BULLETIN
OF "CAROL I" NATIONAL DEFENCE UNIVERSITY

Open Systems Theory
in Organizations and Geopolitics

Anastasios-Nikolaos KANELLOPOULOS, Ph.D. Candidate*

*Department of Business Administration, Athens University of Economics and Business, Greece
e-mail: ankanell@aueb.gr

Abstract

This paper presents a theoretical approach exploring the application of Open Systems Theory within geopolitics. Traditionally, geopolitics has focused on state-centric power dynamics; however, the increasing influence of non-state actors such as multinational corporations, and transnational networks has blurred the boundaries between states and other global entities. By employing Open Systems Theory, this paper offers a new conceptual framework to understand the complex and interconnected nature of modern international relations. The study ultimately argues that Open Systems Theory provides a nuanced perspective essential for analyzing the evolving dynamics of global politics.

Keywords:

Open Systems Theory has long been a cornerstone of organizational theory, providing a framework to understand how organizations interact with and are influenced by their environments. Initially developed in the mid-20th century, the theory responded to the limitations of closed system approaches, which largely ignored the external environment's role in shaping organizational behavior (Bertalanffy 1972; Katz and Kahn 1978). Open Systems Theory posits that organizations are open to and interact with their environments, leading to a continuous exchange of information, resources, and energy that impacts their internal processes and structures (Scott 2003; Daft 2015).

In recent years, scholars have increasingly applied Open Systems Theory to geopolitics, offering new insights into the complex and interconnected nature of global political dynamics (Weber and Waeger 2017). Geopolitics, traditionally focused on the study of power relations between sovereign states, has evolved to consider a broader range of actors, including multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, and transnational networks (Ansell and Weber 1999; Mazis and Troulis 2019). This shift reflects the increasing interconnectedness of the global political environment, where traditional boundaries between states and non-state actors are becoming increasingly blurred (Keren 1979).

This paper engages in a rigorous theoretical analysis grounded in a review of relevant literature to explore the applicability of Open Systems Theory as a framework for understanding the complex and dynamic interactions between organizations, states, and global actors within the geopolitical sphere. Given the abstract and multifaceted nature of the subject, this study adopts a conceptual approach, recognizing that the theoretical exploration of Open Systems Theory offers critical insights into the evolving nature of political actors and boundaries, the intricate interplay between state and non-state entities, and the delicate equilibrium between openness and control within global telecommunications networks. The decision to pursue a purely conceptual analysis stems from the theoretical orientation of the research, which aims to advance scholarly discourse by proposing a nuanced interpretive lens rather than empirical validation. While this study does not incorporate case studies or empirical data, it seeks to contribute to the academic understanding of international relations in the 21st century by offering a refined theoretical perspective that could inform future empirical investigations.

The Evolution of Open Systems Theory

Open Systems Theory is a conceptual framework that views organizations as dynamic entities engaged in continuous interaction with their environment. Unlike closed systems, which are self-contained and isolated, open systems are characterized by permeable boundaries that facilitate the exchange of information, energy, and resources with their surroundings. This theory, rooted in the work of Ludwig von

Bertalanffy (1972) and further developed by scholars such as Daniel Katz and Robert Kahn (1978), provides a holistic perspective on how organizations adapt, evolve, and sustain themselves in complex and changing environments (Scott 2003; Daft 2015).

Central to Open Systems Theory is the idea that organizations are not static structures but are continually influenced by external factors such as economic conditions, technological advancements, social trends, and regulatory changes (Katz and Kahn 1978; Thompson 1967). These influences necessitate ongoing adjustments and adaptations to maintain organizational viability and effectiveness. This perspective shifts the focus from internal mechanisms to the broader context in which organizations operate, emphasizing the interconnectedness between internal and external environments (Lawrence and Lorsch 1967; Wilkinson 2011).

One of the key concepts in Open Systems Theory is the feedback loop, which enables organizations to receive information about their performance relative to their environment. Feedback can be positive, reinforcing current practices, or negative, indicating the need for change (Ashmos and Huber 1987; Wilkinson 2011). This continuous process of feedback and adjustment is crucial for organizational learning and development. For example, a shipping company might receive feedback about delays caused by outdated technology, prompting it to invest in more advanced systems to enhance efficiency and competitiveness (Emery and Trist 1965).

Open Systems Theory also highlights the importance of resource exchange. Organizations depend on various inputs from the environment, such as raw materials, labor, capital, and information. These inputs are transformed through organizational processes into outputs, such as products, services, and waste, which are then returned to the environment (Burns and Stalker 1961; Cummings and Worley 2016). The sustainability of an organization hinges on its ability to manage these exchanges effectively, ensuring that it can secure necessary resources and maintain favorable relationships with its stakeholders (Montuori 2011).

Adaptability is another critical aspect of Open Systems Theory. Organizations must be flexible and responsive to external changes to survive and thrive. This involves not only reacting to immediate challenges but also anticipating future trends and preparing for potential disruptions (Beven 2006). Strategic planning, environmental scanning, and innovation are essential practices for enhancing organizational adaptability. For instance, a shipping company might monitor global trade patterns and geopolitical developments to anticipate shifts in shipping routes and adjust its strategies accordingly (Cummings and Worley 2016).

The theory also emphasizes the role of organizational boundaries, which define the limits of an organization and distinguish it from its environment. However, these boundaries are not fixed; they are dynamic and permeable, allowing for the flow of information and resources. Effective boundary management is crucial for balancing internal stability with

external adaptability (Luhmann 2006). Organizations must protect their core operations while remaining open to external influences that can drive growth and innovation.

Interdependency is a fundamental principle of Open Systems Theory. Organizations are part of larger systems, such as industries, economies, and societies, and their actions can have far-reaching impacts. This interconnectedness means that organizations must consider the broader implications of their decisions and actions (Beven 2006). Collaborative relationships, partnerships, and networks are often essential for navigating complex environments. For instance, a shipping company might collaborate with port authorities, logistics providers, and technology firms to enhance its operational efficiency and service delivery (Galbraith 1998).

The theory also underscores the importance of systemic thinking, which involves understanding the organization rather than focusing on isolated parts. This holistic perspective helps identify the interrelationships and interactions that drive organizational behavior. Systemic thinking encourages managers to consider how changes in one part of the organization can affect other parts and how the organization interacts with its environment. This approach can lead to more effective problem-solving and decision-making, as it considers the broader context and long-term consequences (Cummings and Worley 2016).

In addition to these core concepts, Open Systems Theory also incorporates the idea of homeostasis, which is a system's tendency to maintain its key characteristics and to be resilient in the face of external disruptions. Homeostasis is achieved through various mechanisms, including feedback loops, which help systems self-correct based on interaction with the external environment. This concept has been extensively studied in fields such as mathematics (dynamical systems), engineering, and biology, but it is also relevant in the context of organizational intelligence, particularly in the public sector, where intelligence producers use feedback from consumers to refine their products and ensure relevance (Emery and Trist 1965).

Furthermore, systems theorists like Luhmann (2006) argue that a system has a boundary that separates it from its environment, thereby limiting external influences. However, as Beven (2006) points out, the degree to which a system adapts depends on how well it engages with its environment. This engagement is facilitated by the systemic nature of organizations, where the interdependence of various parts means that modifications in one area will invariably impact others.

Organizational culture, structure, strategies, and processes (systems) also play a significant role in shaping the scope and limitations of a private-sector geopolitically focused strategic intelligence team. For instance, the organizational culture within which a team operates can either facilitate or hinder its ability to respond to external changes. A culture that encourages innovation and flexibility is more likely to support effective adaptation and resilience (Nahavandi *et al.* 2015).

Moreover, the structure of an organization can impact how well it functions as an open system. According to Galbraith (1998), the amount of coordination required within a structure is a function of the amount of uncertainty in the environment, the differentiation between subunits, and the degree to which these subunits are interdependent. In a dynamic environment characterized by high uncertainty, organizations need sophisticated coordination mechanisms to ensure effective operation.

The role of systems in defining how work is done is also critical. As Bertalanffy (1972) suggests, the interconnected nature of an organization's components makes systems heavily reliant on established work processes. These processes largely define the interactions between elements of the system and can be used to improve the operations of a business. In a corporate intelligence context, there is often an emphasis on hierarchical structure and the codification of norms to avoid ambiguity, necessitating clear coordination processes for the creation of intelligence products.

The Changing Nature of Political Actors and Boundaries

Historically, geopolitics has been anchored in the examination of power relations between sovereign states, emphasizing territorial boundaries, national sovereignty, and the distribution of power among these states (Ansell and Weber 1999). This traditional perspective, rooted in the Westphalian model of international relations, assumes that nation-states are the principal actors on the global stage, driven primarily by considerations of national interest, territorial integrity, and security (Mazis and Troulis 2019). However, the global political landscape has undergone significant transformations in recent decades, revealing the limitations of these conventional frameworks in adequately capturing the complexities of contemporary international relations (Weber and Waeger 2017).

Open Systems Theory, which posits that systems are interconnected and interact dynamically with their environments, offers a valuable lens through which to understand these evolving dynamics at both the organizational and geopolitical levels. Unlike closed systems, where boundaries are rigid and impermeable, open systems emphasize the fluidity and permeability of boundaries, allowing for the exchange of information, resources, and influences. This theoretical perspective is particularly relevant in analyzing the current global order, where the rise of non-state actors and the increasing interconnectedness of states have blurred the once-clear boundaries of state authority and influence (Keren 1979). Additionally, the increasing significance of cyber threats, climate change, and global pandemics such as COVID-19 underscores the importance of adopting an Open-Systems approach to understanding the diffusion of influence and the challenges to traditional state sovereignty.

Cybercrime, as a growing threat to global security, exemplifies the challenges posed by the permeability of modern state boundaries. Cybercriminals, often

operating within transnational networks, exploit the interconnectedness of global systems to launch attacks that can disrupt critical infrastructure, steal sensitive information, and undermine the integrity of state institutions (Prabhukar 2024). The decentralized and borderless nature of cyberspace allows these actors to evade traditional forms of law enforcement, thereby challenging the regulatory authority of nation-states. Moreover, state-sponsored cyberattacks have emerged as a strategic tool in international conflicts, with states using cyber capabilities to project power, influence political outcomes, and destabilize adversaries without engaging in conventional warfare (Zaitsev 2023). The complexity and anonymity of cybercrime further complicate efforts to maintain state sovereignty and security, necessitating international cooperation and new forms of governance that transcend traditional geopolitical boundaries.

Climate change represents another profound challenge to traditional notions of state sovereignty and global governance. The impacts of climate change, such as rising sea levels, extreme weather events, and resource scarcity, do not respect national borders and require a coordinated international response (Freeman 2024). As the effects of climate change intensify, they are likely to exacerbate existing geopolitical tensions, leading to conflicts over resources such as water and arable land, mass migrations, and increased pressure on fragile states. These developments highlight the limitations of a state-centric approach to geopolitics, as no single nation can address the global nature of the climate crisis alone. The rise of climate refugees, for example, challenges the capacity of nation-states to control their borders and manage population flows, further eroding the traditional concept of sovereignty (Zaitsev 2023). In this context, Open Systems Theory offers a framework for understanding the interconnectedness of environmental, political, and social systems, emphasizing the need for collaborative approaches to global governance that can address the root causes and far-reaching impacts of climate change.

Moreover, the COVID-19 pandemic has similarly exposed the vulnerabilities of the global system and the limitations of state-centric governance models. The rapid spread of the virus across borders, facilitated by global travel and trade networks, demonstrated the inadequacy of national responses in containing a global health crisis (Reiners 2021). The pandemic has highlighted the importance of international cooperation in managing public health emergencies, as well as the need for robust global institutions capable of coordinating responses and distributing resources equitably. The economic fallout from the pandemic, including disrupted supply chains, unemployment, and financial instability, has further underscored the interconnectedness of national economies and the necessity of a coordinated global response to recovery efforts (Bump 2023). Moreover, the pandemic has accelerated digital transformation, increasing reliance on digital infrastructure while simultaneously exposing it to cyber threats, thus intertwining the challenges of cybercrime with the broader implications of global health crises (Zaitsev 2023). Open Systems Theory provides a critical lens through which to analyze these developments,

highlighting how the permeability of borders and the interdependence of global systems complicate efforts to manage such complex, transnational challenges.

The emergence of new actors such as multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, transnational advocacy networks, and organized crime networks has significantly transformed the geopolitical landscape. These entities operate transnationally, often undermining traditional state-centric power structures. For example, organized crime networks have evolved into sophisticated enterprises that exploit the vulnerabilities of global systems and the permeability of state boundaries, thereby challenging the regulatory authority of nation-states over international affairs (Prabhukar 2024). These networks not only engage in illicit activities but also influence political and economic agendas, often aligning with or against state interests (Zaitsev 2023; Moloney and Legrand 2024). Similarly, cybercrime has emerged as a critical threat, with state and non-state actors alike leveraging cyberspace to disrupt governance, economies, and international security, further complicating the traditional geopolitical landscape.

Furthermore, non-state actors such as multinational corporations and non-governmental organizations significantly influence state sovereignty and global dynamics. Multinational corporations, driven by profit maximization, often operate with considerable autonomy, leveraging their economic power to shape state policies and regulatory frameworks that align with their interests. This economic leverage can sometimes rival that of smaller nation-states, complicating traditional notions of sovereignty and governance (Freeman 2024). In contrast, non-governmental organizations and transnational networks advocate for social justice and environmental sustainability, creating a counterbalance to corporate influence and promoting humanitarian aid (Zaitsev 2023). These interactions highlight the fluidity and complexity of contemporary global governance, as the objectives of profit-driven corporations may conflict with the altruistic goals of NGOs, necessitating a reevaluation of sovereignty in the global context, particularly in light of global challenges like climate change and pandemics.

Moreover, state agencies increasingly reflect the principles of Open Systems in their operations. Central banks, intelligence agencies, and security organizations are no longer confined to traditional nation-state roles. Central banks engage in international monetary policy coordination and financial stability efforts that transcend national borders, directly impacting global economic conditions. Intelligence and security agencies collaborate across borders, sharing information and resources to address transnational threats such as terrorism, cybercrime, and organized crime networks. These agencies, by engaging in extensive networks of international cooperation, blur the lines between domestic and international spheres, further eroding the clear demarcations of state sovereignty.

Additionally, the International Court of Justice (ICJ) exemplifies the complexities of traditional state power institutions, revealing how external influences can shape its decision-making processes. Research indicates that the ICJ's rulings are not solely grounded in legal principles; they can be swayed by political pressures and the strategic interests of powerful states. For instance, Almeida et al. (2023) highlight that the court's decisions may reflect broader geopolitical dynamics, suggesting that powerful nations can exert influence over the ICJ's operations and outcomes. Similarly, Hofbauer (2023) discusses how the interplay of national interests and international law can lead to outcomes that prioritize state agendas over impartial legal adjudication.

Discussion and Conclusion

The transformation of international relations from the Westphalian system—centered on state sovereignty and centralized authority—to a more complex and interconnected global landscape marks a profound shift in the way power, governance, and security are understood. This change is largely driven by the rise of non-state actors, including multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, transnational networks, and cybercriminals, which challenge the traditional dominance of nation-states. Open Systems Theory offers a valuable analytical framework to examine this transformation, emphasizing the fluidity of boundaries and the intricate interactions among various global actors.

The increasing prevalence of cybercrime exemplifies the growing challenges to state sovereignty in a digitally interconnected world. Cybercriminals, operating within transnational networks, exploit global systems to conduct borderless attacks, complicating traditional law enforcement and regulatory mechanisms. State-sponsored cyberattacks further blur the distinction between conventional warfare and digital conflict, highlighting the need for international cooperation and innovative governance frameworks to manage these emerging threats. Future empirical investigations could explore the effectiveness of international cybercrime agreements and the role of multinational coalitions in countering state-sponsored cyber threats.

Climate change also challenges traditional concepts of sovereignty and global governance. Its impacts—ranging from rising sea levels to extreme weather events and resource scarcity—transcend national boundaries, requiring coordinated international responses. As climate-related effects intensify, they are likely to exacerbate geopolitical tensions, leading to resource conflicts, mass migrations, and increased pressure on fragile states. This scenario underscores the limitations of a state-centric approach and highlights the importance of Open Systems Theory, which emphasizes the interconnectedness of environmental, political, and social systems. Empirical research could investigate how international agreements, such as the Paris Agreement, are reshaping state policies and fostering cooperation among diverse actors in response to climate change.

The COVID-19 pandemic has further exposed vulnerabilities in the global system, revealing the inadequacies of state-centric governance in managing transnational crises. The virus's rapid spread, facilitated by global travel and trade networks, demonstrated the necessity of robust international cooperation and effective global institutions for coordinating responses and distributing resources. The pandemic also accelerated digital transformation, increasing reliance on digital infrastructure while exposing it to cyber threats, thereby intertwining the challenges of cybercrime with broader implications for global health and security. Future empirical studies could examine the long-term impacts of the pandemic on global supply chains and the resilience of international health governance structures.

As the geopolitical landscape continues to evolve, the traditional state-centric framework must adapt to account for the growing influence of non-state actors and the interconnected nature of global challenges. While Open Systems Theory provides a valuable framework for understanding these dynamics, it must be complemented by empirical research that explores the enduring role of nation-states in security and defense. Investigations could focus on the effectiveness of international security alliances and the impact of emerging technologies on national defense strategies.

In conclusion, the transition from the Westphalian order to a more complex global paradigm presents both challenges and opportunities. By integrating the insights offered by Open Systems Theory with empirical investigations into contemporary global dynamics, scholars, policymakers, and global citizens can better navigate and shape the future of international relations. This new paradigm demands innovative approaches to governance, security, and economic relations that are responsive to the realities of an interconnected world, where the boundaries between domestic and international affairs are increasingly blurred. Empirical research will be crucial in understanding these shifts and in developing strategies to address the multifaceted challenges of this new era.

References

Almeida, P., H. Porto, G. Romay, and M. Gouvea. 2023. "The growing participation of international organizations and non-state actors in international litigation: An empirical map of the International Court of Justice." *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Políticos*, *127*. https://doi.org/10.9732/2023.v127.968.

Ansell, C. K., and S. Weber. 1999. "Organizing International Politics: Sovereignty and Open Systems." *International Political Science Review* 20(1): 73–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512199201004.

Ashmos, D. P., and Huber, G. P. 1987. "The Systems Paradigm in Organization Theory: Correcting the Record and Suggesting the Future." *Academy of Management Review* 12(4): 607-621.

Bertalanffy, L. 1972. "The history and status of general systems theory." Academy of Management Journal, 15(4): 407-426.

Beven, K. 2006. "A manifesto for the equifinality thesis." Journal of Hydrology 320 (1-2): 18-36.

Bump, N. 2023. "The Slowly Boiling Frog: External State Actors and 21st Century Hemispheric Challenges." *Hemisferio Revista Del Colegio Interamericano de Defensa* (vol. 9): 24–50. https://doi.org/10.59848/24.1207.hv9n2.

Burns, T., and G.M. Stalker. 1961. The Management of Innovation. Tavistock Publications.

Cummings, T. G., and C.G. Worley. 2016. Organization development and change (10th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Daft, R. L. 2015. Organization Theory and Design (12th ed.). Cengage Learning.

Emery, F.E., and E.L. Trist. 1965. "The Causal Texture of Organizational Environments." *Human Relations* 18(1): 21-32.

Freeman, D. 2024. "Sovereignty, human rights and the regulation of transnational corporations: a critical spatial analysis of civil society proposals for a binding treaty." *Globalizations,* 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2024.2353993.

Galbraith, J. R. 1998. Designing Organizations: An Executive Guide to Strategy, Structure, and Process. Jossey-Bass.

Hofbauer, J. A. 2023. "Not Just a Participation Trophy? Advancing Public Interests through Advisory Opinions at the International Court of Justice." *The Law and Practice of International Courts and Tribunals* 22(2): 234–272. https://doi.org/10.1163/15718034-bja10092.

Katz, D., and Kahn, R. L. 1978. The social psychology of organizations (2nd ed.). Wiley.

Keren, M. 1979. "Ideological implications of the use of open systems theory in political science." *Behavioral Science*, 24(5): 311–324. https://doi.org/10.1002/bs.3830240504.

Lawrence, P. R., and Lorsch, J. W. 1967. "Differentiation and Integration in Complex Organizations." *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12(1): 1-47.

Luhmann, N. 2006. "System as difference." *Organization* 13(1): 37-57.

Mazis, I., and Troulis, M. 2019. "Systemic Geopolitical Analysis and Structural Realism: Parallel Routes and Common Challenges." *IOSR Journal of Business and Management* 21(10):1-6. https://doi.org/10.9790/487X-2110010106.

Moloney, K., and T. Legrand. 2024. "Actors, alterations, and authorities: three observations of global policy and its transnational administration." *Policy & Society*, 43(1): 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puae003.

Montuori, A. 2011. Systems approach. In The SAGE encyclopedia of action research (741-746). Sage Publications.

Nahavandi, A., R.B. Denhardt, J.V. Denhardt, and M.P. Aristigueta. 2015. Organizational behavior. SAGE Publications.

Prabhukar Luitel. 2024. "Role of Non-State Actors in National Security." *Unity Journal* 5(1), 57–75. https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v5i1.63160.

A.N. Kanellopoulos
No.3/2024 (vol. 13)
https://doi.org/10.53477/2284-9378-24-29

Reiners, N. 2021. *Transnational Lawmaking Coalitions for Human Rights*. Cambridge University Press.

Scott, W. R. 2003. Organizations: Rational, Natural, and Open Systems (5th ed.). Prentice Hall.

Zaitsev, Stanislav. 2023. "Political implications of the activities of TNCs: Current trends and impact on the concepts of power, legitimacy and sovereignty." *Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Seriâ 25. Meždunarodnye Otnošeniâ I Mirovaâ Politika* 15(2): 35–64. https://doi.org/10.48015/2076-7404-2023-15-2-35-64.

Thompson, J. D. 1967. Organizations in Action: Social Science Bases of Administrative Theory. McGraw-Hill.

Wilkinson, D. 2011. The ambiguity advantage: What great leaders are great at. Palgrave Macmillan.

Weber, K., and D. Waeger. 2017. "Organizations as Polities: An Open Systems Perspective." *Academy of Management Annals* 11(2): 886–918. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2015.0152.