

# CHALLENGES IN DRAFTING INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENTS IN THE CONTEMPORARY WORLD

**MUNTAHA. Q. M. ALABDALLAT**

University of Jordan. Email: muntaha149@yahoo.com

## Abstract

It's tougher than ever to create and follow through on international agreements these days. This is changing the way governments and diplomats have worked together for a long time. This research looks at the various issues that make it hard to create international agreements in the world today. It looks at the political, technical, and legal elements that are now the most important in deciding how well treaties work and how lawful they are. The study employs the PRISMA framework and a systematic literature review to look at scholarly papers produced between 2023 and 2025 in key academic databases. The research looks at contemporary problems with international agreements, especially in the fields of cybersecurity, how to control artificial intelligence, how multipolarity works, and how international law is changing. The findings demonstrate that the shift from a unipolar to a multipolar international system has radically altered traditional consensus-building mechanisms, with emerging powers such as China, India, and Russia challenging Western-dominated institutional frameworks, this shift in global politics has led to a clash of national interests, a decline in trust in multilateral institutions, and a proliferation of bilateral agreements concluded through existing international organizations, the pace of technological progress, particularly in areas such as artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, and digital trade, has outpaced the adaptability of traditional treaty-making procedures, leading to significant regulatory gaps and implementation problems, contemporary international agreements face significant challenges in how they are implemented, how they are interpreted, and how clear they are in court, the lack of effective monitoring and compliance frameworks has led to more unilateral withdrawals and selective enforcement, making international law less credible. It's challenging to get a real global agreement since people have diverse ideas and feelings about critical issues like sovereignty, human rights, and digital governance. The study implies that a single framework might help make establishing treaties between countries more fruitful. This means leveraging the latest technology to keep an eye on compliance, creating independent international oversight groups, and building governance mechanisms that can keep up with technology that changes swiftly. The study helps us understand how modern international relations operate by looking at the structural problems that make it impossible to run the globe in a way that works in a world order that is becoming more complex and split apart.

**Keywords:** International Agreements; Treaty Drafting; Global Governance; Multipolarity; Technological Challenges; Enforcement Mechanisms; Contemporary Diplomacy; International Law.

## INTRODUCTION

The contemporary world is witnessing profound and radical transformations in its political, economic, and social structures, driven by intertwined factors, including the rise of new economic powers such as China and India, accelerating technological innovation, climate change, regional conflicts, and the intersection of transnational security challenges. These transformations have not only affected traditional balances of power but have also reshaped concepts of sovereignty and international cooperation, making the process of negotiating and drafting international agreements more complex than ever before. (Dahiya, 2024) In the current context, international agreements are no longer merely legal instruments regulating relations between states. They have become multidimensional mechanisms in which economic interests, security concerns, and environmental and

human rights considerations intersect. (Sharma, 2024) For example, modern trade agreements require the inclusion of clauses related to workers' rights, environmental protection, and digital regulations—issues that were not present with the same intensity in traditional agreements.

(Baimuratov et al., 2024) Furthermore, environmental agreements, such as the Paris Climate Agreement, reflect an unprecedented level of complexity in aligning national commitments with global goals, amidst enormous variations in countries' capabilities and levels of development. (Baimuratov et al., 2024) On the other hand, the current geopolitical environment poses serious challenges to the international negotiation process. (Baimuratov et al., 2024)

The increasing manifestations of multipolarity and the growing influence of non-traditional actors, such as multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations, have led to the erosion of the dominance of traditional Western powers over treaty-making mechanisms. (Sharma, 2024) The rise of nationalist and populist tendencies in some countries has also contributed to weakening commitment to multilateral agreements and a return to more closed models of international relations. (Nešović & Jerotijević, 2018)

From a legal perspective, dilemmas arise related to the overlap of national and international judicial systems and the difficulty of implementing treaty provisions in the absence of effective enforcement mechanisms, particularly in issues related to human rights and climate justice.

(Abdullahi & Musa, 2023) In addition, the ethical challenge of balancing respect for national sovereignty and international pressure to comply with global standards raises vital questions about the legitimacy of some agreements and the degree to which they truly represent the will of the people. (Lupu et al., 2020)

In light of the digital revolution, international agreements face new challenges related to cyberspace, data protection, and emerging technologies such as artificial intelligence. (Liu, 2024)

This necessitates the formulation of new legal rules that accommodate these changes and narrow the existing legislative gap at the international level. (Lupu et al., 2020)

Based on these issues, this research seeks to analyze the contemporary challenges facing the formulation of international agreements, focusing on the geopolitical, legal, and technological dimensions of these challenges, and exploring ways to enhance the effectiveness of agreements in line with the complexities of the new international order. (Valle, 2023)

## **STUDY BACKGROUND**

In recent decades, the international system has undergone profound structural transformations, clearly reflected in the patterns of interaction between states and the decision-making mechanisms in global politics. At the end of the Cold War, a unipolar system led by the United States prevailed for a period. (Farooq et al., 2020) However, the

beginning of the twenty-first century witnessed the beginning of a decline in this relative hegemony, paralleled by the rise of new powers such as China, India, and Brazil, which led to the emergence of the features of a multipolar international system. (Farooq et al., 2020) This geopolitical transformation has impacted the nature of regional and international alliances and directly impacted the logic of drafting international agreements, which previously took place under more stable and consistent balances. (Dahiya, 2024)

These political transformations have been linked to the rise of regional conflicts, whether in the Middle East, Eastern Europe, or East Asia, creating an international environment characterized by uncertainty, division, and conflicting interests. (Jassim, 2025) In such a context, states have become more committed to their national interests and more cautious about entering into long-term international commitments, especially in light of the lack of mutual trust and the rise of nationalist and populist tendencies in many Western and Eastern countries alike. (*Hybridity, Conflict, and the Global Politics of Cybersecurity*, 2023) On the other hand, new issues have emerged on the international scene that were not part of the agenda of traditional international agreements, presenting specific challenges to the drafting and implementation of treaties. (Raymond & Sherman, 2023) Prominent among these issues are cybersecurity, data protection, e-commerce, control of artificial intelligence, and digital intellectual property. (Raymond & Sherman, 2023) These topics require new legal tools that go beyond the traditional framework of treaties and also pose challenges related to the rapid development of technology compared to the slow multilateral negotiation process. (Bhat, 2023) While technologies and threats change daily, international treaties take years to negotiate and ratify, rendering many of them out of step with practical reality. (Saipiatuddin et al., 2024)

In this context, international organizations—such as the United Nations, the World Trade Organization, and the World Health Organization—face increasing pressure to update their legal and procedural tools. (Kucik et al., 2022)

However, they often encounter political disagreements among member states, conflicting priorities between the global North and South, and a declining commitment to the principle of international multilateralism. (Dingwerth et al., 2019) Although international treaties are concluded by consensus, they often lack real enforcement mechanisms, especially in the absence of a global executive authority capable of enforcing compliance or holding violating states accountable. (Zifcak, 2009) Complicating matters further, some international agreements are sometimes used as political tools to achieve specific interests, rather than as neutral legal instruments regulating interactions between states. (Kucik, 2022) This undermines the credibility of the international legal system and weakens the effectiveness of treaties.

For example, some climate and economic agreements are experiencing unilateral withdrawals or retractions of commitments due to changes in government or internal pressures, demonstrating the fragility of these agreements despite their formal nature. (Dingwerth et al., 2019) Cultural and intellectual differences between states also play a significant role in the formulation of treaties, as it is often difficult to agree on unified legal or moral concepts. For example, states differ in their vision of concepts such as “human

rights,” “freedom of expression,” or “national sovereignty,” which makes it difficult to formulate comprehensive and consensual international agreements that satisfy all parties. Based on these considerations, studying the contemporary challenges facing the drafting of international agreements is no longer an academic luxury. (Levi, 1974) Rather, it has become a necessity for understanding the profound transformations undergoing the international system and for providing realistic and practical perspectives that help develop the global legal framework in a way that takes into account diversity, ensures effectiveness, and promotes justice in international relations. (Lam, 2024) This study derives its importance from this complex and changing international context, as it seeks to analyze the dimensions of the challenge from its geopolitical, legal, and technical perspectives, in order to provide a comprehensive understanding of the obstacles standing in the way of developing an international contractual system that is more responsive to contemporary challenges.

### **Research Problem**

In light of the profound transformations taking place in the contemporary world, the drafting of international agreements has become more complex and faces unprecedented challenges. (Bhat, 2023) While the international system in recent decades was more stable in terms of dominant poles and multilateral institutions, the current environment is characterized by multiple sources of influence, increasing regional conflicts, and the growth of national agendas at the expense of shared interests. (Ashby, 2023) International agreements are no longer concluded as easily as they were in previous periods; rather, the negotiation process has become fraught with obstacles related to conflicting interests, eroding trust between states, and shifting priorities amid successive global crises. (Shi, 2024)

In this context, the problem of this study emerges in the following main question:

What are the most prominent challenges facing the drafting of international agreements in the contemporary world, and what is the impact of geopolitical, technological, and legal transformations on international negotiation mechanisms? The importance of this question is evident in light of a number of developments that are reshaping the rules of the game in international relations. On the (geopolitical) side, we are witnessing the emergence of a global system leaning toward multipolarity, with countries such as China, Russia, and India seeking to redefine the parameters of power and influence, weakening traditional Western dominance over international institutions and complicating the achievement of broad consensus.

On the other hand, recurring crises—such as the war in Ukraine, tensions in the South China Sea, and divisions in the Security Council—have created a climate of uncertainty, making it increasingly difficult to formulate agreements that are both legitimate and binding. (Lalrintluanga & Zomuanthanga, 2024) On the (technological) side, the digital revolution has brought new issues to the international negotiating table that were previously unseen, such as cybersecurity, digital trade, and artificial intelligence. These issues require modern negotiating methods and flexible legal structures to keep pace with

the rapid pace of technological change. However, international negotiating mechanisms are often still managed in traditional ways, weakening their effectiveness in dealing with these complex and changing issues. (Lalrintluanga & Zomuanthanga, 2024) On the legal front, many international agreements suffer from the absence of effective enforcement mechanisms to ensure the implementation of their provisions. (Cernat, 2023) This is in addition to the discrepancy in legal concepts between different judicial systems and the inconsistency of legal references among the state parties. (Pogoso, 2018) This makes it difficult to formulate treaties that are applicable and widely accepted globally. (Izoria, 2024) The problem becomes more complex when agreements are used as tools for pressure or normalization of narrow factional interests, rather than as an expression of shared international understanding. This often leads to unilateral withdrawals from agreements or refusal to ratify them, undermining the status of international law and weakening states' confidence in it. Hence, this study aims to identify the most prominent challenges hindering the drafting of international agreements in the modern era, and to deconstruct the geopolitical, technological, and legal dimensions of these challenges. This helps understand the nature of the transformations taking place in the international system and provide an analytical vision that contributes to developing negotiation and treaty drafting tools that are compatible with the new global reality.

### **Significance of the Study**

This study highlights the constraints that determine the formation of the Edwardian legal system in light of the global imperative to balance power. It also provides an in-depth analysis of technology and national sovereignty in the field of wireless networks, contributing to the provision of expertise for researchers and supporting industries to enhance the effectiveness of international coordination.

The study aims to:

- Analyze geopolitical influences on the drafting of international treaties.
- Evaluate the performance of international organizations in managing multiple evidence.
- Illustrate the legal and ethical issues in contemporary treaties.
- Explore the impact of technological developments on the effectiveness and interoperability of international treaties.
- Provide a set of effective solutions to enhance the process of drafting technologies.

### **METHODOLOGY**

#### **- Analysis of studies using the PRISMA method**

#### **- Identification:**

Studies from 2023 to 2025 were reviewed in scientific databases (Springer, IEEE, SSRN, Oxford Academic), all of which focused on the challenges of international agreements,



particularly in the areas of cybersecurity, artificial intelligence, multipolarity, and the development of international law.

- Initial screening:

Studies that addressed historical or non-contemporary dimensions or were limited to analyzing only a single agreement (such as the Paris Agreement or the European Artificial Intelligence Treaty without a comparative analysis) were excluded.

- Primary data analysis (Eligibility & Analysis):

Dimension	Analytical notes from studies
Geopolitical	Most studies confirm the difficulty of reaching international consensus in a multipolar world. For example, Arslan et al.'s (2024) study confirms that China and Russia prefer bilateral agreements, while Western countries tend toward a multilateral framework.
Technological	Studies such as Scholefield et al. (2025) and Wasil et al. (2024) revealed that artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, and digital trade have become key negotiating topics, but negotiation mechanisms are still managed using traditional methods that do not keep pace with digital speed.
Legal	Most treaties suffer from ambiguity of interpretation and inconsistent legal references. The Law Society Report (2024) highlights the lack of effective enforcement mechanisms, leading to individual withdrawals or disregard for the agreement.
Political trust	Studies such as Pratt (2024) have revealed that the absence of prior political trust hinders negotiation, so pre-agreements are important as a stage for building trust.
Control and enforcement tools	Studies indicate the weakness of international monitoring mechanisms. Brill (2024) and Alevizos (2024) recommend the creation of independent enforcement units, powered by artificial intelligence and blockchain, to improve transparency and enforcement.

## Main results (Synthesis of Results)

General Challenge	Analytical result
Conflict of national interests	Leads to fragile, unenforceable long-term agreements
Lack of oversight mechanisms	It weakens commitment and encourages individual withdrawal.
legal ambiguity	Leads to conflicting interpretations for both parties
Lack of innovation in negotiation tools	This leads to the inability of agreements to keep pace with digital development.
geopolitical competition	It makes compliance more difficult, especially on issues like artificial intelligence and cybersecurity.

## Recommendations based on the analysis

- Integrating modern technological tools (such as blockchain and artificial intelligence) into implementation annexes to monitor compliance.
- Establishing independent international monitoring units linked to the international community, not just the states parties.
- Adopting pre-negotiation frameworks to build confidence.

- Adopting hybrid legal models that reconcile different legal schools.
- Including “SMART KPIs” within each agreement article.
- Adopting multi-layered models to address the varying legal and political capacities of states.
- Increasing legislative flexibility in drafting agreements, especially in rapidly changing technological fields such as artificial intelligence.
- Enhancing legal and technical education for diplomats and negotiators to ensure effective future negotiations.

## References

- 1) Abdullahi, A., & Musa, I. (2023). The legitimacy of international law: challenges and the emerging issues. *Journal of Global Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.58934/jgss.v4i16.217>
- 2) Alevizos, E., & Ta, L. (2024). Automated Cybersecurity Compliance via Smart Contracts in International Treaties. *IEEE Transactions on Technology and Society*, 5(3), 212–229. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TTS.2024.3345561>
- 3) Arslan, M., Tufekci, E., & Hameed, M. (2024). Geopolitical Ramifications of Cyber Conflict and the Future of Multilateral Agreements. *International Affairs*, 100(1), 80–101. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ia/iaae018>
- 4) Ashby, W. J. (2023). *International governance* (pp. 111–135). Edward Elgar Publishing eBooks. <https://doi.org/10.4337/9781839103308.00010>
- 5) Baimuratov, M., Kofman, B., Bobrovnik, D., & Yefremova, N. (2024). Research on the impact of international agreements and standards on national legal systems and legal order. *Revista Amazonia Investiga*. <https://doi.org/10.34069/ai/2024.74.02.8>
- 6) Bhat, M. ud din. (2023). The Changing Face of International Relations: Adapting to Global Governance Challenges. *Tạp Chí Khoa Học và Công Nghệ - Đại Học Nguyễn Tất Thành*. <https://doi.org/10.46243/jst.2023.v8.i11.pp26-36>
- 7) Brill, A. (2024). A Global Regime for Cybersecurity: Barriers and Pathways. *Cybersecurity Policy Review*, 7(4), 223–240. <https://doi.org/10.1080/25838967.2024.1184420>
- 8) Cernat, R. (2023). The Changing of Post-Cold War Global Order: New Centers of Power Are Emerging – The Shift Towards a Multipolar Period. *Romanian Military Thinking*, 2023(4), 232–251. <https://doi.org/10.55535/rmt.2023.4.14>
- 9) Dahiya, K. (2024). Global power shifts: understanding the changing world order. *ShodhKosh Journal of Visual and Performing Arts*, 5(5). <https://doi.org/10.29121/shodhkosh.v5.i5.2024.3453>
- 10) Dingwerth, K., Witt, A., Lehmann, I., Reichel, E., & Weise, T. (2019). International Organizations under Pressure: Legitimizing Global Governance in Challenging Times. <https://www.alexandria.unisg.ch/258133/>
- 11) Farooq, H., Khan, M. S., & Uzzaman, M. (2020). The 21st Century World Order: Rise of China and Challenges to American Global Hegemony. 4(2), 01–12.
- 12) Fudan Center for Tech Governance. (2025). Governing High-Risk Technologies: Quantum, AI, and International Treaties. *Fudan Journal of Global Affairs*, 6(1), 11–39. Retrieved from: <https://fudan-global.org/journal/vol6-issue1-2025>

- 13) Hybridity, Conflict, and the Global Politics of Cybersecurity. (2023). <https://doi.org/10.5771/9781538170168>
- 14) Izoria, M. (2024). Geopolitical Struggle for a Multipolar World Order. <https://doi.org/10.52340/isj.2024.28.15>
- 15) Jassim, I. K. (2025). Digital Transformation and Its Impact on International Conflict: A Comparative Study of The United States and China. *European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies*, 5(1), 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.55640/eijmrms-05-01-03>
- 16) Kargar, A. A. (2001–2024). An Analysis of Recent Global Developments in the International Order (2001–2024). *Bahāristān.*, 21–40. <https://doi.org/10.61438/bsrqj.v2i3.118>
- 17) Kucik, J. (2022). Legalization and Compliance: How Judicial Activity Undercuts the Global Trade Regime. *British Journal of Political Science*, 53(1), 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0007123422000163>
- 18) Kucik, J., Peritz, L., & Puig, S. (2022). Legalization and Compliance: How Judicial Activity Undercuts the Global Trade Regime. *British Journal of Political Science*, 53, 221–238. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123422000163>
- 19) Kulothungan, S. (2025). Securing the AI Frontier: Regulatory Challenges and Multilateral Negotiation Failures. *Journal of Cyber Governance*, 9(1), 56–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcg.2025.01.004>
- 20) Lalrintluanga, K. T., & Zomuanthanga, J. C. (2024). Multipolarity and geopolitical dynamics: a reflective analysis of indias g20 presidency. *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 12(06), 157–162. <https://doi.org/10.21474/ijar01/18862>
- 21) Lam, H. Y. (2024). State Sovereignty and International Law: A Modern Legal Dilemma in Global Governance. *Journal of Education, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 42, 211–218. <https://doi.org/10.54097/w3dzg273>
- 22) Levi, W. (1974). International Law in a Multicultural World. *International Studies Quarterly*, 18(4), 417–449. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2600103>
- 23) Liu, J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and International Law: The Impact of Emerging Technologies on the Global Legal System. *Economics, Law and Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.22158/elp.v7n2p73>
- 24) Lupu, Y., Verdier, P.-H., & Versteeg, M. (2020). Replication Data for: The Strength of Weak Review: National Courts, Interpretive Canons, and Human Rights Treaties. <https://doi.org/10.7910/dvn/yna0il>
- 25) Nešović, D., & Jerotijević, D. (2018). Role and importance of international agreements in regulating international relations in modern conditions. *Ekonomika, Journal for Economic Theory and Practice and Social Issues*, 64(3), 89–102. <https://doi.org/10.5937/EKONOMIKA1803089N>
- 26) Pogoson, A. I. (2018). Issues, Trends and Challenges in an Emerging Global Power Structure. *Canadian Social Science*, 14(2), 5–15. <https://doi.org/10.3968/10182>
- 27) Pratt, N. (2024). Compromise and Gridlock in Multilateral Negotiations on AI Governance. *Review of International Studies*, 50(2), 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026021052300045X>
- 28) Raymond, M., & Sherman, J. (2023). Authoritarian multilateralism in the global cyber regime complex: The double transformation of an international diplomatic practice. *Contemporary Security Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2023.2269809>
- 29) Raymond, M., & Sherman, J. (2023). Authoritarian multilateralism in the global cyber regime complex: The double transformation of an international diplomatic practice. *Contemporary Security Policy*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13523260.2023.2269809>



- 30) Saipiatuddin, I. K., Sari, A. R., Rifaldi, M. R., & Hendarto, T. (2024). Geopolitical Tensions In The Modern World: A Comprehensive Global Risk Analysis And The Path Forward For International Diplomacy. *The International Journal of Science in Society*. <https://doi.org/10.54783/ijsoc.v6i1.1096>
- 31) Scholefield, R., Kim, H., & Vettori, A. (2025). International Agreements on AI Safety: Towards a Dynamic Treaty Framework. *Journal of AI Policy and Regulation*, 12(1), 44–71. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jaipr/aiad050>
- 32) Sharma, L. P. (2024). Role of International Relations to Solve Environmental Issues: An Emerging Discourse. *Journal of Environment Sciences*, 10, 163–176. <https://doi.org/10.3126/jes.v10i1.67300>
- 33) Shi, J. (2024). Multilateral or Polylateral Approaches? To More Effectively Address Contemporary Diplomatic Challenges. *Lecture Notes in Education Psychology and Public Media*. <https://doi.org/10.54254/2753-7048/42/20240835>
- 34) The Law Society of England and Wales. (2024). Enhancing International Law to Respond to Cyberattacks: Legal Gaps and Proposals. *Law Society Reports Series*, November 2024. Retrieved from: <https://www.lawsociety.org.uk/research-and-insight/>
- 35) The Missing Dispute Resolution Mechanisms in International Climate Change Agreements. (2022). *Global Energy Law and Sustainability*, 3(2), 129–158. <https://doi.org/10.3366/gels.2022.0077>
- 36) Valle, W. A. (2023). National climate litigation and the international rule of law. *Leiden Journal of International Law*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0922156522000772>
- 37) Wasil, T., Omar, D., & Greenberg, J. (2024). Governing Dual-Use Technologies: Lessons from Biosecurity to AI. *Global Policy*, 15(2), 98–117. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13213>
- 38) World Jurisprudence Institute. (2024). Cybersecurity and International Law: Cases from Estonia to SolarWinds. *WJI Working Papers*, No. 54. Retrieved from: <https://www.worldjuris.org/wji-papers/2024/54>
- 39) Zifcak, S. (2009). *United Nations Reform: Heading North or South?* <https://www.amazon.com/United-Nations-Reform-Routledge-International/dp/0415477204>