AD EDUXIAN JOURNAL
A Quarterly Multidisciplinary Blind Peer Reviewed & Refereed Online International Journal
Google Scholar Indexing PIF: 1.048(I2OR), 3.125 (IIFS) & 3.8(SJIF)
Vol (3), Issue (3), July-September 2026 *ISSN: 3048-7951*

The Paradox of Sovereignty: Analyzing the Interdependent Roles of National Governments and International Organizations in the Multipolar Era of 2026

Ms Bhaswati Bordoloi[1] ; Dr Gaganjyoti Bora[2]
DOI: http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23752231
Review: 25/09/2026 Acceptance: 29/09/2026 Publication:28/10/2026

Abstract: In the modern world of 2026, the old idea that every country can act entirely on its own—known as the Westphalian model of sovereignty—is being tested. Today's problems, such as climate change and economic instability, are too big for any single nation to solve alone. This research paper examines the partnership between national governments and international organizations like the United Nations (UN), the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the World Trade Organization (WTO). By using simple political theories like realism (which focuses on national power) and liberalism (which focuses on cooperation), this study looks at how global leadership is changing. The paper specifically investigates how major shifts in U.S. policy and the growing influence of "middle powers" like India and Brazil are reshaping the way the world is governed. A key finding of this research is the "vulnerability paradox": international organizations are most needed during global crises, yet this is exactly when governments tend to cut their funding and support to focus on their own domestic issues (Desai, 2026, p. 2). Despite these financial struggles and political disagreements, the study argues that international organizations remain the essential "conductors" of global cooperation. Without them, there would be no organized way to manage global trade or environmental protection. The paper concludes that for the world to remain stable, powerful countries must recommit to working together. Furthermore, international institutions must adapt to a "fragmented landscape" where power is shared among many different nations rather than just a few. Ultimately, the future of global peace and prosperity depends on finding a balance between national interests and the collective good of the international community.

Keywords: Global Governance, Multilateralism, Sovereignty, Vulnerability Paradox, Interdependence

Introduction

The global political system is currently navigating a period of profound transition. As of 2026, the world faces "new global headwinds" characterized by persistent violent conflicts, intense humanitarian crises, and a significant "funding crunch" for international bodies (Desai, 2026, p. 1). Historically, governments were seen as the sole actors in international relations, but the complexity of modern challenges—ranging from climate change to global value chains—demands a "rule-based political order beyond the nation-state" (Global Governance | WZB, 2026, para. 1).

At the heart of this discussion is the tension between Realism, which prioritizes state power and national interest, and Liberal Theory, which emphasizes the capacity for cooperative behavior through international institutions (Liberal Theory in International Relations, n.d., p. 5). Recent events, such as the withdrawal of major powers from international treaties in early 2026, have reignited debates about whether the "Golden Age" of

[1]Research Scholar, Department of Political Science, Barpeta Krishnaguru Adhyatmik Visvavidyalaya, Barpeta, Assam, India
[2] Associate Professor and Research Supervisor Krishnaguru Adhyatmik Visvavidyalaya, Barpeta, Assam, India

multilateralism is ending (Colli, 2026, p. 1). This introduction sets the stage for investigating how these actors interact to either uphold or disrupt the international order.

Objective:

The primary objectives of this research are:

- To evaluate the effectiveness of international organizations in addressing contemporary global crises (climate, health, and economy).
- To examine how national governments' policy shifts influence the authority and legitimacy of IOs.
- To identify the core challenges facing the multilateral system in a multipolar 2026 environment.

Methodology

This paper adopts a qualitative research design, employing a comparative and analytical approach. The study utilizes examination of recent reports from the IMF, UN, and various research institutes (e.g., WZB Berlin Social Science Center).A synthesis of Institutional Liberalism—which trusts the efficacy of regimes for cooperation—and Realism—which views geopolitical ambition as a driver of institutional decline (Liberal Theory in International Relations, n.d., p. 4).Analysis of recent geopolitical events, such as the 2026 U.S. White House Memorandum regarding withdrawal from UN entities, to assess real-world impact (Desai, 2026, p. 2).

1. The Evolving Role of National Governments

Governments remain the primary legitimate actors in international relations, holding the "monopoly on the use of force" and the mandate of domestic representation. However, the nature of governance has shifted from pure Westphalian sovereignty to a model of "strategic interdependence" (Global Governance| WZB, 2026, para. 2).

1.1. Sovereignty and Industrial Policy

As of 2025-2026, many governments have pivoted back toward protectionism and state-led economic planning. The "return of industrial policy" has seen major powers—specifically the U.S., China, and the EU—implementing massive domestic subsidies to secure supply chains in green energy and semiconductor technology. While these policies are popular domestically, they create "frictions in the global trade engine," often bypassing the rules set by the World Trade Organization (IMF, 2025, p. 2). This demonstrates a trend where governments prioritize national resilience over global economic efficiency.

1.2. The Domestic-International Linkage:

Governments act as the "gatekeepers" for international progress. No international treaty—whether the Paris Agreement or the UN Cybercrime Treaty—can function without domestic ratification and enforcement. In 2026, we see that international climate goals are "dependent on the national level for enabling more ambitious and inclusive climate actions" (United Nations University, 2026, para. 4). When governments face domestic political polarization, their ability to perform on the international stage is paralyzed, leading to a "frozen multilateralism" (Colli, 2026, p. 2).

2. The Functional Authority of International Organizations:

If governments are the musicians, international organizations are intended to be the "conductors of the global orchestra" (Desai, 2026, p. 1). IOs provide a platform for socialization, standard-setting, and dispute resolution that individual states cannot provide for themselves.

2.1. Normative and Technical Role:

IOs like the UN and the WHO serve a crucial role in "norm entrepreneurship." They define what is considered acceptable behavior in the international system. For example, the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) has been instrumental in 2026 in pushing for a legally binding global treaty on plastic pollution. These organizations provide the "technical expertise and neutral data" required for states to make informed policy decisions (Desai, 2026, p. 3).

2.2. The IMF and Global Financial Stability:

In the economic sphere, the IMF acts as a lender of last resort. In 2025, the IMF highlighted that the global economy was navigating a "fragmented landscape" where "geopolitical tensions" were actively reshaping trade routes (IMF, 2025, p. 1). By providing policy advice and conditional loans, the IMF influences the domestic policies of sovereign governments, illustrating a significant "transfer of authority" from the state to the international level (Liberal Theory in International Relations, n.d., p. 12).

3. The "Vulnerability Paradox" of 2026

A central theme of current political research is the Vulnerability Paradox. This refers to the fact that IOs are most needed during times of global crisis (such as the 2026 environmental shifts or regional conflicts), yet these are precisely the times when governments withdraw funding and political support to focus on "nationalist survival" (Desai, 2026, p. 2).

3.1. Financial Fragility:

The financial role of IOs is currently under threat. In early 2026, several UN entities reported being on the "brink of bankruptcy" due to the non-payment of assessed contributions by major member states (Desai, 2026, p. 1). When governments use funding as a "political lever," it compromises the independence of the IO, turning it into a tool for the highest bidder rather than a neutral arbiter of global law.

3.2. Crisis of Legitimacy:

The legitimacy of IOs is derived from their perceived fairness and effectiveness. However, the "erosion of the rule-based order" occurs when powerful states ignore IO rulings without consequence (Colli, 2026, p. 3). For instance, the inability of the UN Security Council to resolve major conflicts in 2025-2026 has led to a "decline in the acceptance of traditional leadership" and a rise in "revisionist powers" who seek to create alternative, regional institutions (Colli, 2026, p. 1).

4. **Cooperation in a Multipolar World:** The main study area reveals that we are moving away from "Global Governance" (a centralized system) toward "Global Governance with Chinese/Indian/Regional Characteristics." As middle powers like India, Brazil, and Indonesia take a larger seat at the table, IOs are being forced to reform their voting structures to remain relevant (Liberal Theory in International Relations, n.d., p. 14). Governments are increasingly engaging in "minilateralism"—small groups like the G7, BRICS+, or the Quad—because these smaller forums allow for faster decision-making than the "clunky bureaucracy" of the UN (Desai, 2026, p. 4). While this helps governments achieve short-term goals, it risks "fragmenting the international legal framework," making it harder to solve truly global problems like climate change or pandemic prevention (IMF, 2025, p. 4).

The interaction between these two actors can be summarized as follows: Governments provide the power and resources but are limited by national interests. International Organizations provide the framework and legitimacy but are limited by lack of enforcement power. In 2026, the success of the international system depends on whether governments view IOs as "burdensome constraints" or as "essential force-multipliers" for their own national security (Colli, 2026, p. 4). As the data suggests, the global environment is "in peril," and the current trend of "unstable multipolarism" suggests that the role of IOs will become increasingly contested in the years to come (Desai, 2026, p. 1).

Conclusion

The role of governments and international organizations is no longer one of simple hierarchy but of complex, often strained, interdependence. While governments prioritize strategic advantage, the “most pressing challenges... cannot be effectively managed by individual national governments alone” (Global Governance | WZB, 2026, para. 1). The 2026 outlook suggests that without a “renewed hegemonic commitment,” the world may slide further into “transactional politics” and “unstable multipolarism” (Colli, 2026, p. 1). To ensure a “common planetary future,” IOs must be revitalized through consistent funding and legal adherence by all member states (Desai, 2026, p. 2).

References

Desai, B. H. (2026). 2026: Global environment in peril: A look ahead on the role of the UN. *Environmental Policy and Law*, *56*(1–2), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.3233/EPL-260001

Colli, A. (2026). *The crisis of multilateralism between hegemony and multipolarity* (Working Paper No. 333). I.E.P. Bocconi University. https://iep.unibocconi.eu/publications/working-papers/working-paper-crisis-multilateralism-between-hegemony-and-multipolarity

Global Governance | WZB. (2026). *Research themes and institutional dynamics*. WZB Berlin Social Science Center. https://www.wzb.eu/en/research/international-politics-and-law/global-governance

International Monetary Fund. (2025). *World economic outlook, October 2025: Global economy in flux*. https://www.imf.org/-/media/files/publications/weo/2025/october/english/ch1.pdf

Jindal Journal of International Affairs. (n.d.). *Liberal theory in international relations: A realistic assessment of the era of globalization*. https://jjia.jgu.edu.in/index.php/jjia/article/download/87/86/93

United Nations University. (2026, January 21). *5 things to watch in climate and environment in 2026*. https://unu.edu/ehs/article/5-things-watch-climate-and-environment-2026

Weiss, T. G., & Thakur, R. (2025). *Global governance and the UN: An unfinished journey* (3rd ed.). Indiana University Press.

World Trade Organization. (2026). *World trade report 2026: Maintaining stability in a fragmented world*. https://www.wto.org/english/res_e/publications_e/wtr26_e.htm