



HAL
open science

International Cooperation in International Relations

Charlius Pierre, Lambert Edward, Helen Milner

► **To cite this version:**

Charlius Pierre, Lambert Edward, Helen Milner. International Cooperation in International Relations. *Diplomatie: affaires stratégiques et relations internationales. Les Grands dossiers*, 2024. hal-04601330

HAL Id: hal-04601330

<https://hal.science/hal-04601330v1>

Submitted on 4 Jun 2024

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Public Domain

International Cooperation in International Relations

Charlius Pierre, PhD

June 4, 2024

An Article presented to the Academic Department of International Relations of Atlantic International University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for the Degree of Post Doctorate in International Relations.

CONTENT

- **TITLE:** International Cooperation in International Relations
- **ABSTRACTS**
- **INTRODUCTION**
 - 1- The Presentation of key theories of International Cooperation.
 - A- Strengths and weaknesses of these theories.
 - B- How do these theories inform our understanding of contemporary global challenges?
 - 2- The impact of power dynamics on international cooperation.
 - 3- The role of international organizations in facilitating and maintaining International Cooperation.
 - 4- The regional organizations: their challenges, opportunities and effectiveness in promoting cooperation.
 - 5- The role of non-state actors, such as NGOs and multinational corporations, in shaping global governance policy through cooperation.
 - 6- The analysis of a recent case of successful international cooperation in resolving a global issue.
- **CONCLUSION**
- **ACRONYMS**
- **REFERENCES**

ABSTRACTS

International relations as a new field of study in political science encompasses what regulates world politics and also defines the main role of different actors involved in international system. And international cooperation becomes the strategic means pooled by different actors to maintain global governance policy, where each actor can offer its participation in multilateral diplomacy in various related areas, such as economy, politics, finance, commerce, military, etc. Most often, cooperation allows different actors to work together to combat global problems that humanity and the world face at the risk of human life. Conflicts, wars, epidemics, pandemics, environmental problems, global warming, terrorist attacks, tax evasion, human trafficking, drugs, thus, all types of conflicts that threaten peace, security and stability in the world, for which negotiation remains the main diplomatic tool to facilitate good cooperation between all actors that make up the international system and in order to guarantee progress, development, peace and stability in the world.

International cooperation in international relations is the subject of our study in which some key terms will be developed. First, some key theories of international cooperation will be presented, including their strengths and weaknesses, which at the same time allows us to ask: "How do these theories inform our understanding of contemporary global challenges?" Additionally, this article deepens our understanding of the impact of power dynamics in international cooperation. In this sense, we would like to emphasize how the states which are the main actors in the implementation of cooperation diplomacy seek, at the same time, to compete with each other to defend their own interests and ensure their survival in the anarchic world. To better maintain international relations and build international cooperation, the role of international organizations, whether global or regional, becomes essential to facilitate and shape global governance policy through cooperation, without neglecting the place occupied by private actors, such as NGOs. and multinational corporations. The analysis of a recent case of

successful international cooperation in resolving a global issue, such as Covid-19, is what renders cooperation between different actors possible.

Introduction:

The concept of cooperation is contrasted to that of competition, concurrence or rivalry through which individuals, groups, entities, peoples, states or organizations seek to pursue their own objectives without taking into account the contribution and assistance of others entities in their realization. Contrarily to competition, cooperation is closer to the notion of collaboration, participation or coordination. For *Encyclopedia*, “Cooperation is joint or collaborative behavior that is directed toward some goal and in which there is common interest or hope of reward. Cooperation may be voluntary or involuntary, direct or indirect, formal or informal, but always there is a combination of efforts toward a specific end in which all the participants have a stake, real or imagined”. This is why, “There is no limit to the potential range for cooperation; it is to be found in groups as small as the dyad and as large as leagues of sovereign states”¹. Thus, Cooperation encompass various fields and requires competencies in diverse domains, such as economy, politics, military, finance, development, religion, culture, education, tourism, etc.

Despite its involvement in various fields, cooperation in political, military, economic or financial sphere seems to take a new orientation, to the extent that the lack of cooperation or the failure of negotiations often leads to wars and conflicts between states. However, in the religious, educational, cultural and tourist areas, cooperation encompasses ethical standards to help different actors act without struggling for any specific personal interests, while states, despite their cooperation, continue to struggle to increase their political, military, economic and financial power, as well as their hegemony in the world. This is why, outside the political, military, economic and financial fields, “It is possible to regard cooperation as an ethical norm, as a social process, or as an institutional structure. In ethics and religion, cooperation has been among the most honored of values throughout human history. Indeed, some philosophers and religious teachers have made cooperation synonymous with the whole fabric of morality. Cooperation is stressed in all of the major religions and moral systems of the world. It is at the

¹ “Encyclopedia.com”, “International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences”, May 18, 2018.

very heart of Hinduism and Confucianism and has a hallowed place even in such relatively individualistic religions as Christianity”². In this perspective described and which puts an end to religious wars, cooperation between different religions comes to encompass the term of solidarity, collaboration, participation or coordination for specific objectives they want to achieve when they sometimes work in some specific areas.

However, at political, military, economic, trade and financial levels, cooperation appeared in the international arena when states struggled, fought, and later failed in diplomatic negotiation, for which international organizations were created in order to support power politics in their diplomatic settlements. Considered as a new field of study, International Cooperation has become, since several decades, a branch of International Relations which binds the relationship between numerous actors which involve in world politics. In this sense, Cooperation occurs not only among individuals, states, international organizations, but also among collective entities, including firms, political parties, ethnic organizations, terrorist groups, and nation-states.

International Cooperation Theory which has become a new field of study defines international cooperation in terms of states, but also encompasses other actors, especially Multinationals, Intergovernmental Organizations (IGOs) and Nongovernmental Organizations (NGOs). These diverse actors cooperate for different objectives across a wide range of issue areas: IGOs work with states to combat global environmental problems, firms collude to monopolize markets, NGOs campaign to save the whales, and so on³. However, despite numerous efforts to harmonize the relations of states, groups and individuals in international arena, disputes, protestation, threats, conflicts and wars among them constitute the key factors that determine the duration of their existence, in particular of the smallest states which, in the

² Ibid. Encyclopedias.com

³ “Xinyuan Dai, Duncan Snidal, and Michael Sampson”, *International Cooperation Theory and International Institutions*, 20 November 2017.

one side are experiencing internal conflicts, and in the other side, are often crushed by the military striking powers of the greatest states.

If since 1648, the Peace treaties of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years Religious Wars, has consecrated the principles of territoriality, sovereignty and self-determination, thus, the non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, despite those international agreements fixing the universal organizing principles of the world order, conflicts and wars between states have continued to crush human lives, goods and properties during the previous eras, especially in the West European countries. To increase their influences, European monarchs maximized their powers by declaring wars to each other. We number several wars which occurred during the previous eras the Westphalian Treaties. Among them we can retain: The War of the Spanish Succession (1701-1714), the Seven Year' War (1756-1763) which opposed the European great powers, the Americas and Asia-Pacific, French and Indian War (1754-1763), Anglo-Spanish War (1762-1763), the type of empire built by Napoleon to conquer the numerous countries to increase his power in Europe in 1812, Crimean War in 1854, the Austro-Prussian War in 1866, and the Franco-Prussian War in 1870, without forgetting the last Two World Wars that occurred during the first half of the 20th century (1914-1918; 1939-1945). In fact, conflicts and wars have constituted the key factors destabilizing the world order.

To stop these tragedies and scourges that corrode human societies, and to balance the relationship between the superpowers, the state leaders understood they must cooperate to build a safer world. Cooperation became the biggest challenges and the strategies to bring peace and stability into the world and to humanity. The ideas of cooperation were embraced by philosophical and political scientists who had developed the liberal theory for which cooperation among states reduces the risk of falling into wars. For instance, Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher, had developed the concept of democratic peace theory for which “democracies will not go to war with one another due to the role of the public; he favors a

republican constitution as the basis of the creation of perpetual peace, which would require citizen consent”⁴. Kant writes that “a republican constitution is the most desirable circumstance for perpetual peace, and the absence of war is dependent on mutual respect between states based on regime type. He believes the decision to use force against another state is based on whether the public is prepared to deal with the consequences”⁵. Democratic peace theory, as a new political ideology in international relations, convinced some philosophers and political scientists to assert that it is through cooperation that international relations between different state actors can find some new perspectives of peace, stability and security in the world.

This is why, after the Two Totalitarian Wars that occurred in the first half of the 20th century, ideas of cooperation were born in the West. With the creation of the League of Nations after the First World War in 1919, and the United Nations after the Second World War in 1945, these both institutions can be known as two universal organizations, serving as a guarantee for the pacification of the world. Accordingly, the collapse of the League of Nations favored the foundation and the perpetuation of the United Nations. And among the United Nations, many agencies, and international organizations, public and private, had been created and increased their influence for the progress of humankind. Therefore, despite the foundation and the universal character of these multilateral Organizations to harmonize and pacify the world, the intensity of global conflicts occurred. For instance, the Cold War, which opposed the two Western and Eastern blocs led by the United States and the Soviet Union, incorporated by two political and economic thoughts, such as the Capitalism and Communism, remained the most possible occasion for a nuclear war.

The Cold War, whose name was described as an impossible peace and an improbable war, created threats and a deterrent effect between the United States and the Soviet Union. The

⁴ Therese Etten”, “How convincing is democratic peace thesis”? “Master in International and Diplomatic studies in Prague, Avril 26, 2014.

⁵ Ibid.

Cuban Missile Crisis in 1962 happened when the American government deployed its nuclear missiles in Italy and Turkey, which allowed the Soviet Union, in turn, to deploy its nuclear missiles in Cuba. These deployments by both sides were seen as threats and a deterrent, but they had provoked the American blockade in Cuba and marked the largest confrontation between the two superpowers. Nevertheless, even though these missile crises occurred, the project of cooperation has continuously grown. Thus, the issue of consolidation of democracy in a group of countries led by the United States and the United Nations, as well as the perspectives to promote the economic development and social and cultural progress, make it possible to recognize the place of multilateral institutions for the cohesion of relations between States.

With the crises of the environment, the global warming and pollution, the increase of terrorist threats in Africa and Middle-East, urban growth, illegal migration, pandemics and epidemics, human and organ trafficking, slavery and drugs trafficking, etc. cooperation among actors called more strategies to face such crises having a global character. Global governance becomes a new term to encompass activities at international, transnational and regional levels and refers to public and private sectoral activities that transcend national boundaries. It is through a good policy of cooperation between all stakeholders that this governance policy would be able to respond to the challenges imposed by globalization.

Indeed, in a context of globalization and acceleration of interdependencies - on a global scale - among human societies, but also between humanity and the biosphere, this global governance defines the construction of regulation on the same scale. In other words, global governance refers to the set of rules, laws and standards put in place to regulate economic, migratory, financial and commercial flows, environmental issues as well as human rights. Global governance policy repositions state actors, international organizations, public and private sectors to punish war crimes, fight terrorism and eradicate organ and human trafficking,

environmental crisis, global warming without forgetting the epidemics and pandemics that are corroding our global society. Thus, the challenge of global governance is to collectively influence the destiny of the world by establishing a policy system for regulating these numerous interactions which go beyond the action of states. A quick presentation of the theories of international cooperation could enable us analyze either their strengths or their weaknesses.

1- Presentation of key theories of International Cooperation.

No single theory in domestic and international politics can explain international cooperation. Statesmen, scholars or political scientists define the world as an anarchy in which states get involved in order to ensure their survival. Without any central authority or an international institution to guarantee order and stability, and regulate the international conflicts between states, the state leaders, to self-secure, invest in arms and military capabilities to increase their power and hegemony, and defense their interests. For example, “realists stress how the inherent structure of the international system, particularly its anarchic character, constrains state behavior, since the lack of any central order-giver creates a ‘security dilemma’ for all states, which inclines them toward conflict than cooperation”⁶. Thus, “Realism is based on the assumption that the world is in a constant state of anarchy, where states are focused on survival and self-help”, affirmed Dunne and Schmidt⁷. Therefore, despite the anarchical character of the world order, “The literature on international relations has discussed the prospects of cooperation in an anarchic international system, confronting especially neo-realists and liberal institutionalists”⁸.

⁶ J. Martin, Rochester. *Fundamental principles of International relations*, Philadelphia, Westview Press, 2010, 88.

⁷ Dunne and Schmidt cited in John Baylis, Steve Smith, Patricia Owens. *Globalization: An introduction to the international relations*, New York, Oxford University Press, Edition⁴, 2008, 87.

⁸ Ibid.19

In this sense, *Institutionalists* argue that cooperation can be more than an ephemeral phenomenon, but rather a regular occurrence not only when sponsored by a hegemon, but also when facilitated by institutions. “Idealists argued for a focus on legal-formal aspects of international relations, such as international law and international organizations, and on moral concerns such as democracy and human rights”⁹. Forming a linkage between individuals, states and global institutions, “Radical liberals place great importance on the civilizing capacity of global society. While the rule of law and the democratization of international institutions is a core component of the liberal project, it is also vital that citizens’ networks are broadened and deepened to monitor and cajole these institutions”¹⁰. However, current pessimism about international cooperation puts into question the ability of existing institutions to adapt to power shifts and increasingly complex problems¹¹. In fact, if realist theory argues that statesmen must guarantee their survival in the anarchic world, due to the bad nature of humans which often pushes to wars, liberals argue for a world of cooperation despite the anarchic dimension of the international system.

In reality, international cooperation, as a theory, has become a process of coordination to facilitate harmony, peace and stability in the world. “Following Robert Keohane, a number of scholars have defined cooperation as occurring when actors adjust their behavior to the actual or anticipated preferences of others, through a process of policy coordination. Policy coordination, in turn, implies that the policies of each state have been adjusted to reduce their negative consequences for the other states”¹². Cooperation is usually opposed to competition or conflict, which implies goal-seeking behavior that strives to reduce the gains available to others or to impede their want-satisfaction. But there are other alternatives to cooperation as well.

⁹ Cf. J. M. Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 19.

¹⁰ Dunne cited in Baylis, Smith, Owens, *Op. Cit.* 119.

¹¹ Sebastian Paulo, *International Cooperation and Development Sebastian: A Conceptual Overview*, Bonn 2014, 9.

¹² Helen Milner, *International theories of cooperation among nations: Strengths and weaknesses*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Avril 1992, Vol. 44. No. 3, 467.

Unilateral behavior, in which actors do not take account of the effects of their actions on others, and also inactivity are alternatives to cooperation¹³. Moreover, alongside cooperation, alliance becomes also a possibility to build a multipolar world as well as the multilateralism. Thus, “States form alliances mainly to add to their ability to deter aggression or defeat the aggressor. The overall and alignment structure of the international system at any given moment often informs these sorts of calculations”¹⁴. In this perspective, the world politics has to deal with these two types of coordination, cooperation for peace, security and stability, in the one hand, and strategic alliance to threat and deter, in the other hand.

About alliances, nobody can forget the combination of two forms of alliance provoking the First World War: The Triple-Alliance, and the Triple-Agreement, which opposed Germany, Italy and the empire Austro-Hungary versus France, Britain and Russian empires, and later the United States. During the Cold War, NATO and Warsaw Pact constituted the two main alliances to dominate the world politics. And despite the dislocation of the Soviet Union, NATO remains the strongest alliance of defense under the leadership of the United States. However, since 2001, the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO), becomes a Eurasian political, economic, international security and defense established by China and Russia. Nobody also can contest the rise of BRICS vis-a-vis G7 to challenge the Western hegemony. Moreover, polarity is the term used by nation-states to explain how the world is composed with different poles, and how they plan to maximize their strategies to survive. That means, the world is often divided into opposed blocs under the umbrella of greatest powers, either to deter or to self-defense and defense their allies.

If realists reject the concept of cooperation and describe the anarchic character of the world, we understand that liberals think cooperation is possible. Despite the world is an anarchy and

¹³ Ibid.468

¹⁴ J. Martin Rochester, Op. Cit. 88

that there is no hierarchy and central authority to maintain stability and order, cooperation is the main goal to guarantee peace, stability, and progress among states, and build a just and pacific world. For neo-liberals, anarchy does not mean durable patterns of cooperation are impossible. “For neo-liberal institutionalists, foreign policy is now about managing complex interdependence and the various processes of globalization. It is also about responding to problems that threaten the economic well-being, if not the survival, of the survival around the world”¹⁵. Focusing on state actors and international organizations, public and private sectors to cooperate, Institutionalists conclude to ensure that “Foreign policy leaders must find ways to manage financial markets so that the gap between rich and poor does not become insurmountable”¹⁶. Consequently, for liberals, even by its anarchic dimension and the hegemonic system of major states, cooperation is possible to guarantee different actors in the implementation of foreign policy.

Liberalism, as a current of thoughts, was developed to influence the policy thinking and policy-making. And as Stanley Hoffmann’s relates that, “international affairs become the essence of liberalism, and it is self-restraint, moderation, compromise and peace whereas the essence of international politics is exactly the opposite: troubled, peace, at best, or the state of war”¹⁷. Beyond all beliefs about the inabilities of men and states to work together, those which introduce the world into a field of confrontations which lead to settlements, disputes, even conflicts and wars, cooperation remains the key factor in determining the goodwill of actors to save the world from the tragedies of wars and other threats it continually faces.

The debate in international politics is not closed, but some other scholars come with more thought’ systems, and look for understanding the behavior of more domestic actors in international arena. As we reflect on the capacity of states to increase their power and military

¹⁵Dunne and Schmidt, *Op. Cit.* 134.

¹⁶ Ibid.134

¹⁷ Ibid. 120

defense to ensure their hegemony, in this case, realists focus more on what can occur conflicts and wars among states, due to the interference of great powers, their imperialist vision which allow weaker states to also maximize their military defense. However, “Historically, liberals have agreed with realists that war is a recurring feature of the anarchic states system. But unlike realists, they do not identify anarchy as the cause of war”¹⁸. In the liberal views, war occurs because of imperialism character of the worldwide system, “others in the failure of the balance of power, and still others in the problem of undemocratic regimes”¹⁹. Such theories were rejected by Marxist scholars, but adopt the character of imperialism, which is not only based on the structure of the state, but also on the model of social classes, dividing societies between the ruling class and those that form the proletarian class.

Karl Marx and his colleagues believe that the struggles that take place between states and inside the states are the result of exploitation, inequality and social injustice between different social classes. The Capitalism, based on a system of exploitation, is the main problem which increases poverty among peoples. “Marxist theories argue that the relative prosperity of the few is dependent on the destitution of the many”. In Marx’s words, “Accumulation of wealth at one pole is, therefore, at the same time accumulation of misery, agony of toil, slavery, ignorance, brutality at the opposite pole”²⁰. For Marx, the familiar events that influence the world politics, and paralyze human life remain wars, treaties, international aid operations, which form the structure of a global capitalist system. While Marx used the term totality to describe the character of the social world, his materialist conception of history allowed him to proclaim the end of capitalism, considered as a totalitarian system, which provokes rivalries, conflicts and wars among different social classes and nations.

¹⁸ Ibidem.110

¹⁹ Ibidem.110

²⁰ Ibidem.145

This change of history will occur as a historical process of the economic structure. “In contrast to liberals, who believe that there is an essential harmony of interest between various social groups and classes, Marxists hold that society is systematically prone to class conflict”²¹. Relation between oppressors and oppressed produce struggles, and the struggle between the two arises because capitalists seek to increase their profits and this requires them to exploit ever more their profits and this requires them to exploit ever more harshly the working class. In international relations, this description of class relations within a capitalist system has been applied to describe relations between core (industrialized countries) and periphery (developing countries) and the unequal exchange which occurs between the two²². Marxist theory believes that this single domination of capitalism system, which integrates the economic and political entities, is responsible for transforming the world into chaos.

Alongside Marxist theory which calls to a social change in the international system, we can take into account constructivist theory which focuses on how normative and ideational structures are more important than material structures. Constructivists hold that understanding how actors’ identities shape their interests and strategies is essential to understand their behavior; and they believe that social structures are only sustained through routinized human practices²³. Furthermore, this theory refers to norms and ideas to define the international politics, and how this structure shapes identities, interests, and foreign policies of states, and how states and non-states actors act to reproduce that structure and transform it.

Rational choice of actors is also used to explain the structure of the international order. Rational choice is social theory that offers a framework for understanding how actors operate with fixed preferences they attempt to maximize under a set of constraints. In fact, “Like rational choice, Constructivism is a social theory that is broadly concerned with the relationship

²¹ Ibidem.146

²² Ibidem.249

²³ Ibidem.290

between agents and structures, and has different arguments regarding the rise of sovereignty and the impact of human rights norms on states”²⁴. As a social theory, Constructivism sustains that states organize their domestic politics and international life on a set of norms to be internationalized and institutionalized to maintain cooperation between different actors.

What contrasts constructivism with Marxism is the fact it does not totally reject the material reality of Marxist theory, but believes that despite knowledge, symbols, language and rules that form our mental maps, material reality depends also on ideas and interpretation. It is through ideas and material reality that social structures are founded. Furthermore, Dunne and Schmidt believe in the fact that “Constructivists, though, add that structures can have a causal impact because they make it possible certain kinds of behavior and thus generate certain tendencies in the international system. Sovereignty does not cause states to behave one particular way; instead, it produces them and invests them with certain capacities that make possible certain kinds of behaviors. Being a sovereign state, after all, means that states have certain rights and privileges that other actors in world politics do not. States are permitted to use violence while non-state actors that use violence are, by definition, terrorists”²⁵. Sure in their explanation on the basis of which the international system is built, constructivist scholars explain why realism and liberals fail to explain the contemporary global transformation of world politics.

Neither anarchy nor the multilateral cooperation character of the world politics can justify the actual tendencies of different actors in this complex world. Anarchy, conflicts and wars for realists, and economy cooperation and free trade agreements for liberals are insufficient to explain the global governance. Alliance and cooperation do not disappear the complexity of the international system, due to the unbalanced power of states and the weak influence of some

²⁴ Ibidem.162

²⁵ Ibidem.166

international organizations. And competition which remain the first goals of different statesmen becomes the main cause that explains instability and conflicts. The emergence of new normative beliefs and new knowledge widely accepted by numerous actors of this globalized world can cause a redefinition of interests and a change of behavior of different actors.

A- Strengths and weaknesses of these theories.

Now is the time to highlight the strength and weakness of these theories, and focusing on how they inform our understanding of contemporary global challenges. Thus, to better highlight these aspects related to the cooperation's process we can wonder, what might be the most difficult aspect of international cooperation? This means, "Under what conditions will cooperation emerge in a world of egoists without central authority?", asked Ann Arbor. For Arbor, "This question has intrigued people for a long time. We all know that people are not angels, and that they tend to look after themselves and their own first"²⁶. In fact, cooperation is opposed to competition, this is why, when actors cooperate they need a consensus to achieve negotiation, and such negotiation requires some conditions, tacitly or by agreements, as it can also be imposed, when the deal includes a superpower. Another argument sustains that a basic rule can guarantee the success of cooperation. Moreover, some other arguments maintain, in cooperation, the theories of the strategies of reciprocity, as those of relative and absolute gains or balance exchange to explaining cooperation, for actors assuming either absolute gains or relative gains motivations.

Focusing on the strategy of reciprocity in cooperation, Arbor believes that this condition is sufficient to promote the emergence of good cooperation between the actors who enter into negotiations. The author confirms, for instance, the individuals involved do not have to be

²⁶Ann Arbor cited by "Robert Axelrod", "The evolution of cooperation", New York: Basic Books, 1984

rational: The evolutionary process allows successful strategies to thrive, even if the players do not know why or how. Nor do they have to exchange messages or commitments: They do not need words, because their deeds speak for them. Likewise, there is no need to assume trust between the players: The use of reciprocity can be enough to make defection unproductive. Altruism is not needed: Successful strategies can elicit cooperation even from an egoist. Finally, no central authority is needed: Cooperation based on reciprocity can be self-policing²⁷.

However, such an explanation is in connection with the realist position which describes the anarchic character of the world. It is what Grieco affirms: “The strategy of reciprocity explains cooperation under anarchy, and states pursue their policy, because they know they will be punished for defecting and rewarded for cooperating”. And then, for relative and absolute gains, “Grieco argues that states also pursue relative gains, always seeking to compare their absolute gains with those of other states”²⁸. Moreover, balanced exchange, then, is central to explaining cooperation for those assuming either absolute gains or relative gains motivations. The issue is really what leads to this desire for balance, or equivalence that is, fear of cheating or fear of strengthening the other²⁹. However, despite of the explanation of such theories, cooperation in international relations requires rules in negotiation, and even in bargaining times to reach agreements. Governments, political parties, and business firms which involve in negotiation are all worry about their own capacity and that of others to live up to their stated commitment³⁰.

There is also the theory of communication, for cooperation requires good communication when starts the process of negotiation. Because, good communication can avoid misunderstanding, which is the key indicator to produce threats and struggles, and if threats from greatest nations can motivate weak countries to cooperate, good communication can help

²⁷ Ann Arbor cited by “Robert Axelrod”, *Op. Cit.*

²⁸ Ibid. 470-71

²⁹ Ibidem.472

³⁰ Ibidem.479

state leaders to negotiate, and such negotiation can be successful, and reduces threats and deterrence which handicap cooperation. Thus, good communication is often essential to indicate what the payoff structures are and what cooperation means. That means, outside of trust, rules or agreements, Arbor underlines that “The foundation of cooperation is not really trust, rules or agreements, but the durability of the relationship. When the conditions are right, the players can come to cooperate with each other through trial-and-error learning about possibilities for mutual rewards, through imitation of other successful players, or even through a blind process of selection of the more successful strategies with a weeding out of the less successful ones. Whether the players trust each other or not is less important in the long run than whether the conditions are ripe for them to build a stable pattern of cooperation with each other”, noted Arbor³¹. Good relationship between different states is essential to maintain cooperation.

In reality, a number of hypotheses are used to explain on which strategic tools cooperation can be further extended between actors. First of all, it is sustained that in the cooperation under anarchy, the problem with large numbers is related to the defection problem; it is posited that large numbers increase the probability of defection and reduce the feasibility of sanctioning defector. They create serious collective action problems for states. For, “This basic problem occurs when the pursuit of self-interest by each leads to a poor outcome for all”, pursued Arbor³². This argument seems to suggest that two is the ideal number of players³³. Secondly, the number of actors may not be a structural condition but rather may be a strategic one that can be manipulated by the actors themselves. In such cases, situations involving large numbers can be broken down into situations involving smaller numbers.

³¹ Ibid.

³² Arbor cited in Robert Axelrod, *Op. Cit.*

³³H. Milner, *Op. Cit.* 473

However, a third argument sustains that a recent work in game theory shows, the possibility of cooperation in a relative gains environment can be enhanced by increasing the number of players. For example, Snidal argues that “It is probably more dangerous to suffer a loss in a world with fewer actors than in one with more players, since “more actors enhance the possibilities of protecting oneself through forming coalitions and, generally, the less well united one’s enemies, the safer one is”³⁴. It is a fact that in cooperation, each actor’s behavior is directed toward some goals, and cooperation provides the actors with gains or rewards, affirms Helen Milner³⁵.

A fourth hypothesis advanced to explain cooperation centers on the role of international regimes, which are defined as sets of norms, principles, rules, or decision-making procedures around which actors’ expectations converge. Regimes, it is contended, facilitate cooperation through the functions they perform for states. They mitigate the effects of international anarchy for states by aiding in the decentralized enforcement of agreements³⁶. In this sense, Grieco offers an instance about regimes by examining international trade negotiations conducted within the existing trade regime, the GATT, later WTO and other international or multilateral organizations. The author shares liberal perspectives, concludes by asserting cooperation is possible, even in an anarchic system.

Furthermore, a fifth hypothesis in the recent international relations literature deals with the role of epistemic communities in advancing cooperation. As Haas expresses that, “Such a community is a professional group that believes in the same cause- and-effect relationships, truth tests to accept them, and shares common values; its members share a common understanding of a problem and its solution. The existence of an epistemic community would seem in this view to be a prerequisite for cooperation³⁷”. The epistemic community hypothesis

³⁴ Ibid.474

³⁵ H. Milner, *Op. Cit.* 468.

³⁶ Ibidem.475

³⁷ Ibidem.478

has strong affinities with the regime argument. Both reduce uncertainty, provide information, and facilitate negotiation³⁸. This means, at each level of cooperation, it requires the will of a society for which cooperation will be beneficial or disadvantageous, and such cooperation, in certain perspectives, must be in harmony with the interests, rules, ideas, norms and values of this society. This aspect shares the common view of constructivist theory, for which structures based on rules, ideas, norms and values are the fundamental means to make cooperation possible.

A final hypothesis implicit in some of the recent literature suggests that imbalances in power often in the form of hierarchies are conducive to cooperation, an argument that resembles to hegemonic stability theory. These differences in influence allow stronger actors the greater role in organizing the system; cooperation here is closer to the imposed variety than to the tacit or negotiated forms of the preceding hypotheses³⁹. This kind of cooperation occurs in an asymmetric system, where one state actor is more powerful than other states, for which it can impose its will and rules to them. Such reality describes the situation of the Organization of American States (OAS), in which the United States is considered as the major power which can push out of this organization Cuba, Nicaragua and Venezuela, and imposes its economic sanctions upon them. The same example is valuable for NATO, even major multilateral organization where the US increases its influence, such as the UN, and the Bretton Woods Institutions. For such a perspective, this type of cooperation rejects Marxist theory which condemns imperialist states, and considers them as the fundamental factor to increase inequalities.

Evidently, the theories on cooperation suffer from at least two serious drawbacks, both of which derive from its reliance on systemic theories and game theory. The first problem flows

³⁸ Ibidem,479

³⁹ Ibidem.480

from the way in which the assumption of anarchy is developed causes problems. Second, the literature is remarkable in its neglect of domestic politics. It is said that threats and deterrence render cooperation less possible. And then, the lack of credibility in one's threats and promises is a problem within states, between states and other actors. Analyzing this view from Greico's perspective, we can conclude that the concept of fear is a major concern for actors in cooperation, because in an anarchic world, states fear for their survival, security and existence. This means, they can depend upon their own capabilities to survive, that changes in one's capabilities relative to other states are a state's central concern, and finally that states will not accept cooperative agreements that are relatively unfavorable since this reduces their security.

Greico's position ambitions to explain the consequences of threats that can conduct a state to act under pressure. The degree of fear states have for their survival varies importantly from and independently of the lack of common authority⁴⁰. However, we can retain, despite their fear, many states cooperate freely in defending a world of stability and safety, in which states can commonly progress and succeed. Moreover, the balance of power theories based on anarchy predict this: states will cooperate to counterbalance others whose relative power is growing, thus, the addition of more players increases the likelihood that groups will cooperate to enhance their security. Indeed, the relative gains of your allies in this situation may enhance your own security, however, failure to cooperate may have devastating consequences. Defensive alliance formed by one group of states can push others to do the same, to guarantee their security in case of threats.

B- How do these theories inform our understanding of contemporary global challenges?

⁴⁰ Ibidem.482

Our world is very complex, with many challenges in different issues, situations and dramatic events which pit actors against each other, at different levels and in different areas, which do not allow any form of cooperation, if not struggles, conflicts, dissensions and wars. Face to these issues, International Cooperation has been rejected, and many thinkers believe cooperation does not have its place in our modern world, becomes inefficient, and will not be able to respond to its mission and attain any goals. In other perspectives, International Cooperation Theory has been criticized with some justification, for paying insufficient attention to distribution and power. It is said that, “the original problematic of cooperation under anarchy implicitly treated the achievement of order through international regimes as a public good that benefited all. Despite attention to coordination problems, bargaining, relative gains, and distributional issues in design as noted above, distributional issues and conflicts have not been sufficiently prominent⁴¹.

For example, international sanctions involve cooperation against target countries. In fact, despite these objections, International Cooperation Theory disproves the realist assertion that cooperation under anarchy is impossible without hegemony. Theorizing around this question relies heavily on a depiction of anarchy as a prisoner’s dilemma game where everyone’s incentive is not to cooperate even though all would gain from mutual cooperation⁴². The fact remains that cooperation is always possible, and the creation of multilateral organization seems to be a guarantee of achieving international cooperation.

However, cooperation is not easy, and it is a process which requires negotiation or bargaining. Sometimes a long negotiation process can lead to difficult solutions and make cooperation more complex and, in many other circumstances, give rise to disputes and conflicts. Whether cooperation emerges always depends on the circumstances and strategic

⁴¹ Sebastian Paulo, *Op. Cit.* 17.

⁴² *Ibid.* 5

choices of the actors. Moreover, much scholarly effort has gone into specifying the conditions under which cooperation is likely and how international regimes and institutions may facilitate cooperation. In this case, some analysis focuses on the possibility of cooperation and raises interesting questions regarding the conditions under which strategies of negotiation can promote and guarantee cooperation.

For some scholars, “Cooperation may require an institution that can provide the needed information. Indeed, institutions have been defined as organizational forms that enhance monitoring and information transmission”. Others scholars believe that reputation does matter, and stressed the importance of reputation for effective diplomacy. Consistent with earlier works in International Cooperation Theory, Sartori “argued that states strive to establish reputations for honesty in diplomacy, which enhance their ability to resolve future disputes using diplomacy rather than force”⁴³. Diplomacy of negotiation becomes a tool to implement cooperation among actors which involve in the international system.

Reflecting on the rules and principles that influence cooperation, one can affirm that cooperation among different actors in international relations become very difficult, but not impossible. Liberal scholars, thinkers, political scientists, even statesmen suggest that International Cooperation Theory has important policy implications on how different actors can promote international cooperation through better politics and by designing better institutions, as well as for general issues of international and global governance. Because, in this globalized world, cooperation has already taken important steps in this direction by incorporating domestic politics to a greater degree and by recognizing the agendas of international organizations.

It sometimes becomes difficult for private actors to play an increasing role in public partnerships when states, superpowers are in conflicts at the global level. However, no one can

⁴³ Ibidem.6

deny how the role of these private actors matters in facilitating the international cooperation process, as well as their place to implement humanitarian aids, to provide health care during epidemics, pandemics, natural disasters, internal conflicts and wars. This is why, international cooperation needs to be connected to the normative rules and laws that are always important for its development. Because good negotiation, which allow cooperation, require agreements, and which in turn need to be implemented by rules, treaties or conventions. Thus, even if the theories of international cooperation have been successful, they can be even more successful and much richer if their normative aspects are expanding. Therefore, no one can deny the impacts of the power dynamics of different actors that allow them to self-defend, and defend their objectives and interests on the international system.

2- The impact of power dynamics on international cooperation.

States that are the first and main actors on the international system are often faced with the security dilemma. Because, as it is mentioned in the first topic developed on the top, the world system is an anarchy in which each state ensures its survival. The social, political, economic, financial order and the global trading systems in which states are involved cannot guarantee stability, peace and security that the world needs without facing violence or disputes, conflicts and wars. “Cooperation between states occurs, but it is difficult to achieve and even more difficult to sustain”, affirms John Baylis⁴⁴. Thus, scholars and political scientists retain two main factors which make cooperation difficult: the first is the prospect of cheating; the second is the concern which states have about what are called relative gains⁴⁵. At is explained, for example for the prospect of cheating, states have always been, and remain, fearful that others

⁴⁴ J. Baylis, S. Smith, O. Patricia, *Op. Cit.* 232.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.* 232

will cheat on any agreements reached and attempt to gain advantages over them... although they join alliances and they are aware of the need to provide for their own national security⁴⁶.

About relative gains, “Instead of being interested in cooperation because it will be benefit for both partners, states always have to be aware of how much they are gaining compared with the state they are competing with. Because all states will be attempting to maximize their gains in a competitive, mistrustful, and uncertain international environment, cooperation will always be very difficult to achieve and hard to maintain”⁴⁷. In fact, the imbalance system of the world and the inequality of power among the states do not effectively guarantee peace, security and stability, and which does not effectively allow states forming the international community to maintain long process of cooperation.

In this case, to better interpret and understanding the impact of power dynamics, John J. Mearsheimer who is a realistic political scientist offers his main reflections on the sense of power and how states control their own power. For the author, “Power is based on the material capabilities that a state controls. The balance of power is mainly a function of the tangible military assets that states possess, such as armored divisions and nuclear weapons. However, states have a second kind of power, latent power, which refers to the socio-economic ingredients that go into building military power. Latent power is based on a state’s wealth and the size of its overall population”⁴⁸. By thinking like this, Mearsheimer focuses on what can ensure that great powers act differently according to the goals they want to obtain, and summarizing that the possibility for them to increase their military capabilities and their power does not only reside on the goals of gaining wars, but also it lies in the measures taken to increase the size of their population and their global wealth. This is why, Mearsheimer affirmed

⁴⁶Ibidem.232

⁴⁷ Ibidem.232.

⁴⁸ John J. Mearsheimer cited in Tim Dunne, Milja Kurki, Steve Smith. *International relations theories: Discipline and diversity*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, Third edition, 2013, 78.

that, “Great powers need money, technology, and personnel to build military forces and to fight wars, and a state’s latent power refers to the raw potential it can draw on when competing with rival states”⁴⁹.

To the question *why do states want power*, Mearsheimer presents five straightforward assumptions about the reasons by which states compete between themselves for power in the international system. The first assumption is that great powers are the main actors in world politics and they operate in an anarchic system where there is no hierarchy, centralized authority or ultimate arbiter that stands above states. The second assumption is that all states possess some offensive military capability, has the power to inflict some harm on its neighbor, and that capability varies among states and for any state can change over time. The third assumption is that states can never be certain about the intentions of other states. States ultimately want to know whether other states are determined to use force to alter the balance of power, or whether they are satisfied enough with it that they have no interest in using force to change it.

The fourth assumption is that the main goal of states is survival. States seek to maintain their territorial integrity and the autonomy of their domestic political order. They can pursue other goals like prosperity and protecting human rights, but those aims must always take a back seat to survival, because if a state does not survive, it cannot pursue those other goals. The fifth assumption is that states are rational actors, which is to say they are capable of coming up with sound strategies that maximize their prospects for survival⁵⁰. In this perspective, we can assert that great powers fear each other, this is why among them remains a little trust due to lack of good intentions they manifest which can avoid them maintaining cooperation.

⁴⁹ Ibid.78

⁵⁰ Ibid.79

In the case of their essay as well as their attempt to promote good cooperation, there are tendencies that states continue to fight because of their specific interests that they always want to defend, and also by the fact of their imbalance in power, money, economy, military and their difference in matters of cultures, political ideology and regimes. For imbalanced power, even though they cooperate, this type of cooperation based on inequality between states weakens the international relations in which they must interact, compete, cooperate or self-defend militarily, or at least defend their specific interests. As it is said, “National interest is commonly invoked to explain most countries’ foreign policy behavior”⁵¹. Thus, national interests define the main goals of political actions of states vis-à-vis other states, and any cooperation cannot be effective and efficient without taking into account this aspect.

Furthermore, states are conceptualized here as monolithic entities producing foreign policy decisions based on rational calculations geared toward maximizing the national interest. It is presumed here that all states, no matter who their leaders are (J. Stalin or a W. Churchill) and no matter whether they are democratic or nondemocratic polities, tend to operate in accordance with dictates of *realpolitik*, each driven by similar impulses regarding the promotion of national security, power, and wealth”⁵². States, despite their desire to cooperate, in negotiating policies, their strategies focus on the objectives set to assert their rights and prerogatives, which consist of defending their own interests.

Despite their consensus, at different level, between states, agreements and alliances concluded, and system of cooperation established, the world and human societies often fall into wars and instability. This always pushes state leaders to strengthen their survival strategies. And then, the imbalances that exist between states, through their size, power, finance, economy, production, and their military defense and armament, divide states into great powers

⁵¹ Cf. J. Martin Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 83

⁵² *Ibid.* 83

and small countries, developed countries and underdeveloped countries, rich countries and poor countries, in one word between the Global North and the Global South. Thus, “States form alliances mainly to add to their ability to deter aggression or defeat the aggressor”⁵³. Ruling under the alignment structure of the international arena, states form opposed blocs, split the world into different poles and create a new model of international organizations, at the same time, build a new form of multilateral cooperation. “Political scientists use the term polarity to refer to the number of major powers, or poles, in the international system, and they run debate over whether bipolar or multipolar systems are more prone toward war”⁵⁴. This type of so-called multipolar cooperation defines a new form of multilateral diplomacy, by building different opposed blocks or clubs, such as G7, G20, G77 and BRICS⁺.

Today, the Cold War does not really oppose the United States and Russia, as it was with the Soviet Union after the Second World War, but with China which is the second largest economy of the world, the instigator of the SCO (Shanghai Cooperation Organization), which is leading peace diplomacy in the Middle East, and seems lead the BRICS⁺. Russia is a European country by its culture, but not by institution, since it was excluded from the G8 in 2014 after annexing Crimea. The same goes for Japan, Asian by culture, but Western by institution, an influential member of the G7. Furthermore, the concentration of power under the initiative of five countries to lead the Security Council with their right of veto reflects the authoritarian character of the international order. If in the one hand, some international organizations involve in the interest of the international community to guarantee peace, stability by applying the collective security, on the other hand, new forms of defensive alliances are created with the ability to deter or threaten. The United Nations, for which its mission

⁵³ Ibidem.83

⁵⁴ Ibid. 88

consists in ensuring the collective security, does not have the same mission with NATO which is a defensive alliance.

And then, it is always under the influence of superpowers that many international organizations have been founded. In this situation, the less developed countries always act under the leadership of the great powers which create the rules for conducting the diplomacy of cooperation. For example, the United Nations is known as a universal organization responsible for regulating the international order, however, it is organized in such a way that only five countries have the right to veto within the Security Council, and only nine on fifteen countries have the privilege to influence a decision which governs the UN policies. Furthermore, having the right of veto, the five members of the Security Council do not sometimes take into account the position of the UN when they defend their own interests. Because the United States invaded Iraq in 2003, and Russia did the same when it annexed Crimea in 2014 and invaded Ukraine in 2022, even after the UN oppositions. This is why we can state, it is through the Security Council that collective action and decisions can be taken to implement the United Nations policy and manage the organization to attain its goals.

It is obvious to assert that the creation of international organizations responds to the needs of regulating cooperation between states, and they become intermediary institutions to support the international order. However, despite their importance in implementing the international policy, each state is free to define its politics, its worldview, its economic program, its financial system, its military ideology, etc. As it is noted “Foreign policy is best thought of not as a single driving worldview or game plan but, more realistically, as a series of hundreds of decisions that have to be made, which may or may not hold together in a logically consistent, seamless fashion”⁵⁵. This is why, even though there are many international organizations, all of them do not have the same goals.

⁵⁵ Ibidem.78

For instance, many international or regional organizations are created to implement the foreign policy of the superpowers. In this case, we can self-wonder, which country on the American continent can balance the influence of the United States within the OAS (Organization of American States)? Two countries (Cuba in 1962, Venezuela in 2019) were excluded from OAS under the will of the United States, followed by embargoes it has imposed unilaterally. It is a criterion for understanding that international cooperation is a difficult task and that relations between states are paths full of challenges, problems and contestations.

Moreover, with the division of the world in continents and sub-continents, regions and sub-regions, many international organizations are founded to respond to some specific goals. For instance, ASEAN (Association of Southeast Asian Nations) which is an Asian organization cannot have the same objectives with NAFTA (North American Free Trade Agreement) which is a North American organization, it is the same for African Union and European Union. In addition, the multilateral and multipolar characters, the ideology and vision of the world shape the different strategies of statesmen to define their plan of survival. “According to balance of power, states seek to avoid domination by any one actor in the system; as long as a balance is maintained, not only will hegemony be prevented but the system will remain in stable equilibrium and major war can be averted”⁵⁶. The main rules that shape international relations are those of control, which control consists in surviving from all threats and deterrence. This means, cooperation between states is not really a sign of stability. The involvement of international organizations in the implementation of international cooperation alongside states does not really serve to support the good faith of states and their desire to create a just world in which peace, security, development and stability can be guaranteed.

On the other side, even if demography and population are not the criteria to determine the power of a state, but they can serve as a factor of power. The United States is the richest country

⁵⁶ Ibidem.89

of the world, although it is not the largest country in terms of size, but cannot establish different military bases around the world without enough soldiers. It is the same for some countries like Russia, China in term of size and population, or even Brazil whose leadership is increasingly asserting itself in the international arena. Other political hypotheses retain the concepts of influence and power among states to explain the international order. In this sense, in term of influence and power, there is no possible comparison between France and Democratic Republic of Congo, etc. This is why, less developed countries more often pay the prices of imbalanced world.

Furthermore, the weight of overexploitation of the poorest countries by the superpowers cannot create a just world guaranteeing stability and progress. The more than 400 centuries of colonization, the policy of annexation and the interference of states in the internal affairs of other states create unrest, mistrust and divisions between states within the international community, which often makes cooperation more difficult. However, with the creation of the United Nations, which proclaimed, in its Charter on June 26, 1945 marking the foundation of the great principles of international relations, from the sovereign equality of states to the prohibition of the use of force in these relations in order to protect future generations from the scourge of war. The Preamble of the Charter also proclaims once again the faith of international community in the fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women, as well as of nations, large and small. Three years later, on December 10, 1948, these principles were universally adopted by the United Nations General Assembly that enshrined the rights and freedoms of all human beings, making cooperation between international actors possible.

3- The role of international organizations in facilitating and maintaining International Cooperation.

International Organizations can be considered as a second-level cooperation strategy after states. Such organizations intervened to respond to the lack of leadership of states, of which certain negotiations were failed, and pushed states into disputes, conflicts and wars. These international organizations, with multiple vocations, appeared at one time as an intermediary element to respond to the problems that threatened human societies, not only to prevent conflicts and wars between nation-states, but also to respond to many other related challenges such as health, humanitarian, environmental, economic, commercial, financial, legal, maritime, military or security, global warming, etc. With the creation of these organizations, a new window was opening for many actors to implement global politics and diplomacy alongside states. Despite the public and state character of certain organizations, others are also funded under the direction of the private sectors, better known as Non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

In fact, after the Two World Wars which led to the massacre of numerous human lives and massive destruction of goods and properties, the issue of the consolidation of democracy in a group of countries, as well as that of economic development and social and cultural progress have also made it possible to recognize the place of multilateral, international or regional institutions for the cohesion of relations between states and human beings. Another aspect is also important to elucidate. Because, with the industrial and technological revolutions, the technical means for the opening of the economy and the expansion of financial markets in the context of globalization are already set in motion, but states have needed a certain synchronization for the advent of a full-fledged global company. All these decisions and diplomatic alternations were created to parody the ambiguities which have compartmentalized the interdependent relations of states.

Accordingly, whether global, international or regional organizations, they will be created to respond to these new requirements, to lead nations-states to balance their power. Such

organizations have two main characteristics: Multilateral or multipolar. Furthermore, other actors, emanating from citizens themselves, were clearly proliferating on the horizon, such as NGOs and multinational companies, to constitute increasingly vast and influential transnational networks. This is why, at different level, it is important to release the place of the international organizations in facilitating and maintaining international cooperation.

Because the role of the international organizations cannot be understood if one ignores the challenges to which they must respond in order to bring compassion and solidarity to humanity and the world. To implement their goals and achieve their mission, some new strategies were defined to which the concept of new governance was embraced in order to respond to the challenges of global economy and the issues of world politics. This is why, the need to implement global governance can also be seen as the result of the emergence of a global civic consciousness face to the growth of crises which are invading the world, and which require a global response from all actors, whether public or private.

The United Nations, this global organization with 193 countries forming the General Assembly, has a universal character to regulate the international cooperation among the states and other organizations. In this sense, its Charter specifies that one of the purposes of the United Nations is to “achieve international cooperation by resolving international problems having economic, social, intellectual or humanitarian nature, by developing and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without any distinction of race, sex, language or religion” (art.1§.3). With this in mind, Article 13 of the United Nations Charter specifies that “the General Assembly shall undertake studies and make recommendations with in order to:

- (a) Develop international cooperation in the political field and encourage the progressive development of international law and its codification;

(b) Develop cooperation in the economic, social, intellectual culture and education, public health fields, and facilitate the enjoyment of human rights for all without distinction of race, sex, language or religion, and the enjoyment of human rights and fundamental freedoms⁵⁷.

In a “Joint Declaration” of international organizations on the occasion of the Paris Peace Forum on November 11, 2018, this common commitment is made in these terms:

“We self-congratulate the ongoing cooperation between the United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank Group, the UNESCO, the ILO, the OECD and the WTO. Some topics such as maintaining international peace and security, protecting the environment and biodiversity, implementing and achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), international trade and investment, Human rights and gender equality, the fight against corruption and against tax optimization and evasion are interconnected and require coordinated action. The best way to achieve these goals is to act collectively, with the participation of all states. The most pressing peace and security challenges, that is, climate change, nuclear proliferation, terrorism, pandemics, food insecurity, disaster, global warming, water scarcity, trade conflicts, have a global reach and, therefore, require global solutions⁵⁸.

It is reported that the Paris Peace Forum was proclaimed a month later as the International Day of Multilateralism, Cooperation and Diplomacy for Peace by the United Nations General Assembly (A/RES/73/ 127) on December 12, 2018, and was first celebrated on April 24, 2019. The UN affirms that multilateralism, cooperation and diplomacy are essential to achieving progress in peace and security, sustainable development and human rights, which constitute the three pillars of the United Nations. The commitment to resolve disputes by peaceful means

⁵⁷ See “Human Rights Council”: “Advisory Committee”: “Strengthening international cooperation in the field of human rights”, Session 6th, 17-21 January 2011.

⁵⁸ Consult the website of the French Embassy in Peru on the “Joint Declaration of international organizations on the occasion of the Paris Peace Forum”, “Paris Peace Forum”, on November 11, 2018.

and the absolute desire to protect future generations from the scourge of wars are among the fundamental principles of the Charter of the United Nations⁵⁹. During that event, the General Secretary of the Organization has stated that this international day must make it possible to promote the values of the United Nations, to reaffirm the confidence of our peoples in the goals and principles set out in the Charter, to reaffirm the importance and relevance of multilateralism and international law and to progress towards the achievement of the common goal of achieving lasting peace through diplomacy⁶⁰. Through these declarations and collective actions, the United Nations and all multilateral organizations have come together to respond to the challenges imposed by global politics.

However, it would be important to reflect on the causes for which these international organizations hinder cooperation among States. For the International Organizations, because of their normative anchoring and their political goals, are necessarily exposed to critical debates. Over the last decades, they have given rise to various studies relating to the redefinition of their objectives or the reform of their management. These reflections are notably inspired by contestation from statesmen of the political purpose of such organizations and their ideological orientation. For instance, most of these organizations are therefore dedicated to intervening in the same areas of expertise which require effective and balanced coordination. However, such fully effective coordination would require a unity of decision-making that is not achievable within an international community composed of states with their own interests and heterogeneous political conceptions.

In addition, the requirements for coordination and concentration of programs come up against all kinds of obstacles, which do not only relate to the structure of the international system, but which are mainly due to the diversity of actors, their projects and programs, and

⁵⁹ “United Nations”, “International Day of Multilateralism and Diplomacy for Peace”, Title: “The virtues of multilateralism and diplomacy”, April 24, 2021.

⁶⁰Ibid.

their different objectives. With the growing and the proliferation of international organizations, they reduce the influence of states and make their cooperation more difficult. Thus, the first challenge appears in the fact that international organizations reduce the influence of states in various areas of competence. Through these multilateral institutions, states are not the only actors in international relations; they can neither apply international law nor regulate the international system without taking into account the role of these organizations. And then, international organizations are founded with the aim of strengthening, alongside states, the cooperation which was formerly the sole states initiative.

Many international organizations serve to monitor and counter the leadership of statesmen, on how they act in politics, whether they apply international laws and respect the rights of their people. As an example, the International Court of Justice was created to serve the mediation between states in conflict, but with their consent. And then, the International Criminal Court becomes a jurisdiction responsible for judging people or statesmen accused of genocide, crimes against humanity, crimes of aggression and war crimes, the objective of which is to hold individuals accountable, whether civil or military authorities. Having benefited, however, from a certain autonomy in relation to states, international organizations are certainly created by states and have developed thanks to their support, but their constitutive provisions set principles, normative purposes and political goals obliging the governments or states to adhere to or towards which they must strive. Thus, international organizations are not only global in scope, but it also becomes obvious to locate them at the regional level.

4- The regional organizations: their challenges, opportunities and effectiveness in promoting cooperation.

Regional organizations are also recognized as multilateral and influence international policies and the global order. Reflecting on regionalism, it is affirmed that “Regionalism

remains a more powerful force than globalism”⁶¹. Thus, “Regionalism has various dimensions, and the term is often used to refer to the growth of societal integration within a region and the often undirected processes of social and economic interdependence and may also constitute deepening perceptions of common interests and identity, including self-awareness as a region”⁶². In fact, “Regional agreements cover different mixtures of economic, social, political, and security concerns; and there are different forms of interaction between regionalization and the various ways in which states may promote regional cohesion”⁶³. Regarding regional cooperation, it also has various forms, depending on the policy and goal, and then, the issues with which countries, in a specific region, are dealing with. This is why, “functional cooperation refers to limited arrangements which are agreed between states in order to work together in particular areas, for example, in transport, energy, or health”⁶⁴. In order circumstances, states form regional integration, a process by which they go beyond the removal of obstacles to interaction between their countries, and create a regional space subject to some distinct common rules.

States therefore have obligation to cooperate at the regional level because of their cultural and political systems which differ from one continent to another, from one region to another. Despite their inclusion or integration in certain multilateral organizations with global characteristics, it is fundamental for those countries to cooperate in their specific regions. Today many regions are facing terrorist attacks, and conflicts and wars continue to destroy human lives; all these issues require collective answers. Economic, finance, currency crises, inflation, poverty, environmental damages and global warming allow states to coordinate their actions to resolve these challenges. The most difficult things in this type of cooperation consist

⁶¹ J. M. Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 207

⁶² E. Best, T. Christiansen cited in J. Baylis, S. Smith, P. Owens, *Op. Cit.* 436.

⁶³ *Ibid.* 436

⁶⁴ *Ibidem.*436

in the division of the world into small pieces; this creates a specific identity in each region, which could pit the regions against each other.

And then, the difficulties for several countries to integrate certain regional organizations, because of the rules set by the Charters, the fundamental organs of such organizations, which can directly exclude certain authoritarian regimes which are not ready to guarantee human rights, build a rule of law, banish corruption and restore democracy. Cuba was excluded in OAS since 1962, Venezuela in 2019, as Niger, Burkina Faso, and Mali were excluded from ECOWAS, etc. Such cooperation, even though they ensure relations between states, they guarantee more the foreign policies of the most powerful countries. Nobody can contest the hegemony of the US in the OAS. Moreover, despite their cooperation's system, major states interfere in the internal affairs of other states. All these aspects create mistrust and conflicts, and make negotiation and cooperation more difficult.

Nevertheless, such international institutions and organizations, which serve to promoting multilateralism are important, for they activate the internationalization processes and strengthen the international order. Thus, regional cooperation also fits into the overall context of global political development. Regional organizations are numerous and have different characteristics, and are involved in different domains. In this article, we retain some of them which have a continental dimension. Among regional organization we count African Union, Organization of American States, European Union, ASEAN Regional Forum, etc., and many other sub-regional organizations, also known as multilateral organizations, which strengthen the international relations.

Accordingly, contemporary regionalism in Africa emerged with the politics of anti-colonialism that often on the basis of pre-existing colonial arrangements. In fact, West African Economic and Monetary Union (WAEMU) were created for French West African countries with the currency CFA franc. However, the first stage of Pan-African organization was

primarily political in nature. The Organization of African Unity (OAU), created in 1963, was dedicated to the ending of colonialism and political liberation. The 1991 Treaty of Abuja, coming into force in 1994, established the African Economic Community (AEC). In 2002, the OAU and AEC became the African Union (AU), formally modelled on the European Union⁶⁵.

It is reported that, “The Constitutive Act of the AU further enshrines the right of the Union to intervene in a Member State upon decision of the Assembly, in certain serious circumstances, namely: war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. At the same time, dating from the time of the OAU, the Protocol of June 1998 relating to the African Charter on Human and Peoples’ Rights adopted in 1981, and creating an African Court of Human Rights and of the peoples in force in January 2004. The African Organization with a continental vocation is therefore in the process of being renovated in the direction of greater efficiency and activity, particularly in terms of peacekeeping⁶⁶. The OAU Charter focuses primarily on non-interference and the peaceful settlement of disputes between member states. It encouraged African unity on issues including human rights, but played a smaller role in dealing with regional conflicts⁶⁷. Continental organization, African Union is a multilateral organization which supports the UN in its peacekeeping mission in many African countries ravaged by civil wars and environmental crises.

Regionalization in Asia has followed quite different patterns. For instance, South-East Asia is not a region with a clear historical identity. The very term South-East Asia seems to have come to prominence internationally to describe the areas south of China that were occupied by Japan during the Second World War. The first post-war organizations, notably the 1954 South-East Asian Treaty Organization (SEATO), was made up of an international range of interested

⁶⁵ Ibidem.442

⁶⁶ Josiane Tercinet. *International Relations: The Contemporary International Scene*, Tome I, Grenoble, Grenoble University Press, 2006, 152.

⁶⁷ Linda A. Malone. *Human Rights in the international Law*, Paris, New Horizons, 2004, 65.

powers. Malaysia, the Philippines, and Indonesia briefly formed the Association of South-East Asia as a mean to promote regional solidarity. The establishment of the Association of South-East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967 between Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Singapore, and Thailand was motivated by a sense of common identity to prevent conflicts within the region. Regional cooperation was to be built by an ASEAN Way based on consultation, consensual decision-making, and flexibility. Rather than starting with ambitious political commitments, ASEAN would proceed by small, informal, and voluntary steps, which could eventually become more binding and institutionalized⁶⁸.

Although economic cooperation was foreseen, the evolution of ASEAN was driven by political and security concerns. On the security front, a succession of proposals culminated in the creation of the ASEAN Regional Forum (ARF), which came into effect in 1994, with the aim of pursuing confidence-building measures, preventive diplomacy, and eventually resolution. Other steps were taken in response to the creation of the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), formed in 1989 on the principle of open regionalism. Moreover, in 2003, the member states agreed to create an ASEAN Security Community, an ASEAN Economic Community, and an ASEAN Socio-cultural Community by 2020. A new formal dispute settlement mechanism was created, and the role of the Secretariat was reinforced, together with a Development Fund and increased institutional involvement of the business sector. The development gap between old and new members (Vietnam, Myanmar, Burma, Laos, and Cambodia) also prompted new efforts to promote solidarity, through the Initiative for ASEAN Integration and the Economic Cooperation Strategy⁶⁹. ASEAN, even though it does not contain all Asian countries, but it is known as one the most influential Asian multilateral organization to sustain cooperation in economy, commerce and security.

⁶⁸ Ibid.442

⁶⁹ Ibidem.443

The American continent has also known an organization with a continental vocation. Thus, hemispheric regionalism began with the first Pan-American Conference in Washington on 1889-90. Nine of these conferences took place, leading in the 1930s and 1940s, following decades of US interventionism, to several agreements on peace and security. The Pan-American Union became the Organization of American States (OAS) in 1948⁷⁰. Having 35 members, the Organization of American States was created to promote unity and cooperation among the nations of the Western Hemisphere. Following the adoption of the Inter-American Convention on Human Rights in 1969, the OAS has a remarkable mechanism for protecting human rights, with an Inter-American Court of Human Rights⁷¹. An Inter-American System grew up, including the Inter-American Development Bank and the Inter-American Court of Human Rights. And then, the US policy on regional agreements changed in the later 1980s, it began in 1986 to negotiate a free-trade agreement with Canada. Negotiations then began between the United States, Canada, and Mexico, leading to the establishment in 1994 of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA).

A first Summit of the Americas was held in Miami in 1994, with the aim of achieving a Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) as well as deepening cooperation in drugs, corruption, terrorism, hemispheric security, sustainable development, and the environment⁷². Continental organization, OAS has its importance in this region to sustain democracy and to protect human rights against dictatorial regimes in Latin America. Focusing on the economic and commercial characters of some organizations like NAFTA, Shanghai Economic Cooperation and the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), we can also take into account MERCOSUR, which is a regional organization, implementing economic and commercial policies between countries in Latin America.

⁷⁰ Ibidem.438

⁷¹ Josiane Tercinet, *Op. Cit.* 152-53

⁷² Ibidem.439-40

Europe as other continents has several multilateral organizations, even though it is known by history as the most conflictual region with its bloody wars, but, despite its capability of negotiation and cooperation it contains the most powerful regional institutions. Thus, “The most ambitious regional institution –building project in the world is in Europe, where a regional organization has been established completely with its own flag and anthem. The European Union (EU) is an International Governmental Organization (IGO) consisting of 27 member states that together constitute the third-largest demographic unit in the world and account for 30 percent of the world’s GDP and nearly half of global trade⁷³. European Union was created to guarantee the balance of power and to create political stability in Europe. As a region, Europe therefore has like other continents many international and multilateral organizations, as it remains the most influent regional organization.

The breakup of the Eastern bloc, de facto, causes the advent of an organization with continental scope following the enlargement it entails: The Council of Europe, headquartered in Strasbourg, created in 1949, is dedicated in maintaining peace and democracy and promoting economic and social progress. With a Parliamentary Assembly, it is a showcase of Western democracy. In 1950, the convention for the protection of human rights was adopted, which established the most advanced list of human rights as well as a protection mechanism, improved since, which involves a European Court of Human Rights (ECHR), headquartered in Strasbourg which may be referred to by individuals. It is one of the two systems (the American system) of international protection of human rights serving as a model for a growing number of others. Many Eastern European countries have joined the Court, provided they comply with the requirements regarding the rule of law, democracy and human rights⁷⁴.

⁷³ Cf. J.M. Rochester, 207

⁷⁴ Ibidem.156-57

At first, only six states on the Continent joined together to form the European Coal and Steel Community in 1951. The same six countries expanded their cooperation by signing the Treaty of Rome in 1957, creating the European Economic Community⁷⁵, and continue to add more member states throughout history. It is important to note that the European community system is initially based on three distinct communities, created by three distinct treaties giving each of them international legal personality: as it is cited above, the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC) created for 50 years by the Treaty of Paris, on April 18, 1951, disappeared as agreed in July 2002; the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC) created by the Treaty of Rome, on March 25, 1957 to develop the peaceful uses of atomic energy, and the European Community (EC) created by the other Treaty of Rome, on March 25, 1957 to establish a common market generalized throughout the economy.

In 1954, the idea of a conference on cooperation and security in Europe arose, with the aim of neutralizing Germany, ratifying its vision, reviving the borders, preventing German rearmament and the creation of the EDC (European Defense Community)⁷⁶. With the establishment of peaceful coexistence, the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE) will be organized in July 1973 in Helsinki, during which three themes called the three Helsinki baskets will be addressed:

- 1- Security in Europe,
- 2-Cooperation in the field of economy, science, technology and environment,
- 3- Cooperation in humanitarian fields.

Once this first meeting was completed, works continued in Geneva at expert level. Then a Summit Conference, that is to say, with the heads of states and governments, which was held from July 30 to August 1, 1975 in Helsinki, at which 35 States were represented, 33 European,

⁷⁵Ibid. 207

⁷⁶Ibid.93

plus the United States and Canada, during which participants signed the final act of Helsinki⁷⁷.

These are essentially the principles of peaceful coexistence, respect for human rights in addition, as well as all the provisions taken by states in terms of disarmament and confidence-building measures in military matters. So, the first part of the document is a declaration relating to security in Europe; itself contains a code of conduct of ten principles, often called, the Decalogue of Helsinki: Sovereign equality, inviolability of borders, territorial integrity of states, peaceful settlement of disputes, non-intervention in the internal affairs of states, respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms, equality of rights of peoples, cooperation between states, execution in good faith of obligations assumed in accordance with international law⁷⁸.

The second part contains a cooperation program, and the third part provides for an increase in cultural and educational exchanges, improvement of access to information and its diffusion, development of contacts between people and solution of humanitarian problems⁷⁹. Although some of the founders of the European community envisioned eventual political unification among the members, most of the national leaders have viewed the undertaking in more narrow terms as a vehicle for economic integration. A main rationale behind the project from the start was the desire to emulate the economic model of the United States for a single market, with the absence of trade and other barriers to interstate commerce. The plan was to proceed in several stages:

- 1- A free trade area, in which all tariff barriers would be eliminated between member states;
- 2- A customs union, whereby all member states would impose a common external tariff on all goods from non-member states;
- 3- A common market in which goods and services, workers and capital would be able to move freely across national boundaries;

⁷⁷ Ibid. 94

⁷⁸ Ibidem.94

⁷⁹ Ibidem.95

- 4- An economic and monetary union in which all member states would harmonize their economic policies and accept a single European currency in place of their individual national currencies⁸⁰.

These four stages constituted a challenge for the European Community to achieve economic integration. However, by 1993, with the signing of the Treaty of Maastricht, creating the European Union, all four stages were moving toward completion, and had been called the European Community changed its name to the European Union⁸¹. Moreover, the Treaty creating the European Union remained a complex system, for the European Union was not only expressly endowed with legal personality, being founded on the European Communities, but it was also supplemented by policies and forms of cooperation: the FPCS (Foreign Policy and Common Security) and police and judicial cooperation, and it sets up within the European Community, the Economic and Monetary Union originally of the single currency. This system, perfected by the treaties of Amsterdam in 1997 and Nice in 2000, has applied to the 27 states since the enlargement in 2004⁸².

Under the Maastricht Treaty, all nationals of the twenty-seven member states are EU citizens while retaining their national citizenship, with the right of free movement and residence throughout the Union. Within the EU, under the Schengen Agreement, virtually all internal border controls have been eliminated and a common set of control of external borders have been established, as a common currency, the Euro, was introduced in 1999, to replace national currencies of EU members⁸³. As the other regional organizations, European Union reinforces international relations and allow a largest cooperation among states. Among multilateral, international and regional organizations there are also non-state actors, NGOs and multinational corporations, which shape international cooperation.

⁸⁰ J.M. Rochester, *Op. Cit.* 208

⁸¹ *Ibid.* 208

⁸² J. Baylis, S. Smith, P. Owens, 158

⁸³ Rochester, 208-09

5- The role of non-state actors, such as NGOs and multinational corporations, in shaping global governance policy through cooperation.

After having presented in depth the role of the states and international governmental and multilateral organizations, it is very important to emphasize the place of the Non-governmental and multinational companies play in global governance. Wanting to define the concept of global governance, Kennett Benedict states that “global governance is a purposeful order that emerges from the institutions, processes, norms, formal agreements and informal mechanisms that govern action for the common good. Thus, global governance encompasses activities at international, transnational and regional levels and refers to public and private sector activities that transcend national boundaries. Moreover, the challenge of global governance is to collectively influence the destiny of the world by establishing a system for regulating these numerous interactions which go beyond the action of states. We are talking about global governance in the face of the rise of global problems, such as alarms around global environmental problems or global warming, terrorist attacks, human trafficking, tax evasion, but also regional and national imbalances that result from them: food crises and hunger, migrations, geopolitical imbalances and political instabilities, etc.

The need for global governance is also the consequence of the emergence of a global civic consciousness in the face of the convergence of crises which are taking over the world and which require a global response from all actors, whether public or private. In that case, these kinds of institutions, called NGOs, describe another new phenomenon, born in the wake of global governance and at the heart of the initiatives launched by all the organizations to promote international cooperation, and to also implement the international relations. For instance, NGOs are private, disinterested organizations created by private individuals who emerged in the 19th century, but, whose importance as international actors began to be

perceived after the Second World War. The Charter of the United Nations of June 26, 1945 mentions them in its article 71: “The Economic and Social Council may take all necessary measures to consult non-governmental organizations which deal with questions falling within its competence”. For multinational corporations, they intervene to implement the economic development, notably under the influence of neoliberal political and economic thoughts, which promotes the Capitalism as a model of economic development, opposed to socialism or communism, and the globalization of the economy, finance and trade, to increase the production and investment through technologic innovation.

The different areas in which NGOs intervene embrace humanitarian activities to respond to the needs of populations devastated by disasters. Thus, the expression NGO seems to be considered synonymous with an organization with a humanitarian aim, possibly extended to the objective of development, or even protection of human rights. Humanitarian actions cover health and food aid which is provided in emergency situations, natural disasters (earthquake, starvation, epidemic or pandemic) or technological origin (explosion of a nuclear power plant or a chemical factory), armed conflicts, to people in great distress in terms of survival. Generally, the presence of NGOs is noted in less developed countries which are often prey to violence linked to armed conflicts, confronted with the problems of underdevelopment and exposed to natural disasters and epidemics. The different interventions take place in the field of education, technical assistance, supplies of certain goods (water pumps, tractors, electricity generators, solar panels, etc.), food, medicines and others. We must also take into account the defense of human rights, for which many NGOs aim to help people unjustly imprisoned, especially in countries that are ruled under dictatorial regimes, in order to promote fair trials.

Nowadays, there are more than 30,000 NGOs, intervening in different areas linked to human existence, societies, and different groups, then social movements and organizations. There is a wide variety of them and their action is also very diverse. NGOs also take into

account sports, religious, scientific, military, educational, politics, syndical actions, etc. In this case, we cannot forget the important role of the International Red Cross, World Food Program, Greenpeace international, the Club of Madrid and Rome, Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch, etc. We must also admit that certain NGOs form coalitions on certain subjects with some success, such as the campaign for debt relief for poor countries, for the advent of the International Criminal Court for banning the anti-persona mines.

For Multilateral corporations, they include Multinational Firms and Banks. They appeared more quickly with the application of the Washington Consensus implemented by Williamson, in which certain international and multilateral organizations, such as the IMF, the World Bank and the OECD countries, joined the GATT (General Agreement on tariffs and trade), to respond to trade policies and financial liberalization. In this new policy, trade liberalization interacted with stabilization and financial reform in many countries, which had duty to open their borders, tore down their barriers to the movement of money as well as goods, to attract foreign investments from factories, business and finance.

Sometimes major multinational capitalist companies and financial market investors have gained such weight that they generally challenge international organizations and states in making decisions of general interest of humanity. These multilateral corporations have formed networks, whose role consists of establishing on an international scale a set of flows of goods to facilitate production and promote commercial exchanges. Flows of services are taken into account to the extent that their share is growing rapidly in international trade, particularly transport and business services. In addition, the development of international trade has resulted in an increasing openness and an interdependence of national economies thanks to the exchange of manufactured products.

Mark Casson gives a more nuanced definition and considers that a multinational bank is a bank that owns and controls banking activities in several countries⁸⁴. For Multinational Banks (MBN), they invest in financial activities in foreign territory, and they are a form of multinational firms. These Banks have their mission in the development of financial markets, to be able to facilitate economic development by the means of trade and investment. Thanks to these banks, financial liberalization through innovation has offered new position and risk management opportunities. They have developed mainly with the aim of encouraging direct investment abroad. As financial institutions, they play an agency role, setting up information, and therefore, tend to increase their interventions in these markets by issuing securities or subscribing to assets.

Their multiplication at the beginning of recent decades can be explained firstly by the strong growth in trade: banks supported their clients abroad, thus contributing to the creation of a global banking network. They also seek to penetrate new markets and try to diversify their portfolios to reduce financial risks. Thus, either NGOs or Multinational Firms and Multinational Banks serve to reinforce global governance policy alongside the states and international organization for the benefits of the world, to appease conflicts and disputes, to improve economic and financial system by the means of investment and production, to promote human rights and equality, and to defend lives and goods. However, there is no overall evidence that the goals of these actors generally respond to the development policy of the world put in place for the benefits of humanity. From speech to deeds, the analysis of a recent case of successful international cooperation including global actors at different levels to resolve the spread of the pandemic of Covid-19, which had a global issue can allow us to justify the impacts of cooperation of different actors on global politics.

⁸⁴ “Mark CASSON” cited in the “Journal of Science and Management”, 2007

6- The analysis of a recent case of successful international cooperation in resolving a global issue.

The year 2019 almost was coming to an end whereas a global health crisis emerged, and shook the world, threatened human existence, destroyed human life, and paralyzed diverse activities that bound national and international relations. The COVID-19 pandemic has caused major restrictions on everything that linked commercial relations, foreign and national investments, production mechanisms, paralyzed the global tourism industry, as well as many activities that generate human contacts. Restrictive measures were established by all states of the world to counteract such a pandemic which had killed millions of human lives. All institutions, churches, synagogues, mosques, businesses, schools, markets, enterprises, industries, etc. are closed to counter the propagation of the pandemic. Peoples around the world became afraid because they saw how widely the pandemic was spreading and how contagious it was to kill.

This is why, Covid-19 became a major concern of global politics, which involved different actors, governments and states, International organizations and NGOs, which had taken different measures at different levels to protect the lives of their respective populations. These restrictions were used in a world increasingly exposed to shocks, and to threats of complete disappearance of the world's population. The challenge therefore was to guarantee that there was a balance between allowing governments under strong political pressure to use exemptions and ensuring that these exemptions were not abused and did not provoke crumbling of the multilateral trading system. Criteria were defined under which emergency measures deemed necessary were targeted, proportionate, transparent and temporary, creating therefore barriers to trade or disrupting global supply chains, consistent with World Trade Organization and World Health Organization norms.

However, despite some drastic administrative measures, this global health crisis caused by the COVID-19 pandemic has given rise to other forms of international cooperation. For example, to respond to the needs of the world population, to save more people infected by Covid-19, a Trade and Health Initiative, proposed by a group of World Trade Organization Members in November 2020, was an example of new joint intergovernmental action⁸⁵. First of all, a commercial cooperation between countries affected by the health crisis was effective. Such an initiative planned, firstly, the creation of a special investment fund as it is reported⁸⁶. This cooperation then envisaged a binding commitment on the part of the participating countries not to impose restrictions on the export of essential goods intended for other participating countries.

The initiative also suggests the adoption of an information monitoring system to improve transparency and coordinate trade measures, which could be established on the model of the information system which would include information on all obstacles to trade, of whatever type (tariff and/or non-tariff). And then, these measures were intended to stimulate great countries to produce more vaccines and make them available to the poorest countries, where the pandemic could cause more damage to humans.

A critical part of the fight against the COVID-19 pandemic has been the development and deployment of safe and effective vaccines as quickly as possible. There is no doubt that vaccines are an essential product, and governments have been involved in different ways and at different stages of their development and deployment. The speed with which COVID-19 vaccines were developed was unprecedented, and thanks to private and public sector participation and international cooperation, a rapid and effective response was given to counter the disastrous effects produced by the virus. Several vaccines have been developed or are still

⁸⁵ See “The Report on the world Trade”, 2021: “The role of the international Cooperation in the enforcement of economic resilience”

⁸⁶ Ibid.

under development by private pharmaceutical companies. These companies have benefited from intellectual property rights protection and, in some cases, public financial support.

Certainly, the production and deployment of vaccines has been very difficult and more problematic. The main challenge has been unequal access to vaccines, caused by both supply-side and demand-side factors. Production was geographically concentrated in countries that have technological means to ensure a very complex production process. Vaccine producing countries were both the main sources and destinations for exports of essential inputs for vaccine manufacturing, which translated into bargaining power for economies that did not have companies producing either the final vaccine, or ingredients for vaccines. In addition, some countries with production capacities have restricted their exports. On the demand side, the main problem is the huge global demand and limited resources of low- and middle-income countries. With production concentrated in a few countries and demand coming from all countries, trade was expected to play a key role in ensuring global access to vaccines. In the absence of global coordination, however, countries risked competing in bidding wars and driving up the prices of vaccines and related raw materials.

It was in the face of all these challenges that good coordination between public and private actors has propelled towards cooperation helping to revive production and guarantee universal access to vaccines. To meet the enormous global demand for COVID-19 vaccines, it was necessary for vaccine-producing countries to sharply increase production in the short term using the capacities of existing facilities. Certainly, the access to vaccines remained very unequal and other difficulties persisted in the efforts to vaccinate the population in many underdeveloped and even developed countries. Technology sharing, knowledge transfers through cross-border partnerships have facilitated the expansion of production in multiple contexts. To ensure the global distribution of vaccines, it is also important to maintain a transparent and efficient multilateral trading system. Ensuring that vaccines and their

ingredients get to where they are needed involves keeping borders open, to provide the vaccine on a non-profit basis, particularly in low- and middle-income countries.

The production of vaccines was part of the global commons for effective responses to the pandemic, thanks to the supply of vaccines taking into account the risk of multiplication and widening of the pandemic. In addition to reducing customs duties on equipment and ingredients necessary for vaccine production, countries had also adopted international standards of cooperation and carried out mutual recognition of products in order to facilitate the importation of equipment or ingredients necessary to produce vaccines. Certainly, multilateral and regional legal frameworks have been created, a number of countries, as well as multilateral and regional organizations have advocated for greater cooperation aimed at ensuring equitable and affordable access to medical care. This has resulted in increased cooperation between various states and governmental institutions, international and regional agencies, non-governmental organizations and corporations that have been established to facilitate equitable access to health care.

To prevent such a new pandemic that could be occur in the future, it is around the states, governments, international organizations, corporations, non-governmental organizations, pharmaceutical agencies that cooperation must be maintained to avoid that such a tragedy continue to threatening human existence. Accordingly, it is reported during this sanitarian crisis, some multilateral organizations with global resonance, such as WTO, WHO, IMF, World Bank, have adopted certain decisions to combat the spread of Covid-19 and other related pandemics.

To render operational their decisions, we can note that, “In June 2021, the leaders of these multilateral organizations held the first meeting with the Agency’s Working Group on COVID-19 Vaccines, Treatments and Diagnostics in Developing Countries. In their joint statement, the leaders of these organizations described the Task Force as a ‘crisis unit’ responsible for

contributing to the monitoring, coordination and acceleration of the delivery of health tools to fight COVID-19 in developing countries”⁸⁷. These precautionary measures aimed to mobilize relevant stakeholders and national leaders to address the main obstacles encountered, in accordance with the priorities defined by the members of those organizations, which explained how previous investments can help defeat the pandemic while boosting production capacity, supplies, trade flows and equitable distribution of diagnostic products, oxygen, treatments, medical supplies and vaccines. The set of these measures serve to reduce the spread of the pandemic and guarantee the confidence of the world population who have lived under the threat of Covid-19.

CONCLUSION

Nowadays, International Cooperation becomes the keystone to bind the relationships between States, International Organizations, NOGs, Multinational or Transnational Corporations to regulate the International Relations. Thus, International Cooperation becomes, since last decades, a new field of study to implement the international policy through the new development agendas, understood as the new goals of all actors to accelerate the global governance. It is therefore a fact that conflicts and wars are the biggest problems that the world continues to face in different eras of its history. This is why cooperation is the new name of development and stability which opposes to discord, rivalry, concurrence and competition. The world needs stability, and human societies require justice and peace for their development and progress, while conflicts and wars, disasters, global warming, environmental crisis, epidemics and pandemics, terrorism and human trafficking remain the scourges that continue to ravage them. In fact, cooperation among different actors that involve in global politics is the means by which new strategies can be redefined and new answers can be given.

⁸⁷ See, “The Report on the world Trade”, 2021

The world, for its safety and development requires global collective action in trade, finance, production, investment, health, environment, military, etc. This is to respond to the new goals of development that cooperation between states and other actors must embrace all aspects of human life. And cooperation must be developed at domestic, regional and international levels. It is through summits, conferences, resolutions, conventions, treaties, agendas that the multilateralism finds its place and defines its goals. Even though, the world is facing heterogeneity in increasing disparities between peoples, nations, human beings; such disparities increase rivalries and conflicts and wars, however, cooperation remains the only alternative to take into account human needs and respond to their aspiration.

No peace is possible in this world because of threats and deterrence among nations. Defensive alliances which have always been created cannot guarantee security, peace and stability. The UN, despite its involvement in the diplomacy of peace and security through the Security Council, and the development agenda through its specialized agencies, cannot sometimes resist to the veto power of the five permanent members of the Security Council, and the influence of the superpowers inside the UN that always self-compete. Thus, the UN as well as the regional organizations cannot respond to the preventive diplomacy of peace and security, in order to promote cooperation between states for the progress of the world. All countries, with their irrespective income-level, armed forces, GDP, resources, power, population and territory, also have different level of interest to defend in the international arena. To better implement international cooperation all states, despite their divergence, must share common interests in the defense of common values. All international organizations, including NGOs, Corporations must share the same interest in solving the global challenges of the world through international cooperation strategy.

Common problems require global responses, and this must be the objectives of all countries, for all countries – rich and poor – are sometimes facing the same issues. For instance,

inequality, pandemics, poverty, global warming, etc. are the challenges with which the world is dealing with, and solutions to these issues do not have a specific cross-border repercussion. Thus, collective problems are things that affect every country, and which require collective action. In other ways, what threatens human existence are climate change, migration, terrorism, human trafficking, food insecurity, conflicts and wars, pandemic and natural disasters, which require common and pacific solutions.

Despite international cooperation becomes a field of study and multilateral organizations, private and public sectors are stressed alongside of states to build the multilateralism and the diplomacy of cooperation, we can always wonder how international cooperation works, and if it fails or succeeds? It is an evidence to emphasize that both, by the fact that international cooperation, at certain levels, succeeds, and in many other aspects, fails. Even though realists reject cooperation, but liberals believe in human capacity to collaborate despite the anarchic dimension of the world, the bad intentions of different actors and the characteristic of human nature which is bad. Capitalism and Western democratic movements, even the promotion of human rights and the respect of fundamental freedoms promoted by democratic regimes, do not allow us to maintain the evidence that these values are guaranteed, even in Western societies. In different levels and for diverse reasons, such values and prerogatives are not systematically guaranteed. That means, human sufferings, inequality and social injustice are not only found in authoritarian and less developed countries. Thus, everywhere and anytime, human societies throughout the world are still continuing to face such tribulations or tragedies.

Whatever the economic theory, the political regime, the fundamental and global decision of different actors, as well as the impacts of the organizations and the economic development level, our world continues to face issues; this is why, the diplomacy of cooperation can remain unique alternative to promote the global development and to guarantee stability, peace, security and social justice. The global development agenda needs to link up different actors, public and

private, national, regional and international in order to meet the expectations for implementing international cooperation. Much initiatives must be mobilized through collective action to achieve the global governance, to respond to the needs of this generation without compromising the future generation. Nowadays, the dynamic of international cooperation, as a field to implement international relation policy, is placed beyond the power of nation-states and the superpowers, and does not only occur as a traditional diplomacy between sovereign nation-states, but must be also include multi-actors, multi-mechanisms and multi-level processes where all actors involve to implement the global governance.

ACRONYMS

AEC: African Economic Community

APEC: Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation

ASEAN: Association of Southeast Asian Nations

AU: African Union

ARF: ASEAN Regional Forum

BRICS: Brazil, Russia, India, China, South Africa

CFA franc: Franc of the Financial Community of Africa

CSCE: Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe

EAEC: European Atomic Energy Community

EC: European Community

ECHR: European Court of Human Rights

ECOWAS: Economic Community of West Africa States

ECSC: European Coal and Steel Community

EDC: European Defense Community

EU: European Union

FPCS: Foreign Policy and Common Security

FTAA: Free Trade Area of the Americas

GATT: General Agreement on Tariff and Trade

GDP: Gross Domestic Product

IGO: Intergovernmental organizations

ILO: International Labor Organization

IMF: International Monetary Fund

MERCOSUR: Southern Common Market

MNB: Multinational Banks

NAFTA: North American Free Trade Agreement

NATO: North Atlantic Treaty Organization

NGO: Non-governmental organization

OAS: Organization of American States

OAU: Organization of African Unity

OECD: Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

SCO: Shanghai Cooperation Organization

SDG: Sustainable Development Goals

SEATO: South-East Asian Treaty Organization

UN: United Nations

UNESCO: United Nations Educational, Science and Cultural Organization

WAEMU: West African Economic and Monetary Union

WHO: World Health Organization

WTO: World Trade Organization

REFERENCES :

- 1- Baylis John, Smith Steve, Owens Patricia, *Globalization: An introduction to the international relations*, New York, Oxford University Press, Edition⁴, 2008,
- 2- Benedict Kennett, in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 2001.
- 3- Casson Mark, “Journal of Science and Management”, 2007
- 4- “Dai Xinyuan”, Duncan Snidal, and Michael Sampson”, *International Cooperation Theory and International Institutions*, 20 November 2017.
- 5- “Etten Therese”, “How convincing is democratic peace thesis”? “Master in International and Diplomatic studies in Prague, Avril 26, 2014.
- 6- “Human Rights Council”: “Advisory Committee”: “Strengthening international cooperation in the field of human rights”, Session 6th, 17-21 January 2011.
- 7- Milner Helen, *International theories of cooperation among nations: Strengths and weaknesses*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, Avril 1992, Vol. 44. No. 3.
- 8- Paulo Sebastian, *International Cooperation and Development Sebastian: A Conceptual Overview*, Bonn 2014.
- 9- Rochester J. Martin, Rochester, *Fundamental principles of International relations*, Philadelphia, Westview Press, 2010.
- 10- The French Embassy in Peru on the “Joint Declaration of international organizations on the occasion of the Paris Peace Forum”, “Paris Peace Forum”, on November 11, 2018.
- 11- “The Report on the world Trade”, 2021: “The role of the international Cooperation in the enforcement of economic resilience”.
- 12- “United Nations”, “International Day of Multilateralism and Diplomacy for Peace”, Title: “The virtues of multilateralism and diplomacy”, April 24, 2021.