Proposed functions include monitoring compliance with cyber ceasefire terms, verifying the restoration of critical infrastructure after cyberattacks, providing secure communication channels for civilian populations, and attributing violations of agreed cyber norms. The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) doctrine has also been invoked as a potential justification for cyber peacekeeping, particularly in cases where cyber attacks contribute to state collapse or widespread humanitarian suffering.

However, significant obstacles remain: the limited supply of cyber expertise, political resistance from states that view cyber capabilities as instruments of statecraft, and the structural difficulty of applying geographically-bound peacekeeping mandates to a deterritorialised domain.

3 - The Effectiveness and Legitimacy of Economic Sanctions Imposed by the United Nations

Introduction

Economic sanctions have become one of the most important non-military tools available to the international community. Rather than using armed force, states and international organizations often rely on economic pressure to influence the behavior of governments that violate international law, threaten international peace, or commit serious human rights abuses. Among all international organizations, the United Nations (UN) holds a unique position because its sanctions are legally binding on all member states when adopted by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. The use of sanctions has increased significantly since the end of the Cold War. The Security Council has imposed sanctions on countries, organizations, and individuals involved in armed conflicts, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and violations of international norms. Examples include sanctions against Iraq, Iran, North Korea, Libya, and various terrorist groups. These measures have ranged from comprehensive trade embargoes to targeted financial restrictions and travel bans. Despite their widespread use, economic sanctions remain controversial. Supporters argue that sanctions provide a peaceful alternative to military intervention and allow the international community to respond to threats without resorting to war. Critics, however, question whether sanctions actually achieve their political goals and argue that they often impose severe hardships on ordinary civilians rather than political leaders. These concerns have generated an ongoing debate regarding both the effectiveness and legitimacy of sanctions.

Background of the Issue

The concept of economic sanctions is based on the idea that economic pressure can influence political behavior. By restricting access to international markets, financial systems, trade opportunities, and foreign investment, sanctions seek to increase the costs of certain actions and encourage compliance with international norms. Historically, sanctions have existed for centuries. Ancient Greek city-states sometimes used trade restrictions against rivals, while modern sanctions emerged as a formal diplomatic instrument during the twentieth century. After the establishment of the United Nations in 1945, sanctions became part of the collective security framework envisioned by the UN Charter. The Security Council may impose sanctions when it determines that a situation constitutes a threat to international peace and security. Unlike unilateral sanctions imposed by individual countries, UN sanctions carry international legal authority because they are adopted collectively by member states through the Security Council. During the 1990s, sanctions became one of the most frequently used instruments of international diplomacy. The sanctions imposed on Iraq following its invasion of Kuwait represented one of the most comprehensive sanctions regimes in modern history. Although these measures significantly weakened Iraq's economy, they also contributed to widespread

humanitarian difficulties. The Iraqi case sparked intense debate regarding the ethical consequences of broad economic restrictions. As a result, the international community gradually shifted toward targeted or "smart" sanctions. These measures focus on political leaders, military officials, terrorist organizations, and specific economic sectors rather than entire populations. The goal is to maximize political pressure while minimizing humanitarian harm. Today, sanctions are used in a variety of contexts. They may seek to prevent nuclear proliferation, combat terrorism, end armed conflicts, protect human rights, or support peace agreements. However, questions remain regarding whether sanctions actually change state behavior and whether they can be justified when civilian populations suffer economic consequences. The issue has become increasingly complex due to globalization. Modern economies are interconnected through trade networks, financial systems, and technological infrastructure. As a result, sanctions may produce unintended consequences that extend beyond the targeted state and affect neighboring countries, international businesses, and global markets.

Legal Framework

The legal basis for UN sanctions is primarily found in Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter. This chapter grants the Security Council authority to respond to threats to international peace and security. Article 39 authorizes the Security Council to determine whether a threat to peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression exists. Once such a determination has been made, the Council may adopt measures designed to address the situation.

Article 41 specifically provides for non-military measures. These may include:

- Economic restrictions

- Trade embargoes

- Financial sanctions

- Transportation restrictions

- Communication limitations

Diplomatic measures

If Article 41 measures prove insufficient, Article 42 permits the Security Council to authorize military action. Consequently, sanctions are often viewed as an intermediate option between diplomacy and military intervention.

One of the most important legal characteristics of UN sanctions is their binding nature. Under Article 25 of the Charter, member states agree to carry out Security Council decisions. This distinguishes UN sanctions from unilateral sanctions imposed by individual countries. Nevertheless, legal controversies remain. Critics argue that sanctions sometimes conflict with human rights obligations when they contribute to shortages of food, medicine, or essential services. Others question the fairness of decision-making within the Security Council, where the five permanent members possess veto power. Due process concerns have also emerged regarding targeted sanctions. Individuals placed on sanctions lists may experience restrictions on travel and access to financial assets without having sufficient opportunities to challenge these decisions. In response, the UN has introduced review mechanisms and oversight procedures designed to improve transparency and accountability.

Current Situation

Economic sanctions remain one of the most frequently used instruments of international governance. The United Nations currently maintains multiple sanctions regimes addressing issues such as armed conflict, terrorism, nuclear proliferation, and threats to regional stability. One of the most significant contemporary examples involves North Korea. The Security Council has imposed extensive sanctions in response to the country's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs. These sanctions target financial transactions, trade activities, and access to sensitive technologies. Despite these measures, North Korea has continued many aspects of its nuclear development, leading some observers to question the effectiveness of sanctions alone. Sanctions related to terrorism also remain highly relevant. The United Nations continues to maintain sanctions lists targeting individuals and organizations associated with extremist groups. These measures focus on disrupting financial networks and limiting international mobility. Recent global developments have further complicated sanctions policy. Increased economic interdependence means that sanctions can produce consequences far beyond the targeted state. Energy markets, food supplies, international investment, and supply chains may all be affected by major sanctions regimes. At the same time, advances in technology have

created new challenges. Digital currencies, alternative financial systems, and complex international trade networks can make enforcement more difficult. Governments and organizations may develop strategies to circumvent restrictions, reducing the overall effectiveness of sanctions. Humanitarian concerns remain central to contemporary discussions. International organizations increasingly emphasize the need for exemptions that allow the delivery of food, medicine, and humanitarian assistance. Policymakers continue to seek ways to ensure that sanctions target decision-makers rather than vulnerable civilian populations.

Major Stakeholders

Different actors are affected by sanctions in different ways, and their perspectives often shape international debates on the issue.

United Nations Security Council

The Security Council is the primary body responsible for imposing sanctions under the UN Charter. Its fifteen members, particularly the five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States), play a decisive role in determining when sanctions are applied, modified, or removed.

The Security Council views sanctions as an important tool for maintaining international peace and security. However, disagreements among permanent members can prevent sanctions from being adopted or renewed. Political interests often influence voting behavior, raising questions regarding consistency and fairness.

Targeted States

Countries subjected to sanctions are among the most directly affected stakeholders. Governments often argue that sanctions violate their sovereignty and interfere with domestic affairs. Targeted states may attempt to develop alternative economic partnerships, strengthen domestic production, or seek support from allied countries. Many sanctioned governments claim that sanctions are politically motivated rather than genuinely aimed at maintaining international peace and security.

Civilian Populations

Ordinary citizens frequently experience the indirect consequences of sanctions. Economic restrictions may lead to inflation, unemployment, shortages of essential goods, and reduced access to healthcare services. Although modern targeted sanctions seek to minimize harm to civilians, many humanitarian organizations continue to argue that ordinary people often bear a disproportionate share of the burden.

Humanitarian Organizations

International humanitarian organizations play an important role in monitoring the impact of sanctions on civilian populations. Organizations involved in humanitarian assistance often advocate for exemptions that allow the delivery of food, medicine, and emergency supplies. These groups emphasize that sanctions should never prevent access to basic human needs and humanitarian relief.

Member States

All UN member states are responsible for implementing Security Council sanctions. Their cooperation is crucial for enforcement. However, states may differ significantly in their willingness and ability to enforce sanctions. Some countries strongly support sanctions as a means of promoting international norms, while others view them as ineffective or politically biased.

International Businesses and Financial Institutions

Banks, multinational corporations, and international investors are heavily affected by sanctions. Financial institutions are often responsible for implementing asset freezes and monitoring transactions. Businesses may face significant economic losses when sanctions disrupt trade relations, supply chains, and investment opportunities.

Previous UN Actions

The United Nations has implemented numerous sanctions regimes throughout its history. Examining previous actions helps delegates understand both the strengths and limitations of sanctions as a policy instrument.

Iraq (1990–2003)

Following Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in 1990, the Security Council imposed comprehensive economic sanctions. These measures significantly weakened Iraq's economy and contributed to pressure on the Iraqi government.

However, the sanctions also generated severe humanitarian consequences. Shortages of food, medicine, and essential services led to widespread criticism. The Iraqi case became a major factor in the transition toward targeted sanctions.

Libya (1992–2003)

Sanctions were imposed on Libya after accusations of involvement in international terrorism, particularly the Lockerbie bombing. Restrictions included air travel limitations and economic measures.

Many analysts consider the Libyan case a relatively successful example because sanctions contributed to negotiations and eventual cooperation with international investigations.

Iran

The UN imposed sanctions on Iran due to concerns regarding its nuclear program. These measures targeted financial transactions, arms transfers, and nuclear-related activities.

Supporters argue that sanctions contributed to diplomatic negotiations that eventually resulted in the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). Critics maintain that sanctions alone were not responsible for the agreement.

North Korea

North Korea has been subject to some of the most extensive sanctions regimes in modern history. These measures target financial networks, imports, exports, and access to sensitive technologies.

Despite decades of sanctions, North Korea continues to maintain its nuclear weapons program, leading many experts to question the long-term effectiveness of sanctions in achieving major strategic objectives.

Counter-Terrorism Sanctions

Following the September 11 attacks, the Security Council expanded sanctions targeting terrorist organizations and individuals. Asset freezes, travel bans, and restrictions on financial activities became important tools in international counter-terrorism efforts.

These sanctions remain active today and continue to evolve in response to emerging threats.

Challenges and Criticisms

Although sanctions are widely used, they face significant challenges and criticisms.

Limited Effectiveness

One of the most common criticisms is that sanctions do not always achieve their intended goals. Political leaders may remain in power despite economic pressure, while governments often develop strategies to circumvent restrictions.

Some studies suggest that sanctions are more effective in achieving limited objectives than major political transformations.

Humanitarian Impact

The humanitarian consequences of sanctions remain one of the most controversial aspects of the issue. Economic restrictions can increase poverty, reduce access to healthcare, and weaken public services.

Critics argue that sanctions frequently punish ordinary citizens more than political elites.

Enforcement Difficulties

Effective sanctions require international cooperation. If some countries fail to enforce restrictions, targeted states may continue accessing international markets through alternative channels.

Smuggling networks, illicit financial systems, and sanctions evasion strategies can significantly reduce effectiveness.

Political Bias

Some observers argue that sanctions are applied inconsistently. Powerful countries may receive different treatment compared to weaker states due to political considerations within the Security Council. This perception can undermine the legitimacy of sanctions and reduce international trust in the system.

Sovereignty Concerns

Many governments argue that sanctions interfere with national sovereignty. They claim that external economic pressure may violate the principle that states should determine their own political and economic systems.

Bloc Positions

Western States

Western countries generally support sanctions as an alternative to military intervention. They often emphasize the importance of enforcing international law, protecting human rights, and preventing security threats. The United States, United Kingdom, France, Canada, and many European Union members frequently advocate for targeted sanctions.

Russia and China

Russia and China generally support a more cautious approach. Both countries emphasize state sovereignty and non-interference in domestic affairs. They often argue that sanctions should be used only as a last resort and should be accompanied by diplomatic engagement.

Developing Countries

Many developing countries hold mixed positions. While they support international peace and security, they are often concerned about humanitarian consequences and economic impacts.

These states frequently advocate for greater fairness, transparency, and humanitarian protections.

Non-Aligned States

Countries within the Non-Aligned Movement often stress respect for sovereignty and oppose unilateral sanctions. They may support UN-authorized sanctions but generally favor diplomatic solutions and dialogue.

Humanitarian Actors

Humanitarian organizations prioritize the protection of civilians. They typically support exemptions for humanitarian aid and advocate for stronger monitoring of humanitarian impacts.

Must Answer Questions:

1. Under what circumstances should the United Nations impose economic sanctions?
2. How can the Security Council ensure that sanctions remain consistent with international law and human rights standards?
3. What measures can reduce humanitarian suffering while maintaining political pressure?
4. How can sanctions enforcement be strengthened to prevent evasion?

4 - The Role and Limitations of Global Organizations in Crisis

Management

Introduction

In an increasingly interconnected world, crises rarely remain confined within national borders. Pandemics, financial crises, armed conflicts, climate-related disasters, and humanitarian emergencies often affect multiple countries simultaneously. As a result, international cooperation has become essential for addressing global challenges effectively. Global organizations play a central role in facilitating this cooperation by coordinating responses, providing expertise, mobilizing resources, and supporting affected populations. Organizations such as the United Nations (UN), the World Health Organization (WHO), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Bank have become key actors in modern crisis management. These institutions were established to promote stability, encourage international collaboration, and provide assistance during emergencies. Through financial support, technical expertise, peacekeeping operations, and humanitarian aid, they help countries respond to crises that exceed national capacities. However, despite their importance, global organizations face significant limitations. Political disagreements among member states, limited funding, bureaucratic procedures, and questions regarding legitimacy often restrict their ability to respond effectively. Recent global crises have highlighted both the strengths and weaknesses of international institutions. The COVID-19 pandemic, the 2008 Global Financial Crisis, and various humanitarian emergencies have demonstrated the importance of coordinated international action. At the same time, these events have revealed challenges related to decision-making, resource distribution, and international cooperation.

Background of the Issue

The idea of international cooperation in crisis management emerged from the recognition that certain challenges cannot be solved by individual states alone. Economic instability, infectious diseases, refugee movements, and environmental disasters often cross borders and require collective action. Following the devastation of the Second World War, governments sought to create institutions capable of preventing future conflicts and promoting international stability. The United Nations was established in 1945 with the primary objective of maintaining international peace and security. Over time, additional organizations were created to address specific areas of concern. The World Health Organization was founded in 1948 to coordinate international health efforts and combat global diseases. The International Monetary Fund and the World Bank were established to promote economic stability and support post-war reconstruction. Together, these institutions formed the foundation of the modern international system. As globalization intensified during the late twentieth century, international crises became more interconnected. Financial markets became increasingly integrated, international travel expanded rapidly, and global supply chains linked economies across continents.

While globalization created significant opportunities, it also increased vulnerability to transnational crises. For example, a disease outbreak in one region can quickly become a global pandemic through international travel. Similarly, financial instability in one country may spread through global markets and affect economies worldwide. Climate-related disasters may trigger humanitarian crises, migration flows, and economic disruptions that extend far beyond national borders. These developments have increased the importance of global organizations. They provide platforms for information sharing, technical coordination, financial assistance, and collective decision-making. Nevertheless, their effectiveness often depends on the willingness of member states to cooperate and provide resources. Today, policymakers face a critical question: how can international organizations remain effective in an increasingly complex and politically divided world?

Historical Development of International Crisis Management

The evolution of global crisis management reflects broader developments in international relations. Before the twentieth century, responses to major crises were primarily national or regional in nature. There were few permanent institutions capable of coordinating international action. The creation of the League of Nations after the First World War represented an early attempt to establish a system of collective security. However, the League faced significant limitations and ultimately failed to prevent the outbreak of the Second World War. The establishment of the United Nations in 1945 marked a major turning point. Unlike its predecessor, the UN possessed broader membership and stronger institutional structures. Specialized agencies were gradually developed to address specific global challenges. During the Cold War, international organizations often faced difficulties due to ideological competition between major powers. Nevertheless, institutions such as the WHO and IMF continued to expand their activities and develop expertise in their respective fields. The end of the Cold War created new opportunities for international cooperation. Peacekeeping operations increased significantly, humanitarian interventions became more common, and global organizations assumed greater responsibilities in crisis management. The twenty-first century introduced new challenges. Terrorism, financial crises, pandemics, cyber threats, and climate change required increasingly sophisticated responses. Global organizations adapted by expanding their programs, improving coordination mechanisms, and strengthening partnerships with governments and non-governmental organizations. Recent crises have demonstrated that while international institutions remain indispensable, they must continually evolve to address emerging threats.

Major Global Organizations and Their Mandates

United Nations (UN)

The United Nations is the world's most comprehensive international organization. Its primary objectives include maintaining international peace and security, promoting human rights, supporting sustainable development, and coordinating humanitarian assistance. The UN conducts peacekeeping operations, facilitates diplomatic negotiations, coordinates disaster relief efforts, and supports conflict resolution. During humanitarian emergencies, various UN agencies work together to provide assistance to affected populations. Despite its broad mandate, the UN often faces challenges related to political divisions among member states, particularly within the Security Council.

World Health Organization (WHO)

The WHO serves as the leading international authority on public health. Its responsibilities include monitoring disease outbreaks, coordinating international health responses, establishing health guidelines, and supporting national healthcare systems. The organization played a major role during the COVID-19 pandemic by collecting data, issuing recommendations, and facilitating international cooperation. However, the WHO has also faced criticism regarding the speed of certain responses, funding limitations, and political pressures from member states.

International Monetary Fund (IMF)

The IMF was established to promote international monetary cooperation and financial stability. It provides financial assistance, technical expertise, and policy recommendations to countries experiencing economic difficulties. During financial crises, the IMF offers emergency loans designed to stabilize economies and restore investor confidence. The organization played a significant role during the Asian Financial Crisis, the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, and the economic consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic. Critics argue that IMF programs sometimes impose difficult economic conditions that may create social and political challenges.

World Bank

The World Bank focuses primarily on economic development and poverty reduction. It provides loans, grants, and technical assistance to developing countries. In crisis situations, the World Bank often supports reconstruction efforts, infrastructure development, and long-term recovery projects. Its work is particularly important following natural disasters and armed conflicts.

Other Relevant Organizations

Several additional organizations contribute to crisis management, including regional organizations such as the European Union, African Union, Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), and

NATO. Non-governmental organizations such as the Red Cross and Médecins Sans Frontières also play crucial roles in humanitarian response. These actors often work alongside global organizations to deliver aid and coordinate emergency operations.

Current Situation

Global organizations are currently operating in an environment characterized by unprecedented complexity. Multiple crises frequently occur simultaneously, placing significant pressure on international institutions. The COVID-19 pandemic demonstrated both the necessity and limitations of international cooperation. Organizations such as the WHO coordinated information sharing and public health guidance, while the IMF and World Bank provided financial assistance to countries facing economic hardship. Despite these efforts, unequal access to vaccines, political disagreements, and logistical challenges revealed weaknesses within the international system. Climate change is creating additional challenges. Extreme weather events, rising sea levels, droughts, and food insecurity increasingly require coordinated international responses. Many experts predict that climate-related crises will become more frequent in the coming decades. Armed conflicts continue to generate humanitarian emergencies. Millions of people worldwide have been displaced by violence, increasing the demand for humanitarian assistance and international protection. At the same time, geopolitical tensions among major powers have complicated international cooperation. Disagreements between influential states can delay decision-making processes and limit the effectiveness of global organizations. Technological developments have introduced both opportunities and challenges. Digital communication facilitates information sharing and coordination, yet cyber threats and misinformation campaigns may complicate crisis response efforts.

Major Stakeholders

Crisis management at the global level involves a wide range of stakeholders, each with different interests, responsibilities, and levels of influence.

Member States

Member states are the primary actors within global organizations. They provide funding, participate in decision-making, and implement policies at the national level. Their cooperation is essential for the success of international responses.

However, states often prioritize national interests, which can lead to disagreements and delays in collective action. Powerful states may also exert greater influence over international decision-making processes.

International Organizations

Organizations such as the United Nations, WHO, IMF, and World Bank act as central coordinating bodies in global crises. They design response strategies, distribute resources, and provide technical expertise. Their effectiveness depends heavily on member state cooperation and financial contributions.

Civil Society and NGOs

Non-governmental organizations, including humanitarian groups and advocacy organizations, play a crucial role in crisis response. They often operate directly in affected regions, delivering aid and providing services where state capacity is limited. These organizations are particularly important in humanitarian crises, where rapid response is required.

Affected Populations

Individuals and communities affected by crises are the most vulnerable stakeholders. Their needs include access to food, healthcare, shelter, education, and security. Despite being the primary beneficiaries of crisis management efforts, they often have limited influence in international decision-making processes.

Private Sector

The private sector, including multinational corporations and financial institutions, plays an increasingly important role in crisis management. Companies may provide logistics, funding, technology, and infrastructure support during emergencies. However, private sector involvement may also raise concerns about profit motives and unequal access to resources.

Previous International Actions and Case Studies

COVID-19 Pandemic

The COVID-19 pandemic represents one of the most significant global crises in modern history. The World Health Organization coordinated international health responses by issuing guidelines, tracking the spread of the virus, and supporting vaccine development efforts.

The IMF and World Bank provided financial assistance to countries facing economic collapse. Despite these efforts, unequal vaccine distribution and national competition for medical supplies highlighted major weaknesses in global coordination.

2008 Global Financial Crisis

The 2008 financial crisis demonstrated the importance of international economic cooperation. The IMF played a key role in stabilizing economies by providing emergency loans and policy

recommendations. The World Bank supported developing countries that were indirectly affected by the global economic downturn. Coordination among major economies helped prevent a deeper global recession, although the recovery process varied significantly between countries.

Ebola Outbreak in West Africa

The Ebola outbreak highlighted both the strengths and weaknesses of global health coordination. The WHO and various NGOs provided medical assistance, logistical support, and emergency response teams. However, delayed international response in the early stages of the outbreak was widely criticized, showing the need for faster mobilization mechanisms.

Syrian Refugee Crisis

The Syrian conflict created one of the largest refugee crises in recent history. The United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) coordinated humanitarian assistance and resettlement programs. However, limited funding and political disagreements among member states restricted the effectiveness of the response.

Challenges and Limitations of Global Organizations

Political Divisions

One of the most significant limitations is political disagreement among member states. Conflicting national interests can delay decision-making and weaken collective responses.

In some cases, geopolitical rivalries prevent effective cooperation in crisis situations.

Limited Resources

Many global organizations rely on voluntary contributions from member states. This creates financial uncertainty and limits their operational capacity during large-scale crises. Resource shortages can delay humanitarian aid and reduce the scale of interventions.

Bureaucratic Inefficiency

Large international organizations often face complex administrative procedures. While these structures ensure accountability, they can also slow down emergency response efforts.

In fast-moving crises, delays can significantly reduce effectiveness.

Lack of Enforcement Power

Most international organizations do not have direct enforcement authority. They depend on states to implement decisions, which may not always occur consistently.

Sovereignty Concerns

States often resist external intervention in domestic affairs. Concerns about sovereignty can limit the ability of international organizations to act decisively during crises.

Balancing sovereignty with global responsibility remains a key challenge.

Bloc Positions

Developed Countries

Developed states generally support strong international institutions but often emphasize efficiency, accountability, and cost-sharing. They may advocate for reforms that improve performance and transparency.

Developing Countries

Developing countries often support international cooperation but stress fairness, equitable representation, and financial support. They may call for increased funding and greater voice in decision-making processes.

Emerging Powers

Countries such as China, India, and Brazil tend to support reforms that increase their influence within global institutions. They often advocate for a more multipolar international system.

Western Alliances

Western blocs typically support strengthening existing institutions like the UN, IMF, and WHO while improving coordination and crisis response mechanisms.

Humanitarian and NGO Networks

These actors focus on rapid response, civilian protection, and access to affected populations. They generally advocate for reduced political interference in humanitarian operations.

Must Answer Questions:

1. How can global organizations improve coordination during simultaneous global crises?
2. What reforms are needed to increase funding stability and resource allocation?
3. How can decision-making processes be accelerated during emergencies?
4. What balance should be maintained between state sovereignty and international intervention?

Further Reading and Bibliography:

United Nations and Official Reports

United Nations Charter (1945)

WHO Global Health Reports

IMF World Economic Outlook Reports

UNHCR Global Trends Reports

United Nations Charter, Chapter VII

Academic Literature

Hufbauer, G., Schott, J., Elliott, K., & Oegg, B. *Economic Sanctions Reconsidered*.

Cortright, D., & Lopez, G. *The Sanctions Decade*.

Biersteker, T., Eckert, S., & Tourinho, M. *Targeted Sanctions: The Impacts and Effectiveness of UN Action*.

Barnett, M. & Finnemore, M. *Rules for the World: International Organizations in Global Politics*

Keohane, R. *After Hegemony*

Weiss, T. *What's Wrong with the United Nations and How to Fix It*

Stockholm International Peace Research Institute (SIPRI). SIPRI Yearbook 2024: Armaments, Disarmament and International Security. Oxford University Press, 2024.

European Commission. InvestAI Initiative. Brussels: European Commission, 2025.

U.S. Cyber Command. Command Vision for U.S. Cyber Command. U.S. Department of Defense.