

1. Choose an UN organ or agency. Assess its legitimacy in accordance with Keohane's six criteria for legitimacy.

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) is an international development agency that seeks to support countries in eradicating poverty and achieving the United Nations' (UN) Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Using American academic Robert Keohane's criteria for determining the legitimacy of institutions of global governance, the legitimacy of the UNDP is analysed as follows.

- 1. Minimal Moral Acceptability:** Keohane describes this standard as an emphasis on the democratic nature of an organisation and its focus on recognising and protecting human rights. Thus a "minimal" or more aptly 'minimum' moral acceptability must be present in order for an institution to be legitimate. In principle, the UNDP works in accordance with the standards of democracy and human rights that have been proffered by the United Nations and widely accepted globally. The institution's focus on development and the achievement of the UN's SDGs exhibits that their intentions and activities are working towards a common good, and have at least a minimum of moral acceptability.
- 2. Inclusiveness:** This criterion values the scope of people that are able to contribute to the institution, as it aims to operate on a global basis. Thus, the inclusion of a diverse and well-balanced population is a criterion of legitimacy. The UNDP in its goals to achieve equality, has a diverse internal population from across the globe. The institution also consults with Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs) and other stakeholders for their development projects and policies. Despite this, a level of inequality persists within the institution as more powerful member states tend to dominate the decision-making processes.
- 3. Epistemic quality:** This criterion relates to the democratic practices of an institution, specifically through transparency and consistency of principles. Keohane states that the legitimacy of an institution in this criterion is judged by the beliefs that the institution is based on in comparison to its actions as a body. In carrying out its development work, the UNDP has mostly remained consistent in its practices and principles. Despite this, their epistemic quality is downgraded as a result of their partnerships with authoritarian regimes such as Russia, which has a track record of conduct that violates human rights and contradicts their values as an institution. In fact, in 2020, allegations emerged from the American publication 'Foreign Policy' that the UNDP had instances of corruption in their relationship with Russia, and that millions of funds aimed towards climate change projects had been mismanaged.
- 4. Accountability:** Keohane's criterion of accountability requires that there are specific standards that the institution is expected to meet, information on the institution's performance be easily accessible and that the stakeholders be able to enforce some level of retribution if the institution does not meet its standards. The UNDP has institutional

mechanisms that allow for accountability. Its Accountability Framework is easily accessible and states the standards which the institution is expected to meet. Its Executive Board conducts evaluations and audits of its projects, as well as the Independent Evaluation Office that works to strengthen accountability within the body. While these measures are in place, the effectiveness of them in providing accountability is questionable, as issues of corruption and mismanagement have been identified externally as discussed before with Russia.

5. **Compatibility:** This criterion entails that there must be a level of consent given by the public that the institution works for, with the ability to deny policies that may not suit them. The UNDP operates solely through the consent of its member states, all of which voluntarily support the institution through donations and resources. This provides a good level of legitimacy from this criterion.
6. **Comparative Benefit:** This criterion stipulates that the institution must produce results that are better than any alternatives could create. While the UNDP has made significant developments in poverty reduction and capacity building globally, its benefits still delay in addressing inequality, sustainability and governance. Albeit, these issues are influenced by other factors such as conflicts, politics and economic flows that the UNDP would be unable to address individually.

While stating his criteria, Keohane cautioned against a polar approach in assessing the legitimacy of a body, and instead argued that legitimacy is a matter of degree. The UNDP though falling short in inclusiveness, accountability and epistemic quality, still contributes significant benefit to the global community through its work and has good levels of morality, compatibility and comparative benefit. While the organisation is certainly not a poster child for Global Governance by this criteria, it still holds a level of legitimacy that supports its continued work.

2. Compare and Contrast Realism and Liberal Institutionalism.

Realism and Liberal Institutionalism both exist as prominent theories in the field of global governance. These theories, while sharing some similarities, exist as two opposing ends of the spectrum of political thought surrounding international organisation.

In their foundational principles, both Realism and Liberal Institutionalism view states (countries) as the key actors in international organisation, however their perceptions of states' motivations differ significantly. Realism attributes states' participation in international organisation as actions primarily furthering their self-interest and to support their pursuit of power. Similarly, Liberal Institutionalism acknowledges this self-interest present with states, but does not view it as an inherent characteristic. Instead, Liberal Institutionalists believe that this self-interest can be overcome through the cooperation and collaboration that international organisations can foster.

Additionally, both theoretical frameworks have differing perspectives on the term 'international organisation' and what exactly it entails. Realism acknowledges international organisation as a by-product of the Westphalian system, which refers to the Treaties of Westphalia in 1648 which was credited for ending the Thirty Years War and securing the notion of state sovereignty. The Westphalian 'System' consequently emerged, and refers to an international organisation of states within a recognised territory with a monopoly of force and military power. As such Realists' perspective of international organisation is deeply rooted in the interaction of states in the pursuit of power. According to Realism, this interaction leads to the emergence of certain patterns of order within the international organisation, allowing more powerful states to wield more control over others through its system.

On the other hand, Liberal Institutionalism holds a more optimistic view of International Organisation. According to this framework, International Organisation is crucial in the establishment and maintenance of peace and cooperation between states. It emphasises that states can overcome the nature of competition and self-interest between states, through international organisation which links like-minded states with mutual interests. The framework relies heavily on the concept of Universalism, which makes the notions of International Organisation applicable to all.

Both Realism and Institutional Liberalism, while being widely popular, also produce many critics. Both concepts share a variety of criticisms of their foundational ideologies, and have been argued to be hypocritical in nature. The pessimistic character of the Realist framework, while attracting many supporters, has also brought forth many criticisms. It is often argued that Realism's focus on power politics and self-interest inadvertently influences more conservative foreign policies and relations and has an opposite effect than intended. Instead of primarily serving as a critique of International Organisation, Realism often reinforces the power politics

that it seeks to address. As well as this, the assumptions and patterns that Realism produces, may lead to skewed analyses of International Organisation which do not accurately identify factors that may exist outside of Realism's typical scope.

The liberal nature of Liberal Institutionalism ideology remains one of its most controversial elements and has been widely criticised. Many argue that its framework is fundamentally Eurocentric and privileges a specific set of powerful nations (such as the United States and Britain). Many criticisms also arise from its incompatibility with non-liberal governments and developing countries which yield little power (which mainly exist within the Global South and non-Western regions). As Liberal Institutionalism claims to support cooperation and to some extent 'equality', this criticism highlights some contradictions that exist within its framework. Additionally, the emergence of powerful non-liberal nations such as China and Russia have brought to question the longevity of Liberal Institutionalism as these players increasingly dominate the global stage.

While Realism and Liberal Institutionalism are often posited as completely opposing frameworks, there are several important similarities that are shared between the concepts. The fundamental view of states as the primary actors of International Organisation, as well as the acknowledgement of the presence of self-interest and power politics in International Organisation, link these two concepts significantly. As well as this, they both share an element of contradiction within their theories that have led to widespread criticism. Nevertheless, the stark differences between these theories solidify their nature as somewhat opposites, as they contrast each other severely in their perceptions of states' motivations and their grounding theories.

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 concept of Human Rights has undergone a metamorphosis spanning several centuries, to become its established self in modern times. The 19th Century was a crucial period for Human Rights, as several revolutions emerged which were the first of their kinds to enshrine a national polity with concepts of accepted human rights. This period led the movement of human rights in nationalist nature, through which individual states sought to establish agreed rights to protect and empower their citizens. The 20th Century served as a turning point in the nationalist element of the human rights movement. While individual states still sought to establish and enforce human rights, a larger effort was being put towards an international movement which would encourage an interstate recognition of human rights which proved crucial in its development as a concept.

As a result of a litany of conflicts within and between states, existing class struggles and oppressive structures, the concept of human rights in the 19th Century gained increasing popularity and significance.

At the start of the century, the infamous Haitian Revolution ended in 1804 and brought forth the liberation of slaves in the French colony. The successful revolution shifted the concept of human rights, which in previous centuries was strictly Eurocentric in nature, and allowed it to be applied to non-white races who were grotesquely oppressed. The revolution supported a new wave of liberation of the enslaved within the Caribbean, supporting other revolutions on smaller islands to follow, which ultimately led to the emancipation of slaves in 1834. Meanwhile in Europe, a similar sense of liberation was manifesting as well, which sought to remove social hierarchies and oppressions. The French Revolution of 1848 (February Revolution) led to the collapse of the existing French Monarchy and led to more equitable structures within France, that limited means of oppression by the aristocracy.

In addition to movements of social and political liberation, the concept of human rights also developed in very practical elements in the 19th Century. The warfare that existed during the period, particularly in Europe, brought forth considerations of the physical protections of humans and created a basis for an understanding of how multilateral agreements can protect human rights. This was encompassed in the creation of the Geneva Conventions in 1864 which protected and governed those who were sick or wounded by war. This convention acted as a major milestone in the Human Rights Movement, as it sought to protect the rights of those who were participants in war.

The 20th Century saw more concrete developments in the Human Rights Movement. The nature of the movement was reactionary in nature, but focused significantly on building a framework for the future, and creating inter-state relationships that would encourage peace. This development was greatly influenced by the emergence of World Wars I and II and the Cold War.

After World War I, the regularly criticised League of Nations was created with the aim of maintaining world peace and resolving international disputes. After World War II, the United Nations was created in 1945 and replaced the failed League of Nations. The establishment of the United Nations served as one of the first effective measures of international cooperation and global governance and became arguably the most prolific human rights body. In 1948, The Universal Declaration of Human Rights was officially created and adopted by the United Nations General Assembly. The document still serves as one of the most important developments in human rights, as the rights and freedoms of all humans are enshrined in it. This solidified human rights as more than just a concept, but a well-defined and globally agreed upon institution. This was followed by the creation of several other bodies and conventions that focused on human rights, including the European Convention on Human Rights in 1950 and the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights in 1955.

The international cooperation which emerged in the 20th Century allowed for the liberation of smaller states that were in need of external support. In South Africa, the Anti-Apartheid Movement was greatly supported by the British population, who demanded that the British Government cease to support the oppressive Apartheid regime. Furthermore, the Women's Rights and Civil Rights movements began to spread globally, as these issues were being recognised not merely as national issues, but as shared issues globally.

Human Rights as a concept evolved significantly from the 19th Century's nationalist perception to the 20th Century's International movement. While the emergence of human rights as a concept was definitely reactionary in nature, unfolding from the oppressive and violent features of each century, the shift from its nationalist to international focus allowed for a more established notion of human rights and supported collective efforts to create a more peaceful and equitable global society.