

Choose a UN Organ or UN Agency. Assess its legitimacy in accordance with Keohane's six criteria for legitimacy.

Introduction:

The United Nations operates many branches and organisations with specific goals. Each of these must attain a level of legitimacy to be able to carry out its work, without an impact being visible on its "right to rule", as Keohane puts it. The subject of this work is the UN organ of the International Court of Justice (ICJ), which is the main organ for distributing justice within the United Nations, and exists to provide a legal framework for states to interact with each other.

Keohane's Criteria:

Robert Keohane is the author of the "Global Governance and Legitimacy" article that details the six criteria for legitimacy. Any international organisation that wishes to attain a sense of legitimacy must fulfil all six criteria to receive it. The six criteria are as follows:

- Minimal Moral Responsibility
- Inclusiveness
- Epistemic Quality
- Accountability
- Compatibility
- Comparative Benefit

While the ICJ may or may not succeed in fulfilling all of the criteria, a description and how successful it is in accomplishing them is necessary to answer the scope of the question. In terms of minimal moral responsibility, the ICJ has grounds to stand on. As the principal organ of justice within the UN, the responsibility falls to the ICJ to set the benchmark for minimal moral responsibility. They set the rules for the rest of the UN and its member states through its rulings, and if it were to break them then all of their resolutions and verdicts would be impacted.

The inclusiveness of the ICJ is also an area in which it succeeds, as all member states of the UN are participants in the organisation. Any state that is recognised by the UN can bring another to court for violation of international law, as has been seen recently with South Africa and Israel. The court must remain inclusive, otherwise bias and indecision would greatly impact on its influence and ability to pass judgement when needed.

Epistemic Quality consists of two attributes: Institutional Integrity and Transparency. Again, this is something that the ICJ, like all UN institutions, has to maintain. The integrity of the court is one of its strongest attributes, as it succeeds in maintaining an impartial view, as all courts must, of individuals until a sentence has been passed. Transparency is another area in which the court succeeds in accordance with the criteria of Keohane, as all recordings and sentences of the court are visible online, and the arguments and deliberations of the court are regularly reported in the media.

Accountability is one of the areas in which the court, as all UN institutions, falls short. Appointing a judge to the court requires the overwhelming consent of both the UN Security

Council and of the General Assembly, as well as the initial nomination period before any UN vote can take place. While this is a more democratic approach by the UN towards facilitating accountability, there is no elected official participating in the selection of the judges to the ICJ at any level, which begs the question of how accountable something can be when the population of a nation do not get a direct say.

Most rulings of the ICJ can be understood to be contentious in nature. The ICJ's own website has a section dedicated to it, and details the results of the court's decisions. How compatible these are with the nations involved is a more complicated issue. In the case of Armenia V. Azerbaijan, the recent conflicts over ethnic regions and the expulsion of large portions of smaller groups from within Azerbaijan should show that this ruling has been totally ignored by both states, showing the lack of compatibility on both sides. The ICJ struggles to be compatible with democratic states because it itself is not seen as democratic.

Comparative benefit states that the impact of an institution must be that its actions create a better world than the one that predated it. The rulings of the ICJ are regularly ignored by nations and institutions, actions which remove any good that the rulings of the court would do. It would be hard to argue if there is any general way in which the court has left the world a better place than it was before its creation, as there is little evidence of it.

Conclusion:

Ultimately, the ICJ, like all UN organisations, has massive faults. It is unaccountable to the peoples of the nations that make up its members, its rulings are regularly ignored by members of the UN, and it exists to settle disputes between nations, an action that it fails at consistently. While it is a transparent organisation, more so than the Security Council, it still has massive failings and misses the mark on too much.

Compare and contrast two theories of international relations: Constructivism Vs. Liberal Institutionalism.

There are many theories of international relations, but this assignment will focus on two: Constructivism and Liberal Institutionalism, sometimes called Neoliberalism. There are undeniable similarities between the two, as will be detailed in the rest of this assignment, but both are different theories in their own right.

Constructivism:

The theory of constructivism states that ideals and shared beliefs guide the international relations of states, and form the building blocks of the foreign policies of nations. There are many examples of this, such as the United Nations shared ideals named in its charter, or the European Union, which has participatory members through shared subscription to the idea of supranationality and greater European integration. There are several main problems with this theory, however. Few nations in the history of the modern nation state have had shared ideas with the strength to overcome their own national interest. For example, the British and French governments, despite espousing the right of all nations to decide their own fate, still chose to intervene in the Suez Crisis on the side of Israel, attempting to force the Egyptian government away from a choice that was completely theirs to make.

A similar argument could be made about American intervention in Vietnam, or Iraq, or Afghanistan. International relations cannot rely on the shared ideals of states, as this is always trumped by the national interests of the nations involved. These are often compounded interests, with the events leading to confrontation between states expediting the problem and increasing its volatility - which of course does not help the problem.

Liberal Institutionalism:

Sometimes referred to as Neoliberalism, the international relations theory of liberal institutionalism is built upon the belief that international relations between states are feasible, realistic goals. It maintains, despite overwhelming evidence to the contrary, that it can reduce conflict and competition. The belief of liberal institutionalists that conflict can be reduced through the process of international relations comes from the belief that increasing interaction between states encourages cooperation and other actions, such as transactional and informational.

Like constructivism, however, it fails to take a realistic approach to the construction of theory. It does not take into account national interests in its formulation of its arguments, and as a result comes across more as a delusionally optimistic approach to international relations than as something realistic. Its connections with Neoliberal fiscal and political policy are obvious, in its misunderstanding and outdated views on how nation states interact and just why and how the failings of these states can be more strongly attributed to the national interest than the theories that their politicians use when interacting with other states.

Conclusion:

To conclude this assignment, the international relations theory of World Systems will be used to add an extra level of contrast to the two previously mentioned. Both constructivism and neoliberalism exist within the confines of a capitalist view of the world. World Systems

Theory has its roots in Marxist and other left-wing ideologies, which is extremely visible in its focus on social conflict, class conflict and capital accumulation. The previously discussed international theories detail opinions and views starkly in favour of capitalist countries, such as the United States, as they can espouse loyalty and interest in upholding them while acting entirely against what they detail.

World Systems Theory on the other hand attempts to deal with the massive inequality that exists between nations on a global scale. Constructivism in its use of shared ideals to encourage nations to interact with one another is capitalistic in its view of using markets and other monetary systems to try to pressure states into cooperating with one another, and the theory of liberal institutionalism is not much different. Both rely on the preexisting order of states, and their imbalances, to interact with and expand the capacity for the world to work together for a good purpose. However, they both fail to understand the importance that national interest has on the decision making of states, and ultimately the two theories are seriously hampered by this. World Systems Theory does more for finding a compromise between keeping the status quo and finding ways to make it more equitable.

Discuss the Evolution of the Concept of Human Rights from the 19th Century until the outbreak of the Cold War.

Human rights as a concept is a difficult subject to pin down as first originating. There are arguments to be made that the signing of the Magna Carta in 1215 by King John in what was then the Kingdom of England are the first example, or at least building blocks, of what would later become known as human rights. Perhaps human rights only became a tangible, defensible concept with the formation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948. This essay will attempt to discuss the history of human rights, and the main events in recent human history that have contributed to it.

Origins of Human Rights:

Human rights in the 19th Century are a complex subject, and unfortunately not in the detail that this essay requires. It should however be immediately obvious that human rights played no part in the colonisation of Africa, or the exploitative regimes of the colonial powers in the rest of the world. The mass impoverishment, disease and genocide that took place across the colonial world should provide good examples as to why the opinion that the colonisation of large swathes of the world was beneficial for human rights in those regions immediately after is false.

The outbreak of the Great War was to prove extremely important for the cause of human rights, with the creation of the League of Nations and other international organisations that claimed to champion human rights being created as a direct result of the conflict. However, it also laid the groundwork for the outbreak of the Second World War, and several interwar conflicts. The League of Nations was impotent to stop the invasion of Ethiopia by Italy, a conflict which saw the repeated violation of the League's resolutions and was a direct act of aggression. It can also not be forgotten that the League did not stand up to Nazi Germany, the Soviet Union or Imperial Japan in their invasions of neighbouring nations, as well as in failing to properly mandate the territories seized from the defeated powers of the Great War.

Perhaps most horrifyingly, and most disappointingly, there was no effort made to halt the march in Germany towards genocide. The international community almost unequivocally refused to accept Jewish refugees fleeing the Holocaust, and only when images and videos of the horror became available to the public did the cause for human rights take off. Despite this, the repeated failings of organisations that were created in the wake of the Second World War, fresh in the memory of those who fought it, limited efforts were made to halt similar levels of death and destruction. The American bombing of North Korea during the Korean War, and the failure of the UN to halt the Anglo-French invasion of Egypt, as well as the failings in the Middle East and India showed that ultimately, the international community was willing to condemn human rights.

Conclusion:

In conclusion, the history of human rights is long and storied. It has been marked by terrible tragedy, and total ignorance by the international community when it was convenient for them. The cause of human rights is a just one, but its core is often manipulated and misused in favour of allowing imperialist states to act in their own interest. The US invasions of Iraq and Afghanistan were often painted with the interest of expanding and developing the human

rights cause in the region, but acted almost entirely against that. How many thousands of lives were lost in the bombing of North Korea? How many were lost in the Nakba, and how many millions had to die in Partition in India because of the ambitions of a few diplomats in Westminster? Their failings in ensuring that human rights were protected shows the contempt that former colonial powers had for the suffering of those who lived under their rule, regardless of whether they were free or not.

If it was not for the colonial and imperialist powers that now sit on the UN Security Council as permanent members, the cause of human rights would be lightyears ahead of where it is. But due to the negligence, wilful ignorance and total disregard of the permanent members of the security council, the dream of universal human rights is dead.