

International Institutions as Threat to Sovereignty of Developing Countries

ROSENJE, Musharafa Olapeju, PhD & ADENIYI, Oluwatobi Peter

Department of Political Science, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ijagun, P.M.B. 2118, Ijebu-Ode, Ogun State.

Email Address: rosenjemo@tasued.edu.ng & oluwatobiadeniyi30@gmail.com

Abstract

International institutions through the vehicle of globalisation have gradually impacted on the sovereignty of developing countries as state actors in public policy making and implementation are being enveloped by multiple external actors. States now have limited liberty to decide their policies as it interests them due to the influence of international institutions that loom large on them. This paper examined international institutions as entities that threaten sovereignty of developing countries. It used secondary sources to gather data, while dependency theory was adopted as its framework of analysis. The paper observed that international institutions emerged from the need for states to come together and interact in the international system to solve common problems, which may be difficult to solve individually. It disclosed that the incursion of international institutions as vehicles of globalization has increasingly put the developing states and their institutions under pressure from both the domestic and global sectors. The paper also revealed that the operations of international institutions such as International Monetary Fund (IMF) and World Trade Organisation are highly contentious in terms of putting forward requirements that handicapped the sovereign power of the developing countries, with limited scope for national economic policy and development. This paper concluded that international institutions through various initiatives have grossly undermined the developing countries' sovereignty to the extent that most of them lack adequate capacity to make independent decisions within their territory. The paper recommended, among others, that developing countries should define their objectives in terms of both domestic and foreign policies, and demonstrate the strong will to pursue it vigorously. The states should shun any international institution initiative, which does not serve her foreign and domestic policy goal(s). Also, the developing countries should focus on indigenous policies and programmes for the development that are peculiar to them.

Keywords: Developing countries, Interaction, International institutions, Sovereignty, Threat.

Introduction

Globally, over the years, the imbalance nature of inter-state relations in the international arena, particularly via the operations of international institutions in a globalised world has drastically impacted on the sovereignty of countries, especially the developing countries. This is portrayed in the dependence of economically weak countries on rich countries for financial assistance and other assistance coming through the international institutions. This has also led to other forms of

dependence including political and social dependence (Udalla, 2012) apart from cultural and artistic dependence.

The emergence of globalisation, which is strengthened by information technology, has weakened states' control of their borders and other protectionist policies thus making them no longer fashionable. This development has given room for more free market economies and less restricted relationships among countries and has been further spread by the prevailing democratic wind (Udalla, 2012; Purdă, 2012). International institutions and other non-state actors in the international environment have within the context of globalisation, to some extent, taken over the affairs of states at the international level. An international institution in this sense is a type of unification of efforts by select governments aimed at achieving international collaboration, for which the stated states have established a legal institutional structure or institutions with permanent authority (Oyedokun, 2021; Purdă, 2012).

Furthermore, as states interact in the international system, with the need for coming together to solve common problems, which may be difficult to solve individually, international institutions such as United Nations (UN), African Union (AU), European Union (EU), North-Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, World Health Organisation (WHO) and World Trade Organisation (WTO), among others, emerged. This has equally led to the emergence of Multi-National Corporations (MNCs), Inter-governmental Organisations (IGOs) and Non-Intergovernmental Organisation (NGOs) having freer access to territories of states (Oyedokun, 2021; Udalla, 2012).

However, for a country to be part of an international body, it requires the signing of treaties, which gives the institutions some legal rights. The legal rights of such institutions have reduced the sovereignty of states, most especially the developing countries, in making decision on issues relating to them within the international system. For example, to be part of free trade agreements requires countries to free up their borders and soften migration policies to allow unrestricted in and outflow for humans, goods and services (Oyedokun, 2021). Thus, membership of states to these institutions entails the surrendering of some part of their sovereignty to these institutions giving the institutions some sort of supranational status. States also have the obligation of working towards the achievement of the goals of these institutions, which include among others, human rights protection, non-proliferation of arms and environmental protection (Udalla, 2012).

Thus, the increased international interactions, which are accelerated through the intensified efforts of international institutions, inter and supra-governmental organisations, globalisation, human rights drive and humanitarian law, among others, have indeed challenged the Westphalian concept of sovereignty. The contemporary application and use of sovereignty have restricted the absolute sovereign power of states in international law and relations. Membership of international, intergovernmental and supra-governmental institutions, such as the European Union (EU), African Union (AU), World Health Organisation (WHO), International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank and World Trade Organisation (WTO), among others, has transformed the traditional conceptualisation of sovereignty. Some states have been willing to accept decisions, directives and

regulations adopted by these institutions, thus in essence ceding some of their sovereign powers to such institutions (Wachira, 2007; Tangney, 1996).

An example is the relationship between developing countries with Bretton Woods institutions (IMF and World Bank) in which the countries involved on the whole adopt and implement the monetary and fiscal policies prescribed by the institutions (Marsonet, 2017; Wachira, 2007). Also, the involvement of North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) in Kosovo was an example of some governments choosing to breach the sovereignty of another government to halt ethnic cleansing and genocide. In contrast, the mass killings in Rwanda and Darfur, Sudan, show the tremendous cost of believing that sovereignty is ultimate and so doing little to prevent the death of innocent people (Oyedokun, 2021).

Therefore, international institutions through the vehicle of globalisation have control over states' economies, foreign policies, and communities. Nations, especially the developing ones, cannot fight this development since the entire world is dealing with it, and if a country prevents its entry, that country will be excluded from the contemporary international community, particularly in economic terms because sanctions may be placed on such a country. As a result of the scenario, sovereignty is getting weaker as the world progresses. States would be sensible to reduce their sovereignty to defend themselves because they cannot afford to be alienated from what is happening elsewhere. When a government is unable to care for the fundamental requirements of its population in terms of basic needs, such as security of lives, whether due to lack of competence or deliberate policy, the need may lead to loss of sovereignty (Oyedokun, 2021; Marsonet, 2017).

In view of the foregoing exposition, this paper attempts to examine international institutions as threat to sovereignty of developing countries. For a clear progression, the paper is structured into five sections. The first section treats the conceptual clarification and theoretical framework, while section two gives an overview of the development of international institutions. The third section offers the rationale for the establishment of international institutions, section four x-rays international institutions and the sovereignty of developing countries and the last part, which is section five, gives the conclusion and recommendations.

Methodologically, this study follows the conceptual research approach which focuses on examining the extant literature and existing data established by seasoned academics on the issue under evaluation. The paper examines international institutions as threat to sovereignty of developing countries while reviewing previous literature and data.

Conceptual Clarification

International Institutions

International institutions as a concept have attracted plurality of conceptions from different shades of authorities, perspectives, usages and context. The concept in most times has also been used synonymously and interchangeably with international organisations in several extant literatures. International institutions, originally refers to the organisations of states. In other words, they are bodies, which comprise of sovereign states and exclude non-state actors (Udalla, 2012). The

upshot of this process of arrangement is the establishment of international institutions. It refers to the ways governments arrange themselves for the goals of interacting and encouraging cooperative and collaborative practices in world politics (Russett, Starr & Kinsella, 2006). However, as the world continued to transform and evolve, international non-governmental organisations usually formed by individuals and groups of non-state actors also emerged to be players in the international system having a lot of influence in the activities of states. Thus, Non-Governmental Organisations (NGOs) became part of international institutions (Udalla, 2012).

International institution is the process by which states establish and develop formal, continuing institutional structures for the conduct of certain aspects of their relationships with each other. It represents a reaction to the extreme decentralisation of the traditional system of international relations and an effort by statesmen to adapt the mechanics of that system to the requirements posed by the constantly increasing complexity of the interdependence of states. Particular international institutions may be regarded as manifestations of the organising process on the international level (Audu, 2020). On the whole, they are legally constituted entities that operate across several countries. However, most of these institutions, at times, do not operate for profit. They are organisations with an international membership, scope, or presence. They tend to operate in many countries of the world and they are of two categories – non-governmental and governmental international institutions (Ogunniran, Komolafe & Ogundele, 2019).

However, some major international institutions operating in some developing countries like Nigeria in terms of activity impact are the World Bank, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organisation (WTO), World Health Organisation (WHO) and European Union (EU). Others include United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) and many others coupled with myriad of non-governmental organisations operating from both home and abroad (Audu, 2020; Ogunniran *et al.*, 2019). In a nutshell international institutions in this paper are regarded as organisations, whose membership and scope of operations cut across many countries of the world and are specifically created to perform certain functions.

Sovereignty

Sovereignty has ubiquitous posture with varied legal connotations, political undercurrent, global perceptions and national reactions based on the type of actions taken to manifest or undermine it in state's internal and external relations. No particular definition seems to be comprehensive enough to grasp its essence and satisfy the various views about sovereignty, thus resulting in a multi-disciplinary approach that recognises the legal, political, strategic and economic dimensions of sovereignty as often conceived by scholars, diplomatic experts in international relations and officials of national governments (Banko, 2021).

The modern state and state system conceive sovereignty as a logical consequence of symmetrical valuation of nation's status in authority structure. The development of sovereignty was traced to the Treaty of Westphalia, which formed the basis for ending both the Thirty Years' War (1618-48) and the wars of religion. Westphalia was thus viewed as being instrumental to the

establishment of the key principle of modern statehood, which is predicated on sovereignty (Harrison & Boyd, 2018; Merriam, 1900). Also, sovereignty was said to be established sometime around the 17th century (at the Peace of Westphalia) and, since that time, states have enjoyed ‘unfettered’ rights to self-government, non-intervention and freedom from interference in internal affairs (Glanville, cited in Parmar, 2017).

Sovereignty is thus commonly characterised in political science as the most fundamental feature of the state in the form of total self-sufficiency, that is, dominance in domestic policy and independence in foreign policy (Held, 2003). Sovereignty is therefore, precisely defined as the right and authority to make the ultimate decision or choice concerning the terms of the existence of a territorially based polity. It implies a central core of right and power of self-government, that is, the power to resolve the basic problems of a country internally, rather than at the command or influence of other countries or super powers. No foreign entity has the authority to command or order a sovereign state to behave in a certain manner on issues of fundamental importance to it (Oyedokun, 2021).

Sovereignty does not simply denote the level or quantity of power, as though the extent to which a state is sovereign can be determined by calculating its relative military and economic might. Sovereignty denotes both the right to act and the authority to act (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). In certain circumstances, a state’s authority to act is so constrained and limited that its sovereign right to act is rendered practically useless. Similarly, there are occasions when a state’s real power is so immense that, even if its sovereign right to exercise this power is not formally recognised by others, it is tacitly recognised. These are, however, severe examples. Hence, sovereignty is usually defined as the possession of a right and power (Oyedokun, 2021).

Sovereignty could therefore be regarded as the quality of state power to be supreme in relation to any other existing social power within its territorial limits and independence compared to the power of any state or international body. The quality being expressed in the State’s right to determine freely, without any interference from the outside. The purpose of its activities internally and externally, the fundamental tasks, which it has to fulfill and the necessary means to achieve them, respecting the sovereignty of other states and international law provisions (Vrabie, 1995, cited in Maftai, 2015). From the foregoing above, sovereignty could be interpreted as a complex phenomenon consisting of various dimensions, especially internal and external criteria but essentially a nation’s ability to exercise power and authority over its recognised territorial jurisdiction without the exertion of influence or restrictions from any external body, power or nation.

Theoretical Framework

This paper is anchored on the postulations of the dependency theory of international relations as its framework of analysis. The dependency theory was a critique of modernisation theory. The notion of the modernisation tradition had continued until the early 1960s when Third World scholars, especially Latin American scholars at the initial time began to question the situation, about what kind of relationship existed between the developed and underdeveloped countries. The answer was a

dependency relationship. The proponents of the theory from Latin America include Paul Baran, Andre Gunder Frank, Fernando Henrique Cardoso, Dos Santos and Immanuel Wallerstein, while African scholars like Samir Amin, Walter Rodney, Bade Onimode, Claude Ake, Peter Eke and Frantz Fanon also subscribed to the theory and built on it in the 1960s (Chukwu, & Briggs, 2019).

Dependency is seen as a state in which an outside force or powers abuse a state's policy or the lives of its population, typically by simultaneously enacting unequal socio-economic, political, and cultural measures (Igwe, cited in Chukwu, & Briggs, 2019). The dependency theory posits that the relationship between the West and developing countries is similar to that between a satellite and a metropolis. The Satellite deteriorates while the Metropolis grows (Frank, 1966). The largesse, wherein the West acquires "articulate economies" in emerging countries through international institutions while the remainder secure "disarticulated economies," best illustrates this dependent relationship (distorted economies) (Amin, 1974). Therefore, generally the whole idea and agenda of the incorporation of Africa, Latin America and Asian into the capitalist economic system is to plunder and appropriate her resources and wealth and render it underdeveloped. Therefore, the source of backwardness for these countries is nothing close to consistent sustenance of culture and tradition but is basically a lopsided relationship constructed to favour the West and undermine developing countries (Chukwu, & Briggs, 2019).

In application to this paper, the dependency theory emphasises that the relationship between the international institutions and the developing countries of Latin America, Asia and Africa is nothing more than a dependent one. The fundamental argument of this theory is that the continuous surreptitious erosion of the developing countries' sovereignty and its consequent underdevelopment is as a result of their integration of into a capitalist economic system through international institutions. The pervading social relationship in the capitalist economic system as championed by the international institutions is a dependent one. As such by means of this integration, the resources and sovereignty of developing countries were carted away, thus rendering these countries powerless and underdeveloped. Thus, this framework becomes adequate for our analysis of the subject matter in this paper because it explains the reasons for the emergence, scope of operations and purpose of international institutions as well as threat on developing countries' sovereignty at the global scene.

Historical Overview of International Institutions

International institutions are said to have emerged within the context of history following the emergence of nation-states, particularly at the point when nation-states began to experience a reasonable degree of interactions amongst themselves (Afroz, n.d). Many international institutions were established during times of global hegemony, when one nation has predominated in international power, especially after a major war among the great powers (Caria, 2022). For instance, international institutions such as the UN, the Organisation of American States (OAS), and the World Bank were created after World War II ended in 1945, at the time when the United States had become powerful enough to create rules and institutions that other countries would follow (Afroz, n.d). However, the emergence of international institutions can be divided into many

phases. With insight into historical development, the ancient Greeks could be credited with the first formal institutions, the Amphietyonic League, created in the early sixth century BC for regulating relations between their city states. Later, a confederation, Delos, was created between maritime states of the Aegean islands, which contributed ships and men to maintain a common navy (Reinalda, 2018).

The spread of Roman Empire from Mediterranean area to the most of Western and Central Europe and its remoteness from other centres of power such as China and India precluded inter-state relations of a permanent kind. The Romans evolved military, administrative and legal techniques that were useful in the evolution of international organisations and international law. It is however, fascinating to note that in spite of the decline of Roman Empire, the Roman Church grew in power and remains to this day a powerful international non-governmental organisation, while the Middle Ages witnessed several alliances and associations (Morley, 2010).

With the emergence of the Reformation and Renaissance era, when scientific advancements began to flourish consequent upon industrial revolution, and the ensuing increase of trade and industry, which occurred in the fifteenth, sixteenth, and seventeenth centuries, altered the entire landscape of international relations as the medieval system fell apart. More people now have political, economic, and diplomatic relationships (Koenigsberger, 2014). As the world started getting closer, new complexities of interdependence emerged that gave birth to extended diplomacy in the form of international conferences, treaties and formal peace. The first significant event in this context was the Congress of Westphalia (1648) that ended the Thirty Years' War and readjusted the religious and political affairs of Europe by creating sovereign and independent states (Reinalda, 2018; Afroz, n.d).

Congress of Vienna (1814-15), which was called to re-establish the territorial divisions of Europe at the end of the Napoleonic Wars after the downfall of Napoleon, is treated as the first systematic effort to regulate international affairs by means of regular international conferences. Though the attempt to restore the world order was partially successful, it nevertheless laid the foundation for a political and international system, which lasted for practically a century and shaped the course of world affairs, particularly in Europe (Reinalda, 2018).

Another important events which was regarded as a landmark in the development of international institutions was the two international peace conferences known as The Hague Conferences. The first conference was called on the initiative of Tsar Nicholas II of Russia for the purpose of bringing together the principal countries of the world to discuss and resolve the problems of maintaining universal peace, reducing armaments, and ameliorating the conditions of warfare. Twenty-six countries accepted the invitation to the conference issued by the minister of foreign affairs of the Netherlands (Afroz, n.d).

The delegates to the conference entered into three formal conventions, or treaties. The first and most important one set up permanent machinery for the optional arbitration of controversial issues between countries. This machinery took the form of the Permanent Court of Arbitration, popularly known as The Hague Court or Hague Tribunal. The second and third conventions revised some of the customs and laws of warfare to eliminate unnecessary suffering during a war on the part of all concerned, whether combatants, non-combatants, or neutrals. These two conventions were supplemented by three

declarations, to stay in force five years, forbidding the use of poison gas, expanding (or dumdum) bullets, and bombardment from the air by the use of balloons or by other means. Despite the failure of the conference to limit armaments, or to provide for compulsory arbitration of international disputes - the great countries refused to adopt compulsory arbitration because it infringed on their national sovereignty - the conference was one of the most significant international conferences of modern times, because it was the first multilateral international conference on general issues since the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and pointed forward to the later League of Nations, forerunner of the United Nations (Reinalda, 2018; Afroz, n.d).

The idea of holding the Second International Peace Conference was first promulgated by U.S. Secretary of State John Milton Hay in 1904, and it was called three years later on the direct initiative of the Russian government. The conference took place at The Hague from June 15 to October 18, 1907, and was attended by representatives from 44 countries. The second conference resulted in 13 conventions, which were concerned principally with clarifying and amplifying the understanding arrived at in the first conference. In particular, new principles were established in regard to various aspects of warfare, including the rights and duties of neutrals, naval bombardment, the laying of automatic submarine contact mines, and the conditions under which merchant ships might be converted into warships (Cullinane & Goodall, 2017; Afroz, n.d). The second conference recommended that a third conference be held within eight years. The government of the Netherlands actually began preparations for such a conference, to be held in 1915 or 1916; the outbreak of World War I, however, put an end to the preparations. After 1919, and until the formation of the UN in 1945, the functions of the Hague conferences were largely carried on by the League of Nations (Afroz, n.d).

From the middle of nineteenth century onwards, there was a considerable growth in administrative international institutions, at both intergovernmental and non-governmental levels. For example, the European Commission for the Danube (1856). Other institutions too came up, such as: the Geodetic Union (1864); the International Telegraph Union (1865), later renamed as International Telecommunication Union (ITU); the International Meteorological Organisation (1873); the General Postal Union (1884), later renamed as Universal Postal Union (UPU); the International Copyright Union (1886); the Central Office for International Railway Transport (1890); and the United International Bureau for the Protection of Intellectual Property (1893) (Reinalda, 2018; Cullinane & Goodall, 2017). Such organisations proliferated in the 20th century to cover a wide variety of specific issues. At the same time, the scope of international organisations expanded, culminating with the creation of the League of Nations in 1920. At roughly the same time, organisations started to be established by private citizens, in order to deal with international issues. Thus, in 1840, the World Anti-Slavery Convention was established, and in 1863, a Swiss philanthropist, Henry Dunant, created the Red Cross (Afroz, n.d).

The explication above indicates that international institutions are essentially a process of developing a new structural and procedural framework for the interplay of national governments within the context of the multistate system. It thus represents an attempt by statesmen to improve the operation of that system

by enhancing the institutional equipment available for the conduct of relations among states and by promoting the general acceptance of standards of state behaviour compatible with the minimum requirements of an orderly system. Insofar as international institutions represent a reformist movement within the multistate system, it expresses the awareness of national leaders that international order is requisite to the promotion and protection of the most basic interests of their states (Reinalda, 2018; Howard, 2008).

Therefore, the quest for order through international organisation does not involve repudiation of national interests or subordination of national interests to an overriding internationalism, but at most it involves the redefinition of national interests in conformity with the demands of increasing interdependence and the commitment of statesmen to the pursuit of those interests within the revised framework provided by international institutions. It is not surprising therefore, that governments undertake to use international agencies as instruments of their national policies. Such agencies are created and maintained by governments for instrumental purposes, and their usefulness depends upon the disposition of statesmen who resort to them as instruments of promoting values deemed compatible with their national interests. International institutions, therefore, reflect the view that world order is not more important than national interests, but that it is important to national interests (Cullinane & Goodall, 2017; Howard, 2008).

The Rationale for the Establishment of International Institutions

Worldwide, history recorded that people aspire for peace and security, socio-political and economic co-operation, cultural relationship, brotherhood, and global federations. The international institutions symbolise these hopes and aspirations. As a result of advancement in science and technology, the amount of international economic and social co-operation multiplies through the effective and sustainable role of international institutions. Thus, the international institutions help the people and government of different states to integrate with the world and form an agency of mutual advantage. In view of the fact that the world is characterised by war, conflict, dissension, morbid arms race and terrorism, international institutions has become the platform of stress accommodation and cooperation across national boundaries become the need of the hour. The existence of international institutions is the constant reminder of the world peace and security. For example, the emergence of the League of Nations and United Nations was accompanied by a philosophy of idealism concerning the possibility of world order through national restraint and cooperation utilising the principles of collective security. Thus, all these ideas and practices of resolving state differences, promoting mutually assured development and intergovernmental cooperation are enough to provide rationale to the existence of international institutions (Reinalda, 2018; Afroz, n.d).

The conception of international relations underlying international institution is frequently described as idealistic, in the sense that it minimises the element of conflict and emphasises the potentialities of harmony and cooperation in the relationships of states. International institutions are characterised, by supporters and critics alike, as arrangements for cooperation among states. Most accurately, international institutions can be said to rest upon a dualistic conception of international relations, one which acknowledges both conflictual and cooperative relationships as basic features of the multistate system.

In principle, international institutions represents an attempt to minimise conflict and maximise collaboration among participating states, treating conflict as an evil to be controlled and cooperation as a good to be promoted. In these terms, international institutions both deny the inevitability of war and other manifestations of hostility among countries and express a commitment to the harmonisation of international relations (Howard, 2008).

In fact, a more sophisticated analysis of international institutions reveals a much more complex approach to the conflictual and cooperative aspects of international affairs than that described above. Some international agencies are primarily concerned with problems of conflict, while others emphasise the promotion of collaboration. Within the United Nations, for instance, the Security Council is illustrative of the former type and the Economic and Social Council of the latter. Moreover, conflicting interests of states intrude upon programs of cooperation, making it necessary for cooperation-oriented agencies to deal with problems of conflict, and the common interests of states provide the means by which conflict-oriented agencies undertake to cope with tendencies toward international disorder. Thus, the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation is a regional agency inspired by the East–West conflict after World War II, but it relies upon cooperation among its members to enable it to meet the dangers posed by that conflict. Similarly, the concept of collective security envisages cooperative action by most members of general international institutions as the essential means for deterring or defeating aggression (Reinalda, 2018; Howard, 2008).

Emphasising international peace and security as the rationale for international institutions, Ola (2003) averred that the formative stage of international institutions was replete with brain storming session in which scholars and statesmen were primarily preoccupied with the singular purpose of promoting international peace and security, a situation whereby the world is devoid of crisis, war and breach to the international peace and security. There was the functionalist school whose main contribution was that international peace and security could best be realised through encouragement of apolitical activities amongst countries. The functionalists' school posits that if countries are engaged in socio-economic functions, thereby keeping politics completely in the background, international peace and security will be enhanced since countries will concentrate, through collaborative efforts, on addressing their common problems, through this process war and crisis situation amongst countries will be reduced, if not completely eliminated (Ola, 2003).

It is worthy of emphasis, therefore, to state that the evolution of international institutions is predicated on promotion of international peace and security, socio-political and economic cooperation, cultural relationship, brotherhood, and global federations. International institutions, either intergovernmental or nongovernmental have evolved over the years primarily for the promotion and attainment of peace and security as well as socio-political and economic cooperation (Caballero-Anthony, 2011).

International Institutions and the Sovereignty of Developing Countries

Though, the advent of international institutions in the global scene has bought some benefits to the developing countries. To some extent, the emergence of international institutions through grants, donations and social services, among others has contributed significantly in terms of trade flow, technological advancement, job creation, education support, change in pattern of consumption, foreign investment and economic integration, among others, of the developing countries. For instance, it can be observed that projects embarked upon by World Bank in Nigeria between 1958 and 2018 are 235 in total (Ogunniran *et al.*, 2019). Also, the World Bank extends its higher education support to Nigeria via research, which made it possible for Nigeria to be included in the list of countries whose macroeconomic time-series data are published on World Development Indicators. This has helped researchers at higher education level to conduct good and reliable researches (Ogunniran *et al.*, 2019).

However, the ever increasing influence of international institutions has sparked off debate over the role of the state and whether it can effectively function in the face of a broad set of forces. As a result of the role of international institutions as the vehicle of globalisation, the state and its institutions are increasingly under pressure from both the domestic and global sectors. As the world continues to evolve and develop, international institutions have continuously forged ahead as stakeholders in the international system with significant influence over state activities. International institutions have thus become a component of global affairs (Oyedokun, 2021; Milner, 2018).

It is striking to note that membership of international institutions such as the African Union (AU) or the European Union (EU) undermines traditional sovereignty standards. It is therefore evident that member states have established supranational entities that can make decisions that some member states though may disagree with but factually binding on them. The European Court of Justice, for example, has direct impact and supremacy within national legal systems, even though these ideas were never formally adopted in any treaty. The European Monetary Union established a central bank, which today oversees the monetary affairs of three of the union's four major members. In some places, the Single European Act and the Maastricht Treaty allow for the majority of qualified products of state sovereignty because they were formed through voluntary agreements among their member states. In another sense, however, it profoundly defies traditional notions of sovereignty since these same agreements have weakened the legal autonomy of its members (Oji & Ozoiko, 2011). The agreement to delegate sovereign powers to international institutions is not always binding. Nobody can prohibit member countries from rescinding their participation in international institutions to reclaim the sovereign power they have given up (Bukhari & Munir, 2016; Raustiala, 2003).

It is pertinent to say that today international institutions make decisions that were previously thought to be within the purview of states. Inequality among members of international institutions has become the norm. International institutions through globalisation have led to the rejection of normative principles of universal and equal sovereignty. Unanimity is no longer required for decision making, and veto is also uncommon. Although consensus is frequently utilised, more

often than not, proportional voting or a specifically defined functional majority is used, and certain international institutions have the authority to enforce their judgments on countries (Kingsbury, 1998). The operation of international economic institutions, such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organisation, is highly contentious in terms of putting requirements on countries; even governments, with limited scope for national economic policy, want involvement (Oyedokun, 2021; Ibrahim & Ainuddin, 2017).

States' position in the contemporary world is primarily influenced by their power, which can be measured in terms of economic resources, military capabilities, or both. Although several African countries such as Egypt, Nigeria, and South Africa satisfy this condition in their respective sub-regions, on a global scale, they (like several other new states) have become progressively marginalised, particularly with the rapid advancement in science and technology and the growth of international institutions. This trend has various political and economic repercussions that political scientists should consider when considering the issues of emerging countries in global politics (Banko, 2021; Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014). This is because it has placed the emerging countries in a precarious situation in comparison with the big countries like the US within the context of interaction and protection of nation's sovereignty.

In view of this situation, the emerging states, particularly those of Africa, Asia, and Latin America, have been subjected to unrestricted political and economic exploitations cloaked in a slew of international diplomatic ties that are frequently antagonistic to both people and the environment. At first, it was slavery, later to colonialism and neo-colonialism. But international institutions tied to the apron-string of globalisation are the most pervasive contemporary version of the World Powers' mechanism of degrading the sovereignty of many emerging states. Because of these new states' inadequate development of science and technology, they are incapable of negotiating well in the international division of labour and the social riches it generates (Banko, 2021; Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014).

The concept of globalisation is a big plan to "villagise" the world to the point that one may access the whole world from the comfort of one's room. Indeed, it seeks to undermine (if not eliminate) conventional and jurisdictional borders and barriers of particular states, to the detriment of new ones. However, while international institutions coupled with trade liberalisation are the engine that propels globalisation, information and communication technology (ICT) is the gasoline that keeps it running. Consequently, the Third World states, particularly those that are severely undeveloped or developing, suffer the most from this globalisation through international institutions initiative; this is because they are primarily technologically inferior and so oriented to consuming rather than producing (Milner, 2018; Ibrahim & Ainuddin, 2017).

Given this, and coupled with the monopolisation of the international economy by the developed countries, trade policies favour the developed countries, and the efforts of some developing states are frequently sabotaged by entrenched global structures of exploitation. International institution is one of the great sabotage techniques employed by the industrialised old powers against the less-industrialised emerging states. Indeed, international institutions as powered by globalisation,

encapsulate all the nemeses of enslavement, imperialism, naked colonialism and neo-colonialism. The conclusion is that international politics is still characterised by high-level injustices and exploitation carried out with complete impunity, the notion ‘where might is right’ still prevails (Banko, 2021; Ejikeme & Ugwueze, 2014).

Conclusion

This paper examined international institutions as threat to sovereignty of developing countries. It revealed that international institutions emerged from the need for states to come together and interact in the international environment to solve common problems, which may be difficult to solve individually. The paper disclosed that the increasing trends of international institutions as the vehicle of globalisation have increasingly put states, especially the developing ones and their institutions under pressure from both the domestic and global sectors. Therefore, international institutions as powered by globalisation encapsulate all of the nemeses of enslavement, imperialism, naked colonialism and neocolonialism, which has been covertly undermining the sovereignty of developing countries of Africa, Asia and Latin America.

Also, it was revealed that the operations of international institutions such as International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organisation, are highly contentious in terms of putting forward requirements that handicapped the sovereign power of countries, especially the developing ones, with limited scope for national economic policy and development. This paper concluded that international institutions through various mechanisms have grossly undermined the developing countries’ sovereignty to the extent that most of these states lack adequate capacity to make independent decisions within their territories.

Recommendations

In order to get out of these bobby traps of the international institutions and strengthen the sovereignty developing countries, the following recommendations were offered:

- i. The developing states should recognise the trend in the global system and place themselves in a better position focusing attention on their local peculiarity and comparative advantage to take advantage of the change to improve their policy process in order to be a better players in the international stage.
- ii Developing countries policy actors should organise trainings and capacity building workshops to learn the modern systems of accountability and project management in order to evolve a better partnership with international institutions like the World Bank, IMF and others.
- iii Developing countries should reduce dependence on international institutions, keep an eye on the public debt because dependency limits critical decision making and makes countries more likely to accommodate the interests of international institutions and the big powers behind them, which may be detrimental to the host country.

- iv Developing countries must define their objectives both domestically and in their foreign policy and develop the strong will to pursue it vigorously. The states should be able to shun any international institutions which do not serve her foreign and domestic policy goal(s).
- v Developing countries should focus on indigenous policies and programmes for the development that are peculiar to them.

References

- Afroz, A. (n.d). *Evolution of international organization: Congress of Vienna to the League of Nation*. Retrieved from <https://www.scribd.com/doc/37994331/Evolution-of-International-Organisations>
- Audu, U.W. (2020). *Brief history of international organizations*. Retrieved from https://www.academia.edu/40950756/Brief_History_of_International_Organisations_Brief_History_of_International_Organisations
- Banko, O.H. (2021). Interrogating the rivalry between state sovereignty and forces of globalization in international relations and politics among nations. *South East Journal of Political Science (SEJPS)*, 7(1), 1-23.
- Bartelson, J. (2006). The concept of sovereignty revisited. *The European Journal of International Law (EJIL)*, 17(1), 463-474.
- Bukhari, M. & Munir, K. (2016, September 9). Impact of globalization on income inequality in selected Asian countries. *MPRA Paper No. 74248*, pp.1-33. Retrieved from <https://mpra.ub.unimuenchen.de/74248/>
- Caballero-Anthony, M. (2011). Non-traditional security challenges, regional governance, and the ASEAN Political Security Community (APSC). In R. Emmers (Ed.), *ASEAN and the Institutionalization of East Asia*. London: Routledge.
- Caria, S. (2022). Cooperation regimes and hegemonic struggle: Opportunities and challenges for developing countries. *Politics and Governance*, 10(2), 71-81.
- Chukwu, R.D. & Briggs, D.C.T. (2019). Globalisation and democratisation in Africa. *International Journal of Comparative Studies in International Relations and Development*, 5(1), 96-107.
- Cullinane, M.P. & Goodall, A. (2017). *The open-door era: United States foreign policy in the Twentieth Century*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ejikeme, J. N., & Ugwueze, M. I. (2014). New states in world politics: Prospects and challenges. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 19(10), 1-11.

- Goldstein, J. S. (2003). *International relations* (5th ed.). Delhi: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Harrison, K., & Boyd, T. (2018, July 30). The state and sovereignty in understanding political ideas and movements. Retrieved from <https://www.manchesteropenhive.com/view/9781526137951/9781526137951.00005.xml>
- Held, D. (2003). The changing structure of international law: sovereignty transformed? In D. Held & McGrew (Ed.), *The changing structure of international law* (pp. 162-174).
- Howard, P. (2008). *International organisations*. Redmond, WA: Microsoft Corporation.
- Ibrahim, K. M., & Ainuddin, I. L. A. (2017). The impact of globalisation on African culture and politics. *Journal of International Studies*, 13, 1-14.
- Kingsbury, B. (1998). Sovereignty and inequality. *European Journal of International Law*, 9, 599-625.
- Koenigsberger, H. G. (2014). *Early modern Europe 1500-1789*. London: Routledge.
- Maftai, J. (2015). Sovereignty in international law. *ACTA Universitatis Danubius*, 11(1), 54-65.
- Marsonet, M. (2017). National sovereignty vs. globalization. *Academicus - International Scientific Journal*, 15, 47-57.
- Merriam, C. (1900). *History of the theory of sovereignty since Rousseau*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Milner, H. V. (2018). *Globalization and its political consequences: The effects on party politics in the west*. Retrieved from https://milner_globalization_political_consequences.pdf
- Morley, N. (2010). *The Roman Empire: Roots of imperialism*. New York: Pluto Press.
- Ogunniran, M. O., Komolafe, B. F., & Ogundele, A. R. (2019). The impact of World Bank and other international organizations on higher education system in Nigeria. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 7(3), 76-82.
- Oji, E. A., & Ozioko, M.V. C. (2011). Effect of globalization on sovereignty of states. *Nnamdi Azikiwe University Journal of International Law and Jurisprudence*, 2, 256-270.
- Ola, J. T. (2003). *International law and organization in a dynamic world*. Nigeria: Joeecryss Ventures Nig.
- Oyedokun, D. M. (2021). An assessment of the impact of globalisation on the sovereignty of the new states in global affairs. *RUJMASS*, 7(2), 11-22.

- Parmar, S.S. (2017). Understanding the concept of 'sovereignty'. *International Journal of Law*, 3(1), 31-35,
- Purdă, N. (2012). Aspects on the international legal personality of international organizations: Challenges of the knowledge society. *Legal sciences*, 891-900.
- Raustiala, K. (2003). Rethinking the sovereignty debate in international economic law. *Journal of International Economic Law*, 6(4), 841-878.
- Reinalda, B. (2018). *The evolution of international organisation as institutional forms and historical processes to 1945*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Russet, B., Starr, H., & Kinsella, D. (2006). *World politics: The menu for choice* (8th ed.). Belmont: Thompson Wadsworth.
- Singhal, A.K., Malik, I., & Singh, A.P. (2013). The concept of sovereignty in past and in present scenario. *Report and Opinion*, 5(12), 93-98.
- Tangney, P. (1996). The new internationalism: The cession of sovereign competences to supranational organizations and constitutional change in the United States and Germany. *Yale Journal of International Law*, 21, 395- 458.
- Udalla, E. A. (2012). International organizations and state sovereignty: Implications for public policy making and implementation in Nigeria.
- Wachira, G. M. (2007). Sovereignty and the 'United States of Africa' insights from the EU. *Institute for Security Studies, ISS Paper 144*, 1-16.
- Winkler, A. (2014). The Federal Charter of 1291 and the founding of the Swiss State. *Swiss American Historical Society Review*, 50(1), 33-50.