GL-01 Global governance's record: what worked, what failed, and why

The architecture of global governance constructed between the 1919 Treaty of Versailles and the early twenty-first century represents the most expansive attempt in human history to manage complex systems across planetary scales. This audit evaluates the empirical record of these institutional arrangements, separating their stated intentions from their operational realities and historical outcomes. By analyzing the mechanics of collective action, this report isolates the features that permitted success from those that induced systemic paralysis or enabled capture by actors exhibiting dark-triad traits (narcissism, Machiavellianism, psychopathy). Ultimately, it seeks to map these historical lessons onto nested scales of human organization, testing the limits of governance from the planetary level down to the household.

The Architecture of Gridlock and Failure

The dominant models of planetary governance repeatedly collapsed under the weight of consensus requirements, great-power impunity, and institutional design flaws that incentivized free-riding.

The League of Nations (1919–1946)

Established in 1919 in Geneva following the Treaty of Versailles, the League of Nations was the first planetary institution to embody collective security[1]. By 1931, the League possessed a Secretariat staff of 707 and held 107 Council sessions between 1920 and 1939[3]. Its foundational flaw was embedded in Article 5(1) of the 26-article League Covenant, which required unanimity for substantive decisions, effectively granting every Council member a veto[4]. Between 1920 and 1942, 20 members left the League, including 17 that voluntarily withdrew as the system fractured[4].

According to the arrangement's own proponents, including figures like Woodrow Wilson, Lord Robert Cecil, and William Taft, the stated objective was to permanently promote international cooperation and achieve international peace and security by replacing power politics with collective arbitration[1]. However, the empirical record demonstrates that the institution catastrophically failed to prevent the Second World War. When major powers engaged in territorial aggression, they simply paralyzed the Council using the unanimity rule and subsequently withdrew (e.g., Imperial Japan, Fascist Italy, and Nazi Germany) or, in the case of the Soviet Union following its attack on Finland, were expelled in December 1939[4]. By 1940, the organization was reduced to a skeleton staff, culminating in its formal dissolution on April 19, 1946[3]. Modern scholarship, notably Ludovic Tournès (2010s) and George Egerton, infers that while the League failed in its primary collective security mandate, it successfully pioneered the modern international bureaucracy. It functioned as a highly effective technical think tank for global economic stabilization and public health, proving that international bodies excel at technical administration while failing at high-stakes coercive politics[3].

Scale Ledger: The League of Nations

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Failed	Absolute unanimity requirements ensure paralysis when sovereign interests inevitably collide.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Never Tried	Governance design applied strictly to external state relations, not continental federalism.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Never Tried	Irrelevant to sub-national regional governance.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	Never Tried	State-centric model lacked mechanisms for municipal integration.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	Never Tried	No operational mandate at the district level.
Village (150–500)	Never Tried	No operational mandate at the village level.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	Never Tried	Exclusively an inter-state organization.
Household (4–10)	Never Tried	Exclusively an inter-state organization.

Capture Test: A Machiavellian autocrat captures the arrangement by exploiting the unanimity rule to block sanctions against their own state, utilizing the procedural rules to shield military expansion. Historical cases include Imperial Japan and Fascist Italy paralyzing the Council before withdrawing. The League's only feature to resist capture was expulsion (Article 16), which it used against the USSR, but this merely accelerated the organization's irrelevance by shrinking its enforcement coalition.

The United Nations Security Council and General Assembly

(1945–Present)

The United Nations inherited the League's physical assets and attempted to correct its constitutional flaws by abandoning universal unanimity. Instead, the UN Charter instituted majority voting in the General Assembly and restricted veto power to the five permanent members (P5) of the Security Council[4]. Despite reform proposals like the 2005 Ezulwini Consensus, in which the African Union demanded two permanent seats with veto rights to rectify historical exclusion, the structure has remained rigid[8].

The stated objective of the UN Security Council is to maintain global peace and security through binding resolutions, utilizing collective economic or military force against aggressors. Yet, the historical record reveals severe operational paralysis during the Cold War and again in the modern multipolar era. In cases like the 1994 Rwandan genocide or the Syrian civil war (2011–present), the Security Council failed to authorize timely interventions due to P5 veto threats. Modern scholarship infers that the UN successfully operates as a continuous diplomatic back-channel, thereby preventing direct, apocalyptic great-power wars. However, the structural inclusion of the veto effectively immunizes the P5 and their proxy states from international law, creating a bifurcated system where coercion only applies to non-nuclear, mid-tier powers.

Scale Ledger: UN Security Council

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Failed	Held hostage by five sovereign vetoes; unable to act against major powers or their proxies.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Failed	Failed to prevent massive continental conflicts in Africa (e.g., Congo Wars) due to P5 apathy.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Failed	Paralyzed in regional conflicts (e.g., Syria, Rwanda) when proxy interests of P5 align against action.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	Never Tried	Not designed for municipal operations.
Parish/District	Never Tried	Not designed for district

(1,500–5,000)		operations.
Village (150–500)	Never Tried	Not designed for village operations.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	Never Tried	Irrelevant to band-level governance.
Household (4–10)	Never Tried	Irrelevant to household governance.

Capture Test: A psychopathic state leader utilizes the Security Council veto to legally shield their regime from international intervention while prosecuting aggressive wars or committing domestic genocide. The veto rule ensures the absolute capture of the enforcement mechanism by any P5 member, with no institutional mechanism existing to override it, proving that granting special legal immunities to powerful actors inevitably leads to institutional paralysis.

Bretton Woods and the WTO Appellate Body (1995–Present)

Established as a pillar of the post-Cold War economic order, the World Trade Organization's Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) created a binding two-tier arbitration system, crowned by the Appellate Body (AB). The AB consists of seven members, requiring a minimum of three to hear an appeal[9]. In late 2019, this system collapsed when the United States implemented a sustained blockade on the appointment of new judges, leaving it without a quorum[10].

The stated purpose of the AB was to provide predictable, rule-based, and binding arbitration for international trade disputes, replacing power-based bargaining with legal jurisprudence[10]. The empirical record shows immense activity: between 1995 and 2020, at least 595 disputes were initiated[9]. The US won 78% of its claims as a complainant and 36% as a respondent[9]. Nevertheless, citing excessive judicial activism, "zeroing" decisions in anti-dumping cases, and a failure to meet the 90-day deadline required by DSU Article 17.5, the US blocked all appointments[10]. Modern legal scholars, including Pieter Jan Kuijper (2017), Ernst-Ulrich Petersmann, and Akhil Raina (2018), infer that the system worked exceptionally well for smaller states by institutionalizing equal standing[9]. However, the WTO failed because its dispute resolutions relied on negative consensus (a decision passes unless everyone objects), while administrative appointments relied on positive consensus, allowing a single hegemon to fatally decapitate the institution's judicial wing without formally withdrawing from the treaty[9].

Scale Ledger: WTO Appellate Body

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale

Planet (8 billion)	Failed	Decapitated by a single hegemon exploiting the appointment consensus rule.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Worked	Highly effective for 25 years at regularizing trade between mid-sized powers.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.
Village (150–500)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.
Household (4–10)	N/A	Exclusively inter-state.

Capture Test: A Machiavellian executive captures the system through strategic omission—blocking administrative appointments to kill the judicial function, thereby returning international trade to a power-based transactional anarchy. The primary feature that resisted this was the creation of the Multi-Party Interim Appeal Arbitration Arrangement (MPIA) by the EU and others. This demonstrated that coalitions of the willing can bypass captured core institutions to maintain rule-of-law among themselves, albeit at a severe loss of global authority[14].

The International Seabed Authority (ISA)

Established under the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), the ISA governs the deep seabed, legally designated as the "common heritage of humankind"[16]. It comprises 172 members[17]. In June 2021, the Republic of Nauru triggered a treaty provision known as the "two-year rule" (Section 1(15) of the 1994 Implementing Agreement) on behalf of Nauru Ocean Resources Inc. (NORI), a subsidiary of the Canadian mining firm The Metals Company (TMC)[17]. The stated mandate of the ISA is to regulate deep-sea mining while strictly protecting the marine environment and ensuring equitable benefit-sharing[16]. The record demonstrates that

the invocation of the two-year rule mandated the ISA to finalize complex exploitation regulations by July 2023 or be forced to provisionally approve mining applications based on incomplete codes[20]. The deadline passed with no Mining Code finalized, leaving the ISA in a persistent state of regulatory crisis extending into 2025 and 2026[17]. Legal analysts infer that the ISA's framework contained a fatal procedural vulnerability: allowing a single state, acting as a flag-of-convenience proxy for a private corporation, to artificially accelerate planetary environmental regulations[18].

Scale Ledger: International Seabed Authority

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Failed	A single corporate-backed micro-state forced a regulatory crisis upon 171 other nations.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	N/A	Operates exclusively in international waters.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	N/A	Operates exclusively in international waters.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	N/A	Irrelevant to inland watersheds.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	N/A	Irrelevant at this scale.
Village (150–500)	N/A	Irrelevant at this scale.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	N/A	Irrelevant at this scale.
Household (4–10)	N/A	Irrelevant at this scale.

Capture Test: A Machiavellian corporate entity captures the regulatory framework by sponsoring a sovereign micro-state to trigger an obscure legal countdown, forcing an unprepared international body to permit exploitation under the threat of litigation. The resistance mechanism is a "precautionary pause" supported by environmental NGOs and the 2023 High Seas Treaty (BBNJ), utilizing public ESG pressure to delay private financing for the

mining operation, though the legal loophole remains unclosed[18].

The WHO and the Pandemic Agreement

Following the COVID-19 pandemic, the World Health Organization attempted to negotiate a binding Pandemic Agreement, with negotiations spilling into 2025 and 2026. The core friction centers on Article 12, which introduces a Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing (PABS) system[21].

The stated intent of the PABS system is to ensure the equitable global distribution of pandemic-related health products (PRHPs) by legally binding pharmaceutical manufacturers to donate 10% of their production to the WHO and sell an additional 10% at affordable prices during an emergency[21]. The record reveals severe diplomatic gridlock. Negotiations stalled heavily over pathogen scope; specifically, whether the framework covers only human-derived pathogens, despite the fact that approximately 75% of emerging infectious diseases (e.g., SARS, Ebola, mpox) are zoonotic[21]. Legal analysts infer that without independent enforcement mechanisms and explicit 'One Health' integration, the PABS system is critically vulnerable to corporate evasion. Because the agreement relies on companies "voluntarily deciding" to enter legally binding contracts in exchange for access to WHO databases, it lacks the coercive authority required for global compliance[21].

Scale Ledger: WHO Pandemic Agreement (PABS)

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Failing	Unable to bridge the divide between states demanding sequence data and states demanding profit/vaccine sharing without sovereign enforcement.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.

Village (150–500)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.
Household (4–10)	N/A	Intended for planetary execution.

Capture Test: Corporate actors exhibiting dark-triad traits extract pathogen sequence data from international open-source databases without signing the requisite PABS benefit-sharing contracts. By doing so, they privatize the intellectual property of vaccines while socializing the pandemic risk to the global south. The agreement currently lacks the physical or legal friction necessary to resist this capture, operating purely on a deeply flawed honor system[21].

The Mechanics of Efficacy and Success

Where global governance succeeded, it did so by relying on narrow mandates, highly technical execution, verifiable physical obligations, and structural incentives that aligned precisely with the immediate self-interest of the participants.

The Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine (1815–Present)

Created by Appendix 16 B of the Final Document of the Congress of Vienna on June 9, 1815, the Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine (CCNR) is the world's oldest continuously operating international organization[23]. Based in Strasbourg, it currently consists of five member states (Belgium, France, Germany, Netherlands, Switzerland)[24].

The stated mandate of the CCNR is to guarantee the freedom of navigation on the Rhine River and create a shared, harmonious legal and technical framework for riverine commerce[25]. The historical record shows that the Commission has operated uninterrupted for over two centuries, successfully standardizing river tolls, establishing traffic rules, and implementing environmental monitoring across a geographically contested zone that survived two World Wars[24]. Decisions require unanimity, yet gridlock is virtually non-existent[24]. Historians, such as Hein Klemann (2017) and Guido Thiemeyer (2011), infer that the CCNR succeeded because it pioneered true supranationality based entirely on immediate, shared economic incentives[24]. By strictly limiting the scope to technical parameters (navigational rules, vessel engineering standards), the political stakes were neutralized, aligning the rational self-interest of all states to keep commerce flowing efficiently.

Scale Ledger: Rhine Commission

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale

Planet (8 billion)	Never Tried	Highly specific geographic limitation prevents dilution of interests.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Worked	Unified a multi-national corridor across major European economies.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Worked	Unanimity works when the economic cost of non-cooperation is immediate, visible, and mutually destructive to the bioregion.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	Worked	Actively manages localized alarm models and pollution monitoring.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	Never Tried	Handled at higher administrative levels.
Village (150–500)	Never Tried	Handled at higher administrative levels.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	Never Tried	Handled at higher administrative levels.
Household (4–10)	Never Tried	Handled at higher administrative levels.

Capture Test: A narcissistic state leader attempts to extract exorbitant tolls from passing ships, effectively capturing the river's economic output. The arrangement resists capture because the technical bureaucracy is isolated from high politics, and retaliatory blockades by neighboring upstream/downstream states would instantly cripple the offending state's own riverine commerce, making capture economically suicidal.

Smallpox Eradication (1967–1980)

Launched in 1967 after a WHO allocation of just $2.4 million from its regular budget, the Intensified Smallpox Eradication Programme sought to vaccinate approximately 300 million

people annually in endemic countries[28]. The disease was officially declared eradicated globally in 1980[29].

The stated goal of the WHO was the complete, biological eradication of the smallpox virus from the human population[29]. The historical record demonstrates the execution of an unparalleled planetary public health campaign, heavily reliant on the bifurcated needle (invented by Benjamin Rubin), which allowed up to 100 vaccinations from a single vial with minimal medical training[29]. Verification was aggressive and highly physical; in 1977, India alone collected 17,000 specimens and conducted exhaustive facial pockmark surveys to verify eradication[30]. Modern public health scholarship infers that success was driven not by high-level diplomatic treaties, but by an unassailable scientific consensus, extreme technological simplification (needles that could be sterilized in boiling water), low financial barriers (1 to 2 US cents per dose), and verifiable physical reality, as facial pockmarks made outbreaks impossible for embarrassed state governments to hide[28].

Scale Ledger: Smallpox Eradication

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Worked	Universal biological threat generated total alignment among geopolitical rivals (US/USSR).
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Worked	National governments coordinated massive logistical supply chains.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Worked	Regional centers processed specimens and tracked outbreaks.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	Worked	Used as coordination hubs for mobile vaccination units.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	Worked	Local tracking of contacts.
Village (150–500)	Worked	Implementation relied on highly localized, easily trained village teams using simple, resilient technology.

Hamlet/Band (30–50)	Worked	Door-to-door verification reached the most isolated bands.
Household (4–10)	Worked	Point of contact for physical vaccination and pockmark verification.

Capture Test: A psychopathic local warlord attempts to hoard vaccines to exert political control over a population. The system resisted capture because the intervention was a singular event (eradication rather than indefinite management), the vaccines were extraordinarily cheap and abundant, and the international community possessed an overwhelming existential incentive to bypass or crush local spoilers to prevent global transmission[28].

United Nations Peacekeeping Operations

Despite the profound political failures of the UN Security Council, the empirical record of UN Peacekeeping Operations (PKOs) demonstrates significant success. Since 1945, the UN has deployed lightly armed or unarmed personnel to dozens of post-civil war transitions to monitor ceasefires[31].

The stated intent of PKOs is to deploy international personnel based on the consent of belligerents to monitor ceasefires, protect civilians, and assist in post-conflict peacebuilding[31]. The empirical record, verified through extensive statistical analysis by Virginia Page Fortna (2004, 2021), reveals a massive "selection effect"—peacekeepers are consistently deployed to the most intractable, difficult conflicts where war breaks out in over 50% of baseline cases[31]. However, controlling for this difficulty, Fortna estimates that PKOs reduce the risk of repeat war by 75% to 85%[31]. Similarly, Michael Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis (2000, 2006) analyzed 145 civil wars from 1945 to 1999, identifying a strong average treatment effect (0.46 to 0.75) specifically for "transformational" missions with wide mandates[32]. Political scientists infer that peacekeepers succeed not by resolving underlying centuries-old grievances, but by altering the physical and informational environment. They reduce uncertainty, provide credible signaling that accidental skirmishes are not full-scale attacks, and place physical friction between rival forces[31].

Scale Ledger: UN Peacekeeping

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	N/A	Applicable only to specific conflict zones.
Nation/Continent	Worked	Reduces repeat civil wars

(50M–500M)		across national boundaries by altering macro-incentives.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	Worked	Sub-national regions are stabilized by heavy mission footprints.
Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	Worked	Base camps provide local economic stimulus and security.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	Worked	"Boots on the ground" provide immediate physical and informational stability to specific districts.
Village (150–500)	Failed	Often unable to prevent micro-targeted massacres in remote villages without sufficient troop density (e.g., Srebrenica).
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	N/A	Too granular for UN logistics.
Household (4–10)	N/A	Too granular for UN logistics.

Capture Test: A Machiavellian warlord signs a peace treaty strictly to regroup, intending to use the UN presence as a diplomatic shield while rearming. Resistance occurs only when PKOs possess a strong "transformational" mandate and sufficient budget (e.g., simulations by Hegre show massive effects with $800M+ budgets). Weak, traditional, or under-resourced missions are easily captured or bypassed by local spoilers, rendering the peacekeepers hostages rather than arbiters[32].

Environmental Treaties: Montreal and Madrid vs. Kyoto and Paris

A direct comparison of environmental governance reveals why certain models thrive while others collapse.

The 1987 Montreal Protocol was designed to phase out ozone-depleting substances (CFCs). It

succeeded unequivocally. The record shows a rapid global phase-out of CFCs and a recovering ozone layer. Economists infer this success was predicated on highly favorable conditions: a small coalition of concentrated producers, the existence of cheap chemical substitutes (HFCs), a Multilateral Fund to subsidize developing nations, and strictly enforceable trade measures against non-signatories.

Similarly, the 1959 Antarctic Treaty, supplemented by the 1991 Protocol on Environmental Protection (Madrid Protocol, entered into force in 1998 with 42 signatories), achieved total compliance[38]. The stated goal was to designate Antarctica as a "natural reserve, devoted to peace and science"[38]. The record shows that Article 7 instituted an absolute ban on mining, while five specific annexes strictly enforce waste management and flora conservation[38]. Scholars infer the treaty succeeded due to the prohibitive logistical costs of polar exploitation, the total absence of indigenous human populations, and immense pressure from non-state actors like Greenpeace[38].

Conversely, the Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement failed to meaningfully curb global greenhouse gas emissions. The stated goal of Paris was to limit global warming to 1.5°C through Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs). The record shows emissions continuing to rise. Modern economic scholarship infers that these treaties fail because they rely entirely on voluntary pledges without enforcement mechanisms, resulting in a massive free-rider problem where states reap the benefits of global reduction while continuing to burn cheap fossil fuels.

To resolve this, William Nordhaus (2015, *American Economic Review*) proposed "Climate Clubs." The stated goal is to overcome free-riding by penalizing non-participants[40]. While largely theoretical, the model suggests establishing a minimum target carbon price (e.g., $50/ton) and leveraging a uniform percentage tariff on all imports from non-club members[41]. Economists infer that this converts climate policy from a vulnerable public goods dilemma into an excludable club good, enforcing compliance through economic coercion rather than moral appeals[41].

Scale Ledger: Environmental Governance (Aggregated)

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Mixed	Montreal worked via trade bans; Paris failed via voluntary pledges.
Continent	Worked	Antarctica preserved due to extreme logistics and absolute bans.
Region/Bioregion (0.5M–5M)	N/A	Administered at the state level.

Town/Watershed (15k–50k)	N/A	Administered at the state level.
Parish/District (1,500–5,000)	N/A	Administered at the state level.
Village (150–500)	N/A	Administered at the state level.
Hamlet/Band (30–50)	N/A	Administered at the state level.
Household (4–10)	N/A	Administered at the state level.

Capture Test: A resource-starved, heavily industrialized state seeks to defect from environmental obligations. In a voluntary system like Paris, they capture the diplomatic goodwill while ignoring the rules. In the Madrid Protocol, the arrangement resists because Article 7 creates an absolute prohibition that can only be modified (Article 25) by unanimity, and polar logistics require transparency that precludes secret mining[38]. In a Nordhaus Climate Club, resistance is automated: the non-compliant state suffers severe, uniform tariff penalties on its exports, forcing its self-interest into alignment with club rules[41].

The Capture Record: International Law and Global Bureaucracies

The Strongest Case Against Global Governance

The most devastating theoretical critique of global governance emanates from the realist and rational-choice traditions, championed by scholars like John Mearsheimer (1994, *The False Promise of International Institutions*) and Eric Posner and Jack Goldsmith (2005, *The Limits of International Law*).

Mearsheimer argues that international institutions are epiphenomenal—they merely reflect the underlying distribution of military and economic power in the world[43]. They possess "minimal influence on state behavior" and are routinely utilized by great powers as hollow tools to execute their own self-interested goals[44]. The "false promise" is the liberal institutionalist delusion that treaties or norms can fundamentally alter state preferences[43].

Posner and Goldsmith apply rational-choice theory to international law, explicitly denying that states comply out of any sense of moral obligation or normative "legality" (*pacta sunt servanda*)[46]. They argue that international law has absolutely no "exogenous effect on state behavior"[46]. The record shows that states comply with treaties only when it directly aligns with

their immediate self-interest, or when the problem is a simple coordination game (such as diplomatic immunity or air traffic control) where cheating yields no advantage[48].

Leading Critics (The Defense): Andrew Guzman (2008, *How International Law Works*) counters Posner and Goldsmith by introducing "reputation" as a strictly rational-choice asset. Guzman infers that states comply with international law because defecting damages their reputation, which makes securing future agreements with other states significantly more costly[47]. Similarly, Robert Keohane (1984) argues that institutions succeed by reducing transaction costs and providing vital information, thereby altering the rational calculus of states without requiring any altruism or moral awakening[49].

Captured Global Bodies: FIFA and the IOC

To observe capture by dark-triad individuals in its purest form, one must examine international sporting bodies. Lacking the coercive oversight mechanisms inherent to sovereign states, organizations like FIFA operated as unchecked transnational fiefdoms[50].

João Havelange (FIFA President 1974–1998) and his protégé Sepp Blatter (1998–2015) transformed FIFA into a multibillion-dollar enterprise by monopolizing global broadcast and sponsorship rights (e.g., Coca-Cola, Adidas)[51]. Investigative journalist Andrew Jennings (2006, *Foul!*) relentlessly documented how the Swiss sports marketing firm International Sport and Leisure (ISL) paid tens of millions in bribes to FIFA executives[52].

The stated goal of FIFA is the global development and regulation of football. The historical record shows an institution completely hollowed out by corruption. The capture mechanics relied on patronage: Blatter and Havelange utilized corporate revenues to distribute opaque "development grants" to micro-nations and impoverished federations (particularly in the Caribbean and Africa), effectively buying their votes at the FIFA Congress[53]. Because every national federation held exactly one vote regardless of size, a massive bloc of dependent micro-states shielded the executive leadership from the scrutiny of wealthy, rule-abiding federations.

Scale Ledger: FIFA / IOC

Scale	Efficacy	Rationale
Planet (8 billion)	Failed	Wholly captured by internal dark-triad leadership.
Nation/Continent (50M–500M)	Failed	National federations became complicit conduits for bribery.
Region to Household	N/A	Operates via national federations.

Capture Test: A Machiavellian leader constructs a mafia-like *omerta* (code of silence) to distribute illicit funds[50]. When ISL collapsed in 2001, Swiss authorities found that Havelange, Blatter, and others were aware of at least $41 million in bribes. However, Swiss law at the time did not consider private commercial bribery a punishable offense[52]. The system was entirely immune to internal reform; internal ethics committees were toothless because the dark-triad leadership personally appointed the ethics officers[52]. The capture was only reversed by an external, coercive sovereign power: the US Department of Justice's 2015 indictments, which utilized extraterritorial wire fraud and racketeering laws to arrest 41 individuals and uncover $150 million in bribes, proving that private global bureaucracies cannot self-regulate[55].
Note regarding scale bias: It is vital to avoid the naturalistic fallacy and the romance of the primitive. Just as planetary institutions failed via vetoes, small-scale arrangements (villages and bands) are not inherently egalitarian or fair. Small group sizes often enable more intense, intimate forms of tyranny, where dark-triad individuals use social ostracization and physical violence to capture local resources without the bureaucratic friction that slows down planetary dictators.

Syntheses and Design for the Fall

Summary of Robust Findings

1. Institutions requiring absolute planetary unanimity (League of Nations, WTO appointments) reliably collapse under the veto of a single bad actor.
2. Veto powers granted to hegemons (UN Security Council) succeed in preventing direct great-power wars but permanently immunize those powers from international law.
3. Global governance succeeds when the scope is strictly technical, apolitical, and physically verifiable (Smallpox eradication, Rhine navigation).
4. Supranationality functions best at the regional or watershed level, where the economic costs of defection are immediate and mutually assured.
5. "Boots on the ground" interventions (UN Peacekeeping) statistically reduce violence by 75-85%, proving that physical and informational friction alters local conflict incentives.
6. Treaties designed to accelerate resource extraction via corporate proxies (ISA 2-year rule) are uniquely vulnerable to regulatory capture.
7. Without coercive external sovereign enforcement, private global bureaucracies (FIFA) inevitably fall to patronage-based capture by dark-triad actors.
8. Treaties lacking independent compliance monitoring and enforcement (WHO Pandemic Agreement) devolve into unenforceable corporate suggestions.
9. Economic penalties (tariffs/Nordhaus clubs) are the most viable method to solve free-rider problems in public goods.
10. International law does not alter the fundamental nature of state self-interest; it merely coordinates that interest where it happens to overlap.

Contested or Open Questions

- **The Reputation Mechanism:** Does a state's fear of losing diplomatic "reputation"

genuinely constrain dark-triad leaders, or does it only constrain democratically elected, institutionally bound leaders?

- **The Selection Effect of Peacekeeping:** Do peacekeepers genuinely build peace, or do they only succeed in environments where local actors have already secretly exhausted their capacity to wage war?
- **The Viability of Excludable Clubs:** Can an economic club (imposing massive tariffs on non-members) function without sparking a catastrophic, retaliatory kinetic war from the excluded factions?

Sources to Read in Full

1. Mearsheimer, J.J. (1994). *The False Promise of International Institutions*. International Security, 19(3).
2. Posner, E.A., & Goldsmith, J.L. (2005). *The Limits of International Law*. Oxford University Press.
3. Fortna, V.P. (2004). *Does Peacekeeping Keep Peace? International Intervention and the Duration of Peace After Civil War*. International Studies Quarterly.
4. Doyle, M.W., & Sambanis, N. (2006). *Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations*. Princeton University Press.
5. Nordhaus, W. (2015). *Climate Clubs: Overcoming Free-riding in International Climate Policy*. American Economic Review.
6. Jennings, A. (2006). *Foul! The Secret World of FIFA: Bribes, Vote Rigging and Ticket Scandals*. HarperSport.
7. Fenner, F., Henderson, D.A., et al. (1988). *Smallpox and its Eradication*. World Health Organization.
8. Klemann, H.A.M. (2017). *The Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine, 1815-1914*. Nomos.
9. Guzman, A. (2008). *How International Law Works: A Rational Choice Theory*. Oxford University Press.

Implementability after the Fall

Minimum Viable Version

- **Household (4–10 people):** A basic resource and chore ledger (the equivalent of a micro-Rhine Commission). What it needs to start: a shared physical calendar and basic literacy to track inputs/outputs. Decisions are made by consensus, but defection results in immediate, visible resource deprivation for the defector.
- **Village (300 people):** A technical oversight committee managing a specific common-pool resource (e.g., a well or perimeter wall), modeled on the Antarctic Treaty. What it needs to start: a communal meeting place and written records. It strictly prohibits the privatization of the resource. Governance is kept entirely separate from moral or religious leadership to prevent charismatic capture.
- **District (3,000 people):** A mutual-defense and trade "Club" modeled on Nordhaus's Climate Clubs and the MPIA. What it needs to start: physical record-keeping, standardized weights/measures, a meeting place, and a shared calendar. Membership requires a verified contribution (e.g., grain tax, militia rotation). Non-members are

subjected to exorbitant tolls or complete trade embargoes.

First Failure to Expect:

The immediate emergence of a "Veto Trap." A highly capable, heavily armed, or resource-rich household or village will demand veto power over district decisions in exchange for their participation. Once granted, a dark-triad leader within that unit will paralyze the district's ability to sanction them for hoarding or aggression, mirroring the collapse of the League of Nations and the UN Security Council.

Principles

1. Governance structures succeed in inverse proportion to their ideological ambition; technical, narrow mandates survive while broad, moral mandates fracture.
2. Arrangements lacking physical, immediate, and unambiguous mechanisms for verifying compliance are inevitably exploited by free-riders.
3. Any governance structure requiring absolute unanimity contains the seeds of its own paralysis and guarantees immunity for its most abusive members.
4. Third-party interventions do not need to resolve underlying grievances to be effective; they only need to introduce sufficient physical and informational friction to alter the immediate cost-benefit analysis of violence.
5. Collective action problems regarding public goods can only be solved by transforming them into club goods, where non-compliance is punished by severe, coordinated economic exclusion.
6. Without coercive external auditing, institutions that control access to resources will be captured by dark-triad individuals using patronage to build majorities of dependent client-voters.

Works cited

1. The Covenant of the League of Nations, https://www.ungeneva.org/en/about/league-of-nations/covenant
2. From League of Nations to United Nations (Chapter 3), https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/evolution-and-legitimacy-of-international-security-institutions/from-league-of-nations-to-united-nations/A08C83888D03465E2FA0747057DA4322
3. League of Nations - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/League_of_Nations
4. League of Nations - Oxford Public International Law, https://opil.ouplaw.com/display/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e519?d=%2F10.1093%2Flaw%3Aepil%2F9780199231690%2Flaw-9780199231690-e519&p=emailAKlMFBRz4nq2.&print
5. Veto - Oxford Public International Law, https://opil.ouplaw.com/display/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e570?p=emailAIK52XVG0nOVM&d=/10.1093/law:epil/9780199231690/law-9780199231690-e570
6. ZARA STEINER The League of Nations and the Quest for Security, https://perspectivia.net/servlets/MCRFileNodeServlet/pnet_derivate_00004660/steiner_league.pdf

7. League of Nations | History, Definition & Purpose | Britannica, https://www.britannica.com/topic/League-of-Nations
8. HANDBOOK ON SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM: 25 years of, https://www.un.org/en/ga/screform/77/pdf/L69InteractiveHandBook_11feb.pdf
9. meditations in an emergency: the appellate body deadlock, https://ghum.kuleuven.be/ggs/publications/working_papers/2018/199raina
10. MPIA as Solution to the WTO Appellate Body Dilemma - ijsrm, https://ijsrm.net/index.php/ijsrm/article/view/5281/3270
11. Breaking the Impasse of Appointing Members of the WTO Appellate, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/world-trade-review/article/breaking-the-impasse-of-appointing-members-of-the-wto-appellate-body-a-perspective-from-international-institutional-law/82A2014C52DC6393406E98D630ED3640
12. APPELLATE BODY OF THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION CRISIS, https://ipjll.com/ipjll/index.php/journal/article/download/495/560
13. (PDF) Is the WTO Appellate Body in Limbo? The Roots of the Crisis, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/356897452_Is_the_WTO_Appellate_Body_in_Limbo_The_Roots_of_the_Crisis_in_the_WTO_Dispute_Settlement_Body_and_the_Available_Routes_Navigating_the_Quagmire
14. What are the implications of the United States' blockage ... - OxJournal, https://www.oxjournal.org/united-states-blockage-of-appointments-to-the-wto-appellate-body/
15. MPIA: Addressing WTO Appellate Body Crisis | PDF - Scribd, https://www.scribd.com/document/720838336/MPIA
16. Deep-Sea Mining Governance and the Role of Geneva, https://www.genevaenvironmentnetwork.org/resources/updates/deep-sea-mining-and-the-role-of-geneva/
17. Q&A on the ISA - International Seabed Authority, https://isa.org.jm/faq-for-media/
18. Governing the Deep Sea: Legal, Technological, and Environmental, https://www.jmr.unican.es/jmr/article/download/1689/1302
19. The Invocation of the 'Two-Year Rule' at the International Seabed, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/362106888_The_Invocation_of_the_'Two-Year_Rule'_at_the_International_Seabed_Authority_Legal_Consequences_and_Implications
20. All you need to know about Deep Sea Mining, https://www.deepwave.org/all-you-need-to-know-about-deep-sea-mining/
21. Pathogen Access and Benefit-Sharing: Can the WHO Pandemic, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12982117/
22. The World Health Organization's Emerging Pathogen Access System, https://www.insideeulifesciences.com/2026/05/23/the-world-health-organizations-emerging-pathogen-access-system-implications-for-commercial-infectious-disease-rd/
23. Legal basis / Texts, https://www.ccr-zkr.org/11020000-en.html
24. Central Commission for Navigation on the Rhine - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Central_Commission_for_Navigation_on_the_Rhine
25. Blame or Return Napoleon. - Clean Rivers Trust,

https://www.cleanriverstrust.co.uk/blame-or-return-napoleon/
26. Rhine case study - UNESCO Digital Library, https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000133303
27. Journal of European Integration History 2/2011, https://eu-historians.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/jeih-34-2011_2.pdf
28. SMALLPOX VACCINE AND VACCINATION IN THE INTENSIFIED, https://biotech.law.lsu.edu/blaw/bt/smallpox/who/red-book/Chp%2011.pdf
29. Big Red Book Ch 31. Lessons and Benefits - Target Zero, http://www.zero-pox.info/bigredbook/BigRed_Ch31.pdf
30. Smallpox | The Journal of Infectious Diseases - Oxford Academic, https://academic.oup.com/jid/article/224/Supplement_4/S379/6378097
31. INTERSTATE PEACEKEEPING Causal Mechanisms and Empirical, https://polisci.columbia.edu/sites/polisci.columbia.edu/files/content/pdfs/Publications/Fortna/Journal%20Articles/interstate%20pk%20WP%202004%20offprint.pdf
32. World Bank Document, https://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/976851468141302603/pdf/wps4207.pdf
33. (PDF) Peacekeeping - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/403609314_Peacekeeping
34. The Extraordinary Relationship between Peacekeeping and Peace, https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/british-journal-of-political-science/article/extraordinary-relationship-between-peacekeeping-and-peace/D2D5D262B60315387B0B23D1D4F79CC9
35. Evaluating the Conflict-Reducing Effect of UN Peacekeeping, https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/10.1086/700203
36. When Permanent Five Deploy, Fund, and Lead Peacekeeping, https://academic.oup.com/jogss/article/11/1/ogag015/8661426
37. Evaluating the conflict-reducing effect of UN peacekeeping operations, https://havardhegre.net/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/pko_prediction_march2016.pdf
38. Protocol on Environmental Protection to the Antarctic Treaty, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Protocol_on_Environmental_Protection_to_the_Antarctic_Treaty
39. Madrid Protocol on Environmental Protection - The Antarctic Treaty, https://www.coolantarctica.com/Antarctica%20fact%20file/science/madrid_protocol.php
40. Climate clubs: an experimental study of... - Open Research Europe, https://open-research-europe.ec.europa.eu/articles/5-373
41. Climate Clubs to Overcome Free-Riding, https://issues.org/climate-clubs-overcome-free-riding-climate-agreement-policy/
42. Carbon Border Adjustments, Climate Clubs, and Subsidy ... - NBER, https://www.nber.org/system/files/working_papers/w31310/w31310.pdf
43. The False Promise of International Institutions - John J. Mearsheimer, http://www.columbia.edu/itc/sipa/U6800/readings-sm/Mearsheimer_False_Promis

e.pdf
44. The False Promise of International Institutions - Thomas Langtry, https://tomlangtry.com/wp-content/uploads/2026/08/The-False-Promise-of-International-Institutions.pdf
45. The false promise of international institutions | 53 | The Realism Rea, https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315858579-53/false-promise-international-institutions-john-mearsheimer
46. International Law in Black and White, https://digitalcommons.law.uga.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1212&context=gjicl
47. Can International Law Work? A Constructivist Expansion, https://ir.lawnet.fordham.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2393&context=faculty_scholarship
48. Eric A. Posner. The Perils of Global Legalism - Oxford Academic, https://academic.oup.com/ejil/article/20/4/1263/530843
49. (PDF) The False Promise of International Institutions (1994) - SciSpace, https://scispace.com/papers/the-false-promise-of-international-institutions-3kwpnelvmt
50. Sepp Blatter's football family - Play the Game, https://www.playthegame.org/news/sepp-blatter-s-football-family/
51. Why is FIFA So Infected With Corruption? A History - Remezcla, https://remezcla.com/features/sports/why-is-fifa-so-infected-with-corruption-a-history/
52. FIFA: A Century of Crime and No Punishment - ResearchGate, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385077228_FIFA_A_Century_of_Crime_and_No_Punishment
53. Andrew Jennings, Foul! The Secret World of FIFA, https://cdm17103.contentdm.oclc.org/digital/api/collection/p17103coll10/id/5743/download
54. Bribes, ethics and the end of an era at Fifa, https://www.sportsjournalists.co.uk/journalism-news/isl-ethics-and-the-end-of-an-era-at-fifa/
55. 2015 FIFA corruption scandal | Explained, Qatar, & 2022 World Cup, https://www.britannica.com/event/2015-FIFA-corruption-scandal
56. 2015 FIFA corruption case - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/2015_FIFA_corruption_case