

<b>Course Name</b>	<b>: International Relations and Politics</b>
<b>Course Code</b>	<b>: BIRD 115</b>
<b>Course level</b>	<b>: level 1</b>
<b>Credit Units</b>	<b>: 4 CU</b>
<b>Contact Hours</b>	<b>: 60 Hrs</b>

### **Course Objective**

By the end of this course unit, students should be able to explain the history and development of international relations through use of different theories. They also understand lessons that can be drawn for their respective country's economic development. Students also got to identify inter-governmental organizations and show its success and failures in the promotion of world (international) relations

### **Course Content**

International relations  
History of international politics  
Theory of international politics  
Concepts is international relations  
Systematic tools of international relations  
Institutions in International relations  
United nations  
Human rights and humanitarian assistance  
Social and Economic Development  
Controversy and criticisms  
Arab - Israel conflict  
Political Economy  
Political History of the world  
State Institutions  
Objections and use of term

### **Mode of delivery**

Personal study  
Face to face lectures  
DVD/VHS  
Online presentations

### **Assessment**

**Course work** 40%  
**Exams** 60%  
**Total Mark** 100%

## **International Politics**

**International relations (IR)** or **International Studies (IS)** represents the study of foreign affairs and global issues among states within the international system, including the roles of states, inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), non-governmental organizations (NGOs), and multinational corporations (MNCs). It is both an academic and public policy field, and can be either positive or normative as it both seeks to analyze as well as formulate the foreign policy of particular states. It is often considered a branch of political science.

Apart from political science, IR draws upon such diverse fields as economics, history, law, philosophy, geography, sociology, anthropology, psychology, and cultural studies. It involves a diverse range of issues including but not limited to: globalization, state sovereignty, ecological sustainability, nuclear proliferation, nationalism, economic development, global finance, terrorism, organized crime, human security, foreign interventionism and human rights.

### ***History***

The history of international relations is often traced back to the Peace of Westphalia of 1648, where the modern state system was developed. Prior to this, the European medieval organization of political authority was based on a vaguely hierarchical religious order. Westphalia instituted the legal concept of sovereignty, which essentially meant that rulers, or the legitimate sovereigns, had no internal equals within a defined territory and no external superiors as the ultimate authority within the territory's sovereign borders. A simple way to view this is that sovereignty says, "I'm not allowed to tell you what to do and you are not allowed to tell me what to do." Classical Greek and Roman authority at times resembled the Westphalian system, but both lacked the notion of sovereignty.

Westphalia encouraged the rise of the independent nation-state, the institutionalization of diplomacy and armies. This particular European system was exported to the Americas, Africa, and Asia via colonialism and the "standards of civilization". The contemporary international system was finally established through decolonization during the Cold War. However, this is somewhat over-simplified. While the nation-state system is considered "modern", many states have not incorporated the system and are termed "pre-modern". Further, a handful of states have moved beyond the nation-state system and can be considered "post-modern". The ability of contemporary IR discourse to explain the relations of these different types of states is disputed. "Levels of analysis" is a way of looking at the international system, which includes the individual level, the domestic nation-state as a unit, the international level of transnational and intergovernmental affairs, and the global level.

What is explicitly recognized as International Relations theory was not developed until after World War I, and is dealt with in more detail below. IR theory, however, has a long tradition of drawing on the work of other social sciences. The use of capitalizations of the "I" and "R" in International Relations aims to distinguish the academic discipline of International Relations from the phenomena of international relations. Many cite Thucydides' *History of the Peloponnesian War* as the inspiration for realist theory, with Hobbes' *Leviathan* and Machiavelli's *The Prince* providing further elaboration. Similarly, liberalism draws upon the work of Kant and Rousseau, with the work of the former often being cited as the first elaboration of democratic peace theory. Though contemporary human rights is considerably different than the type of rights envisioned under natural law, Francisco de Vitoria, Hugo Grotius and John Locke offered the first accounts of universal entitlement to certain rights on the basis of common humanity. In the twentieth century, in addition to contemporary theories of liberal internationalism, Marxism has been a foundation of international relations.

## **Theory**

IR theories can be roughly divided into one of two epistemological camps: "positivist" and "post-positivist". Positivist theories aim to replicate the methods of the natural sciences by analysing the impact of material forces. They typically focus on features of international relations such as state interactions, size of military forces, balance of powers etc. Post-positivist epistemology rejects the idea that the social world can be studied in an objective and value-free way. It rejects the central ideas of neo-realism/liberalism, such as rational choice theory, on the grounds that the scientific method cannot be applied to the social world and that a 'science' of IR is impossible.

A key difference between the two positions is that while positivist theories, such as neo-realism, offer causal explanations (such as why and how power is exercised), post-positivist theories focus instead on constitutive questions, for instance what is meant by 'power'; what makes it up, how it is experienced and how it is reproduced. Often, post-positivist theories explicitly promote a normative approach to IR, by considering ethics. This is something which has often been ignored under 'traditional' IR as positivist theories make a distinction between 'facts' and normative judgments, or 'values'.

During the late 1980s/1990 debate between positivists and post-positivists became the dominant debate and has been described as constituting the Third "Great Debate" (Lapid 1989).

## **Positivist Theories**

### **Realism**

**Realism** focuses on state security and power above all else. Early realists such as E.H. Carr and Hans Morgenthau argued that states are self-interested, power-seeking rational actors, who seek to maximize their security and chances of survival. Any cooperation between states is explained as functional in order to maximize each individual state's security (as opposed to more idealistic reasons). Many realists saw World War II as the vindication of their theory. It should be noted that classical writers such as Thucydides, Machiavelli, and Hobbes are often cited as "founding fathers" of realism by contemporary self-described realists.<sup>[citation needed]</sup> However, while their work may support realist doctrine, it is not likely that they would have classified themselves as realists (in this sense of the term). Realists are often split up into two groups: Classical or Human Nature Realists (as described here) and Structural or Neorealists (below).

### Liberalism/idealism/Liberal Internationalism

**Liberal international relations theory** arose after World War I in response to the inability of states to control and limit war in their international relations. Early adherents include Woodrow Wilson and Norman Angell, who argued vigorously that states mutually gained from cooperation and that war was so destructive to be essentially futile. Liberalism was not recognized as a coherent theory as such until it was collectively and derisively termed idealism by E. H. Carr. A new version of "idealism" that focused on human rights as the basis of the legitimacy of international law was advanced by Hans Köchler.

### Neoliberalism

**Neoliberalism** seeks to update liberalism by accepting the neorealist presumption that states are the key actors in international relations, but still maintains that non-state actors (NSAs) and intergovernmental organizations (IGOs) matter. Proponents such as Maria Chattha argue that states will cooperate irrespective of relative gains, and are thus concerned with absolute gains. This also means that nations are, in essence, free to make their own choices as to how they will go about conducting policy without any international organizations blocking a nation's right to sovereignty. Neoliberalism also contains an economic theory that is based on the use of open and free markets with little, if any, government intervention to prevent monopolies and other conglomerates from forming. The growing interdependence throughout and after the Cold War through international institutions led to neo-liberalism being defined as institutionalism, this new part of the theory being fronted by Robert Keohane and also Joseph Nye.

### Regime Theory

**Regime theory** is derived from the liberal tradition that argues that international institutions or regimes affect the behavior of states (or other

international actors). It assumes that cooperation is possible in the anarchic system of states, indeed, regimes are by definition, instances of international cooperation.

While realism predicts that conflict should be the norm in international relations, regime theorists say that there is cooperation despite anarchy. Often they cite cooperation in trade, human rights and collective security among other issues. These instances of cooperation are regimes. The most commonly cited definition of regimes comes from Stephen Krasner. Krasner defines regimes as "institutions possessing norms, decision rules, and procedures which facilitate a convergence of expectations."

Not all approaches to regime theory, however are liberal or neoliberal; some realist scholars like Joseph Greico have developed hybrid theories which take a realist based approach to this fundamentally liberal theory. (Realists don't say cooperation *never* happens, just that it's not the norm; it's a difference of degree).

### **Post-positivist/reflectivist theories**

#### **International society theory (the English school)**

**International society theory**, also called the **English School**, focuses on the shared norms and values of states and how they regulate international relations. Examples of such norms include diplomacy, order, and international law. Unlike neo-realism, it is not necessarily positivist. Theorists have focused particularly on humanitarian intervention, and are subdivided between solidarists, who tend to advocate it more, and pluralists, who place greater value in order and sovereignty. Nicholas Wheeler is a prominent solidarist, while Hedley Bull and Robert H. Jackson are perhaps the best known pluralists.

#### **Social Constructivism**

Social Constructivism encompasses a broad range of theories that aim to address questions of ontology, such as the Structure and agency debate, as well as questions of epistemology, such as the "material/ideational" debate that concerns the relative role of material forces versus ideas. Constructivism is not a theory of IR in the manner of neo-realism, but is instead a social theory which is used to better explain the actions taken by states and other major actors as well as the identities that guide these states and actors.

Constructivism in IR can be divided into what Hopf (1998) calls 'conventional' and 'critical' constructivism. Common to all varieties of constructivism is an interest in the role that ideational forces play. The most famous constructivist scholar, Alexander Wendt noted in a 1992 article in *International Organization*

(later followed up by a book, *Social Theory of International Politics* (1999)), that "anarchy is what states make of it". By this he means that the anarchical structure that neo-realists claim governs state interaction is in fact a phenomenon that is socially constructed and reproduced by states. For example, if the system is dominated by states that see anarchy as a life or death situation (what Wendt terms a "Hobbesian" anarchy) then the system will be characterised by warfare. If on the other hand anarchy is seen as restricted (a "Lockean" anarchy) then a more peaceful system will exist. Anarchy in this view is constituted by state interaction, rather than accepted as a natural and immutable feature of international life as viewed by neo-realist IR scholars.

### **Critical international relations theory**

**Critical international relations theory** is a set of schools of thought in international relations (IR) that have criticized the status-quo—both from positivist positions as well as postpositivist positions. Positivist critiques include Marxist and Neo-Marxist approaches and Neo-Gramscianism. Some may also consider Social Constructivism as a positivist theory. Postpositivist critiques include postmodernist, postcolonial and feminist approaches, which differ from both realism and liberalism in their epistemological and ontological premises. Critical theory is also widely deployed by scholars working in this area.

Such theories are now widely recognized and taught and researched in most universities, but are as yet less common in the United States. They are taught at both undergraduate and postgraduate levels in many major universities outside the US, where a major concern is that "a myopic discipline of IR might contribute to the continued development of a civil society in the U.S. that thinks, reflects and analyzes complex international events through a very narrow set of theoretical lenses.

### **Marxist theories**

Marxist and Neo-Marxist international relations theories are positivist paradigms which reject the realist/liberal view of state conflict or cooperation; instead focusing on the economic and material aspects. It makes the assumption that the economy trumps other concerns; allowing for the elevation of *class* as the focus of study. Marxists view the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation. The ultimate goal of Marxist theory is to transform the international society into a collective utopia.

## **Social Constructivism**

Social Constructivism is an attempt at bringing some of the epistemological and ontological premise of postpositivistic theories into positivism. Its proponents claim it is a middle ground between positivist and postpositivist theories. Social Constructivism focuses on the power of ideas in defining the international system—its founder, Alexander Wendt, noted that *anarchy is what states make of it*, implying that the international structure is not only a *constraint* on state action, but in fact *constitutes* state action through constituting the identities and interest of state agents.

## **Criticisms**

Social Constructivism is considered by many postpositivists as being positivist as the focus of analysis is the state (*at the ignorance of other factors such as ethnicity, class, race or gender*); and considered by many positivists as postpositivist, as it forgoes many positivist assumptions.

## **Postpositivist theories**

Postpositivist (or reflectivist) theories of IR attempt to integrate a larger variety of security concerns. Supporters argue that if IR is the study of foreign affairs and relations, it ought to include non-state actors as well as the state. Instead of studying solely *high politics* of the state, IR ought to study world politics of the *everyday world*—which involves BOTH high and low politics. Thus, issues such as gender (*often in terms of feminism which generally holds salient the subordination of women to men—though newer feminisms allow for the reverse too*) and ethnicity (*such as stateless actors like the Kurds or Palestinians*) can be *problematized* and made into an international security issue—supplanting (*not replacing*) the traditional IR concerns of diplomacy and outright war.

The postpositivist approach can be described as *incredulity towards metanarratives*—in IR, this would involve rejecting all-encompassing stories that claim to explain the international system. It argues that neither realism nor liberalism could be the full story. A postpositivist approach to IR does not claim to provide universal answers but seeks to ask questions instead. A key difference is that while positivist theories such as realism and liberalism highlight *how power is exercised*, postpositivist theories focus on *how power is experienced* resulting in a focus on both different subject matters and agents.

Often, postpositivist theories explicitly promote a normative approach to IR, by considering ethics. This is something which has often been ignored under traditional IR as positivist theories make a distinction between positive facts and normative judgements—whereas postpositivists argue that *discourse is constitutive of reality*; in other words, that it is impossible to be truly independent and factual as power-free knowledge cannot exist. (#)

Postpositivist theories do not attempt to be scientific or a social science. Instead, they attempt to in-depth analysis of cases in order to "understand" international political phenomena by asking relevant questions to determine in what ways the status-quo promote certain power relations.

## **Feminism**

Feminist IR is a broad term given to those scholars who have sought to bring a concern with gender into the academic study of international politics. In terms of IR theory it is important to understand that feminism is derived from the school of thought known as reflectionism. One of the most influential works in feminist IR is Cynthia Enloe's *Bananas, Beaches and Bases* (Pandora Press 1990). This text sought to chart the many different roles that women play in international politics: as plantation sector workers, diplomatic wives, sex workers on military bases etc. The important point of this work was to emphasise how when we look at international politics from the perspective of women we are forced to reconsider what we think international politics is 'all about'. However, it would be a mistake to think that feminist IR was solely a matter of identifying how many groups of women are positioned in the international political system. From its inception, feminist IR has always shown a strong concern with thinking about men and, in particular, masculinities. Indeed, many IR feminists argue that the discipline is inherently masculine in nature. For example, in her article "Sex and Death in the Rational World of Defense Intellectuals" *Signs* (1988), Carol Cohn identified how a highly masculinised culture within the defense establishment contributed to the divorcing of war from human emotion.

What is evident, therefore, is that a feminist IR involves looking at how international politics effects and is affected by both men and women and also at how the core concepts that are employed within the discipline of IR (e.g. war, security etc) are themselves thoroughly gendered. It should also be noted that feminist IR has not only concerned itself with the traditional focus of IR on states, wars, diplomacy and security - feminist IR scholars have also emphasised the importance of looking at how gender shapes the current global political economy. In this sense, there is no clear cut division between feminists working in IR and those working in the area of International Political Economy (IPE).

Feminist IR emerged largely from the late 1980s onwards. The end of the Cold War and the re-evaluation of traditional IR theory during the 1990s opened up a space for gendering International Relations. Because feminist IR is linked broadly to the critical project in IR, by and large most feminist scholarship has sought to problematise the politics of knowledge construction within the discipline - often by adopting methodologies of deconstructivism associated with postmodernism/poststructuralism. The growing influence of feminist and women-centric approaches within the international policy communities (for



example at the World Bank and the United Nations) is more reflective of the liberal feminist emphasis on equality of opportunity for women.

## Criticisms

By focusing on 'traditional' women's roles (as victims or being *used* by men), feminist IR may exclude those women participating as diplomats or soldiers as well as ignoring men's issue such as why it is generally *men* are forced to fight in wars. Furthermore, as with criticisms with feminism in general, feminism almost always treats women as the subject of analysis at the exclusion of men—whether as agents or victims. In defence, some feminisms do consider men—though it still often makes the assumption that due to patriarchy, a certain, *rational man* is privileged. This may result in a confirmation bias.

Two of the most well known scholars to raise criticisms of feminist IR have been Robert Keohane and Francis Fukuyama. Keohane's target was not feminist IR per se but the attachment of many feminist IR scholars to postmodernist methodologies and theories. For Keohane, feminist IR need to develop scientific testable theories—a claim that J. Ann Tickner responded to with her piece 'You Just Don't Understand!'. Fukuyama suggested that the problem with feminist IR was that it put forward the view that if women ran the world then we would live in a much more peaceful world, a claim that he disputed.<sup>[citation needed]</sup> In fact, few feminist IR scholars have argued this,<sup>[citation needed]</sup> and even those that have would put forward a much more nuanced and sophisticated argument than that suggested by Fukuyama.

## Postcolonialism

Postcolonial IR challenges the *eurocentrism* of IR—particularly its parochial assumption that Western Enlightenment thinking is superior, progressive and universally applicable. Postcolonialists argue that this is enabled through constructing the *Other* as irrational and backwards.<sup>[2]</sup>

Postcolonial IR attempts to expose such parochial assumptions of IR; for example, in the construction of white versus coloured peoples. An example is the IR story of a *white men's burden* to educate and liberate coloured men and women, to protect coloured women from coloured men. Often this is linked to other postpositivist theories, for example, through Postcolonial feminism, which analyze issues in IR through the lenses of *both* gender and culture.

Examples of the parochialistic nature of IR include *geographical parochialism* and *cultural chauvinism*. For the former, the construction of the Cold War era as a time of peace ignores the reality that major conflicts continued in the developing world. Furthermore, the oft-cited history of IR is constructed in western terms (*more information under history*); and IR has been used to justify everything from imperialism to a *playground* for skirmishes between the two

Cold War superpowers. For the latter, the West (through IGOs such as the IMF's quick rush to "save" Asia in the aftermath of the Asian Financial Crisis of 1997–8 could be seen as both a *white men's burden* to save Asia or to reformulate Asian capitalism in a Western image.<sup>[3]</sup>

## Criticisms and Defence

Such IR stories are purposefully limited in scope in terms of statecentric modelling, cataloguing and predicting in formal terms; and like other postpositivist theories, they do not attempt to form an overarching theory as after all, postpositivism is defined as *incredulity towards metanarratives*. This is replaced by a sensitivity and openness to the unintended consequences of metanarratives and their negative impacts on the most marginalised actors in IR. In defence, postpositivists argue that metanarratives have proven unworkable. Thus, such theories, although limited in scope, provide for much greater possibilities in the normative work of developing an emancipatory politics, formulating foreign policy, understanding conflict, and making peace, which takes into account gender, ethnicity, other identity issues, culture, methodology and other common issues that have emerged from problem-solving, rationalist, reductive accounts IR.

**Critical international relations theory** is the application of 'critical theory' to international relations. Proponents such as Andrew Linklater, Robert W. Cox and Ken Booth focus on the need for human emancipation from States. Hence, it is "critical" of mainstream IR theories that tend to be state-centric.

## Marxism

Marxist and Neo-Marxist theories of IR reject the realist/liberal view of state conflict or cooperation; instead focusing on the economic and material aspects. It makes the assumption that the economy trumps other concerns; allowing for the elevation of class as the focus of study. Marxists view the international system as an integrated capitalist system in pursuit of capital accumulation. Thus, the period of colonialism brought in sources for raw materials and captive markets for exports, while decolonialization brought new opportunities in the form of dependence.

Linked in with Marxist theories is dependency theory which argues that developed countries, in their pursuit of power, penetrate developing states through political advisors, missionaries, experts and MNCs to integrate them into the integrated capitalist system in order to appropriate natural resources and foster dependence by developing countries on developed countries.

Marxist theories receive scant attention in the United States where no significant socialist party ever existed. It is more common in parts of Europe

and is one of the most important theoretic contributions of Latin American academia, for example through Liberation theology.

## **Leadership Theories**

### **Interest Group Perspective**

Interest Group theory posits that the driving force behind state behavior is sub-state interest groups. Examples interest groups include political lobbyists, the military, and the corporate sector. Group theory argues that although these interest groups are constitutive of the state, they are also causal forces in the exercise of state power.

### **Strategic Perspective**

Strategic Perspective is a theoretical approach that views individuals as choosing their actions by taking into account the anticipated actions and responses of others with the intention of maximizing their own welfare.

## ***Poststructuralist theories***

Poststructuralist theories of IR developed in the 1980s from postmodernist studies in political science. Post-structuralism explores the deconstruction of concepts traditionally not problematic in IR, such as 'power' and 'agency' and examines how the construction of these concepts shapes international relations. The examination of 'narratives' plays an important part in poststructuralist analysis, for example feminist poststructuralist work has examined the role that 'women' play in global society and how they are constructed in war as 'innocent' and 'civilians'.

Examples of post-positivist research include:

- Feminisms ("gendering" war)
- Postcolonialism (challenges the euro-centrism of IR)

## ***Concepts in international relations***

### **Conjuncture**

In decision making in international relations, the concept of International Conjuncture, together with freedom of action and equality are important elements. Decision makers must take into account the set of international conditions in taking initiatives that would create different types of responses.

## **Systemic level concepts**

International relations is often viewed in terms of **levels of analysis**, the **systemic level** concepts are those broad concepts that define and shape an international milieu, characterised by Anarchy.

### **Power**

The concept of **power in international relations** can be described as the degree of resources, capabilities, and influence in international affairs. It is often divided up into the concepts of hard power and soft power, hard power relating primarily to coercive power, such as the use of force, and soft power commonly covering economics, diplomacy and cultural influence. However, there is no clear dividing line between the two forms of power.

### **Polarity**

**Polarity** in International Relations refers to the arrangement of power within the international system. The concept arose from **bipolarity** during the Cold War, with the international system dominated by the conflict between two superpowers, and has been applied retrospectively. Consequently, the international system prior to 1945 can be described as **multi-polar**, with power being shared among Great powers. The collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 had led to what some would call unipolarity, with the United States as a sole superpower. However, due to China's surge of economic success after joining the World Trade Organization in 2001, combined with the respectable international position they hold within political spheres and the power that the Chinese Government exerts over their people (consisting of the largest population in the world), there is debate over whether China is now a superpower or a possible candidate in the future.

Several theories of international relations draw upon the idea of polarity. The **balance of power** was a concept prevalent in Europe prior to the First World War, the thought being that by balancing power blocs it would create stability and prevent war. Theories of the balance of power gained prominence again during the Cold War, being a central mechanism of Kenneth Waltz's Neorealism. Here, the concepts of balancing (rising in power to counter another) and bandwagoning (siding with another) are developed.

**Hegemonic stability theory** (developed by Robert Gilpin) also draws upon the idea of Polarity, specifically the state of unipolarity. Hegemony is the preponderance of power at one pole in the international system, and the theory argues this is a stable configuration because of mutual gains by both the dominant power and others in the international system. This is contrary to many Neorealist arguments, particularly made by Kenneth Waltz, stating that

the end of the Cold War and the state of unipolarity is an unstable configuration that will inevitably change.

This can be expressed in **Power transition theory**, which states that it is likely that a great power would challenge a hegemon after a certain period, resulting in a major war. It suggests that while hegemony can control the occurrence of wars, it also results in the creation of one. Its main proponent, A.F.K. Organski, argued this based on the occurrence of previous wars during British, Portuguese and Dutch hegemony.

## Interdependence

Many advocate that the current international system is characterized by growing interdependence; the mutual responsibility and dependency on others. Advocates of this point to growing globalization, particularly with international economic interaction. The role of international institutions, and widespread acceptance of a number of operating principles in the international system, reinforces ideas that relations are characterized by interdependence.

## Dependency

Military exercises often help increase strategic cooperation between countries. Shown here are Indian Navy, Japan Maritime Self-Defense Force and U.S Navy ships in formation, during a trilateral exercise in 2007.

**Dependency theory** is a theory most commonly associated with Marxism, stating that a set of **Core** states exploit a set of weaker **Periphery** states for their prosperity. Various versions of the theory suggest that this is either an inevitability (standard dependency theory), or use the theory to highlight the necessity for change (Neo-Marxist).

## Systemic tools of international relations

- **Diplomacy** is the practice of communication and **negotiation** between representatives of states. To some extent, all other tools of international relations can be considered the failure of diplomacy. Keeping in mind, the use of other tools are part of the communication and negotiation inherent within diplomacy. Sanctions, force, and adjusting trade regulations, while not typically considered part of diplomacy, are actually valuable tools in the interest of leverage and placement in negotiations.
- **Sanctions** are usually a first resort after the failure of diplomacy, and are one of the main tools used to enforce treaties. They can take the form of diplomatic or economic sanctions and involve the cutting of ties and imposition of barriers to communication or trade.
- **War**, the use of force, is often thought of as the ultimate tool of international relations. A widely accepted definition is that given by Clausewitz, with war being "the continuation of politics by other means".

There is a growing study into 'new wars' involving actors other than states. The study of war in International Relations is covered by the disciplines of 'War Studies' and 'Strategic studies'.

- The **mobilization of international shame** can also be thought of as a tool of International Relations. This is attempting to alter states' actions through 'naming and shaming' at the international level. This is mostly done by the large human rights NGOs such as Amnesty International (for instance when it called Guantanamo Bay a "Gulag")<sup>[2]</sup>, or Human Rights Watch. A prominent use of was the UN Commission on Human Rights 1235 procedure, which publicly exposes state's human rights violations. The current Human Rights Council has yet to use this Mechanism
- The allotment of **economic and/or diplomatic benefits**. An example of this is the European Union's enlargement policy. Candidate countries are allowed entry into the EU only after the fulfillment of the Copenhagen criteria.

### ***Unit-level concepts in international relations***

As a **level of analysis** the unit level is often referred to as the state level, as it locates its explanation at the level of the state, rather than the international system.

### **Regime type**

It is often considered that a state's form of government can dictate the way that a state interacts with others in the international system.

**Democratic Peace Theory** is a theory that suggests that the nature of democracy means that democratic countries will not go to war with each other. The justifications for this are that democracies externalise their norms and only go to war for just causes, and that democracy encourages mutual trust and respect.

**Communism** justifies a world revolution, which similarly would lead to peaceful coexistence, based on a proletarian global society.

### **Revisionism/Status quo**

States can be classified by whether they accept the international status quo, or are revisionist, i.e. want change. Revisionist states seek to fundamentally change the rules and practices of international relations, feeling disadvantaged by the status quo. They see the international system as a largely western creation which serves to reinforce current realities. Japan is an example of a state that has gone from being a revisionist state to one that is satisfied with the status quo, because the status quo is now beneficial to it.

## **Religion**

It is often considered that religion can have an effect on the way a state acts within the international system. Religion is visible as an organising principle particularly for Islamic states, whereas secularism sits at the other end of the spectrum, with the separation of state and religion being responsible for the Liberal international relations theory.

### ***Individual or sub-unit level concepts***

The level beneath the unit (state) level can be useful both for explaining factors in International Relations that other theories fail to explain, and for moving away from a state-centric view of international relations.

- **Psychological factors in International Relations** - Evaluating psychological factors in international relations comes from the understanding that a state is not a 'black box' as proposed by Realism, and that there may be other influences on foreign policy decisions. Examining the role of personalities in the decision making process can have some explanatory power, as can the role of misperception between various actors. A prominent application of sub-unit level psychological factors in international relations is the concept of Groupthink, another is the propensity of policymakers to think in terms of analogies.
- **Bureaucratic politics** - Looks at the role of the bureaucracy in decision making, and sees decisions as a result of bureaucratic in-fighting, and as having been shaped by various constraints.
- **Religious, Ethnic, and secessionist groups** - Viewing these aspects of the sub-unit level has explanatory power with regards to ethnic conflicts, religious wars, transnational diaspora (diaspora politics) and other actors which do not consider themselves to fit with the defined state boundaries. This is particularly useful in the context of the pre-modern world of weak states.
- **Science, Technology and International Relations**- How science and technology impact the global health, business, environment, technology, and development.
- **International political economy**, and economic factors in international relations.<sup>[3]</sup>

### ***Institutions in international relations***

International institutions form a vital part of contemporary International Relations. Much interaction at the system level is governed by them, and they outlaw some traditional institutions and practices of International Relations, such as the use of war (except in self-defence).

As humanity enters the Planetary phase of civilization, some scientists and political theorists see a global hierarchy of institutions replacing the existing system of sovereign nation-states as the primary political community. They argue that nations are an imagined community that cannot resolve such modern challenges as the “Dogville” effect (strangers in a homogeneous community), the legal and political status of stateless people and refugees, and the need to address worldwide concerns like climate change and pandemics. Futurist Paul Raskin has hypothesized that a new, more legitimate form of global politics could be based on “constrained pluralism.” This principle guides the formation of institutions based on three characteristics: irreducibility, where some issues must be adjudicated at the global level; subsidiarity, which limits the scope of global authority to truly global issues while smaller-scope issues are regulated at lower levels; and heterogeneity, which allows for diverse forms of local and regional institutions as long as they meet global obligations.

## International organization

An **international organization** is an organization with an international membership, scope, or presence. There are two main types:<sup>[1]</sup>

- **International nongovernmental organizations (INGOs):** non-governmental organizations (NGOs) that operate internationally. These may be either:
  - International non-profit organizations. Examples include the World Organization of the Scout Movement, International Committee of the Red Cross and Médecins Sans Frontières.
  - International corporations, referred to as multinational corporations. Examples include The Coca-Cola Company and Toyota.
- **Intergovernmental organizations**, also known as **international governmental organizations (IGOs)**: the type of organization most closely associated with the term 'international organization', these are organizations that are made up primarily of sovereign states (referred to as member states). Notable examples include the United Nations (UN), European Union (EU; which is a prime example of a supranational organization), and World Trade Organization (WTO). The UN has used the term "intergovernmental organization" instead of "international organization" for clarity.<sup>[2]</sup>

## United Nations

The **United Nations (UN)** is an international organization whose stated aims are facilitating cooperation in international law, international security,



economic development, social progress, human rights, and the achieving of world peace. The UN was founded in 1945 after World War II to replace the League of Nations, to stop wars between countries, and to provide a platform for dialogue. It contains multiple subsidiary organizations to carry out its missions.

There are currently 192 member states, including nearly every sovereign state in the world. From its offices around the world, the UN and its specialized agencies decide on substantive and administrative issues in regular meetings held throughout the year. The organization is divided into administrative bodies, primarily:

- The General Assembly (the main deliberative assembly);
- The Security Council (decides certain resolutions for peace and security);
- The Economic and Social Council (assists in promoting international economic and social cooperation and development);
- The Secretariat (provides studies, information, and facilities needed by the UN);
- The International Court of Justice (the primary judicial organ).

Additional bodies deal with the governance of all other UN System agencies, such as the World Health Organization (WHO) and United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF). The UN's most visible public figure is the Secretary-General, currently Ban Ki-moon of South Korea, who attained the post in 2007. The organization is financed from assessed and voluntary contributions from its member states, and has six official languages: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish.<sup>[2]</sup>

## ***History***

Following in the wake of the failed League of Nations (1919-1946), which the United States never joined, the United Nations was established in 1945 to maintain international peace and promote cooperation in solving international economic, social and humanitarian problems. The earliest concrete plan for a new world organization was begun under the aegis of the U.S. State Department in 1939. Franklin D. Roosevelt first coined the term 'United Nations' as a term to describe the Allied countries. The term was first officially used on January 1, 1942 when 26 governments signed the Atlantic Charter, pledging to continue the war effort.<sup>[3]</sup> On 25 April 1945, the UN Conference on International Organization began in San Francisco, attended by 50 governments and a number of non-governmental organizations involved in drafting the Charter of the United Nations. The UN officially came into existence on 24 October 1945 upon ratification of the Charter by the five permanent members of the Security Council — France, the Republic of China, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States — and by a majority of the other 46 signatories. The first meetings of the General

Assembly, with 51 nations represented, and the Security Council, took place in Westminster Central Hall in London in January 1946.<sup>[4]</sup>

The UN's reputation was tarnished in 2003 after the Oil-for-Food scandal. The programme was established in 1996 to allow Iraq to sell oil on the world market in exchange for food, medicine, and other humanitarian supplies for Iraqi citizens who were affected by international economic sanctions in the wake of the first Gulf War. Allegations of abuse and corruption surfaced in 2003, and Benon Sevan, the former director, was suspended and then resigned from the UN after he was found to have accepted bribes from the Iraqi regime. It was recommended that his UN immunity be lifted to allow for a criminal investigation.<sup>[5]</sup> Beyond Sevan, Kojo Annan, Kofi Annan's son, was alleged to have illegally procured Oil-for-Food contracts on behalf of the Swiss company Cotecna. India's foreign minister, K. Natwar Singh, was removed from office because of a role in the scandal, and the Cole Inquiry investigated whether the Australian Wheat Board breached any laws with its contracts with Iraq.<sup>[6]</sup>

## **Organization**

The United Nations system is based on five principal organs (formerly six - the Trusteeship Council suspended operations in 1994);<sup>[7]</sup> the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), the Secretariat, and the International Court of Justice.

Four of the five principal organs are located at the main United Nations headquarters located on international territory in New York City. The International Court of Justice is located in The Hague, while other major agencies are based in the UN offices at Geneva, Vienna, and Nairobi. Other UN institutions are located throughout the world.

The six official languages of the United Nations, used in intergovernmental meetings and documents, are Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish,<sup>[2]</sup> while the Secretariat uses two working languages, English and French. Five of the official languages were chosen when the UN was founded; Arabic was added later in 1973. The United Nations Editorial Manual states that the standard for English language documents is British usage and Oxford spelling (en-gb-oed), and the Chinese writing standard is Simplified Chinese. This replaced Traditional Chinese in 1971 when the UN representation of China was changed from the Republic of China to People's Republic of China. The Republic of China is now commonly known as "Taiwan".

## **General Assembly**

The General Assembly is the main deliberative assembly of the United Nations. Composed of all United Nations member states, the assembly meets in regular yearly sessions under a president elected from among the member states. Over

a two-week period at the start of each session, all members have the opportunity to address the assembly. Traditionally, the Secretary-General makes the first statement, followed by the president of the assembly. The first session was convened on 10 January 1946 in the Westminster Central Hall in London and included representatives of 51 nations.

When the General Assembly votes on important questions, a two-thirds majority of those present and voting is required. Examples of important questions include: recommendations on peace and security; election of members to organs; admission, suspension, and expulsion of members; and, budgetary matters. All other questions are decided by majority vote. Each member country has one vote. Apart from approval of budgetary matters, resolutions are not binding on the members. The Assembly may make recommendations on any matters within the scope of the UN, except matters of peace and security that are under Security Council consideration.

Conceivably, the one state, one vote power structure could enable states comprising just eight percent of the world population to pass a resolution by a two-thirds vote.<sup>[citation needed]</sup> However, as no more than recommendations, it is difficult to imagine a situation in which a recommendation by member states constituting just eight percent of the world's population, would be adhered to by the remaining ninety-two percent of the population, should they object.

## **Security Council**

The Security Council is charged with maintaining peace and security among countries. While other organs of the United Nations can only make 'recommendations' to member governments, the Security Council has the power to make binding decisions that member governments have agreed to carry out, under the terms of Charter Article 25.<sup>[8]</sup> The decisions of the Council are known as United Nations Security Council resolutions.

The Security Council is made up of 15 member states, consisting of 5 permanent members - China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States - and 10 non-permanent members, currently Austria, Burkina Faso, Costa Rica, Croatia, Japan, Libya, Mexico, Turkey, Uganda, and Vietnam. The five permanent members hold veto power over substantive but not procedural resolutions allowing a permanent member to block adoption but not to block the debate of a resolution unacceptable to it. The ten temporary seats are held for two-year terms with member states voted in by the General Assembly on a regional basis. The presidency of the Security Council is rotated alphabetically each month,<sup>[9]</sup> and is held by United States for the month of September 2009.

## **Secretariat**

The United Nations Secretariat is headed by the Secretary-General, assisted by a staff of international civil servants worldwide. It provides studies, information, and facilities needed by United Nations bodies for their meetings. It also carries out tasks as directed by the UN Security Council, the UN General Assembly, the UN Economic and Social Council, and other UN bodies. The United Nations Charter provides that the staff be chosen by application of the "highest standards of efficiency, competence, and integrity," with due regard for the importance of recruiting on a wide geographical basis.

The Charter provides that the staff shall not seek or receive instructions from any authority other than the UN. Each UN member country is enjoined to respect the international character of the Secretariat and not seek to influence its staff. The Secretary-General alone is responsible for staff selection.

The Secretary-General's duties include helping resolve international disputes, administering peacekeeping operations, organizing international conferences, gathering information on the implementation of Security Council decisions, and consulting with member governments regarding various initiatives. Key Secretariat offices in this area include the Office of the Coordinator of Humanitarian Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. The Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter that, in his or her opinion, may threaten international peace and security.

## **Secretary-General**









The Secretariat is headed by the Secretary-General, who acts as the *de facto* spokesman and leader of the UN. The current Secretary-General is Ban Ki-moon, who took over from Kofi Annan in 2007 and will be eligible for reappointment when his first term expires in 2011.<sup>[10]</sup>

Envisioned by Franklin D. Roosevelt as a "world moderator", the position is defined in the UN Charter as the organization's "chief administrative officer", but the Charter also states that the Secretary-General can bring to the Security Council's attention "any matter which in his opinion may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security" giving the position greater scope for action on the world stage. The position has evolved into a dual role of an administrator of the UN organization, and a diplomat and mediator addressing disputes between member states and finding consensus to global issues.<sup>[10]</sup>

The Secretary-General is appointed by the General Assembly, after being recommended by the Security Council. The selection can be vetoed by any member of the Security Council,<sup>[13]</sup> and the General Assembly can theoretically

override the Security Council's recommendation if a majority vote is not achieved, although this has not happened so far.<sup>[14]</sup> There are no specific criteria for the post, but over the years it has become accepted that the post shall be held for one or two terms of five years, that the post shall be appointed based on geographical rotation, and that the Secretary-General shall not originate from one of the five permanent Security Council member states.<sup>[14]</sup>

#### Secretaries-General of the United Nations<sup>[15]</sup>

No.	Name	Country of origin	Took office	Left office	Note
1	<b>Trygve Lie</b>	 Norway	2 February 1946	10 November 1952	Resigned
2	<b>Dag Hammarskjöld</b>	 Sweden	10 April 1953	18 September 1961	Died while in office
3	<b>U Thant</b>	 Burma	30 November 1961	1 January 1972	First Secretary-General from Asia
4	<b>Kurt Waldheim</b>	 Austria	1 January 1972	1 January 1982	
5	<b>Javier Pérez de Cuéllar</b>	 Peru	1 January 1982	1 January 1992	First Secretary-General from South America
6	<b>Boutros Boutros-Ghali</b>	 Egypt	1 January 1992	1 January 1997	First Secretary-General from Africa
7	<b>Kofi Annan</b>	 Ghana	1 January 1997	1 January 2007	
8	<b>Ban Ki-moon</b>	 South Korea	1 January 2007	Incumbent	

#### International Court of Justice

The International Court of Justice (ICJ), located in The Hague, Netherlands, is the primary judicial organ of the United Nations. Established in 1945 by the United Nations Charter, the Court began work in 1946 as the successor to the Permanent Court of International Justice. The Statute of the International Court of Justice, similar to that of its predecessor, is the main constitutional document constituting and regulating the Court.<sup>[16]</sup>

It is based in the Peace Palace in The Hague, Netherlands, sharing the building with the Hague Academy of International Law, a private centre for the study of international law. Several of the Court's current judges are either alumni or former faculty members of the Academy. Its purpose is to adjudicate disputes among states. The court has heard cases related to war crimes, illegal state interference and ethnic cleansing, among others, and continues to hear cases.<sup>[17]</sup>

A related court, the International Criminal Court (ICC), began operating in 2002 through international discussions initiated by the General Assembly. It is the first permanent international court charged with trying those who commit the most serious crimes under international law, including war crimes and genocide. The ICC is functionally independent of the UN in terms of personnel and financing, but some meetings of the ICC governing body, the Assembly of States Parties to the Rome Statute, are held at the UN. There is a "relationship agreement" between the ICC and the UN that governs how the two institutions regard each other legally.<sup>[18]</sup>

### **Economic and Social Council**

The Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) assists the General Assembly in promoting international economic and social cooperation and development. ECOSOC has 54 members, all of whom are elected by the General Assembly for a three-year term. The president is elected for a one-year term and chosen amongst the small or middle powers represented on ECOSOC. ECOSOC meets once a year in July for a four-week session. Since 1998, it has held another meeting each April with finance ministers heading key committees of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Viewed separate from the specialized bodies it coordinates, ECOSOC's functions include information gathering, advising member nations, and making recommendations. In addition, ECOSOC is well-positioned to provide policy coherence and coordinate the overlapping functions of the UN's subsidiary bodies and it is in these roles that it is most active.

The United Nations Charter outlines the rules for membership:

1. Membership in the United Nations is open to all other peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.
2. The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council.

## **Group of 77**

The Group of 77 at the UN is a loose coalition of developing nations, designed to promote its members' collective economic interests and create an enhanced joint negotiating capacity in the United Nations. There were 77 founding members of the organization, but the organization has since expanded to 130 member countries. The group was founded on 15 June 1964 by the "Joint Declaration of the Seventy-Seven Countries" issued at the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The first major meeting was in Algiers in 1967, where the *Charter of Algiers* was adopted and the basis for permanent institutional structures was begun.<sup>[21]</sup>

## **Functions**

### **Peacekeeping and security**

UN peacekeeping missions. Dark blue regions indicate current missions, while light blue regions represent former missions.

The UN, after approval by the Security Council, sends peacekeepers to regions where armed conflict has recently ceased or paused to enforce the terms of peace agreements and to discourage combatants from resuming hostilities. Since the UN does not maintain its own military, peacekeeping forces are voluntarily provided by member states of the UN. The forces, also called the "Blue Helmets", who enforce UN accords are awarded United Nations Medals, which are considered international decorations instead of military decorations. The peacekeeping force as a whole received the Nobel Peace Prize in 1988.

The founders of the UN had envisaged that the organization would act to prevent conflicts between nations and make future wars impossible, however the outbreak of the Cold War made peacekeeping agreements extremely difficult due to the division of the world into hostile camps. Following the end of the Cold War, there were renewed calls for the UN to become the agency for achieving world peace, as there are several dozen ongoing conflicts that continue to rage around the globe.

A 2005 RAND Corp study found the UN to be successful in two out of three peacekeeping efforts. It compared UN nation-building efforts to those of the United States, and found that seven out of eight UN cases are at peace, as opposed to four out of eight US cases at peace.<sup>[22]</sup> Also in 2005, the Human Security Report documented a decline in the number of wars, genocides and human rights abuses since the end of the Cold War, and presented evidence, albeit circumstantial, that international activism — mostly spearheaded by the UN — has been the main cause of the decline in armed conflict since the end of the Cold War.<sup>[23]</sup> Situations where the UN has not only acted to keep the peace

but also occasionally intervened include the Korean War (1950-1953), and the authorization of intervention in Iraq after the Persian Gulf War in 1990.

A British armoured car painted as it appeared while deployed on a UN peacekeeping mission

The UN has also drawn criticism for perceived failures. In many cases, member states have shown reluctance to achieve or enforce Security Council resolutions, an issue that stems from the UN's intergovernmental nature — seen by some as simply an association of 192 member states who must reach consensus, not an independent organization. Disagreements in the Security Council about military action and intervention are seen as having failed to prevent the 1994 Rwandan Genocide,<sup>[24]</sup> failed to provide humanitarian aid and intervene in the Second Congo War, failed to intervene in the 1995 Srebrenica massacre and protect a refugee haven by the authorizing the peacekeepers to use force, failure to deliver food to starving people in Somalia, failure to implement provisions of Security Council resolutions related to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and continuing failure to prevent genocide or provide assistance in Darfur.

### **Human rights and humanitarian assistance**

Eleanor Roosevelt with the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1949

The pursuit of human rights was a central reason for creating the UN. World War II atrocities and genocide led to a ready consensus that the new organization must work to prevent any similar tragedies in the future. An early objective was creating a legal framework for considering and acting on complaints about human rights violations. The UN Charter obliges all member nations to promote "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights" and to take "joint and separate action" to that end. The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, though not legally binding, was adopted by the General Assembly in 1948 as a common standard of achievement for all. The Assembly regularly takes up human rights issues.

The UN and its agencies are central in upholding and implementing the principles enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. A case in point is support by the UN for countries in transition to democracy. Technical assistance in providing free and fair elections, improving judicial structures, drafting constitutions, training human rights officials, and transforming armed movements into political parties have contributed significantly to democratization worldwide. The UN has helped run elections in countries with little or no democratic history, including recently in Afghanistan and East Timor. The UN is also a forum to support the right of women to participate fully in the political, economic, and social life of their countries. The UN contributes to raising consciousness of the concept of human rights through its covenants



and its attention to specific abuses through its General Assembly, Security Council resolutions, or International Court of Justice rulings.

The purpose of the United Nations Human Rights Council, established in 2006, is to address human rights violations. The Council is the successor to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which was often criticised for the high-profile positions it gave to member states that did not guarantee the human rights of their own citizens. The council has 47 members distributed by region, which each serve three year terms, and may not serve three consecutive terms. A candidate to the body must be approved by a majority of the General Assembly. In addition, the council has strict rules for membership, including a universal human rights review. While some members with questionable human rights records have been elected, it is fewer than before with the increased focus on each member state's human rights record.

The rights of some 370 million indigenous peoples around the world is also a focus for the UN, with a Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples being approved by the General Assembly in 2007. The declaration outlines the individual and collective rights to culture, language, education, identity, employment and health, thereby addressing post-colonial issues which had confronted indigenous peoples for centuries. The declaration aims to maintain, strengthen and encourage the growth of indigenous institutions, cultures and traditions. It also prohibits discrimination against indigenous peoples and promotes their active participation in matters which concern their past, present and future.<sup>[37]</sup>

In conjunction with other organizations such as the Red Cross, the UN provides food, drinking water, shelter and other humanitarian services to populaces suffering from famine, displaced by war, or afflicted by other disasters. Major humanitarian branches of the UN are the World Food Programme (which helps feed more than 100 million people a year in 80 countries), the office of the High Commissioner for Refugees with projects in over 116 countries, as well as peacekeeping projects in over 24 countries.

## **Social and economic development**

### **Millennium Development Goals**

1. eradicate extreme poverty and hunger;
2. achieve universal primary education;

3. promote gender equality and empower women;
4. reduce child mortality;
5. improve maternal health;
6. combat HIV/AIDS, malaria, and other diseases;
7. ensure environmental sustainability; and
8. develop a global partnership for development.

The UN is involved in supporting development, e.g. by the formulation of the Millennium Development Goals. The UN Development Programme (UNDP) is the largest multilateral source of grant technical assistance in the world. Organizations like the World Health Organization (WHO), UNAIDS, and The Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis and Malaria are leading institutions in the battle against diseases around the world, especially in poor countries. The UN Population Fund is a major provider of reproductive services. It has helped reduce infant and maternal mortality in 100 countries.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

The UN also promotes human development through various related agencies. The World Bank Group and International Monetary Fund (IMF), for example, are independent, specialized agencies and observers within the UN framework, according to a 1947 agreement. They were initially formed as separate from the UN through the Bretton Woods Agreement in 1944.<sup>[38]</sup>

The UN annually publishes the Human Development Index (HDI), a comparative measure ranking countries by poverty, literacy, education, life expectancy, and other factors.

The Millennium Development Goals are eight goals that all 192 United Nations member states have agreed to try to achieve by the year 2015.<sup>[39]</sup> This was declared in the United Nations Millennium Declaration, signed in September 2000.

## **Mandates**

From time to time the different bodies of the United Nations pass resolutions which contain operating paragraphs that begin with the words "requests", "calls upon", or "encourages", which the Secretary-General interprets as a mandate to set up a temporary organization or do something. These mandates can be as little as researching and publishing a written report, or mounting a full scale peace-keeping operation (usually the exclusive domain of the Security Council).

Although the specialized institutions, such as the WHO, were originally set up by this means, they are not the same as mandates because they are permanent organizations that exist independently of the UN with their own membership

structure. One could say that original mandate was simply to cover the process of setting up the institution, and has therefore long expired. Most mandates expire after a limited time period and require renewal from the body which set them up.

One of the outcomes of the 2005 World Summit was a mandate (labeled id 17171) for the Secretary-General to "review all mandates older than five years originating from resolutions of the General Assembly and other organs". To facilitate this review and to finally bring coherence to the organization, the Secretariat has produced an on-line registry of mandates to draw together the reports relating to each one and create an overall picture.<sup>[40]</sup>

## **Other**

Over the lifetime of the UN, over 80 colonies have attained independence.<sup>[41]</sup> The General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples in 1960 with no votes against but abstentions from all major colonial powers. Through the UN Committee on Decolonization,<sup>[42]</sup> created in 1962, the UN has focused considerable attention on decolonization. It has also supported the new states that have arisen as a result self-determination initiatives. The committee has overseen the decolonization of every country larger than 20,000 km<sup>2</sup> and removed them from the United Nations list of Non-Self-Governing Territories, besides Western Sahara, a country larger than the UK only relinquished by Spain in 1975.

The UN declares and coordinates international observances, periods of time to observe some issue of international interest or concern. Using the symbolism of the UN, a specially designed logo for the year, and the infrastructure of the United Nations System, various days and years have become catalysts to advancing key issues of concern on a global scale. For example, World Tuberculosis Day, Earth Day and International Year of Deserts and Desertification.

The UN is financed from assessed and voluntary contributions from member states. The regular two-year budgets of the UN and its specialized agencies are funded by assessments. The General Assembly approves the regular budget and determines the assessment for each member. This is broadly based on the relative capacity of each country to pay, as measured by their Gross National Income (GNI), with adjustments for external debt and low per capita income.<sup>[44]</sup>

The Assembly has established the principle that the UN should not be overly dependent on any one member to finance its operations. Thus, there is a 'ceiling' rate, setting the maximum amount any member is assessed for the regular budget. In December 2000, the Assembly revised the scale of assessments to reflect current global circumstances. As part of that revision, the regular budget ceiling was reduced from 25% to 22%. The U.S. is the only

member that has met the ceiling. In addition to a ceiling rate, the minimum amount assessed to any member nation (or 'floor' rate) is set at 0.001% of the UN budget. Also, for the least developed countries (LDC), a ceiling rate of 0.01% is applied.<sup>[44]</sup>

The current operating budget is estimated at \$4.19 billion<sup>[44]</sup> (refer to table for major contributors).

A large share of UN expenditures addresses the core UN mission of peace and security. The peacekeeping budget for the 2005-2006 fiscal year is approximately \$5 billion (compared to approximately \$1.5 billion for the UN core budget over the same period), with some 70,000 troops deployed in 17 missions around the world.<sup>[45]</sup> UN peace operations are funded by assessments, using a formula derived from the regular funding scale, but including a weighted surcharge for the five permanent Security Council members, who must approve all peacekeeping operations. This surcharge serves to offset discounted peacekeeping assessment rates for less developed countries. As of 1 January 2008, the top 10 providers of assessed financial contributions to United Nations peacekeeping operations were: the United States, Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, France, Italy, China, Canada, Spain, and the Republic of Korea.<sup>[46]</sup>

Special UN programmes not included in the regular budget (such as UNICEF and UNDP) are financed by voluntary contributions from other member governments. Most of this is financial contributions, but some is in the form of agricultural commodities donated for afflicted populations.

### ***Personnel policy***

The UN and its agencies are immune to the laws of the countries where they operate, safeguarding UN's impartiality with regard to the host and member countries.<sup>[47]</sup> This independence allows agencies to implement human resources policies that may even be contrary to the laws of a host - or a member country.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

Despite their independence in matters of human resources policy, the UN and its agencies voluntarily apply the laws of member states regarding same-sex marriages, allowing decisions about the status of employees in a same-sex partnership to be based on nationality. The UN and its agencies recognize same-sex marriages only if the employees are citizens of countries that recognize the marriage. This practice is not specific to the recognition of same-sex marriage but reflects a common practice of the UN for a number of human resources matters. It has to be noted though that some agencies provide limited benefits to domestic partners of their staff and that some agencies do not recognise same-sex marriage or domestic partnership of their staff.

## **Reform**

Since its founding, there have been many calls for reform of the United Nations, although little consensus on how to do so. Some want the UN to play a greater or more effective role in world affairs, while others want its role reduced to humanitarian work.<sup>[48]</sup> There have also been numerous calls for the UN Security Council's membership to be increased, for different ways of electing the UN's Secretary-General, and for a United Nations Parliamentary Assembly.

The UN has also been accused of bureaucratic inefficiency and waste. During the 1990s the United States withheld dues citing inefficiency, and only started repayment on the condition that a major reforms initiative was introduced. In 1994, the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS) was established by the General Assembly to serve as an efficiency watchdog.<sup>[49]</sup>

An official reform programme was begun by Kofi Annan in 1997. Reforms mentioned include changing the permanent membership of the Security Council (which currently reflects the power relations of 1945), making the bureaucracy more transparent, accountable and efficient, making the UN more democratic, and imposing an international tariff on arms manufacturers worldwide.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

In September 2005, the UN convened a World Summit that brought together the heads of most member states, calling the summit "a once-in-a-generation opportunity to take bold decisions in the areas of development, security, human rights and reform of the United Nations."<sup>[50]</sup> Kofi Annan had proposed that the summit agree on a global "grand bargain" to reform the UN, renewing the organisation's focus on peace, security, human rights and development, and to make it better equipped at facing 21st century issues. The result of the summit was a compromise text agreed on by world leaders,<sup>[51]</sup> which included the creation of a Peacebuilding Commission to help countries emerging from conflict, a Human Rights Council, and a democracy fund, a clear and unambiguous condemnation of terrorism "in all its forms and manifestations", and agreements to devote more resources to the Office of Internal Oversight Services, to spend billions more on achieving the Millennium Development Goals, to wind up the Trusteeship Council due to the completion of its mission, and that the international community has a "responsibility to protect" - the duty to intervene in when national governments fail to fulfill their responsibility to protect their citizens from atrocious crimes.

The Office of Internal Oversight Services is being restructured to more clearly define its scope and mandate, and will receive more resources. In addition, to improve the oversight and auditing capabilities of the General Assembly, an Independent Audit Advisory Committee (IAAC) is being created. In June 2007, the Fifth Committee created a draft resolution for the terms of reference of this

committee.<sup>[52][53]</sup> An ethics office was established in 2006, responsible for administering new financial disclosure and whistleblower protection policies. Working with the OIOS, the ethics office also plans to implement a policy to avoid fraud and corruption.<sup>[54]</sup> The Secretariat is in the process of reviewing all UN mandates that are more than five years old. The review is intended to determine which duplicative or unnecessary programmes should be eliminated. Not all member states are in agreement as to which of the over 7000 mandates should be reviewed. The dispute centres on whether mandates that have been renewed should be examined. As of September 2007, the process is ongoing.<sup>[55]</sup>

### ***Controversy and criticism***

There has been controversy and criticism of the UN organization and its activities since at least the 1950s. In the United States, an early opponent of the UN was the John Birch Society, which began a "get US out of the UN" campaign in 1959, charging that the UN's aim was to establish a "One World Government." After the Second World War, the French Committee of National Liberation was late to be recognized by the US as the government of France, and so the country was initially excluded from the conferences that aimed at creating the new organization. Charles de Gaulle criticized the UN, famously calling it *le machin* ("the stuff"), and was not convinced that a global security alliance would help maintaining world peace, preferring to it direct defence treaties between countries. In 1967, Richard Nixon, while running for President of the United States, criticized the UN as "obsolete and inadequate" for dealing with then-present crises like the Cold War, Jeane Kirkpatrick, who was appointed by Ronald Reagan to be United States Ambassador to the United Nations, wrote in a 1983 opinion piece in *The New York Times* that the process of discussions at the Security Council "more closely resembles a mugging" of the United States "than either a political debate or an effort at problem solving."

In a February 2003 speech, soon before the United States invasion of Iraq (for which he had been unable to get UN approval), George W. Bush said, "free nations will not allow the United Nations to fade into history as an ineffective, irrelevant debating society."<sup>l</sup> In 2005, Bush appointed John R. Bolton to the position of Acting U.S. Ambassador to the UN; Bolton had made several statements critical of the UN, including saying, in 1994, "There is no such thing as the United Nations. There is only the international community, which can only be led by the only remaining superpower, which is the United States."<sup>l</sup>

In 2004, former ambassador to the UN Dore Gold published a book called *Tower of Babbble: How the United Nations Has Fueled Global Chaos*. The book criticized what it called the organization's moral relativism in the face of (and occasional support of)<sup>[61]</sup> genocide and terrorism that occurred between the moral clarity of its founding period and the present day. While the UN during its founding period was limited to those nations that declared war on at least

one of the Axis powers of World War II, and thus were capable of taking a stand against evil, the modern United Nations has, according to Gold, become diluted to the point where only 75 of the 184 member states during the time of the book's publication "were free democracies, according to Freedom House."<sup>1</sup> He further claimed that this had the effect of tipping the scales of the UN so that the organization as a whole was more amenable to the requirements of dictatorships.

### **Accusations of bias in the Arab-Israeli conflict**

Issues relating to the state of Israel, the Palestinian people and other aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict occupy a large amount of debate time, resolutions and resources at the United Nations.

The adoption of UNSCOP's recommendation to partition Palestine by the United Nations General Assembly in 1947<sup>[63]</sup> was one of the earliest decisions of the UN. After the 1948 Arab-Israeli War, the UN defined the term "refugee" in the case of Palestinian Arabs fleeing Israel in significantly broader terms than it does for other refugees of other conflicts; this is a road block in the refugee problem and increases dependence on the UN.<sup>[64]</sup> The UN has sponsored several peace negotiations between the parties, the latest being the 2002 Road map for peace.

In the late 1970s, Iraq built a 40 MW light-water nuclear materials testing reactor (MTR) with French assistance. When Israel destroyed the facility in 1981, the United Nations Security Council condemned Israel. According to political commentator Alan Dershowitz, commentators have since decided that Israel was within its moral and legal rights to destroy the facility and history has proven that it was the correct course of action.<sup>[65]</sup> Furthermore, the alleged apathy toward large scale humanitarian crises in places like Congo and selective focus on controversies involving Israelis have drawn criticism.<sup>[66]</sup>

In recent years,<sup>[when?]</sup> the Middle East was the subject of 76% of country-specific UNGA resolutions, 100% of the Human Rights Council resolutions, 100% of the Commission on the Status of Women resolutions, 50% of reports from the World Food Program, 6% of Security Council resolutions and 6 of the 10 Emergency sessions. Of note is Resolution 3379 (1975) stating that "Zionism is racism"; it was rescinded in 1991. These decisions, passed with the support of the OIC countries, invariably criticize Israel for its treatment of Palestinians. Many, such as Dore Gold, Alan Dershowitz, Mark Dreyfus, and the Anti-Defamation League have qualified this degree of criticism as excessive.<sup>[66][67][68][69]</sup>

### ***Claims of disproportionate attention***

Professor Don Habibi of the University of North Carolina at Wilmington lamented the limited reports on Sudan and Darfur, in contrast to reports on Israel. He criticized the United Nations, among other organizations, for their "obsession" with Israel, to the exclusion of other human rights violators. Habibi wrote:<sup>[70][71]</sup>

This obsession would make sense if Israel was among the worst human rights offenders in the world. But by any objective measure this is not the case. Even with the harshest interpretation of Israeli's policies, which takes no account of cause and effect, and Israel's predicament of facing existential war, there can be no comparison to the civil wars in Sudan, Algeria, or Congo.

### **Accusations of antisemitism**

The UN has been accused by such human rights activists as Elie Wiesel, Anne Bayefsky, and Dershowitz of tolerating antisemitic remarks within its walls.

A UN sponsored conference was held in 2001 in Durban, South Africa. The conference was meant to combat racism, but ended up being a forum for world leaders to make various anti-Semitic statements. Cartoons were handed out at the conference equating the Nazi swastika with the Jewish Star of David.<sup>[77]</sup> Tom Lantos, Colin Powell, Charles Schumer, Elie Wiesel, Irwin Cotler, and Alan Dershowitz are all on record condemning the entire conference as hateful, racist, and anti-Semitic.

### **Accusations of support for terrorism under the guise of "national liberation"**

According to Dore Gold and Alan Dershowitz, the United Nations has a long history of elevating what it calls "national liberation movements," armed groups who commit violence against civilians to achieve political goals, virtually to the status of civilians.<sup>[67][78]</sup> Occasionally, the UN has even invited terrorists<sup>[79][80][81]</sup> and states who support terrorism to participate in shaping how the UN responds to terrorism.

In July 1976, Palestinian and German terrorists hijacked an Air France plane headed from France to Israel, landed it in Uganda, and threatened to kill the civilian hostages. Ugandan dictator Idi Amin Dada provided sanctuary for the terrorists in the Entebbe airport. After Israel raided the Ugandan airport and saved most of the hostages, United Nations Secretary General "Kurt Waldheim condemned Israel" for the violation of "Ugandan sovereignty."<sup>[82]</sup>

Alan Dershowitz noted that while Tibetans, Kurds, and Turkish Armenians all desire "national liberation," the United Nations has only officially recognizes Palestinian claims to "national liberation" and allows representatives of the Palestinian cause to speak at the UN. The difference between the three groups



and the Palestinians is that the Palestinians use terrorism as a tactic for getting their voice heard while the other three do not. The UN, according to Dershowitz, favors "national liberation" groups who practice terrorism above those who do not; including those people who have been under more brutal occupation for a longer time (such as Tibetans). The UN also allows its refugee camps in the Palestinian territories to be used as terrorist bases and allows state sponsors of terrorism to be on the Security Council.<sup>[83][84]</sup> According to a Dutch report, the violence against the West Papua people is an established pattern since the handing over of the territory by the Dutch and the UN Act of Free Choice referendum. The government of the Netherlands commissioned Professor Pieter J. Drooglever to review the issues of the hand-over by the Dutch, led by the then foreign minister Joseph Luns with assistance by the United Nations. The report became public in December 2005.<sup>[85]</sup> In 2003, the indigenous rights organization, Friends of Peoples Close to Nature, released a documentary called *Papua Merdeka*, which criticizes the UN vote - Act of Free Choice. According to the movie, the UN was responsible for the continuing colonization and exploration of the West Papuan's natural resources. This film shows the history of violence the native population of West Papua have endured for many decades under the Indonesian military, and shows how to this day, the West Papuans continue their struggle for independence from Indonesia.<sup>[86]</sup>

## Political economy

**Political economy** originally was the term for studying production, buying and selling, and their relations with law, custom, and government. *Political economy* originated in moral philosophy. It developed in the 18th century as the study of the economies of states—*polities*, hence *political* economy.

In late nineteenth century, the term "political economy" was generally replaced by the term economics, used by those seeking to place the study of economy upon mathematical and axiomatic bases, rather than the structural relationships of production and consumption (cf. marginalism, Alfred Marshall).

### **History of the term**

Originally, *political economy* meant the study of the conditions under which production or consumption within limited parameters was organized in the nation-states. The phrase *économie politique* (translated in English as *political economy*) first appeared in France in 1615 with the well known book by Antoine de Montchrétien: *Traité de l'économie politique*. French physiocrats, Adam Smith, David Ricardo and Karl Marx were some of the exponents of political economy. In 1805, Thomas Malthus became England's first professor of political economy, at the East India Company College, Haileybury,

Hertfordshire. The world's first professorship in political economy was established in 1763 at the University of Vienna, Austria; Joseph von Sonnenfels was the first tenured professor.

In the United States, political economy first was taught at the College of William and Mary; in 1784 Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations* was a required textbook.<sup>[1]</sup>

Glasgow University, where Smith was Professor of Logic and Moral Philosophy, changed the name of its Department of Political Economy to the Department of Economics (ostensibly to avoid confusing prospective undergraduates) in academic year 1797–1798, leaving the graduating class of 1798 as the last to be graduated with a Scottish Master of Arts degree in Political Economy.

### ***Current approaches to political economy***

Contemporarily, *political economy* refers to different, but related, approaches to studying economic and political behaviours, ranging from the combining of economics with other fields, to the using of different, fundamental assumptions that challenge orthodox economic assumptions:

- *Political economy* most commonly refers to interdisciplinary studies drawing upon economics, law, and political science in explaining how political institutions, the political environment, and the economic system—capitalist, socialist, mixed—influence each other. When narrowly construed, it refers to applied topics in economics implicating public policy, such as monopoly, market protection, government fiscal policy,<sup>[2]</sup> and rent seeking.<sup>[3]</sup>
- Historians have employed *political economy* to explore the ways in the past that persons and groups with common economic interests have used politics to effect changes beneficial to their interests.<sup>[4]</sup>
- "International political economy" (IPE) is an interdisciplinary field comprising approaches to international trade and finance, and state policies affecting international trade, i.e. monetary and fiscal policies. In the U.S., these approaches are associated with the journal *International Organization*, which, in the 1970s, became the leading journal of international political economy under the editorship of Robert Keohane, Peter J. Katzenstein, and Stephen Krasner. They are also associated with the journal *The Review of International Political Economy*. There also is a more critical school of IPE, inspired by Karl Polanyi's work; two major figures are Susan Strange and Robert W. Cox.<sup>[5]</sup>
- Economists and political scientists often associate the term with approaches using rational choice assumptions, especially game theory, in explaining phenomena beyond economics' standard remit, in which context the term "positive political economy" is common.<sup>[6]</sup>

- Anthropologists, sociologists, and geographers, use *political economy* in referring to the neo-Marxian approaches to development and underdevelopment postulated by André Gunder Frank and Immanuel Wallerstein.
- Contemporary political economy students treat economic ideologies as the phenomenon to explain, per the traditions of Marxian political economy. Thus, Charles S. Maier suggests that a political economy approach: *interrogates economic doctrines to disclose their sociological and political premises....in sum, [it] regards economic ideas and behavior not as frameworks for analysis, but as beliefs and actions that must themselves be explained.*<sup>[7]</sup> This approach informs Andrew Gamble's *The Free Economy and the Strong State* (Palgrave Macmillan, 1988), and Colin Hay's *The Political Economy of New Labour* (Manchester University Press, 1999). It also informs much work published in *New Political Economy* an international journal founded by Sheffield University scholars in 1996.<sup>[8]</sup>

### ***Disciplines related to political economy***

Because political economy is not a unified discipline, there are studies using the term that overlap in subject matter, but have radically different perspectives:

- Sociology studies the effects of persons' involvement in society as members of groups, and how that changes their ability to function. Many sociologists start from a perspective of production-determining relation from Karl Marx.
- Political Science focuses on the interaction between institutions and human behavior, the way in which the former shapes choices and how the latter change institutional frameworks. Along with economics, it has made the best works in the field by authors like Shepsle, Ostrom, Ordeshook, among others.
- Anthropology studies political economy by studying the relationship between the world capitalist system and local cultures.
- Psychology is the fulcrum on which political economy exerts its force in studying decision-making (not only in prices), but as the field of study whose assumptions model political economy.
- History documents change, using it to argue political economy; historical works have political economy as the narrative's frame.
- Economics focuses on markets by leaving the political—governments, states, legal frameworks—as givens. Economics dropped the adjective *political* in the 19th century, but works backwards, by describing "The Ideal Market", urging governments to formulate policy and law to approach said ideal. Economists and political economists often disagree on what is preeminent in developing production, market, and political structure theories.

- Law concerns the creation of policy and its mediation via political actions that have specific results, it deals with political economy as political capital and as social infrastructure—and the sociological results of one society upon another.
- Human Geography is concerned with politico-economic processes, emphasizing space and environment.
- Ecology deals with political economy, because human activity has the greatest effect upon the environment, its central concern being the environment's suitability for human activity. The ecological effects of economic activity spur research upon changing market economy incentives.
- International Relations often uses political economy to study political and economic development.
- Cultural Studies studies social class, production, labor, race, gender, and sex.
- Communications examines the institutional aspects of media and telecommunication systems, with particular attention to the historical relationships between owners, labor, consumers, advertisers, and the state.

## **Political history of the world**

The **political history of the world** is the history of the various political entities created by the Human race throughout their existence on Earth and the way these states define their borders. Throughout history, political entities have expanded from basic systems of self-governance and monarchy to the complex democratic and communist systems that exist today, in parallel, political systems have expanded from vaguely defined frontier-type boundaries, to the definite boundaries existing today.

### ***Ancient history***

In ancient history, civilizations did not have definite boundaries as states have today, and their borders could be more accurately described as frontiers. Early dynastic Sumer, and early dynastic Egypt were the first civilizations to define their borders. Moreover, for the past 200,000 years and up to the twentieth century, many people have lived in non-state societies. These range from relatively egalitarian bands and tribes to complex and highly stratified chiefdoms.

The first states of sorts were those of early dynastic Sumer and early dynastic Egypt, which arose from the Uruk period and Predynastic Egypt respectively at approximately 3000BC.<sup>[1]</sup> Early dynastic Egypt was based around the Nile River in the north-east of Africa, the kingdom's boundaries being based around the Nile and stretching to areas where oases existed.<sup>[2]</sup> Early dynastic Sumer was

located in southern Mesopotamia with its borders extending from the Persian Gulf to parts of the Euphrates and Tigris rivers.<sup>[1]</sup>

By 2500 BC the Indian civilization, located in the Indus Valley had formed. The civilization's boundaries extended 600KM inland from the Arabian Sea.<sup>[3]</sup>

336 BC saw the rise of Alexander the Great, who forged an empire from various vassal states stretching from modern Greece to the Indian subcontinent, bringing Mediterranean nations into contact with those of central and southern Asia, much as the Persian Empire had before him. The boundaries of this empire extended hundreds of kilometers.<sup>[4]</sup>

The Roman Empire (509 BC - 476 AD) was the first western civilization known to accurately define their borders, although these borders could be more accurately described as frontiers;<sup>[5]</sup> instead of the Empire defining its borders with precision, the borders were allowed to trail off and were, in many cases, part of territory indirectly ruled by others.<sup>[6]</sup>

Roman and Greek ideals of nationhood can be seen to have strongly influenced Western views on the subject, with the basis of many governmental systems being on authority or ideas borrowed from Rome or the Greek city-states. Notably, the European states of the Dark Ages and Middle Ages gained their authority from the Roman Catholic religion, and modern democracies are based in part on the example of Ancient Athens.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

### ***Middle ages***

China entered the Sui Dynasty,<sup>[7]</sup> this saw a change in government and an expansion in its borders as the many separate bureaucracies unified under one banner.<sup>[8]</sup> This evolved into the Tang Dynasty when Li Yuan took control of China in 626.<sup>[9]</sup> By now, the Chinese borders had expanded from eastern China, up north into the Tang Empire.<sup>[10]</sup> The Tang Empire fell apart in 907 and split into ten regional kingdoms and five dynasties with vague borders.<sup>[11]</sup> 53 years after the separation of the Tang Empire, China entered the Song Dynasty under the rule of Chao K'uang, although the borders of this country expanded, they were never as large as those of the Tang dynasty and were constantly being redefined due to attacks from the neighboring Tartar people known as the Khitan tribes.<sup>[12]</sup>

In Western Europe, briefly mostly united into a single state under Charlemagne around 800CE, a few countries, including England, Scotland, Iceland and Norway, had already effectively become nation states by 1,000CE, with a kingdom (Commonwealth in Iceland's case) largely co-terminus with a people mostly sharing a language and culture.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

Over most of the continent, the peoples were emerging around ethnic, linguistic and geographical groups, but this was not reflected in political entities. In particular, France, Italy and Germany, though recognised by other nations as countries where the French, Italians and Germans lived, did not exist as states largely matching the countries for centuries, and struggles to form them, and define their borders, as states were a major cause of wars in Europe until the 20th century. In the course of this process, some countries, such as Poland under the Partitions and France in the High Middle Ages, almost ceased to exist as states for periods. The Low Countries, in the Middle Ages as distinct a country as France, became permanently divided, today into Belgium and the Netherlands. Spain was formed as a nation state by the dynastic union of small Christian kingdoms, augmented by the final campaigns of the Reconquista against Al-Andaluz, the vanished country of Islamic Iberia.<sup>[citation needed]</sup>

In 1299 CE,<sup>[13]</sup> the Aztec empire arose in lower Mexico, this empire lasted over 500 years and at their prime, held over 5,000 square kilometers of land.<sup>[14][15]</sup>

200 years after the Aztec and Toltec empires began, northern and central Asia saw the rise of the Mongol empire. By the late 13th century, the Empire extended across Europe and Asia, briefly creating a state capable of ruling and administrating immensely diverse cultures.<sup>[16]</sup> In 1299, the Ottomans entered the scene, these Turkish nomads took control of Asia Minor along with much of central Europe over a period of 370 years, providing what may be considered a long-lasting Islamic counterweight to Christendom.<sup>[17]</sup>

Exploiting opportunities left open by the Mongolian advance and recession as well as the spread of Islam. Russia took control of their homeland around 1613, after many years being dominated by the Tartars. After gaining independence, The Russian princes began to expand their borders under the leadership of many tsars.<sup>[12]</sup> Notably, Catherine the Great seized the vast western part of Ukraine from the Poles, expanding Russia's size massively. Throughout the following centuries, Russia expanded rapidly, coming close to its modern size.<sup>[18]</sup>

### ***Early modern era***

In 1700, Charles II of Spain died, naming Phillip of Anjou, Louis XIV's grandson, his heir. Charles' decision was not well met by the British, who believed that Louis would use the opportunity to ally France and Spain and attempt to take over Europe. Britain formed the Grand Alliance with Holland, Austria and a majority of the German states and declared war against Spain in 1702. The War of the Spanish Succession lasted 11 years, and ended when the Treaty of Utrecht has signed in 1714.<sup>[19]</sup>

Less than 50 years later, in 1740, war broke out again, sparked by the invasion of Silesia, part of Austria, by King Frederick II of Prussia. Britain, the

Netherlands and Hungary supported Maria Theresa. Over the next eight years, these and other states participated in the War of the Austrian Succession, until a treaty was signed, allowing Prussia to keep Silesia.<sup>[20][21]</sup> The Seven Years' War began when Theresa dissolved her alliance with Britain and allied with France and Russia. In 1763, Britain won the war, claiming Canada and land east of the Mississippi. Prussia also kept Silesia.<sup>[22]</sup>

Interest in the geography of the Southern Hemisphere began to increase in the 18th century,<sup>[23]</sup> in 1642, Dutch navigator Abel Tasman was commissioned to explore Southern Hemisphere, during his voyages, Tasman discovered the island of Van Diemen's Land, which was later named Tasmania, the Australian coast and New Zealand in 1644.<sup>[24]</sup> Captain James Cook was commissioned in 1768 to observe a solar eclipse in Tahiti and sailed into Stingray Harbor on Australia's east coast in 1770, claiming the land for the British Crown.<sup>[25]</sup> Settlements in Australia began in 1788 when Britain began to utilize the country for the deportation of convicts,<sup>[26]</sup> with the first free settlers arriving in 1793.<sup>[27]</sup> Likewise New Zealand became a home for hunters seeking whales and seals in the 1790s with later non-commercial settlements by the Scottish in the 1820s and 30s.<sup>[28]</sup>

In Northern America, revolution was beginning when in 1770, British troops opened fire on a mob pelting them with stones, an event later known as the Boston Massacre.<sup>[29]</sup> British authorities were unable to determine if this event was a local one, or signs of something bigger<sup>[30]</sup> until, in 1775, Rebel forces confirmed their intentions by attacking British troops on Bunker Hill.<sup>[31]</sup> Shortly after, Massachusetts Second Continental Congress representative John Adams and his cousin Samuel Adams were part of a group calling for an American Declaration of Independence. The Congress ended without committing to a Declaration, but prepared for conflict by naming George Washington as the Continental Army Commander.<sup>[30]</sup> War broke out and lasted until 1783, when Britain signed the Treaty of Paris and recognized America's independence.<sup>[32]</sup> In 1788, the states ratified the United States Constitution, going from a confederation to a union<sup>[30]</sup> and in 1789, elected George Washington as the first President of the United States.<sup>[33]</sup>

By the late 1780s, France was falling into debt, with higher taxes introduced and famines ensuing.<sup>[34]</sup> As a measure of last resort, King Louis XVI called together the Estates-General in 1788 and reluctantly agreed to turn the Third Estate (which made up all of the non-noble and non-clergy French) into a National Assembly.<sup>[35]</sup> This assembly grew very popular in the public eye and on July 14, 1789, following evidence that the King planned to disband the Assembly,<sup>[34]</sup> an angry mob stormed the Bastille, taking gun powder and lead shot.<sup>[35]</sup> Stories of the success of this raid spread all over the country, this sparked multiple uprisings in which the lower-classes robbed granaries and manor houses.<sup>[34]</sup> In August of the same year, members of the National Assembly wrote the revolutionary document Declaration of the Rights of Man

and of the Citizen which proclaimed freedom of speech, press and religion.<sup>[34]</sup> By 1792, other European states were attempting to quell the revolution. In the same year Austrian and German armies attempted to march on Paris, but the French repelled them. Building on fears of European invasion, a radical group known as the Jacobins abolished the monarchy and executed King Louis for treason in 1793. In response to this radical uprising, Britain, Spain and the Netherlands join in the fight with the Jacobins until the Reign of Terror was brought to an end in 1794 with the execution of a Jacobin leader, Maximilien Robespierre. A new constitution was adopted in 1795 with some calm returning, although the country was still at war. In 1799, a group of politicians led by Napoleon Bonaparte unseated leaders of the Directory.<sup>[35]</sup>

### ***State institutions***

Communist states share similar institutions, which are organized on the premise that the communist party is a vanguard of the proletariat and represents the long-term interests of the people. The doctrine of democratic centralism, which was developed by Lenin as a set of principles to be used in the internal affairs of the communist party, is extended to society at large. According to democratic centralism, all leaders must be elected by the people and all proposals must be debated openly, but, once a decision has been reached, all people have a duty to obey that decision and all debate should end. When used within a political party, democratic centralism is meant to prevent factionalism and splits. When applied to an entire state, democratic centralism creates a one-party system.<sup>[1]</sup>

The constitutions of most communist states describe their political system as a form of democracy.<sup>[2]</sup> Thus, they recognize the sovereignty of the people as embodied in a series of representative parliamentary institutions. Communist states do not have a separation of powers; instead, they have one national legislative body (such as the Supreme Soviet in the Soviet Union) which is considered the highest organ of state power and which is legally superior to the executive and judicial branches of government.<sup>[3]</sup> Such national legislative politics in communist states often have a similar structure to the parliaments that exist in liberal republics, with two significant differences: first, the deputies elected to these national legislative bodies are not expected to represent the interests of any particular constituency, but the long-term interests of the people as a whole; second, against Marx's advice, the legislative bodies of communist states are not in permanent session. Rather, they convene once or several times per year in sessions which usually last only a few days.<sup>[4]</sup>

When the national legislative body is not in session – that is, most of the time – its powers are transferred to a smaller council (often called a "presidium") which combines legislative and executive power, and, in some communist states,<sup>[which?]</sup> acts as a collective head of state. The presidium is



usually<sup>[weasel words]</sup> composed of important communist party members and votes the resolutions of the communist party into law.

Another feature of communist states is the existence of numerous state-sponsored social organizations (trade unions, youth organizations, women's organizations, associations of teachers, writers, journalists and other professionals, consumer cooperatives, sports clubs, etc.) which are integrated into the political system. In some communist states, representatives of these organizations are guaranteed a certain number of seats on the national legislative bodies. In all communist states, the social organizations are expected to promote social unity and cohesion, to serve as a link between the government and society, and to provide a forum for recruitment of new communist party members

Communist states maintain their legitimacy by claiming to promote the long-term interests of the whole people, and communist parties justify their monopoly on political power by claiming to act in accordance with objective historical laws. Therefore, political opposition and dissent is regarded as counter-productive or even treasonous. Some communist states have more than one political party, but all minor parties are required to follow the leadership of the communist party. Criticism of proposed future policies is usually tolerated, as long as it does not turn into criticism of the political system itself. However, in accordance with the principles of democratic centralism, communist states usually do not tolerate criticism of policies that have already been implemented in the past or are being implemented in the present. However, communist states are widely seen as being *de facto* dictatorships by historians and sociologists, since the elections they held tended to be heavily rigged

### ***Objections to use of term***

Some communists, such left communists, dispute the validity of the term "communist state". In classical Marxism, communism is the final phase of history at which time the state would have "withered away" and therefore "communist state" is a contradiction in terms under premises of this theory. Current states are either in the capitalist or socialist phase of history – making the term "socialist state" preferable to Communists – and the role of the communist party (i.e. the vanguard party) is to pull a nation toward the communist phase of history. The reason why most Western scholars prefer the term "communist state" rather than "socialist state" to describe these countries is because some socialists like left communists oppose the idea of a vanguard party pulling a nation towards communism, and thus the term "socialist state" is liable to cause confusion.

Some Marxists have also opposed the usage of the term "communist state". Since the 1930s, anti-Stalinist Marxists have argued that the existing

communist states did not actually adhere to Marxism, but rather to a perversion of it that was heavily influenced by Stalinism. This critique was based on a variety of arguments, but nearly all anti-Stalinist communists argued that the Soviet model did not represent the interests of the working class. As such, Trotskyists referred to the Soviet Union as a "degenerated workers' state" and called its satellites "deformed workers states".

Not every country ruled by a communist party is viewed by left communists and Trotskyists as a communist state. As noted above, the term "communist state" has been created and used by Western political scientists to refer to a specific type of one-party state. Communist parties have won elections and governed in the context of multi-party democracies, without seeking to establish a one-party state. Examples include San Marino, Republic of Nicaragua (in the 1980s), Republic of Moldova (since 2001), Cyprus (presently), and the Indian states of Kerala, West Bengal and Tripura. These countries and states do not fall under the definition of a communist state.

### **References & Bibliography**

- *Critical Theory and International Relations: A Reader*, ed. by Steven C. Roach, Routledge, 2007, 432 p.
- *Women, Culture, and International Relations* (Critical Perspectives on World Politics) ed. By Vivienne Jabri, Eleanor O'Gorman, Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc, US, 1999,
- Jenny Edkins, *Poststructuralism & International Relations: Bringing the Political Back in* (Critical Perspectives on World Politics), Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc, US, 1999,
- Cynthia Enloe, *The Curious Feminist: Searching for Women in a New Age of Empire* (Paperback), University of California Press 2004,
- Jim George, *Discourses of Global Politics: A Critical Introduction to International Relations*, Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc, US, 1994
- Emin Fuat Keyman, *Globalization, State, Identity/Difference: Toward a Critical Social Theory of International Relations*, Prometheus Books, 1997
- Richmond OP, *Peace in IR*, London: Routledge, 2008.
- Carne Ross, *Independent Diplomat: Despatches from an Unaccountable Elite* (Crisis in World Politics), C. Hurst & Co, 2007
- Christine Sylvester, *Feminist international relations: an unfinished journey*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2002
- Cynthia Weber, *International Relations Theory. A Critical Introduction*, 2nd edition, Taylor & Francis 2004,