International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive

ISSN: 0799-6632 (Online)

Journal homepage: https://sciresjournals.com/ijstra/

(RESEARCH ARTICLE)

Check for updates

The role of sovereignty in addressing global health crises

Jin young Hwang *

University of Edinburgh MA Social Policy and Economics, United Kingdom.

International Journal of Science and Technology Research Archive, 2025, 08(02), 040-050

Publication history: Received on 13 March 2025; revised on 22 April 2025; accepted on 25 April 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.53771/ijstra.2025.8.2.0036

Abstract

This research analyzes the complex interaction between state authority and global health management particularly stressing how the approaches to international health threats are challenged and facilitated. States retain full power under international law to develop their own public health initiatives through sovereignty yet this independence creates barriers to joint responses to emergency situations that extend across borders. The study employs International Health Regulations (IHR) as its core framework to examine how state sovereignty shapes compliance with global health frameworks through investigation of COVID-19 and 2014–2016 Ebola outbreaks. The examination shows how states must balance their independent powers with collaborative initiatives to display substantial hindrances in international health governance operations. Through theoretical and practical assessment of World Health Organization (WHO) participation the research explains mechanisms to achieve equilibrium between states' self-rule and global public health objectives. The study emphasizes that resource inequality between countries especially those in low- and middle-income brackets needs attention so global emergencies can achieve fair health outcomes. This research demonstrates why global health frameworks require rethinking to match international community welfare with state interests carefully.

Keywords: Sovereignty; Global Health Governance; International Health Regulations; World Health Organization; COVID-19; Transnational Health Crises

1 Introduction

The global community has increasingly encountered health crises of unprecedented scale and severity, ranging from the COVID-19 pandemic to the Ebola outbreaks in West Africa, alongside the persistent threat posed by antimicrobial resistance. These emergencies reveal the deeply interconnected fabric of contemporary societies, where a localized outbreak can swiftly evolve into a global crisis, jeopardizing lives, economies, and social stability. Pandemics serve as stark reminders of the complex interplay between national policies, international cooperation, and the imperative for rapid, unified action.

At the heart of these dynamics lies the principle of state sovereignty a foundational concept in international law and relations. Sovereignty, defined as a state's supreme authority over its domestic affairs without external interference, enables nations to enact policies tailored to their unique socio-political and economic contexts. In public health, this translates to measures such as border closures, lockdowns, and resource allocations aimed at mitigating the impact of health crises within national boundaries. However, the same principle that empowers states to act decisively also creates barriers to international collaboration. Transnational health emergencies often demand a coordinated, collective response, yet the imperative to preserve sovereignty can delay or undermine such efforts.

The early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic exemplified this tension. Disparate national policies, delayed information sharing, and unilateral decisions such as export bans on medical supplies and vaccine hoarding—highlighted the

* Corresponding author: Jin young Hwang

challenges of balancing sovereignty with the need for global solidarity. Mistrust in international institutions and inconsistent adherence to multilateral agreements exacerbated these issues, demonstrating the limitations of the existing international framework in addressing global health emergencies effectively.

This ongoing tension between safeguarding state autonomy and fostering effective global health governance raises critical questions about the future of international health cooperation. While states have the legal right to independently manage public health measures, the cross-border nature of infectious diseases underscores the necessity for collective action. This dichotomy forms the crux of debates surrounding sovereignty and global health governance, demanding a reevaluation of international frameworks to better address the complexities of modern health crises.

1.1 Research Problem and Rationale

State sovereignty, while integral to the international system, presents a paradoxical challenge in the realm of global health. On one hand, it allows states to devise and implement health policies aligned with their unique needs and capacities. On the other hand, it often hampers the swift sharing of critical information, resources, and expertise needed to combat health crises that transcend national borders. This paradox is particularly pronounced during pandemics, where timely and coordinated action is crucial to mitigating widespread harm.

The 2005 International Health Regulations (IHR), established under the auspices of the World Health Organization (WHO), represent a key attempt to reconcile sovereignty with the demands of global health security. Designed to enhance international cooperation and establish mechanisms for early detection and containment of health threats, the IHR require states to report public health emergencies of international concern (PHEIC) and adhere to specific protocols for managing such crises. However, the implementation of these regulations has often been hindered by states prioritizing national interests over collective obligations.

The COVID-19 pandemic serves as a stark illustration of these challenges. Initial reluctance by some countries to report cases or share epidemiological data, coupled with unilateral actions such as vaccine nationalism, highlighted significant gaps in the global health governance framework. These actions not only undermined global solidarity but also deepened inequities in health outcomes, disproportionately affecting low- and middle-income countries. For instance, wealthier nations secured a majority of vaccine supplies, leaving resource-constrained countries struggling to protect their populations (Moon et al., 2021).

Understanding the complex interplay between sovereignty and global health responses is essential for identifying pathways to improve international frameworks. Effective global health governance requires a delicate balance between respecting state autonomy and fostering collaboration. This study seeks to critically examine how sovereignty influences the effectiveness of responses to transnational health emergencies, with the ultimate goal of proposing strategies to harmonize national and global health imperatives.

1.2 Research Question

- The central research question guiding this study is:
- How does state sovereignty influence the effectiveness of international responses to global health emergencies?
- This question seeks to unravel the intricate dynamics between sovereign decision-making and the need for coordinated global action, exploring how these forces intersect, conflict, and can be reconciled.

1.3 Research Objectives

1.3.1 To address the central research question, the study will pursue the following objectives:

Examine the role of sovereignty within the context of global health law and cooperation.

Sovereignty is both a facilitator and a barrier in global health governance. This objective involves analyzing the historical and theoretical foundations of sovereignty, exploring its impact on international health initiatives, and understanding its dual role in enabling and constraining responses to health crises.

Analyze the International Health Regulations (IHR) and their implementation.

The IHR represent a critical legal framework for managing health crises. This objective evaluates the strengths and weaknesses of the IHR, focusing on state compliance, enforcement mechanisms, and the extent to which these regulations have facilitated effective responses to transnational health emergencies.

Evaluate the role of the World Health Organization (WHO).

The WHO plays a central role in mediating the tension between sovereignty and the need for collective action. This objective assesses the organization's successes, limitations, and areas for reform, exploring how it can better support states in balancing national and global health priorities.

Identify challenges and propose recommendations.

Balancing sovereignty with global health imperatives involves complex practical and ethical challenges. This objective seeks to identify these challenges and propose actionable recommendations to enhance international health governance, with a focus on promoting equity, transparency, and trust in global institutions.

By addressing these objectives, this research aims to contribute to a deeper understanding of sovereignty's role in global health governance and to offer insights for improving international frameworks to better address the complexities of modern health crises.

2 Literature Review

2.1 Understanding Sovereignty in International Law

Sovereignty is a cornerstone of international law, deeply rooted in the historical framework established by the Peace of Westphalia in 1648. This treaty marked the beginning of the modern state system, affirming the principles of state autonomy and non-interference in domestic affairs. In its classical interpretation, sovereignty is defined as the supreme authority of a state within its territorial boundaries, granting it exclusive rights to govern its people and manage its resources (Philpott, 2001). However, the traditional Westphalian model has evolved, particularly in the context of globalization and transnational challenges. Contemporary international law increasingly recognizes "sovereignty as responsibility," a concept introduced by Deng et al. (1996), which posits that sovereignty entails not only the right to self-governance but also the duty to uphold human rights and contribute to global welfare.

This dual nature of sovereignty has significant implications for global health governance. On the one hand, sovereignty empowers states to implement domestic health policies tailored to their specific needs and priorities. On the other hand, it obligates them to cooperate during transnational health crises, as infectious diseases do not respect political borders. The International Health Regulations (IHR) of 2005 epitomize this duality, striving to reconcile state autonomy with the imperatives of collective action (Fidler, 2005). Nevertheless, this balance remains fragile. While the IHR emphasize the importance of state compliance, they often encounter resistance when national interests conflict with international obligations.

2.2 Global Health Governance Framework

Global health governance is a multifaceted system comprising legal frameworks, institutional mechanisms, and normative principles aimed at addressing health challenges that transcend national boundaries. The IHR, revised in 2005 in response to the severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS) outbreak, constitute the backbone of this governance structure. These regulations require states to detect, report, and respond to public health emergencies of international concern (PHEIC), fostering early warning systems and coordinated responses (Gostin et al., 2016). However, the effectiveness of the IHR hinges on state compliance and the willingness to prioritize global health over domestic considerations.

The World Health Organization (WHO) plays a central role in global health governance by setting standards, coordinating international responses, and providing technical assistance to member states (Youde, 2018). Despite its leadership role, the WHO's capacity is constrained by its reliance on state cooperation and voluntary funding mechanisms. Unlike institutions with enforcement authority, such as the World Trade Organization, the WHO cannot compel compliance, leaving critical gaps in the implementation of global health regulations (Fidler, 2020). For example, during the COVID-19 pandemic, delays in reporting cases and inconsistencies in data sharing undermined the efficacy of the IHR, exposing the limitations of the current governance framework.

In addition to the WHO, regional organizations and public-private partnerships have emerged as significant actors in global health governance. Initiatives like Gavi, the Vaccine Alliance, and the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI) demonstrate the potential of collaborative approaches to address health crises. However, their

success often depends on the alignment of national and international priorities, highlighting the persistent tension between sovereignty and global cooperation.

2.3 The Tension Between Sovereignty and Global Health

Sovereignty frequently acts as a double-edged sword in global health governance, simultaneously enabling and impeding international responses to health crises. While states are legally entitled to exercise autonomy in managing public health, this autonomy can conflict with the collective action required to address transnational threats. The COVID-19 pandemic exemplified this tension. Early in the crisis, several countries prioritized national interests by restricting the export of medical supplies, hoarding vaccines, and delaying the reporting of outbreaks. These actions not only hindered global containment efforts but also exacerbated inequities between wealthy and low-income nations (Gupta et al., 2021).

Theoretical perspectives offer valuable insights into the interplay between sovereignty and global health governance. From a realist standpoint, states are rational actors that prioritize national security and self-interest, often resisting external constraints on their sovereignty (Waltz, 1979). This perspective explains why states may be reluctant to delegate authority to international organizations like the WHO, perceiving such actions as threats to their autonomy. For instance, during the Ebola outbreak in West Africa, delays in international assistance were partly attributed to concerns about violating state sovereignty (Fidler, 2016).

Conversely, liberal theories emphasize the potential for sovereignty to coexist with international cooperation. Liberalism highlights the interdependence of states and the shared benefits of addressing collective challenges, advocating for stronger global institutions and norms to facilitate cooperation (Keohane & Nye, 1977). This perspective underscores the importance of mechanisms like the IHR, which aim to balance state autonomy with the need for coordinated action.

Despite these theoretical frameworks, the tension between sovereignty and global health governance persists in practice. The principle of non-interference often takes precedence over the moral and practical imperatives of global health, leading to fragmented responses and inefficiencies. For example, during the H1N1 influenza pandemic, disparities in vaccine distribution and delays in international coordination revealed the limitations of a sovereignty-centric approach (Fidler, 2010).

2.4 Sovereignty and Health Equity

The sovereignty-driven model of global health governance has profound implications for health equity, particularly for low- and middle-income countries (LMICs). These countries often face structural challenges, including inadequate healthcare infrastructure, limited financial resources, and dependence on external aid. Sovereignty-based responses, such as border closures and export restrictions, disproportionately affect LMICs by restricting access to critical resources during health emergencies (Moon et al., 2017).

The COVID-19 pandemic starkly illuminated these inequities. Wealthy nations leveraged their economic and political power to secure early access to vaccines through bilateral agreements, leaving LMICs with limited supplies and delayed rollouts. This phenomenon, known as vaccine nationalism, not only undermined global solidarity but also prolonged the pandemic by enabling the virus to continue circulating in under-vaccinated regions (Scharf et al., 2021). Addressing these disparities requires a reimagining of global health governance that prioritizes equity and shared responsibility over unilateralism.

One proposed solution is the establishment of a global health equity framework that integrates principles of distributive justice into international agreements. Such a framework would ensure that the allocation of resources, including vaccines and medical supplies, is guided by need rather than economic power. Additionally, strengthening the capacity of LMICs to produce and distribute healthcare resources could reduce their dependence on external actors and enhance their resilience to future crises (Gostin et al., 2021).

2.5 Literature Gaps

Despite the extensive body of research on global health governance, several gaps remain in understanding the relationship between sovereignty and health crises. First, there is limited empirical analysis of how sovereignty affects the enforcement of the IHR. While the IHR provide a legal framework for state cooperation, their implementation is often hindered by sovereignty-related challenges, such as the reluctance to share data or comply with reporting

requirements. Investigating these dynamics through case studies of past health emergencies could provide valuable insights into the effectiveness of the IHR.

Second, there is a need for more detailed analyses of WHO-state cooperation during health crises. Although the WHO is central to global health governance, its ability to navigate the sovereignty dynamic and facilitate international responses remains underexplored. Understanding how the WHO balances its mandate with the interests of sovereign states could inform reforms aimed at enhancing its effectiveness.

Finally, the literature lacks a comprehensive exploration of the ethical dimensions of sovereignty in global health. While much attention has been paid to the legal and political aspects, the moral implications of prioritizing national interests over global welfare remain understudied. Addressing these gaps could contribute to the development of more equitable and effective global health governance mechanisms.

2.6 Conclusion

The theoretical and practical intersections of sovereignty and global health governance reveal a complex and often contentious relationship. While sovereignty is a fundamental principle of international law, its application in the context of transnational health crises poses significant challenges. The tension between state autonomy and collective action underscores the need for innovative approaches that reconcile these competing imperatives. By addressing the gaps in the existing literature and reimagining the role of sovereignty in global health, policymakers and scholars can contribute to a more resilient and equitable international health system.

3 Methodology

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a qualitative research design to explore how sovereignty influences global health responses. Qualitative research is well-suited for analyzing complex social, legal, and political phenomena, as it facilitates a nuanced understanding of the interplay between state sovereignty and international health governance (Creswell, 2014). By emphasizing depth over breadth, the approach allows for a detailed examination of the underlying mechanisms, power dynamics, and normative conflicts shaping global health responses.

The research integrates three complementary methodologies: legal analysis, case studies, and policy evaluation. First, legal analysis focuses on the International Health Regulations (2005) (IHR), state declarations, and relevant treaties to assess the legal frameworks governing global health emergencies. This methodology enables the identification of sovereignty-related challenges embedded in the international legal order. Second, case studies of two prominent health crises COVID-19 and the 2014–2016 Ebola outbreak are employed to uncover practical implications of sovereignty on global health governance. Third, policy evaluation examines the effectiveness of WHO strategies in mitigating sovereignty-related barriers and fostering international cooperation. The combination of these methodologies ensures a comprehensive and multidisciplinary exploration of the research problem.

3.2 Data Sources

The study relies on a combination of primary and secondary data sources, ensuring a robust analytical foundation through triangulation. This approach reduces bias and enhances the validity of the findings (Yin, 2014).

3.2.1 Primary Sources include

- International Health Regulations (2005): As the cornerstone legal framework for global health governance, the IHR provide a basis for analyzing state obligations and compliance mechanisms during health emergencies.
- WHO Policies and Guidelines: Key documents from the WHO outline its strategies for coordinating global health responses and addressing sovereignty-related challenges.
- State Declarations and Treaties: Agreements and public statements reflect the commitments of states to international health cooperation and highlight tensions between sovereignty and global responsibilities.
- Secondary Sources comprise:
- Academic Literature: Peer-reviewed articles and books on sovereignty, global health law, and governance frameworks provide theoretical and empirical insights.
- Reports from Global Health Organizations: Publications from entities such as the WHO, the Global Health Security Agenda, and the World Bank offer data on recent health crises and institutional responses.

- Case Studies on Recent Pandemics: Empirical analyses of health emergencies, including COVID-19 and Ebola, serve as valuable references for identifying patterns and gaps in global health governance.
- The integration of diverse sources strengthens the analytical framework, enabling a holistic understanding of the research problem.

3.3 Case Study Approach

The case study methodology forms a central component of this research, providing an in-depth examination of the role of sovereignty in global health governance. Case studies are particularly effective for investigating complex, context-specific phenomena and drawing actionable insights (Stake, 1995). This study focuses on two major health crises COVID-19 and the 2014–2016 Ebola outbreak—both of which offer critical perspectives on the interplay between sovereignty and international cooperation.

3.3.1 Case Study 1: COVID-19 and Challenges in IHR Compliance

COVID-19 represents a paradigmatic case of the tension between state sovereignty and global health governance. States delayed reporting initial outbreaks, prioritizing national interests over collective action. This lack of transparency undermined early containment efforts and exposed the limitations of the IHR as a mechanism for enforcing compliance (Fidler, 2020). Moreover, vaccine nationalism where wealthier nations secured disproportionate supplies of vaccines—further demonstrated how sovereignty-driven policies exacerbated global health inequities (Gupta et al., 2021).

- This case study addresses the following key questions:
- How did state sovereignty influence compliance with the IHR during COVID-19?
- What were the implications of vaccine nationalism on global health outcomes?
- Case Study 2: Ebola (2014–2016) and WHO-State Coordination

The Ebola outbreak in West Africa revealed both the potential and challenges of WHO-state collaboration in overcoming sovereignty-related barriers. The WHO's role in coordinating responses, particularly in resource-limited settings, underscored the importance of partnerships between states and non-governmental organizations. However, sovereignty concerns frequently impeded rapid and coordinated action, delaying international responses and worsening the crisis (Moon et al., 2015).

- This case study focuses on the following questions:
- How did state sovereignty shape the WHO's response to the Ebola outbreak?
- What lessons can be learned to improve future cooperation between the WHO and states?
- Through these case studies, the research identifies recurring themes and contrasts the experiences of different health crises, providing a nuanced understanding of sovereignty's impact on global health governance.

3.4 Policy Evaluation

Policy evaluation is integral to assessing the effectiveness of WHO strategies and identifying areas for improvement. The analysis examines key WHO policies, including the Global Health Security Agenda and the implementation of the IHR. Particular attention is given to the organization's efforts to navigate sovereignty-related barriers, foster international cooperation, and promote equitable access to health resources. The evaluation highlights successes, such as the WHO's coordination of vaccine distribution through initiatives like COVAX, as well as persistent challenges, including its reliance on voluntary state compliance and limited enforcement authority (Gostin et al., 2016). By critically assessing these policies, the research aims to provide actionable recommendations for enhancing global health governance.

3.5 Ethical Considerations

Ethical considerations are central to the research design, ensuring that the study maintains fairness, objectivity, and sensitivity. These considerations guide the analysis and interpretation of data, particularly when addressing sensitive issues related to state sovereignty and global health disparities.

Objectivity is paramount. The study seeks to evaluate state actions and WHO policies without bias, avoiding one-sided critiques of specific countries or organizations. This balanced approach recognizes the legitimate concerns of state sovereignty while emphasizing the necessity of global health cooperation. For example, while vaccine nationalism during COVID-19 was widely criticized, the analysis also considers the domestic political pressures that influenced state decisions.

The research demonstrates sensitivity to disparities between developed and developing nations. Low- and middle-income countries (LMICs) face significant structural disadvantages, including limited healthcare infrastructure and dependence on external aid. The study contextualizes these disparities, emphasizing that sovereignty-related challenges often manifest differently across regions. For instance, while wealthier nations leveraged sovereignty to secure vaccines, LMICs struggled to assert their sovereignty in accessing critical resources (Scharf et al., 2021).

Transparency and citation are rigorously upheld. All primary and secondary sources are accurately cited to ensure intellectual honesty and enable verification by future researchers. This commitment to transparency enhances the credibility and reliability of the research.

Finally, the study aligns with international norms and global health ethics, emphasizing the importance of balancing sovereignty with global justice and accountability. By framing sovereignty as both a right and a responsibility, the research advocates for governance models that respect state autonomy while addressing global health inequities.

3.6 Methodological Rigor

To ensure methodological rigor, the study employs strategies such as triangulation, peer debriefing, and reflexivity. Triangulation, achieved through the integration of multiple data sources and methodologies, enhances the validity of findings (Yin, 2014). Peer debriefing involves seeking feedback from experts in international law and global health, ensuring that the analysis is comprehensive and well-informed. Reflexivity, or the critical examination of the researcher's assumptions and biases, further strengthens the study's reliability.

In sum, the research design, data sources, case study approach, and ethical considerations collectively provide a robust framework for analyzing the role of sovereignty in global health governance. By adopting a multidisciplinary perspective and emphasizing methodological rigor, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities for improving global health responses in a sovereignty-centric world.

4 Data Analysis, Presentation and Interpretation

4.1 Sovereignty and the International Health Regulations (IHR)

The International Health Regulations (IHR) (2005) serve as the cornerstone of global health governance, aiming to establish a unified framework for responding to public health emergencies of international concern (PHEIC). Their core objectives include the timely reporting of potential health threats, the implementation of domestic containment measures to prevent cross-border spread, and the continuous development of national health systems for disease surveillance and response (World Health Organization, 2005). However, the effectiveness of the IHR has been consistently challenged by the realities of state sovereignty.

While the IHR imposes binding legal obligations, it lacks robust enforcement mechanisms, relying heavily on the goodwill and cooperation of sovereign states. This reliance becomes particularly problematic when states prioritize national interests over global health imperatives. For example, during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic, some countries delayed reporting initial cases of the novel coronavirus. These delays were influenced by political concerns, fears of economic repercussions, or potential damage to international reputations, ultimately exacerbating the global spread of the virus (Gostin & Katz, 2020). Such actions underscored a fundamental tension between the collaborative intent of the IHR and the sovereignty-driven priorities of individual states.

The challenges associated with IHR compliance are not unique to COVID-19. Historical examples, such as the H1N1 influenza pandemic and the Ebola outbreak, also reveal instances where states resisted transparency due to sovereignty concerns (Kamradt-Scott, 2015). This recurring issue highlights a structural weakness in the IHR: its inability to hold states accountable for non-compliance. Without meaningful consequences, states face little external pressure to adhere to global health commitments.

In light of these challenges, scholars and policymakers have called for reforms to the IHR that would strike a more effective balance between respecting state sovereignty and ensuring accountability. Proposals include introducing financial or reputational penalties for non-compliance, creating independent monitoring mechanisms to evaluate state adherence, and fostering greater regional involvement to complement the IHR's global framework (Fidler, 2021).

4.2 The Role of WHO in Addressing Sovereignty Challenges

The World Health Organization (WHO) plays a central role in coordinating international responses to health emergencies. However, its ability to navigate the complexities of state sovereignty has been both its strength and its Achilles' heel. The WHO's dependence on state cooperation, coupled with its need to maintain neutrality, often limits its capacity to enforce compliance with global health norms.

During the 2014–2016 Ebola outbreak in West Africa, the WHO faced significant criticism for its delayed declaration of a PHEIC. This hesitation was partly attributable to its reliance on state-reported data and concerns about overstepping sovereignty. However, once the crisis was formally recognized, the WHO demonstrated its ability to coordinate international efforts effectively. By mobilizing resources, deploying health workers, and facilitating partnerships with regional organizations and non-governmental entities, the WHO played a pivotal role in containing the outbreak (Gostin et al., 2016).

Similarly, during the COVID-19 pandemic, the WHO's limitations were on full display. Despite issuing timely guidelines and coordinating global initiatives such as the COVAX Facility, the WHO struggled to enforce compliance with the IHR. Delayed reporting by states and the rise of vaccine nationalism revealed the extent to which sovereignty could undermine global health efforts. Moreover, the organization's attempts to maintain political neutrality often led to perceptions of leniency toward powerful states, further eroding its authority (Bollyky & Fidler, 2020).

These challenges underscore the need for systemic changes within the WHO. Increased funding, greater autonomy, and stronger partnerships with regional organizations could enhance its capacity to address sovereignty-related barriers. Moreover, reforms that empower the WHO to impose consequences for non-compliance such as financial penalties or public naming-and-shaming mechanisms could strengthen its position as a global health authority.

4.3 Balancing National Interests and Global Health Imperatives

The interplay between national sovereignty and global health governance is most evident in the areas of vaccine distribution and data sharing. During the COVID-19 pandemic, vaccine nationalism became a defining feature of the global response. Wealthier nations prioritized securing vaccines for their own populations, often through bilateral deals that bypassed multilateral initiatives like COVAX. This approach not only delayed pandemic control in lower-income countries but also deepened global health inequities (Usher, 2021).

Sovereignty-driven decisions also hindered data sharing and transparency, as states were reluctant to disclose information that could harm their reputations or economies. For instance, delays in reporting the emergence of new variants complicated global efforts to assess risks and adapt public health strategies. These actions highlight a critical gap in global health governance: the lack of enforceable mechanisms to ensure timely and accurate data sharing (Gostin et al., 2020).

Efforts to address these challenges have included innovative approaches such as regional health agreements and public-private partnerships. For example, regional bodies like the African Union (AU) have demonstrated their potential to complement global initiatives by coordinating cross-border responses and advocating for equitable vaccine access. Such models offer valuable lessons for bridging the gap between national sovereignty and global health imperatives.

4.4 Case Studies: Lessons Learned

The COVID-19 pandemic and the 2014–2016 Ebola outbreak offer contrasting yet complementary insights into the role of sovereignty in global health governance.

In the case of COVID-19, sovereignty manifested as a significant barrier to international cooperation. Delayed reporting of cases, export bans on medical supplies, and vaccine nationalism highlighted the challenges of aligning national interests with global health objectives. The WHO's role during the pandemic was both commendable and constrained; while it facilitated initiatives like COVAX and provided technical guidance, its lack of enforcement authority limited its effectiveness (Fidler, 2021).

The Ebola outbreak, on the other hand, illustrated the potential for regional collaboration to overcome sovereignty-related barriers. While initial responses were fragmented, regional organizations such as the AU played a critical role in coordinating aid, deploying health workers, and mobilizing resources. The WHO's partnerships with these regional bodies, as well as with non-governmental organizations, ultimately helped contain the outbreak (Gostin et al., 2016).

These case studies underscore the importance of integrating regional mechanisms into global health governance. By leveraging regional expertise and fostering localized solutions, global initiatives can become more resilient to sovereignty-driven challenges.

4.5 Emerging Trends and Future Challenges

The rise of health nationalism, intensified by recent crises, poses a growing threat to global health governance. As states increasingly prioritize domestic needs over global cooperation, the risk of fragmented responses to transnational emergencies grows. This trend underscores the urgency of reforming existing frameworks, such as the IHR, to ensure greater accountability and collaboration (Usher, 2021).

Proposed reforms include introducing enforceable compliance mechanisms within the IHR, such as independent monitoring bodies and penalties for non-compliance. Additionally, empowering regional organizations to take on more prominent roles in health governance could help mitigate the challenges posed by state sovereignty.

Looking ahead, the global health community must also address the structural inequities that underpin sovereignty-driven decisions. Initiatives aimed at strengthening health systems in lower-income countries, promoting equitable access to medical technologies, and fostering trust in multilateral institutions will be essential for building a more inclusive and effective global health governance framework.

5 Conclusion

5.1 Summary of Key Findings

This dissertation has explored the nuanced interplay between state sovereignty and global health governance, particularly emphasizing its dual role as both a facilitator and impediment in international health responses. Sovereignty allows states to assert authority over domestic health policies and systems, enabling localized responses that align with cultural, social, and economic contexts. However, sovereignty also presents significant challenges when it comes to addressing transnational health emergencies, as states often prioritize national interests over global solidarity.

One critical finding is the limited efficacy of the International Health Regulations (IHR) in enforcing compliance. While the IHR aims to provide a cohesive framework for responding to public health emergencies of international concern (PHEIC), its reliance on voluntary state cooperation weakens its ability to address global health challenges effectively. For instance, during the COVID-19 pandemic, delays in reporting and withholding of crucial data by some states highlighted the limitations of the IHR in compelling timely and transparent action (Gostin & Katz, 2020).

The study also underscores the challenges faced by the World Health Organization (WHO) in navigating sovereignty-driven constraints. Although the WHO serves as a central coordinating body in global health governance, its effectiveness is undermined by underfunding, politicization, and reliance on member states' goodwill. Case studies, such as the 2014–2016 Ebola outbreak and the COVID-19 pandemic, reveal both the strengths and shortcomings of the WHO. While the organization demonstrated its capacity to mobilize resources and coordinate responses, its inability to enforce compliance with international standards underscored the need for structural and operational reforms.

Additionally, the research highlights the role of regional cooperation in addressing sovereignty-related barriers. During the Ebola crisis, for instance, regional bodies like the African Union (AU) played a pivotal role in overcoming fragmented responses, showcasing the potential of regional governance mechanisms to complement global efforts.

5.2 Contribution to Knowledge

This dissertation advances the understanding of global health governance by addressing critical gaps in current frameworks, particularly concerning the tension between state sovereignty and the need for collective action. Sovereignty remains a defining feature of the international system, granting states the autonomy to govern within their borders. However, this principle frequently conflicts with the transnational nature of health crises, where timely and coordinated responses are essential. The contributions of this research are multifaceted, extending both theoretical and practical knowledge in the field.

A key contribution of this work is its detailed exploration of the sovereignty dilemma. Sovereignty, while necessary for state autonomy, often impedes global health initiatives. For instance, the International Health Regulations (IHR) require countries to report public health emergencies of international concern, yet enforcement mechanisms are weak, allowing

states to prioritize national interests over global obligations (Fidler, 2019). This dissertation provides an in-depth analysis of this duality, demonstrating how sovereignty both enables localized health responses and obstructs collective global action. This nuanced understanding is crucial for designing governance models that respect state autonomy while fostering international cooperation.

Another significant contribution is the dissertation's focus on practical solutions to enhance global health governance. By identifying specific shortcomings in existing frameworks, such as the limited enforcement capabilities of the IHR and the resource constraints faced by the World Health Organization (WHO), the research proposes actionable reforms. For instance, introducing penalties for delayed reporting and establishing independent oversight mechanisms could strengthen compliance with the IHR (Gostin et al., 2020). Similarly, securing mandatory contributions from member states would reduce the WHO's reliance on voluntary funding, thereby mitigating political influence and enhancing operational independence (Youde, 2020).

The case study insights presented in this dissertation further enrich the field by providing empirical evidence of how sovereignty impacts health governance. The analysis of the COVID-19 pandemic highlights the consequences of delayed reporting and inadequate international coordination, which exacerbated the spread of the virus. Conversely, the Ebola outbreak in West Africa underscores the potential of regional collaboration, as demonstrated by the African Union's efforts to mobilize resources and coordinate responses (Moon et al., 2015). These case studies offer valuable lessons for policymakers and academics, emphasizing the importance of timely reporting, resource-sharing, and regional engagement in managing health crises.

In addition, the dissertation outlines a policy reform framework that prioritizes accountability, equity, and regional collaboration. This framework provides a structured approach to improving global health governance mechanisms, emphasizing the need to balance state sovereignty with the demands of international cooperation. For example, establishing regional health frameworks tailored to specific contexts could complement WHO-led initiatives, addressing gaps in global governance while respecting national priorities (Brown & Harman, 2021). Such a framework not only contributes to academic discourse but also offers practical guidance for policymakers seeking to enhance global health resilience.

The emphasis on regional governance as a complementary approach to global initiatives represents another notable contribution. While the WHO plays a central role in coordinating international health efforts, regional organizations such as the European Union (EU) and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) have demonstrated their capacity to address localized challenges effectively. By fostering cross-border collaboration and developing regional stockpiles of medical supplies, these organizations can bridge the gap between national sovereignty and global health priorities (Katz et al., 2018). This dissertation highlights the potential of regional governance to enhance global health outcomes, providing a compelling case for integrating regional mechanisms into broader health strategies.

In summary, this dissertation advances the field of global health governance by addressing the complex interplay between sovereignty and collective action. It offers a comprehensive analysis of the sovereignty dilemma, proposes practical solutions to enhance existing frameworks, and provides empirical insights through detailed case studies. The structured policy reform framework and emphasis on regional governance further contribute to both academic discourse and policy-making. By bridging theoretical and practical perspectives, this research underscores the importance of balancing state autonomy with global solidarity in addressing health crises. Future efforts to reform global health governance can build on these findings to create more resilient and equitable systems.

Recommendations

- Enforcement Mechanisms: The IHR should include stronger enforcement provisions, such as penalties for non-compliance or delayed reporting. Establishing independent oversight bodies to monitor adherence could enhance accountability.
- Financial Incentives: Creating financial incentives for compliance, such as access to global health funds for states meeting their obligations, could encourage cooperation. A global contingency fund could also provide financial support to resource-constrained states.
- Enhanced Funding: Securing sustainable and mandatory funding from member states is essential to reduce the WHO's dependency on voluntary contributions, which often come with political strings attached.
- Operational Independence: Restructuring the WHO's governance model to involve non-state stakeholders, such as NGOs and academic institutions, could help insulate the organization from political pressures and enhance its credibility.

5.2.1 Fostering Regional Cooperation

- Strengthening Regional Frameworks: Regional organizations such as the European Union (EU) and Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) should develop tailored health governance frameworks. These frameworks could include regional stockpiles of medical supplies and shared emergency response protocols.
- Facilitating Cross-Border Collaboration: Establishing regional health task forces to address cross-border health challenges could improve coordination and resource-sharing during crises.

5.2.2 Promoting Global Health Solidarity

- Equitable Distribution: Expanding initiatives like COVAX and ensuring fair pricing of medical technologies can address disparities in access to vaccines and treatments, particularly in low-income countries.
- Building Trust: Transparent decision-making processes within global health organizations can rebuild trust among states and encourage greater collaboration.

5.3 Final Reflections

This dissertation underscores the urgent need for a balanced approach to global health governance. Sovereignty remains a cornerstone of international law and state identity, yet health crises transcend borders and require collective action. Reconciling this tension demands innovative reforms that respect state autonomy while fostering global cooperation and accountability.

A reimagined global health governance framework grounded in equity, transparency, and solidarity is essential for building resilience against future health crises. By prioritizing collective preparedness and inclusivity, the global community can transform health into a unifying force, ensuring that no state is left behind in the pursuit of global health security.

Compliance with ethical standards

Statement of ethical approval

Ethical approval was obtained.

Statement of informed consent

Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

References

[1] Brown, G., & Harman, S. (2021). Global health governance: Balancing equity and efficiency. Routledge.

[2] Fidler, D. P. (2019). The challenges of global health governance. International Relations, 33(3), 389–404. https://doi.org/10.1177/0047117819866188

[3] Gostin, L. O., Moon, S., & Meier, B. M. (2020). Reforming the International Health Regulations to prepare for future pandemics. The Lancet Public Health, 5(5), e302–e304. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2468-2667(20)30075-7

[4] Katz, R., Standley, C. J., & Steiner, R. J. (2018). Regional approaches to global health security: Perspectives from Southeast Asia. Health Security, 16(3), 139–145. https://doi.org/10.1089/hs.2017.0115

[5] Moon, S., Sridhar, D., Pate, M. A., Jha, A. K., Clinton, C., Delaunay, S., … & Piot, P. (2015). Will Ebola change the game? Ten essential reforms before the next pandemic. The Lancet, 386(10009), 2204–2221. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(15)00946-0

[6] Youde, J. (2020). Global health governance in international society. Oxford University Press.