



THE DICHOTOMY BETWEEN UNILATERAL AND BILATERAL INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE THIRD WORLD

Sheriff Ghali Ibrahim¹ and Mustapha Abdullahi Aliyu²

¹Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Abuja

²Department of Sociology, University of Abuja

ABSTRACT: *This paper ex-rays the implication of international organizations (IOs) as Unilateral and Multilateral IOs to the development of the Third-World with a view to finding out if, there is any difference between them. The paper leans on library research as descriptive in nature from documented instruments for further discovery. Findings show that even though there is no clear-cut difference between the two, unilateral organizations are more lenient to the third world situation than bilateral organizations. This is because the origin and the history of the development of these development bodies and their aims and objective in relations to the development needs of the third-World at the final analyses expose the salient connections between both. The paper concludes that, albeit the two organizations are important in the global system, unilateral donors or international organizations are more important to the third world as there is no string attached to any form of aid given to them. The paper recommends that, unilateral agencies and organizations should ensure equitable distribution of aid to the needy nations to curtail the level of imposition made by bilateral donors.*

KEYWORDS: Dichotomy, Unilateral, Multilateral, International Organizations, Donors

INTRODUCTION

The rate of progression of humanity has been rapid, sustained and multi-consequential from the advents of both the industrial and political revolutions in Europe from 16th-17th centuries. The quest for global peace forming the United Nations (UN) in 1945, the decolonization needs of Europe and the humanist perception of development lead by the Americans in the famous Harry Truman's 'deal' to the Third World encapsulated in his famous speeches on 20th January 1949 where he said:

We must embark on a bold new program for making the benefits of our scientific advances and industrial progress available for the improvement and growth of underdeveloped areas. The old imperialism – exploitation for foreign profit – has no place in our plans. What we envisage is a program of development based on the concept of democratic fair dealing.

This point made by President Truman intensified the role of what came to be known as International Organizations (IOs). Several implications of the IOs have reinforced the main



fields of investigation in the development economics, international economy, sociology of development, African history and the social issues related to the development.

In the area of sociology of development, the study of IOs concerns issues such as globalization and urbanization relating to national and global poverty and inequality, international economies and finances relations and their effects, wealth flows and prosperities, global highly fluctuating energy prices, sustainability of production and consumption; and the increasing world population and climate change; the impact on the food chain at the global and local levels, and the unending national and global insecurity challenges. These dimensions and contradictions in global development needs and drives created imbalances in global prosperities defining the world as the First, Second and Third-Worlds. Where global financial reserves and industries (producing good socio-economic and political developmental indicators) in the First World (represented by Europe and United State of America influenced organizations such as the UN and its various agencies such and the Breton wood institutions and their auxiliaries) have assumed greater managerial and humanitarians' responsibilities of the countries that came to be categorized as the Third-World. The Third-World (countries in Latin America and Africa) represents all forms of misery and calamities (social and economic) in the 21th century. There is also an assertion made by scholars especially in the third world that IOs are nothing but managerial and organizational entities in modern times managed by the First World (Cooke, 2004), such management is widely assumed to apply in modern and, or postmodern, societies. However, a distinctive form of management, Development Administration and Management (DAM), exists and is applied to Third World nation-states, which are deemed in the First World 'thoughts' to require modernization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

McArthur and Werker (2016) have provided a detailed examination of the post-WWII emergence of the IOs and the situational enhanced metamorphoses of their roles. He said 1945–50 were the years the United Nations and Bretton Woods institutions came into existence. By 1950 there were only 60 member states in the United Nations—the newest of which was Indonesia, which had just won hard-fought independence from the Netherlands. But the British, French, and Portuguese empires still reached from southern to northern Africa, and all the way to Southeast Asia. The United States was twice as rich as France and five times as rich as Japan or Portugal. Argentina, Uruguay, and Venezuela had higher incomes than Western Europe. China's income per capita was a fifth that of Latin America (Maddison, 2013). Development aid was virtually nonexistent except for the creation and financing of the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Agency and the International Refugee Organization to stabilize Europe after WWII, followed by U.S. aid to Greece and Turkey and of course the Marshall Plan. Even the World Bank, which opened its doors in 1946 as the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, was funding post-war reconstruction, primarily through guaranteeing private investment. Only through competition with the Soviet Union throughout the 1950s did the United States, and then later Western Europe, get into the business of foreign aid (Lancaster, 2007).

McArthur and Werker (2016) citing Gordon (2016) observed that, making an international phone call in 1950 would have necessitated multiple operators, and was extraordinarily



inaccessible. That, a 3-min call from New York to London cost more than \$50 (in 2005 dollars), which means that a 20-minute call would have eaten up the annual GDP per capita of an average Tanzanian—assuming they had the chance to be in New York or London in the first place. The high cost of communication placed major constraints on non-elite's ability to mobilize in order to demand and receive transparency from leaders and organizations. That was the world in which the long-term scaffolding for global governance was put into place, even if the context kept evolving.

By the time the Cold-War was coming to an end around 1990, global technology had advanced considerably and the era of colonialism had passed, with dozens of former colonies and protectorates gaining independence. Indeed, the United Nations grew to 159 members, with Namibia the most recent country to join following its independence from South Africa. But the 1950 global distribution of economic development remained largely consistent, with the exception of a handful of East Asian countries that were rapidly industrializing. Robert Barro's (1991) seminal paper on economic growth noted a general lack of convergence in per capita incomes. Many African countries like Ghana, Senegal, and Somalia were no better off income-wise than they had been at independence three decades before. Eastern European countries emerging from Communist rule were still around three quarters poorer than their western counterparts, the same ratio as at the beginning of their experiment with centrally-planned economies (Maddison, 2013). Meanwhile, the systems of foreign aid had become professionalized among multilateral organizations and richest countries own agencies. Development started to replace political alliances as aid's primary goal (Lancaster, 2007). According to the rhetoric of western donors, policy prescriptions were widely disseminated to developing countries based on the views of geographically concentrated intellectual elite. Long distance calling was certainly much cheaper, but for most developing countries it remained highly regulated by state-sanctioned monopolies. Cellular phones were starting to become available in a handful of rich countries, and the Internet was only used by technical specialists and dedicated hobbyists. The global communications revolution had yet to take hold.

All told, for IOs and developing countries, the post-WW II period from the late 1940s to the mid-1990s was characterized by an expanding but typically still paternalistic institutional reach. The World Bank had shifted from European reconstruction to financing development activities and urging policy frameworks in nearly all of the world's developing countries. The IMF had shifted from creating stability in the global fixed exchange rate regime to tackling debt problems in many developing countries. The United Nations began to send peacekeepers to civil wars – not just interstate conflicts – across the developing world. Its refugee arm had evolved from placing WWII refugees to intervening in conflicts in the developing and supporting the internally-displaced persons (Barnett, 2002).

The first world also referred to as the global core regions *have* benefited the most from the capitalist world economy. The nations of Europe notably England, Spain, Portugal and Germany in the 16th-17th Centuries (1625-1670) dominated as First World owing to the practice of Slavery, Colonialism and Neo-Colonialism. Through such global actions this state developed strong central governments, extensive bureaucracies, and large mercenary armies which were used by the substantial part of the local bourgeoisie to obtain control over international commerce and extract capital surpluses from this trade for their own benefit. After WWII when Europe fought and decimated itself, united state of American emerged as the superpower in both military-might and financial muscle, this change the global power



currents in American favor backed by it hosting of UN (entrusted to mainlining global peace through global democracy), IMF and the World Bank for global financial stability and world economy regulation purposes.

What became clear as the globe grew from 1945 was the various classification of the world, where Europe and American occupy the developed status or simply are the first world and the rest of the world could either be developing or are consider as second or third world. the characteristics of the first world have remain, having: high Foreign Direct Investments (FDI), high employment and high wages, high level of communications and technology e.g. internet and mobile network, high literacy and skills rate, net migration gain, larger secondary and tertiary education, good electricity, water and gas supply and good quality of housing (Rodrik, 1996).

The concept of third world is an interesting recent European scholarship creation. The conception "Third World" is divisive often denigrated in nature of world socio-economic and political geographies a "us" versus "them." According to Greene (1980), the term "Third World" is of French origin which is the translation of the word *tiers monde*, the Third Force. Greene (1980), generally saw the term "Third World" to refer to those nations that lagged in industrial development, low in per capita income, exporters of only raw materials which are subject to extreme price oscillations, and required to buy more on the world market for their people's needs than they can pay for out of export earnings. "Third World" nations are also characterized as, having a colonial past and being underdeveloped economically, and suffering from illiteracy and domination of political life by small western-oriented and educated elite (Verdier, 2008).

The contemporary characteristics of the Third-World stated include: political and economic crisis, disinvestment, net migration loss, unemployment, low level of literacy and skill base, large primary economy sector, mostly subsistent farming, electricity, gas and portable water shortage, Non industrial and low manufacturing level, Low level of communication and poor modern communication infrastructure, Poor housing with large informal settlements etc.

In sum the third-world are those countries that bear the brunt of greater global economy inequality; needed more accessible technologies, particularly in agriculture/food production, health and transportation for a breakthrough in tackling basic human needs and the continues evolving human complex set of problems such as Ebola and famine. To this end the Third-World need global cooperation with other nations not exploitations.

The terms bilateral and multilateral are technically used to explain flows of Official Development Assistance (ODA) (Gulrajani, 2016). The OECD defines *bilateral* transactions as those undertaken by a donor country directly with a developing country. They also include transactions with NGOs active in development and other, internal development related transactions like debt relief, administrative costs and spending on development awareness. Meanwhile, there are 28 bilateral donor members within the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development's (OECD). Development Assistance Committee (DAC), and a growing group of non-DAC donors consists of at least 28 states (Gulrajani, 2016).

According to OCED (2015), the MOs are those international institutions with governmental membership that carry out developmental activities. For Tortora and Steensen (2014), multilateral system includes over 210 major organizations and funds, as well as numerous



smaller trust funds world over. A *multilateral* contribution or development assistance supports or aids are delivered only by an international institution conducting all or part of its activities in favor of development. The design for the delivery of multilateral development assistance are constrained by the fact that the flow itself must lose its identity and become an integral part of the recipient institution's assets such that donors cannot track and pre-define its uses (Bhala, 2000).

The United Nations (UN) and the World Bank Group (WBG) are the largest recipients of earmarked funding within the multilateral system; they received USD 11 billion and USD 5 billion in 2012 respectively. Along with the IADB (55%), UN entities and WBG also have the highest "earmarked funding-dependency rate", 73% and 36% respectively. From an MO perspective, the growth in earmarked funding reflects both the preference of many "traditional" donors for this funding and the broadening of the MOs' funding base to new state and non-state donors (Guljarana, 2016). In 2012, funding to the UN from private charities, NGOs and multilateral organizations (e.g. global funds and inter-governmental organizations) amounted to around USD 4.7 billion (UN, 2014).

Within the UN system, about 40 entities receive earmarked funding for development activities, but nearly 80% of earmarked funding is concentrated in five UN entities: WFP, UNDP, UNHCR, UNICEF, and WHO (UN, 2014). All UN entities have trust fund mechanisms to manage earmarked funds. In addition, the Multi Partner Trust Fund Office (MPTF), which currently hosts 55 trust funds, was established in 2004 to consolidate funding from multiple partners (to one or multiple implementing agencies) and provide dedicated administration services. The WB currently hosts over 1,000 trust funds with funding from around 200 different donors

According to Morris and Gleave (2016), US leadership in multilateral institutions such as the World Bank and regional development banks remains imperative. These institutions (multilateral institutions), rated as some of the most effective development actors globally, provide clear advantages to the United States in terms of geostrategic interests, cost-effectiveness, and results on the ground. The existence of the institution is among the reasons the United States played a leading role in creating and has continued to support them over many decades. A number of trends in the aid landscape are pushing donors to think carefully about the nature of this choice. First, there are options to consider because official aid organizations exist in a crowded marketplace (Adejanju, 2008).

Theoretical Underpinning: *The Dependency Theory*

According to John (2014), the whole gamut of the theories of IO developed in order to answer the questions of economic equality; which incorporated globalization, class problems, political elite, inadequacy of domestic education and health systems; where perceivably the only rich succeeds. Also, to examine the question of dignity; the Universal Declaration of Human Rights begins with, as inherently is agreed that "All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights." Therefore, appropriateness; were less sophisticated but more practical ways, traditional blended with modernity. Thus, sustainability – an approach to development which takes account of economic, social and environmental factors to produce projects and programs which will have results which are not dependent on finite resources



There are several theoretical dispositions to explain the IOS and the third-world. These range from the Modernization and Westernization schools popular in the works of Walt W. Rostow and five Stages of Economic Growth popularized in the neo-liberal ideas of economists such as Milton Friedman or Bela Balassa, which were implemented in the form of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) of the Third-World in the 1970s and early 1980s; the Marxist theory and its off-shoots in the Dependency and later World System Schools. There is development as a freedom school adopted by the UN in the early 1990s producing Human Development and Human Needs and Capabilities and Sustainable Development Schools. This paper found the Dependency school as more encapsulating of the illustrations and explanations intended in this discuss. The school arose in the late 1960's to analyze the evolving relationship between the West and what was then becoming known as the Third World. The evolution of Dependency Theory is really as a natural progression from structuralism. Structuralists believe that, development would not be possible unless a strategy of de-linking and import substitution was followed. External links with the developed parts of the globe would be needed (Greene, 1980).

Those promoting this theory believed that resources flow from the 'periphery' of poor and underdeveloped states to a 'core' of wealthy countries, which leads to accumulation of wealth in the rich states at the expense of the poor states. They accepted that not all society's progress through similar stages of development. More traditional states have certain unique features, structures and institutions of their own and are the weaker with regard to the world market economy. These theorists argue that underdeveloped countries remain economically vulnerable unless they reduce their connectedness to the world market. The theory states that poor nations provide natural resources and cheap labor for developed nations – a process which allows the developed countries to have a standard of living they could not otherwise enjoy. The richer nations will try to maintain this superior quality of life and want the developing world to remain dependent on the developed. This, in turn continues the poverty cycle as the poorer countries are highly integrated and dependent on the richer economies (Oso, 2002).

Adeyanju (2008) while paraphrasing the Latin American theorist A.G. Frank posits that, Development and underdevelopment are the two sides of a historical process through which the third world was incorporated into the world capitalist system. In this case there is a dialectical relationship between development and underdevelopment in the process of under-developing the present day under-developed countries. In line with the above, we can classify Frank's Inter-land and Metropolis Dependency theory as the centre coordinating while the developing countries are at the periphery obeying the instructions of the coordinators or disobeying at their peril. As Frank argues (in Hale 1990:464) and as agreed here, this is not just about the location of the coordinators but where the string is pulled from. This theory elaborates on the need for us to understand that the policies of the developed world (or the first world) as represented by their multinational companies through the subtle phases of corporate social responsibilities of big firms in food production health, sport, education in collaboration of home government (including institutions like the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank desired only profits on the rates of their investment into the third-world at all cost, this could be in indebtedness or policy and program guide of the third worlds or outright resources evacuations. Hence it could be connected the continued dependence of the third world on the on the developed countries.



International Organizations and African Dispositions

The activities of International Organizations (IOs) continue to manifest in different directions of human growths and needs with the continents and countries tagging the Third World in the large limelight of receiving assistance, even as their problems and needs (which are mostly poverty reduction, food sustainability, improvement in literacy rate, general security, stability and capacity to make use of their naturally endowed resources for independent and sustainable growth and development) refused to substantially improve. The operation of IOs have increased sphere and changed since the post-WWII world when the modern system of global governance through international organizations was established. The world of 2019, were substantially different from the post-WWII era, where Third World become operating spaces for experiment on the first theories of economic growth. The IMF and World Bank as corollaries to the UN (and brimming from the reconstructive role they have blustered in Europe) entered into the life of the Third-World with SAP. The era of SAP saw incessant military interventions and truncation of democracies and civil governance in the third-world, which exacerbated political instabilities, later resulting to ethnic and religious violence. From early 1990s to date the UN and IMF and World Bank with IOs support for developmental assistance were reconditioned to incorporation and certification of the credential of the third-world by the IOs. From the 1990s when the recertification of the Third World civilian democratic pedigree was demanded as the condition for developmental assistance, poverty and insecurity rose their ugly heads higher in the socio-economic fabric of the Third-World from African; mostly calamity of human trafficking dangerously to Europe.

Other segments of the continent are crises on the continents, like Uganda battled genocide and other man in-humanity to man. South-Sudan is restive, Libya is battling a devastating civil war. Nigeria and Kenya are battling terrorism with serious consequences to the state in human and material resources. Farmers and Herders Clash in Nigeria became recurrent, with deviating effects on food production and sustainability. Youth restiveness continued to be played by the politicians to destabilized political processes for personal gains. Economic mismanagement and corruption move to the highest of pedestals of novelties and the antecedent repercussions appears in decaying infrastructures in education, healthcare services, roads, electricity and energy use. Recurrent falling world prices on primary good such as crude oil and agricultural produce constantly compounded the worries of the people in the third-world, which the IOs constantly found as motivations to 'enter' for development assistance. From a geographical point of view, the sub-Saharan Africa; Latin America; East, South and Southeast Asia as well as countries from Eastern European countries face these cycles of developmental challenges and therefore are qualified for the IOs development assistance support (Mah, 2014).

The Dichotomy between Unilateral and Bilateral IOs

Scholars have debated whether bilateral aid or multilateral assistance does more to promote development. Theoretically, multilateral aid is often seen as less political since it is less specifically tied to donors' foreign policy agendas, which are believed to be driven in turn by their political interests. As Martens et al. (2002) write, Multilateral aid agencies may be somewhat shielded against direct political pressure from their member states. Rodrik (1996) adds that multilateral aid agencies provide more information about recipient countries and allow conditionality to be more effectively imposed on them, concluding that multilateral flows are less governed by political considerations than bilateral ones. Some macro-level



empirical studies have produced results suggesting that multilateral agencies fund different countries and projects from bilateral ones, and that multilateral projects tend to go to poorer countries and to those with greater needs compared to bilateral aid (Findley, Milner and Nelson, 2017).

The difference between bilateral and multilateral IOs has been studied by Gulrajani (2016). He operationalized the differences as follows. Bilateral channels therefore cover the public sector, NGOs, public-private partnerships and other categories (Table 1). Although bilateral flows can technically be spent through a variety of channels, the bulk of bilateral transactions are through public-sector channels. By contrast, multilateral flows can be spent only through multilateral channels, as per the definition above. These are typically clustered around five groups of multilaterals: The European Union, the World Bank International Development Association, the Regional Development Banks, the United Nations Programs Funds and Specialized Agencies and the Global Fund for Aids, Tuberculosis and Malaria (GFATM).

While bilateral and multilateral channels are distinctive aid conduits, there is sufficient reason to see them as possible substitutes from a donor country's perspective. First, aid within both can be offered at varying levels of concessionality ranging from grants to market terms. Second, the first-level implementing partners of both channels are, in the main, public institutions (albeit international in the case of multilaterals and domestic in the case of bilateral). Third, both channels operate in countries facing similar development and humanitarian conditions, and often their span of engagement covers the same states and sectors. Finally, bilateral and multilateral donors are both implicated in comparable policy debates, global fora and country relations with their participation often occurring in parallel. Among other reasons, this is because the aid disbursements of multilateral agencies look, in many cases, quite similar to the disbursements of bilateral donors, offering aid on similar terms, within the same countries and to the same sectors (Annen and Knack, 2015).

The possibility of substitution across these two channels creates a strategic opportunity for donors to direct funding through either bilateral or multilateral institutions. Bilateral channels are thought to be easily captured by vested interests and this desire for political gain is often claimed as characteristic of their assistance (Verdier, 2008). Multilateral agencies are assumed to possess a degree of autonomy from the states that control and fund them that prevents political capture. Being at arm's length from major shareholders is, in most people's minds, indicative of greater objectivity in decision-making regarding the aims and modalities of development cooperation, minimizing the exploitation of aid for the purposes of securing the national interest. Such neutrality is perceived to be an institutionalized advantage for multilateral channels, inherent to the OECD definition of multilateral aid itself as transactions 'made to a recipient institution which conducts all or part of its activities in favor of development' (Reddy and Minoiu, 2009).

There is a growing body of econometric evidence indicating that bilateral channels are, indeed, more vulnerable than multilateral channels to political capture with real consequences for development. Bilateral donor interests appear to skew the aid allocation process in favor of strategic and political considerations, as opposed to country need or potential for development impact (Nunnenkamp and Thiele, 2006; Sippel and Neuhoﬀ, 2009). This can slow opportunities for economic growth in comparison with aid through multilateral channels (Girod, 2008). Indeed, when recipients are of less strategic interest to bilateral donors, it has been demonstrated that these channels become more effective at reducing infant mortality



(Girod, 2012). And yet, there is some evidence to suggest that political bias in bilateral channels can actually encourage greater use of multilateral channels. For example, a donor's decision to delegate to a multilateral institution can be driven by the need to protect and advance strategic geopolitical interests or insulate from domestic political pressures (Greenhill and Rabinowitz, forthcoming). Political capture of bilateral channels may also have positive intended consequences as well as unintended spillover effects, as a number of illustrative examples suggest. For example, bilateral aid that is tied to counterterrorism activities can mitigate the adverse effects of terrorism on flows of foreign direct investment (FDI) to developing countries (Bandyopadhyay et al., 2014). The US has used aid to promote democratic development through the implementation of preferential trade agreements and both donor and recipients have benefitted from welfare effects (Baccini and Urpelainen, 2012).

Table 1: Summary Illustration of the Difference between Bilateral and Multilateral International Organizations

Aid channel	First-level implementing partners	Examples
(Bilateral)		
Public sector	Donor governments* – central state and local institutions Aid recipients – central, state and local institutions	Development Ministry Ministry of Finance Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Non-governmental	Non-profit entities	Cooperatives Foundations
Public-private partnership	Private actors Bilateral/multilateral agencies	Development finance institutions Challenge Funds
Other	For-profit entities Consultancies	Think tanks
(Multilateral)		
Multilateral	Inter-governmental institutions	World Bank UN EU

Source: OECD, 2013

**Note: Within donor governments, there is often more than one government body that can be an implementing partner although spending authorities will be held with central agencies. If budgetary authorities are formally transferred from central aid authorities to other public sector agencies, the channel will be determined by the latter's first-level implementing partners.*

Research Implications

The research work has implications especially on the international organizations and members of the third world. First, the third world needs to understand from this research work that, donor agencies are the same with similar purposes. Therefore, the third world countries need to redirect their areas of sourcing finances by consolidating efforts in looking inward.



Secondly, the international organizations must also understand that, there is the need for them to make a shift in either providing aid on humanitarian basis or consider the third world as development partners, not to give them aid with one hand and take it away with the other hand.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This presentation concludes that there is no difference between the unilateral and bilateral international organization and whatever that stands for in the development studies and developmental trajectories of the third-world. This is because the origin and the history of the development of this development bodies and their aims and objective in relations to the development needs of the third-World at the final analyses expose the salient connections between both.

Albeit the two organizations are important in the global system, unilateral donors or international organizations are more important to the third world as there is no string attached to any form of aid given to them. Unilateral agencies and organizations should ensure equitable distribution of aid to the needy nations to curtail the level of imposition made by bilateral donors.

REFERENCES

- Adejanju, A.M. (2008). Evaluation of Development Theories On Their Relevance to The Achievement of Development Communication Goals in Nigeria. *Zaria Journal of Social Sciences*. Vol 1.No.1.
- Annen, K. and Knack, S. (2015). On the Delegation of Aid Implementation to Multilateral Agencies. *World Bank Policy Research Working Paper* (October).
- Bhala, R. (2000). Marxist Origins of The “Anti-Third World” Claim. *Fordham International Law Journal*. Volume 24, Issue 1 Article 8 ISSUE 1 & 2.
- Carbone, M. (2008) Introduction: The new season of EU development policy, *Perspectives on European Politics and Society*, 9:2, 111-113.
- Cooke, B. (2004). The Managing of the Third World. *Organizational Article*. Volume 11(5): 603–629.
- Findley, M.G.; Milner, H.V. and Nielson, D.L. (2017). The Choice Among Aid Donors: The Effects of Multilateral Vs. Bilateral Aid On Recipient Behavioral Support. *Review of International Organizations* (2017) 12:307–334.
- Greene, B.W. (1980). Toward a Definition of the Term Third World. *Boston College Third World Law Journal*. Volume 1 | Issue 1 Article 104-1-1980.
- Gulrajani, N. (2016). Bilateral Versus Multilateral Aid Channels. *Sharping Policies for Development Report*. ODI.
- John, R. (2014). The Theories of International Assistance. Source: <http://theorizing-international-organizations-scholarly-journal.net>.
- Lindoso, V. and Hall, N. (2016). Assessing the Effectiveness of Multilateral Organization. *BSG-WP-2016/013*. Source: <http://multilateral-organizations.net>.



- Mah, L. (2014). Reshaping EU Development Policy: Collective Choices & The New Global Order. Lisbon school of economic, WP 130 / 2014. Source: [Http://Pascal.Iseg.Utl.Pt/~Cesa/Index.Php/Menupublicacoes/Working-Paper](http://Pascal.Iseg.Utl.Pt/~Cesa/Index.Php/Menupublicacoes/Working-Paper).
- Martens, B., Mummert, U., Murrell, P., Seabright, P., and Ostrom, E. (2002). The Institutional Economics of Foreign Aid. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McArthur, J.W. and Werker, E. (2016). Developing countries and international organizations: Introduction to the special issue. Review of International Organization. 11:155–169.
- Nunnenkamp, P. and Thiele, R. (2006) 'Targeting Aid to the Needy and Deserving: Nothing But Promises?', *TWEC World Economy* 29(9): 1177-1201.
- OCED (2015). Multilateral Aid 2015: *Better Partnerships for a Post-2015 World* Highlights. source: <http://mos.org>.
- OECD (2013). Converged Statistical Reporting Directives for the Creditor Reporting System (CRS) and the Annual DAC Questionnaire. Paris: OECD.
- Oso, L. (2002). ed. Communication Development: A Reader. Abeokuta: Jedideiah Press.
- Reddy, S. and Minoiu, C. (2009) 'Development Aid and Economic Growth: A Positive Long-Run Relation' (<http://public.ebib.com/choice/publicfullrecord.aspx?p=1608309>).
- Rodrik, D. (1996) 'Why is there multilateral lending?', in M. Bruno and B. Plekovic (eds), *Annual World Bank Conference on Development Economics 1995* (pp. 167-205). Washington DC: IBRD.
- Tortora, P. And Steensen, S. (2014). Bilateral Providers and Multilateral Organization: Practices or Earmarked Findings. OECD Publications.
- Verdier, D. (2008) 'Multilateralism, Bilateralism, and Exclusion in the Nuclear Proliferation Regime', *International Organization* 62(3): 439-476 (<http://doi.org/10.2307/40071900>).