

1. Choose an UN organ or UN agency. Assess the legitimacy of the World Health Organization (WHO) in accordance with Keohane's six criteria for legitimacy.
2. Choose two theories from the ones we've discussed: Realism, Classical liberal internationalism, Liberal institutionalism, and Constructivism. Compare and contrast the two you've chosen.
3. Discuss the evolution of the concept of human rights from the 19th century to the 20th century. (Up to the Cold War- lecture 6).

The legitimacy of the World Health Organization (WHO) has been a topic of discussion among scholars and policymakers. WHO is a critical international organization that plays a key role in global health governance. According to Robert Keohane, a prominent scholar in the field of international relations, an institution's legitimacy should be based on six criteria: minimal moral acceptability, inclusiveness, epistemic quality (integrity/transparency), accountability, compatibility with democratic governance, and comparative benefit. By examining the WHO through these criteria, we can better understand its legitimacy and effectiveness in addressing global health challenges.

Keohane's first criterion stipulates that an international institution must have minimal moral acceptability to be considered legitimate, ensuring that an organization's actions respect human rights. Minimal moral acceptability is an important criteria for legitimacy, as it ensures that the actions and decisions of an organization are in line with international laws and norms. As the leader in global health, the WHO owes minimal social accountability towards those it has a significant impact on (especially marginalized and vulnerable populations). The ideals of the WHO are focused on global health which is morally acceptable and the WHO has built acceptability through its track record of effectively responding to global health crises. Also, the WHO follows ethical laws/regulations. However, WHO has been critiqued for exhibiting cultural relativism and lacking universal guidelines resulting in inconsistencies, which questions its ethicality.

Inclusivity is another key aspect of legitimacy, as it ensures that all relevant stakeholders have a voice in the decision-making process. The WHO embraces participation through its member states, which have a role in setting the organization's priorities and policies. Additionally, the WHO engages with civil society organizations, academia, and the private sector to gather diverse perspectives and expertise in addressing global health challenges. However, there have been concerns about the dominance of certain rich countries like the USA in decision-making processes, questioning WHO'S inclusivity.

Transparency is crucial for legitimacy, as it fosters trust and accountability in an organization's actions. The WHO demonstrates epistemic quality by making its policies, decisions, and financial information publicly available. This transparency helps to build credibility and trust among stakeholders, including member states, donors, and the public.

In today's society, it is expected that every organization be accountable and responsible to those it holds power over. The WHO has mechanisms in place to hold itself accountable, such as regular evaluations and audits of its programs and activities. The WHO also annually hosts The World Health Assembly meeting with representatives from all 194 member states. Additionally, member states can hold the organization accountable through their oversight and funding contributions. However, the WHO has faced criticism for its response to the COVID-19 pandemic, particularly regarding its communication and coordination with member states. Some countries have accused the organization of being slow to declare the outbreak a public health emergency of international concern and of not providing timely and accurate information. Also there have been concerns about ineffective resources management and inadequate attempts to address global health issues.

Compatibility with democratic governance is important for state corporations as the success of health initiatives depends on the level of support and stability in specific regions. Health issues often require tough decisions that may not be favorable for everyone, creating national/global tension. The WHO's actions may not always align with the sovereignty of individual states, as a shifting coalition of states and NGOs is often involved in health issues. The WHO's independence from political influence and reliance on voluntary funding from member states and external donors raises concerns about its ability to prioritize public health over political interests. As the highest authority providing global health in an international system, the WHO is held to high standards and expectations by society. The WHO has played a crucial role in leading health matters, setting norms/standards, combating infectious diseases, promoting vaccination programs, providing emergency assistance and providing healthcare services to vulnerable populations making its comparative benefit overwhelming. Despite criticisms, the WHO's commitment to global health is evident in its significant contributions.

In conclusion, the World Health Organization has come under scrutiny/fire for its legitimacy. However, an assessment of WHO shows its legitimacy in accordance with Keohane's six criteria. The WHO has demonstrated its moral acceptability, inclusivity, procedural, transparency, accountability, and comparative benefits. However, the WHO also faces challenges in terms of funding and coordination with member states. Its inability to meet all global demands has weakened public confidence, questioning its effectiveness and accountability in an era of global governance. However, despite these escalating criticisms the WHO still holds legitimacy as a key player in global health.

No 2.

Realism and classical liberalism are two significant theories in international relations that offer competing perspectives on how states interact with one another. Realism, founded by scholars like Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes, is rooted in the idea that states are primarily concerned with their own security and survival in a world characterized by anarchy. In contrast, classical liberalism, developed by thinkers like Adam Smith and Immanuel Kant, holds that cooperation and peaceful interactions between states are possible through institutions and mutual respect for shared values and norms. I will critically compare and contrast the key tenets of realism and classical liberalism, examining their views on international relations, human nature, the role of states, and the prospects for peace and prosperity in the international system.

One of the key differences between realism and classical/liberal international relations theory lies in their view of human nature. Realists tend to have a pessimistic view of human nature, believing that individuals and states are driven by self-interest and a desire for power. They argue that this leads to competition and conflict in international relations. In contrast, classical/liberal theorists believe that human beings are capable of reason, empathy, and cooperation, and that these qualities can be harnessed to build a more peaceful and just world.

Another key distinction between realism and classical liberalism is their views on the role of the state in international relations. Realists argue that the state is the primary actor in the international arena, with its primary goal being the protection and advancement of its own interests. Realists argue that the balance of power is a key determinant of stability in the international system with power being the primary currency in international politics. This often involves competition and conflict with other states, as each seeks to secure its own survival in a dangerous and uncertain world. In contrast, classical liberals emphasize the importance of soft power, diplomacy between international institutions and organizations, and multilateral cooperation in peaceful international relations. They believe that states can work together to address common challenges and achieve mutual benefits through diplomacy and dialogue.

Additionally, realists see the international system as anarchic, meaning that there is no higher authority or central government to enforce rules and regulate behavior. They argue that states must rely on their own capabilities and resources to survive in this competitive environment. In contrast, classical/liberal theorists believe that states can work together to create institutions, norms, and rules that promote cooperation and resolve disputes peacefully.

Furthermore, realism and classical liberalism have differing perspectives on the prospects for peace and prosperity in the international system. Realists are generally pessimistic about the possibility of achieving lasting peace and stability, as they believe that states will always prioritize their own interests over those of others leading to the perpetuation of conflict. In contrast, classical liberals are more optimistic about the potential for peace and cooperation between states, as they believe that shared values and norms can serve as the basis for peaceful interactions and mutual understanding.

Despite these differences, realism and classical/liberal international relations theory share some commonalities. Both perspectives recognize the importance of power and security in international relations, and both emphasize the role of states as key actors in the international system. They also both recognize the impact of historical and cultural factors on international politics, and the significance of leadership and decision-making in shaping foreign policy. Additionally, both perspectives acknowledge the role of non-state actors, such as multinational corporations, non-governmental organizations, and international terrorist groups, in shaping the international environment.

In sum, realism and classical liberalism offer contrasting views on international relations, human behavior, the role of the state, and the prospects for peace and prosperity in the international system. Realists believe that states are inherently self-interested and power-hungry, leading to a competitive and conflict-prone world. In contrast, classical liberals argue that states can cooperate, and form alliances based on shared values and interests, creating a more peaceful and stable international system. Realists emphasize power politics, conflict, and the competitive nature of the international system, while classical/liberal theorists stress cooperation, diplomacy, and the importance of international institutions. While these two theories may have their differences, they both offer valuable insights into the complexities of international relations and the challenges facing states in the modern world. By critically comparing realism and classical/liberal international relations theory, we can gain a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of global politics and the challenges facing the international community today.

No. 3

The evolution of human rights in the 19th and 20th centuries was shaped by a variety of social, political, and economic factors, including the spread of democratic ideas, the rise of nationalism, and the aftermath of two world wars. The emergence of key documents like the

French Declaration of the Rights of Man and of the Citizen and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in the early 18th century, laid the groundwork for the modern human rights movement. Furthermore, events like the American Civil War marked by the abolition of slavery, and the suffrage movement were significant in shaping human rights history, emphasizing the need for human rights, challenging exploitation and dehumanization. During this period, the concept of human rights began to take on a more universal and humanitarian character, as nations sought to protect the rights and dignity of all individuals.

The League of Nations, established in 1919, at the negotiations over the Treaty of Versailles following the end of World War I, aimed to prevent future wars and promote international cooperation in the aftermath of World War I. Despite the Great Depression, the League promoted universal peace and established the International Labour Organization, confirming modern economic/social rights. However, it failed to prevent World War II, highlighting the limitations of international cooperation in protecting human rights during conflict. The League's establishment marked a significant step forward in the evolution of human rights.

The period between the two world wars was a pivotal time in human rights development.. The atrocities committed during these global conflicts highlighted the urgency of establishing a comprehensive framework for protecting human rights on a global scale. The horror of the Holocaust, atomic weapons and the League's failure compelled the international community to create a new peace based on the recognition of fundamental human rights and take effective measures to prevent future wars. Consequently, the United Nations (UN) Charter was created in 1945, which aimed to prioritize the protection of human rights as a fundamental aspect of international peace and security. As part of the UN's dedication to human rights, the Commission on Human Rights was established under Eleanor Roosevelt in 1946, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights was adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1948 which further solidified the recognition of human rights as a universal and fundamental principle that should be upheld by all nations. Conventions like the Geneva and Hague Conventions were also established to protect human rights during wartime. However, a power struggle between the USSR and Western states caused the Cold War, leading to a split in the commission and two separate bills of rights for the East and West.

The Cold War era, which spanned from the late 1940s to the early 1990s, was a particularly tumultuous period in the evolution of human rights, marked by entrenchment of a

liberal-democratic vs individualistic interpretation of human rights. The ideological rivalry between the United States and the Soviet Union, and their respective allies, led to the proliferation of authoritarian regimes and human rights abuses in many parts of the world. The concept of human rights became a central issue in the ideological conflict between these superpowers, with each side accusing the other of violating the rights of its citizens and supporting repressive regimes.

The end of the Cold War in the early 1990s marked a new chapter in the evolution of human rights, as the collapse of communist regimes in Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union led to a wave of democratic transitions and political reforms. The concept of human rights began to take on a more prominent role in international affairs, as countries around the world sought to uphold the principles of democracy, rule of law, and respect for human rights. The establishment of international criminal tribunals, such as the International Criminal Court, marked a significant step forward in the fight against impunity for human rights violations and war crimes.

In conclusion, the evolution of human rights during the 19th and 20th centuries to the Cold War era was marked by significant progress and setbacks, as nations grappled with the challenges of protecting individual freedoms, promoting social justice, and upholding the principles of human dignity/equality. Important events such as the abolition of slavery, the League of Nations and the UN marked the evolution of human rights during this period. However, the first part of the 20th century and the horrors of two World Wars was the catalyst that the world needed to create a lasting and meaningful international human rights protection system.