

**PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF ALGERIA**

**Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research**

**University of Tlemcen**



**Faculty of Letters and Languages**

**Department of English**

**Section of English**

**The vague promises of International Institutions and  
their Position towards Man (WWII-Now)**

*A Dissertation Submitted to the Department of English as a Partial Fulfillment of the  
requirements for a Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization.*

**PRESENTED BY:**

Ms Sarra HOUHOU

**Supervised by:**

Dr Daoudi FRID

**Co-Supervisor:**

Ms Ilhem BENDAHMANE

**BOARD OF JURY**

Dr Souad BERBAR

MCB

President

Dr Daoudi FRID

MCA

Supervisor

Dr Souad HAMIDI

MCB

Examiner

2021-2022

## Dedications

*To my heart's rose gardens "Mother"*

*To the guiding light in my path "Father"*

*To the paradise of Earth "All my sisters"*

*to everyone I care about*

## ***Acknowledgments***

*“All perfect and true praise belongs to Allah who guided us to attain to this”*

*Throughout the writing of this thesis, I have received a great deal of support and encouragement.*

*First, My sincere thanks to my supervisor*

*Dr. Frid Daoudi, your influential philosophy pushed me to deepen my thinking and elevate my work.*

*I express my thanks to my co-supervisor.*

*Ms. Ilhem Bendahmane for her guidance, advice and endless support.*

*I give sincere thanks to the examiners for giving me from their time to assess the research.*

*To all of the teachers who helped us develop our creative potential over the course for five years, thank you.*

## **Abbreviation List**

**UN:** United Nation

**UNSC:** United Nations Security Council

**UNOSOM:** United Nations Operation in Somalia

**UNITAF:** Unified Task Force

**UNAMIR:** United Nations Mission in Rwanda

**UDHR :** Universal Declaration for Human Rights

## **Abstract**

The world has long desired the reforms that global institutions can provide. Man has always hoped these institutions will bring about the desired change and preserve world peace and security. Institutions have always promised to fulfil all of these desires. Nevertheless, all of those promises were nothing more than decorative patterns, serving only their interests. The goal of this study is to examine international institutions' promises and determine how they react in such sensitive situations to maintain peace and security. So, to gain a better understanding of this topic, a historical approach is required. This then seeks to shed light on their failures to prevent wars, and it has even declared war on the pretext of establishing civilization. The extended essay is divided into two chapters in this regard. The first chapter deals with an overview of institutions as well as from the two central perspectives, realism and liberalism. That control the world today. It also discusses the role of institutions in influencing people's lives. The second chapter tries to analyze the reasons for all of the given objectives made by international institutions, and this was done by tackling various examples to demonstrate the contradictory impact of those same institutions.

**Keywords:** Institutions, Realism, Liberalism, States, United Nations, Human Rights, Peace, Security.

## Table of Contents

Dedications .....	I
<i>Acknowledgments</i> .....	II
Abbreviation List.....	III
Abstract .....	IV
Table of Contents .....	V
General Introduction.....	1
Chapter one: Definition of the Main Concepts .....	3
1.1 Introduction .....	4
1.2 The concept of Institutions .....	4
1.3 Different Philosophical Views about Institutions .....	6
1.3.1 Realism.....	6
1.3.1.1 Institutions in a Realist World .....	9
1.3.2 Liberalism.....	10
1.3.2.1 The role of Liberal Institutions .....	11
1.4 The concept of Human Rights .....	12
1.4.1 Human rights ‘Essential Properties.....	13
1.4.1.1 Human Rights and the State’ Conception.....	14
1.5 The Role of Institutions In Protecting Human Rights.....	16
1.5.1 Peace Promoting .....	18
1.5.1.1 Conflict is not the Cornerstone .....	20
1.5.1.2 Defining the Infrastructure Required to Maintain Peace .....	21
1.5.2 Security ensures.....	22
1.6 Conclusion.....	25
Chapter two: Institutions in Action.....	26
1.1 Introduction.....	27
1.2 The impact of Institutions on Influencing People’s lives .....	27
1.2.1 The development of Political Institutions.....	28
1.2.2 The Globalizing Trade by the Economic Institutions.....	29
1.2.3 The Non-governmental Institutions .....	30
1.3 The contradictory Influence of Institutions on Global Peace and Security.....	32
1.4 The failures of the United Nations Peacekeeping Missions .....	36
1.4.1 Israeli Occupation (1948-Now).....	38
1.4.2 Somali Civil War (1991-Now).....	40

1.4.3 Rwandan Civil War (1994) .....	42
1.4.4 The Congo Peacekeeping Scandal.....	44
1.5 War making and State making as an Organized Crime .....	45
1.6 Conclusion.....	47
General Conclusion .....	51
Works Cited.....	53

# **General Introduction**



## General Introduction

Examining the history of the world allows us to question the primary causes and long-term trends that shape it. From the Cold War to the twenty-first century, the world witnessed a series of ups and downs, achievements and failures that demonstrated the effectiveness of institutions in reshaping the world's order. In this regard the establishment of institutions was and still is the dominant power during the first decades of the twentieth century, where it attempted to create a more favourable environment in various sectors of the society. However as time passed, the passion shifted to specific other priorities.

Human existence is a battle against environmental conditions. The motto of today's human beings is to gain all that can be gained, achieve all that can be achieved, and conquer all that can be conquered. Humans' very essence, or the most crucial aspect of human life, is to generate means of subsistence.

In terms of systems, history reveals how various institutions emerged and evolved to form the structure, culture, and practices we see today, providing valuable insights into how to influence humans and meet all their needs. Institutions, in particular, hold great promise for safeguarding human rights and promoting international peace and security. Although, in the shadow of ongoing conflicts and civil wars, they demonstrate the inverse of the promises that institutions have dared to make since the beginning.

For example, when a country experiences a conflict, whether internal or external, the institutions step in, claiming that their only goal is to resolve the conflict and protect human life. Regrettably, this intervention frequently aggravates the situation.

Because it appears that the institutions' intervention was primarily motivated by a desire to strengthen their control and influence over the most significant number of countries, the defence of human rights and maintaining peace and security were merely pretexts for other objectives.

The interest of this research work is centred on the following questions: what is the position of institutions in the face of violent conflict? what are its main objectives? Moreover how does it react when confronted with reality? The preceding questions are aimed at decoding international institutions' promises to create a better world and analyzing their accurate and fair views.

This paper is divided into two sections. The first chapter explains the main definitions of the key concepts and ideas that are interconnected. This allows the reader to follow the flow of the research as the ideas shift from general to the specific goal of this chapter, which is "the main promises of international institutions."

The second chapter, titled 'institutions in action,' seeks to determine whether previously stated promises have been fulfilled. The chapter is concerned with both the positive services provided by international institutions to humanity in a variety of fields. And their contradictory influence, using the United Nations as an example, demonstrates its failures in peacekeeping in various areas, particularly in the Middle East and North Africa.

**Chapter one:**  
**Definition of the Main Concepts**

## 1.1 Introduction:

It was said that, the fabric of free institutions endures. From this respect and other various contexts, the concept of institution emerged widely. The value of institutions is reflected in their care for individuals and their position in maintaining the country's political, economic and social balance. Thus institutions were and still are the most influential tool in the world governmental system. As a response of the idea which claimed that nothing lasts without institutions, the great majority to them have made promises to improve their infrastructure and services in order to serve the human being and protect their rights.

This chapter aims to shed light on the concept of institutions and how different theorists and philosophers considered them, particularly from the two main perspectives that now control the world system, realism and liberalism. The review shifts its interest to human rights and the role of institutions in protecting them. Finally, this chapter focuses mainly at last on the idea of peace and ensures security, which are the most fundamental promises made by all international institutions. So, what is the reason for the incorporation of institutions? Are they established by and for the people, or some other reason?

## 1.2 The concept of institutions:

There is no extensively- agreed upon definition of institutions in the transnational relations literature. (Keohane qtd. in Mearsheimer 8) .The conception is occasionally defined so astronomically as to encompass all of international relations, which gives it little logical bite. (Stein qtd. in Mearsheimer 8) .For illustration defining

institutions as an “honoured pattern of attitude or practice around which prospects converge”.(Young qtd. in Mearsheimer 8), allows the conception to cover nearly every formalized pattern of exertion between countries. Still, it is possible to concoct a helpful description harmonious with how most institutionalist scholars employ the conception. (Mearsheimer 8). North and Thomas argue that “I define institutions as a set of rules that stipulate how states cooperate and compete with each other” (qtd. in Mearsheimer 8).

They define good forms of state governance, and interdict unacceptable kinds of attitude (8). These rules are negotiated by countries, and according to numerous prominent proponents, they number the collective acceptance of advanced morals, which are standard of geste defined in terms of rights and duties. (Krasner qtd. in Mearsheimer 8). These rules are generally homogenized in transnational agreements, and are generally embodied in associations with their own particulars budgets (Ruggie qtd. in Mearsheimer 9). However, rules are generally incorporated into a formal international association per se that compels countries to observe the rules. Institutions are not a form of world government. States themselves must choose to observe what they created (John qtd. in Mearsheimer 9). According to Charles Lipson, institutions, in short, call for "the decentralized cooperation of individual sovereign states, without any effective mechanism of command"(qtd. in Mearsheimer 9).

Institutions have increasingly become the focus of social science questioning, especially in political science and sociology. The early 1980s, the emergence of the methodological approach known as new institutionalism, and its intellectual streams,

including rational choice institutionalism, historical institutionalism, normative institutionalism, and sociological institutionalism reinforced their importance (Gilad).

Institutions have been demonstrated to have a significant impact on political processes and outcomes. Again, the various theoretical approaches to institutions differ in terms of the nature of that impact. Rational choice institutionalists emphasize the role of institutions in shaping the degree of stability and change in a political system by determining the number of people whose consent is required to change the status quo. Historical institutionalists emphasize the path-dependent effect of institutions, in which the contingent choice of one institution over another, for example, private over public provision of pensions—results in political actors' investment in adaptation to the selected institution, and thus in its durability and regular divergence of countries' institutional forms. Normative and sociological institutionalists, on the other hand, explain the convergence of governance regimes across countries—for illustration, privatization and the new general operation reforms — as a result of the legality of those institutional forms (Gilad).

### **1.3 Different Philosophical Views about Institutions**

In order to understand how institutions do or do not work, one has to examine first the different institutionalist theories separately

#### **1.3.1 Realism**

According to Morgenthau, Realism paints a bleak picture of global politics (qtd. in Mearsheimer 9). The international system is portrayed as a brutal arena in which

states seek opportunities to exploit each other and thus have little reason to trust one another. (Evera qtd. in Mearsheimer 9). Each state strives not only to be the most powerful actor in the system, but also to ensure that no other state achieves that lofty position (Mearsheimer 9).

International relations are not always at war, but they are always in a state of constant security competition, with the threat of war lurking in the background. The level of competition varies depending on the situation. In this competitive world, states frequently cooperate, which may seem counterintuitive. Nonetheless, inter-state cooperation has its limits, owing to the dominating logic of the market. No amount of cooperation can eliminate security competition. Genuine tranquillity, According to Realism, a world without states competing for power is unlikely (9).

Morgenthau and Waltz demonstrate that the five assumptions about the international system that underpin realism's pessimistic view of how the world works are the source of this perspective. The first point to make is that the international system is anarchic. This does not imply that it is chaotic or riddled with the disorder (qtd. in Mearsheimer 9).

That conclusion is easy to reach because realism depicts a world characterized by security, competition and war. However, realists use, "anarchy" has nothing to do with conflict; rather, it is an ordering principle that states that the system is made up of independent political units (states) with no central authority above them. In other words, states have sovereignty because there is no higher ruling body in the international system. There is no "government over governments." (Claud qtd. in Mearsheimer 10).

The second assumption is that states are born with some offensive military capability, giving them the ability to harm and possibly destroy one another. States can be dangerous to one another. A state's military power is typically associated with the specific weaponry at its disposal, though even in the absence of weapons, individuals within a state could use their feet and hands to attack the population of another state. The third assumption is that states can never be sure of other states' intentions. No state can be confident that another state will not use its offensive military capability against it. This is not to say that states always have bad intentions. Another state may be consistently benign, but it is impossible to be certain of that judgment because intentions cannot be predicted with 100 percent on average certainty. There are numerous potential causes of aggression, and no state can be sure that another is not motivated by one of them (10).

The fourth assumption is that survival is the most basic motivation driving states. States wish to preserve their sovereignty. The fifth assumption is that states consider how to survive in the international system in a strategically manner. States are rational in their utility. They may, however, make errors from time to time because they operate in a world of imperfect information, where potential adversaries have incentives to misrepresent their strengths or weakness and conceal their true intentions (10).

According to Morgenthau, 'None of these assumptions alone mandates that states will behave competitively. The fundamental assumption dealing with motives says that states merely aim to survive, which is a defensive goal' (qtd. in Mearsheimer 10).



### 1.3.1.1 Institutions in a Realist World

Realists also fete the state occasionally operates through institutions. Still, they believe that those rules reflect countries' computations of tone-interest grounded primarily on the international distribution of power. The most crucial state in the system creates and shapes institutions so that they can maintain their share of the world's power, or indeed increase it (Mearsheimer 13). In this view, institutions are essential 'arenas for acting out power relationships' (Evans and Wilson qtd. in Mearsheimer 13).

For Realists, the causes of war and peace are substantially a function of the balance of power, and institutions largely image power distribution in the system. In Short, the balance of power is the independent variable that explains war; institutions are merely an intermediating variable in the process (13).

NATO is an institution, and it played a part in precluding World War 2 and helping the west win the cold war. Nevertheless, NATO was principally an incarnation of the bipolar distribution of power in Europe during the Cold war, and it was the balance of power, not NATO per se, that provided the crucial maintenance stability on the mainland. NATO was essentially an American tool for managing power in the face of the soviet trouble (13-14). Now with the collapse of the Soviet Union, realists argue that NATO must either vanish or reconstitute itself on the base of the new distribution of power in Europe (Hellmann and wolf qtd. in Mearsheimer 14). NATO cannot remain as it was during the Cold War (14). Although liberal institutionalism has a different philosophy in this regard.

### 1.3.2 Liberalism

Axelrod and Keohane argue that, Liberal institutionalism does not directly address the question of whether institutions cause peace, but instead focuses on the more modest goal of explaining cooperation when states' interests are not fundamentally opposed (qtd. in Mearsheimer 15). The theory specifically examines cases where states are having difficulty cooperating because they have 'mixed' interests; in other words, each side has incentives to cooperate as well as incentives not to cooperate (Keohane qtd. in Mearsheimer 15).

Milner declared that "Cooperation benefits both sides; however, liberal institutionalists define cooperation as "goal-directed behaviour that entails mutual policy adjustments so that all sides end up better off than they would otherwise be." (qtd. in Mearsheimer 15).

The theory has off-the-shelf relevance in situations where states' interests are fundamentally conflicting, and neither side believes it stands to gain much from cooperation. In these circumstances, countries aim to gain an advantage over each other. They suppose in terms of winning and losing, and this always leads to violent security competition, and occasionally war. Nevertheless, liberal institutionalism does not deal directly with these situations, and therefore says little about resolving or indeed ameliorating them. (Mearsheimer 15).

As a result, the theory largely ignores security issues in favour of focusing on economic and, to a lesser extent, environmental concerns (Keohane and Levy qtd. in Mearsheimer 15). The theory assumes that international politics can be divided into two domains: security and political economy, and that liberal institutionalism

applies primarily to the latter but not the former. Charles Lipson expresses this theme clearly when he writes that "significantly different institutional arrangements are associated with international economic and security issues." (qtd. in Mearsheimer 16). Furthermore, the likelihood differs markedly within these two domains: when economic relations are at stake, cooperation can be sustained among several self-interested states Whereas the prospects for cooperation are 'more impoverished ...in security affaires' (Lipson qtd. in Mearsheimer 16). As a result, proponents of the theory pay little attention to the security realm, where questions about war and peace are raised (16).

Nonetheless, there are compelling reasons to scrutinize Liberal institutionalism. Liberal institutionalism asserts that institutions are a significant source of international stability. Furthermore, one could argue that if the theory demonstrates a solid causal relationship between institutions and economic cooperation, it would be relatively simple to move on to the next step and link cooperation with peace (Mearsheimer "Back to the future instability in Europe After the Cold War" 16), Some proponents of the theory believe that institutions contribute to international stability, implying that they believe it is simple to link cooperation and stability (Keohane qtd. in Mearsheimer 16).

Mearsheimer also declared ,“I doubt this claim, mainly because proponents of the theory define cooperation so narrowly as to avoid military issues. Let us assume, however, that liber institutionalists are attempting to take a gain step toward developing a theory that explains how institutions push states away from war” (16).

### **1.3.2.1 The role of Liberal Institutions**

Institutions, according to liberal institutionalists, facilitate cooperation by:

- Bringing down transaction costs (Keohane et al 39-51).

- Information provision (39-51).
- Increasing the credibility of commitments (39-51).
- Creating coordination focal points (39-51).
- Facilitating the reciprocity principle (39-51).
- Extending the future's shadow (39-41) (Oye 1-24) (Fearon 269-305).
- Enabling issue interlinkages **raises** the cost of non-compliance (Poast 277-310).

Using historical institutionalism logics, John Ikenberry contends that institutions may be highly durable because:

- They raise expectations for future behaviour.
- They create incentives for continuity by forming coalitions, routines, and connections among actors.
- They result in spillovers as other forms of cooperation from existing institutions. (23, 29-31)
- High start-up costs deter actors from establishing challenger institutions.
- Learning effects provide incentives for actors to remain loyal to existing institutions (23, 29-31).

## 1.4 The concept of Human Rights

In the most general sense, human rights are understood as rights which belong to any individual as a consequence of being human, independently of acts of law. In stating the existence of human rights, we state that every human being,

simply because he or she is a human being, and is entitled to something. The existence of such rights is expressed in the output (especially in literature) of various cultures at various times (Hersh qtd. in Piechowiak 3). According to Weston, “However, the real 'career' of human rights category, started only after the Second World War” (qtd. in Piechowiak 3). It became a common category in practical disputes, not only in law, but also in politics, morality, and religion. The modern concept of human rights is based on experiences of 'legal lawlessness,' in which crimes were committed with the permission of the law, and some human beings were denied their status as such. The emergence of international human rights law was a response to these experiences. The human rights conception adopted at the time is now the paradigm for understanding human rights not only in international law but also in other areas of culture.

This concept includes an attempt to explain the reasons for the massive violations of fundamental rights, as well as a proposal for solutions to ensure that such violations do not occur again in the future. The solutions include both conduct standards and postulates referring to the human beings, state, and positive law conceptions (Piechowiak 3). The international community's recognition of each individual's unique worth led to concern not only for the elimination of elements harmful to the individual, but also for the creation of conditions that would allow him or her to develop and flourish (3-4).

### **1.4.1 Human rights ‘Essential Properties**

The first, identical sections of the Preambles to the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the International Covenants on Human Rights state that "recognition of

the inherent dignity and equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of world freedom, justice, and peace." In the second section of the Covenants' Preambles, it is stated that "these rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person." (Piechowiak 5).

Recognizing the indivisibility and interdependence of various rights is an essential feature of today's conception of human rights. 'All human rights are universal, indivisible, interdependent, and interconnected' (9). The international community must treat human rights globally in a fair and equal manner, on the same footing, and with the same emphasis' (The Vienna Declaration). Each aspect of a human being (physical, psychological, moral, spiritual, social, and so on) deserves consideration. Individual development necessitates favourable social, political, economic, cultural, and environmental conditions. Furthermore, ensuring a minimum in one of these is usually required for developing or preventing degradation in another; for example, ensuring minimum social standards is required for exercising political rights.

However, it appears impossible to define, all cases and in general terms, how the means for preventing a human being's degradation or ensuring his/her development should be distributed. The starting point is a specific person living in unusual circumstances. The goal of the formulated law is human well-being, not abstract values. Recognizing inherent dignity as the source of rights also acknowledges that rights are secondary to an individual and exist for the benefit of the individual as a whole (9).

#### **1.4.1.1 Human Rights and the State's Conception**

The concept of human rights is linked with a specific concept of the State and positive law, in which the individual is given a central place; respect for his or her.

dignity takes precedence over the good of a group and the good of the State. The recognition of the dignity and the rights that flow from that dignity is the foundation of justice, according to the paradigmatic view of human rights (Universal Declaration of Human Rights) and, thus, the foundation of any legal system that claims to be just. Indicating the extra-legal foundations of positive law and modelling the legal system based on human rights respect helps to keep positive law from devolving into "legal lawlessness." The State and the law protect the individual in society (Piechowiak 9).

The state and the law protect the individual from being treated as a mere means and promote the creation of conditions conducive to holistic development. Other state responsibilities are subordinated to these functions and may be carried out only within the framework of fundamental rights and freedoms. Despite the fact that human rights law was created, among other things, to protect the individual against the power of the State, with the introduction of this model, the State is increasingly regarded as a guardian of human rights. The modern state is typically based on human rights and respect (9).

The state and the law protect the individual from being treated as a mere means and promote the creation of conditions conducive to his or her holistic development. Other responsibilities of the state are subordinated to these functions and may be carried out only within the framework of fundamental rights and freedoms. Despite the fact that human rights law was created, among other things, to protect the individual against the power of the State, with the introduction of this model, the State is increasingly regarded as a guardian of human rights (9-10). The modern state founded on human rights are

typically characterized as a democratic state governed by the rule of law and implementing an appropriate social policy. These characteristics point to essential aspects of social life organization. These aspects, however, should always be viewed in context in order to avoid making any of them absolute. Democracy, promoted first and foremost because the individual is a free and rational agent (a being "endowed with reason and conscience"), cannot be understood as the absolute primacy of majority will. A state governed by the rule of law cannot be reduced to mere conformity with laws that have been appropriately adopted in a formal sense. The postulate of implementing an appropriate social policy does not imply that the State should unconditionally ensure direct subsistence to every individual; rather, it must be understood as a postulate to support the individual's initiative and responsibility for himself/herself and other members of society (Piechowiak 10).

When considering the paradigmatic conception of human rights, neither a social contract, nor the will of individuals, nor the State, can be regarded as the source of human rights and just legal order; human rights cannot be justified solely as a condition for the possibility of social conflict, nor as a condition that the system must meet in order to function (10).

### **1.5 The Role of Institutions in Protecting Human Rights**

Human rights protection became a concern for the international community in the early twentieth century. The League of Nations, founded at the end of World War I, attempted to develop an international legal framework, as well as international monitoring mechanisms, to protect minorities. The horrors of World War II inspired the international community to ensure that such atrocities would never be repeated, and they



provided the impetus for the modern movement to establish an international system of binding human rights protection (The United Nations Human Rights Treaty System 3).

One of the purposes of the United Nations, according to its 1945 Charter, is to promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all (3). The adopting of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights by the United Nations General Assembly in 1948 was the first step toward achieving this goal. It is regarded as the authoritative interpretation of the term "human rights" in the United Nations Charter. The Universal Declaration, along with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social, and Cultural Rights, both adopted in 1966, form the International Bill of Human Rights. Since 1948, hundreds of universal and regional, binding and non-binding instruments have codified human rights and fundamental freedoms, touching almost every aspect of human life and covering a wide range of civil, political, economic, social, and cultural rights. As a result, the codification of human rights is nearly complete (3).

National governments play a vital role in the realization of human rights. Human rights involve interpersonal relationships as well as interpersonal relationships with the state. As a result, the practical task of protecting and promoting human rights is primarily a national one, and each State must bear responsibility for it. At the national level, adequate legislation, an independent judiciary, the enactment and enforcement of individual safeguards and remedies, and the establishment of democratic institutions are the best ways to protect rights. Furthermore, the most effective education and information campaigns are likely to be those designed and implemented at the

national or local level, considering the local cultural and traditional context (National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights 1).

When a state ratifies a human rights instrument, it either incorporates its provisions directly into domestic legislation or undertakes to comply with the obligations contained there in other ways. As a result, most countries' domestic laws now include universal human rights standards and norms. However, the mere existence of a law to protect certain rights is frequently insufficient if these laws do not also provide for all of the legal, powers, and institutions required to ensure their practical realization (1).

This issue of effective national implementation has sparked much of international interest and action, particularly in recent years. The emergence or re-emergence of democratic rule in many countries has drawn attention to the critical role of democratic institutions in safeguarding the legal and political foundations on which human rights are based (2).

As a result, it has become increasingly clear that effective enjoyment of human rights necessitates the establishment of national infrastructures for their protection and promotion. Many countries have established official human rights institutions in recent years. While the tasks of such institutions vary significantly from country to country, they all serve the same purpose and are thus referred to collectively as national institutions for the protection and promotion of human rights (2).

### **1.5.1 Peace Promoting**

As declared by the Report of the Advisory Group of Experts on the Review of the Peacebuilding Architecture, The Advisory Group of Experts introduced the language

of "sustaining peace" as a counterpoint to the term "peacebuilding" in its review of the peacebuilding architecture. Although initially conceived as a comprehensive process, peacebuilding has come to be narrowly defined as time-bound, exogenous interventions that occur "after the guns fall silent" in fragile or conflict-affected states (qtd. in 'International Peace Institute' 1) Sustaining peace seeks to reclaim peace in its own right and detach it from the subservient affiliation with conflict that has defined it over the past four decades (Youssef Mahmoud qtd. in 'International Peace Institute' 1). Since the United Nations Security Council and General Assembly passed landmark resolutions on sustaining peace in April 2016, UN member states and practitioners have begun to consider what this concept entails ( Security Council Resolution qtd. in 'international Peace Institute' 1).

The International Peace Institute stated that; first, we define peacekeeping as an explicit and deliberate policy goal for all states, regardless of whether they are afflicted by violent conflict. Second, maintaining peace is supported by an infrastructure of institutions, norms, attitudes, and capacities from various sectors and levels of social organization. This infrastructure must be nurtured and updated on a regular basis in order to adapt to changing contexts and circumstances. Third, peacekeeping is an endogenous process that necessitates strong and inclusive national ownership and leadership. Finally, maintaining peace is multi-sectoral and all-encompassing, requiring attention at the highest levels of the national government (1).

Committing to sustaining peace necessitates returning to the beginning of the process of building peace, ushering in a paradigm shift in our understanding of peace. Sustaining peace seeks to broaden the peace agenda by including proactive measures

it was aimed at building on existing peace by reinforcing the structures, attitudes, and institutions that support it (1-2). This new paradigm can strengthen the prevention agenda while also improving the effectiveness of ongoing peacekeeping interventions. It is not a radical call to replace existing interventions with new processes, but rather a complete rethinking of how we approach peace and peace-related interventions (2).

### **1.5.1.1 Conflict is not the Cornerstone**

The peace agenda is rooted in peace and conflict studies scholarship and is supported by rhetoric that ranges from post-conflict reconstruction to broader debates on peaceful coexistence. In practice, however, peacebuilding has been confined to the narrower end of the spectrum; it is perceived as only relevant in contexts where conflict is manifest or imminent. As a result, peacebuilding is regarded as a subset of conflict resolution or conflict transformation (2). Because of the binary relationship ascribed to conflict and peace, stable states with no violent conflict are excluded from the peace study, even though the fact that these are the case studies most likely to reveal the factors associated with peace. All societies have characteristics that contribute to maintaining peace, whether they are institutions, cultures, policies, or the less tangible, quotidian, and tacit norms of interaction between individuals and groups. However, in the absence of manifest conflict, these characteristics go undocumented and are rarely nurtured. Existing peacekeeping capacities risk extinction, exposing even the most peaceful societies to future conflict. As a result, all states should apply and adopt the sustaining peace agenda (2).

Whereas peacebuilding begins with conflict and ends with peace, sustaining peace begins with identifying the attributes and assets that have sustained social cohesion, inclusive development, the rule of law, and human security—the factors that contribute to a peaceful society (2). As many scholars have argued, conflict is a natural Phenomenon arising from social interactions, and even a desirable one, in so far as it often leads to innovation and progress (Lederach qtd. in ‘International Peace Institute’ 2). In this sense, peace is the ability to manage and transform conflict in a peacefully and constructively manner, rather than the absence of conflict. Assuming that, all societies experience conflict, those that do not descend into violence must have structures and capacities for maintaining peace, even if these are not explicitly stated (2).

### **1.5.1.2 Defining the Infrastructure Required to Maintain Peace**

Grewal reveals that, the most difficult challenge for those seeking to comprehend sustaining peace is defining the concrete actions that will contribute to its effective implementation. The conceptual underpinnings of peacekeeping can be traced back to Johan Galtung's seminal work on "positive peace." (qtd. in ‘International Peace Institute’ 2). Positive peace requires building and strengthening the factors that foster peace (Mahmoud qtd. in ‘International Peace Institute’ 2). Among these factors are those that enable "everyday peace," such as solidarity and compassion between different ethnic groups, as well as systemic factors such as equitable resource distribution, well functioning institutions, tolerance for diversity, respect for the rights of others, physical safety, and access to food and clean drinking water (‘Institute for Economics and Peace’ qtd. in ‘International Peace Institute’ 2).

Sustaining peace aims to put more emphasis on identifying and strengthening what is already working, rather than just fixing what is broken. Even stressed-out societies have capacities that must be developed. Furthermore, maintaining peace is a continuous process, not a one-time event (2).

Contexts change as a result of both internal fluctuations and external shocks, necessitating an adjustment in the norms and institutions that govern society. Migration patterns, for example, alter a society's social balance, and maintaining social cohesion in the face of such changes necessitates citizens' willingness and ability to adopt new norms of social interaction and extend their tolerance threshold. The inability to respond to changes, both internal and external, is an indication of a society's peace infrastructure's weakness (2-3).

### **1.5.2 Security ensures**

The theory of collective security addresses the question of how to bring about peace (Claude et al qtd. in Mearsheimer 26). It recognizes that military power is and will continue to be a central feature of international politics for the foreseeable future. The proper management of military power is the key to enhancing stability in this world of armed states (Mearsheimer 26). As Inis Claude points out, "the problem of power is here to stay; it is, realistically, not a problem to be eliminated but a problem to be managed." (qtd. in Mearsheimer 26). Collective security begins with the assumption that states will behave realistically (Thayer qtd. in Mearsheimer 28). The goal, however, is to move beyond the self-help world of realism, in which states fear each other and are motivated by balance-of-power considerations, despite the theory's assumption that military power will remain a fact of life in the international system. Institutions,

according to proponents of collective security, are critical to achieving this lofty goal. The goal is to persuade states to base their behaviour on three fundamentally anti-realist norms (28). To begin, states must abandon the use of military force to change the status quo. They must refrain from launching aggressive wars and instead agree to settle all disputes peacefully. Collective security allows for status quo changes, but those changes must be achieved through negotiation, not at the end of a rifle barrel (28). As Claude mentions, the theory "depends upon a positive commitment to the value of world peace by the great mass of states." (qtd. in Mearsheimer 28).

However, the theory recognizes that some states may refuse to accept this norm: if the norm were universally accepted, there would be no need for a collective security system to deal with troublemakers, because there would be none (Glaser et al qtd. in Mearsheimer 28) nevertheless, the overwhelming majority of states must abandon conquest wars or the system will collapse (28).

Second, when acting against isolated aggressors, "responsible" states must choose to align their national interests with the broader interests of the international community rather than narrow self-interest (29). States, must specifically believe that their national interests are inextricably linked with the national interests of other states, so that attack on any state is considered an attack on all states (Woodrow qtd. in Mearsheimer 29). As a result, when a thorny issue arises in the system, all responsible states must automatically and collectively confront the aggressor with overwhelming military force (29). The primary objective is to "create automatic collective obligations." As stated by Morgenthau (qtd. in Mearsheimer 29).

Third, states must have faith in one another. States must not only follow the first two norms, but they must also trust that other states will follow suit. Collective security cannot function if states fear each other, as they do in a realist world (29). Claude emphasizes that states must be "willing to entrust their destinies to collective security" (29). Confidence is a necessary condition for the system's success; states must be willing to rely on its effectiveness and impartiality." (Claude qtd. in Mearsheimer 29).

Trust is the most important of the three norms because it supports the other two. States, in particular, must be confident that almost all of the other states in the system will sincerely renounce aggression and will not change their minds later. States must also be confident that if an aggressor targets them, none of the other responsible states will back down and fail to confront the instigator. This element of certainty is critical in a collective security system because if it fails, at least some states that have ignored the balance of power and eschewed alliances will be vulnerable to attack (30).

This discussion of trust brings up another point about the difficulties that a collective security system faces when confronted with multiple aggressors. The previous discussion concentrated primarily on the logistical challenges of dealing with multiple troublemakers. However, the presence of multiple aggressors raises the question of whether most states in the system are deeply committed to peace, and thus, whether trusting collective security makes sense. The more troublemakers there are in the system, the more sceptical responsible states will be of their investment in collective security. This logic also applies to claims that collective security can be achieved without requiring all states to join the system (30).



## 1.6 Conclusion

Since the end of the Second World War, Western policymakers have sought to establish international institutions-based security arrangements in Europe and other parts of the world. Indeed, such norms and institutions play an essential role in today's world system management of a wide range of regional and global changes.

The first chapter investigates the claim that institutions keep states from taking military action and promote peace. However, Realists and institutionalists disagree on whether institutions have a significant impact on the prospects for international stability. Realists oppose, while institutionalists agree. Otherwise, the approach to international politics is based on the belief that institutions play an important role in ensuring human rights and promoting global peace. This chapter paves the way for the second, which will investigate why institutions are so highly regarded by policymakers and academics, despite the lack of evidence that they are a significant cause of peace.

**Chapter two:**  
**Institutions in Action**

## 1.1 Introduction

The establishment of international institutions is one of the most admirable efforts in world history to influence people's lives and support the society in which they wish to live, apart from achieving world peace. The latter exhibits many of the characteristics of the liberal ideal; however, it has not achieved its ostensible goal of making the international community a more peaceful.

This chapter highlights the influence of institutions on humanity without neglecting their blind spots. First, the positive aspects of the institutions were reflected in all of their public successes and how they contributed to the favourable impact on individuals. While, in terms of these institutions' contradictory roles, the United Nations was the most notable international organization for analysis, claiming to maintain global peace and security. Nonetheless, the truth was and continues to be quite different. This is why many theorists and critics have observed a wide gap between what they promised people and how they act in reality. Among them, Ferdinand de Saussure, the founder of modern linguistics and semiology, says “Nearly all institutions, it might be said, are based on signs, but these signs do not directly evoke things”.

## 1.2 The impact of Institutions on Influencing People's lives

Many nations faced challenges following the devastation of World War II and the hardships of the Great Depression (1929-1939). Global conflict, poverty, injustice, and instability were all addressed by leaders. Intergovernmental organizations such as

the League of Nations (1920-1946) attempted but failed to promote peace and economic security. As a result, world leaders devised a new strategy (Elshaikh).

Their ideas resulted in the establishment of several new institutions. An institution is a complex and long-lasting social structure that is organized. Institutions shape community organizations by influencing behaviour, customs, and laws. Leaders in, this case, desired to establish institutions that would benefit communities or networks of people. These institutions would work toward specific social, political, or economic objectives. The new institutions formed at the end of the Second World War were political, economic, and even non-governmental (Elshaikh).

### **1.2.1 The development of political institutions**

The League of Nations was established in 1918 to prevent another world war. However, by 1943, at the height of World War II, it had failed. Global leaders recognized the need for a new institution capable of achieving similar but distinct goals. As a result, the United Nations was established in 1945. The United Nations was created to fill a void left by the League of Nations: collective security. This means that all members (nations, not individuals) have to unite as an international community and resist aggression. Preventing aggression in the first place is ideal. However, the UN has some tools for dealing with aggression and conflict if they occur. The United Nations' judicial arm, which deals with legal issues, is one of these tools. This judicial arm is known as the International Court of Justice (ICJ), and it is based in the Dutch city of The Hague. The Court's role is to resolve disputes between member states and advise the various agencies of the United Nations (Elshaikh).

The United Nations has also established safeguards for global health and human rights. The 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights is perhaps the best example of this (UDHR). It is a set of human rights, women's and children's rights, and labour standards. Another example is the United Nations' establishment of the World Health Organization in 1948. (WHO). The goal of this agency is to ensure global public health. So, the UN serves many different functions, all aimed at a better, healthier, fairer, and more peaceful world (Elshaikh). As a result, some have referred to the UN as a "world government" in charge of an international community. However, it operates very differently than a government. The United Nations is not a sovereign nation with authority to punish its citizens. It must instead exert influence over its members through treaties, monitoring, special procedures, and commissions (Elshaikh).

### **1.2.2 The Globalizing Trade by the Economic Institutions**

The formation of the United Nations demonstrates that countries were serious about reducing violent conflict after World War II. However, war violence was not the only source of concern. Many leaders were occupied with economic insecurity and poverty as well. Most world economies were still struggling after the Great Depression. Some leaders met in the United States even before the war ended in 1945 to address this issue. Their goal was to devise policies to govern the global economy. They desired to avoid the ups and downs of the interwar period and to maintain stable currencies. Two important institutions were established. The first was the International Monetary Fund (IMF). The second was the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, which later became the World Bank. The original goals of these institutions were to help.

control the destructive ups and downs of global markets. They were established to ensure that the world economy grew in balanced (Elshaikh).

The IMF and World Bank's initial goals were to protect employment and living standards. They also wanted to ensure that trade was balanced and not dominated by a few countries. As a result, both institutions have invested in assisting member countries in developing their resources and productive capacities. The IMF's written mission reflected this, emphasising on international cooperation, balanced growth in international trade, and stability. Its initial goals were primarily focused on regulation. The World Bank had a slightly different focus: reconstruction and development. They were supposed to assist member countries in sharing risks, resources, and information. This was supposed to be non-political. The voting power of each state was proportional to its economic contribution (Elshaikh).

This non-political approach was critical because member countries wanted to avoid the nationalist policies that had caused the Great Depression to be so devastating. Instead, these institutions functioned by increasing cooperation. For example, the IMF provided loans to developing countries to cover trade deficits. The World Bank invested heavily in debt relief and reconstruction projects, particularly in Europe. Global markets did become increasingly linked broad networks. This made it much easier for money and investments to move. These institutions were also key to managing financial crises and economic transitions (Elshaikh).

### **1.2.3 The Non-governmental Institutions**

According to Elshaikh, International non-governmental organizations are another type of institution that works to affect change on a global scale (INGOs).

organizations such as the International Committee of the Red Cross and Oxfam International have been working to address global health issues and poverty since the nineteenth century. Human rights advocacy organizations such as Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have recently had a significant impact on how people perceive their role in the world. These organizations have enabled many more people to see themselves as global citizens who are part of a global community. Environmental activist groups such as Greenpeace have had a similar impact. This is because these organizations are increasingly using media campaigns to raise awareness. These campaigns instill a sense of global responsibility (Elshaikh).

This belief in the value of collective action highlights the ways in which these institutions shape people's communities. When you stop to think about it, this is a very powerful and effective belief (Elshaikh). Amnesty International, for example, has been effective by building on the United Nations' human rights efforts. They have drawn attention to abuses and advocated for violent acts such as rape to be classified as war crimes. They also mobilised global opposition to nuclear testing and South Africa's racist Apartheid system, by influencing global opinion. That is no small feat. It fosters a strong sense of connectedness and shared responsibility. It fosters a strong sense of connectedness and shared responsibility. It is so powerful that American President Dwight Eisenhower once said, when asked if nuclear testing should continue, "the new thermo-nuclear weapons are tremendously powerful; however, they are not... as powerful as is world opinion today in obliging the United States to follow certain lines policy." (Elshaikh).

ELShaikh, in her article, asserts that, Because of international political and economic institutions, as well as global non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the world is now connected in unprecedented ways. They have built more significant , more fluid networks. They have also fostered broader, more all-encompassing senses of community. However, these connections have not always been equal. In some cases, the effects were only partial, inconsistent, short-lived, or negative. They have not always been successful in averting crises. Many people fall behind. Furthermore, by promoting economic liberalization, these institutions have resulted in fewer social safeguards. In many cases, countries have been forced to reduce social protections such as healthcare in order to receive debt relief, loans, or other investments. For better or worse, these changes have resulted in increased global uniformity.

### **1.3 The contradictory Influence of Institutions on Global Peace and Security**

The number of actors actively involved in global governance has increased dramatically over the last eight decades, convincing large segments of the population that international institutions are now the driving engine of the economic, political, and social policy worldwide. With international organizations like the UN, NATO, and the IMF claiming to effectively address the world's poverty, underdevelopment, peacekeeping, and security issues, it appears that Harry Truman was correct to believe in the following lines: 'For I dip into the future, Far as human eye could see, Saw the Vision of the world, and all the wonders that would be...' (Zweifel qtd. in Andrei 1).



Unfortunately, this is not the case in today's international system, and empirical evidence supports the "realist" rather than the "institutionalist" approach' (Mearsheimer qtd. in Andrei 1). Many of the international institutions lauded for their importance in promoting and establishing peace and security in the global system have the opposite effect. NATO is the institutional apparatus of a military alliance, which naturally raises concerns about security and conflict potential among non-member states (Keohane qtd. in Andrei 1). The same can be said of the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which has so far only managed to cause massive economic problems in many developing countries in South America, laying the groundwork for future security issues in the affected regions. Beginning with the assumptions of 'decentralized cooperation theory' (Gilligan qtd. in Andrei 1).

The current international system is one of 'self-help' (Waltz qtd. in Andrei 1) and also one of a permanent 'prisoner's dilemma' (Krause and Williams qtd. in Andrei 1). "A system in which states are constantly challenged by the constant 'security competition'" (Waltz qtd. in Andrei 1). exist on both the political and economic levels. As a result, it is only a matter of deduction that the emphasis in understanding international relations remains on the self-interested state (Andrei 1). Furthermore, the realist viewpoint correctly suggests that it is primarily powerful states that choose to create, control, and lead international institutions in order to use them to their advantage and, to some extent, to reduce the uncertainty prevalent in the international arena (Mearsheimer qtd. in Andrei 1). From there, it is time to examine some of the major international institutions and demonstrate

both their inefficiency in achieving global peace and security, as well as their lack of authority over their member states (Andrei 1)

According to Held, The United Nations is one of the most powerful institutions in global governance. It is a veritable global bureaucracy made up of numerous "nested arrangements." (qtd. in Andrei 1), which, in theory, regulates and represents all of humanity's social, economic, and security interests. Its main body, the Security Council, with its five permanent members, the United States, Russia, China, the United Kingdom, and France, is living proof of 'Realpolitik,' a type of politics that operates under the pragmatic terminology of 'nuclear, chemical, biological, and ballistic missiles.' (d'Orville qtd. in Andrei 2).

With the achievement of world peace as its primary goal, the United Nations has repeatedly demonstrated its inability to handle the securitization and pacification of many geographical areas. A good example is the 1994 Rwandan genocide, when Hutu government officials launched a nationwide extermination campaign against all Tootsie tribe inhabitants, an atrocity that the United Nations was unable to prevent or stop despite having a significant number of its armed forces deployed in the region at the time (crimesofwar.org qtd. in Andrei 2).

Another example is the Sudanese crisis, which has yet to be resolved despite the suffering of millions of people (crimesofwar.org qtd. in Andrei 2). The 1990 massacre of 8000 Muslims in Srebrenica by the Serbian army, then under the command of Serb leader Radovan Karadzic, is a more recent example of the UN's inability to manage a security crisis. The examples above demonstrate that the United Nations has so far failed to deliver on its promise of world peace and security, owing primarily to the

encroachments the P5 members have made in delivering appropriate policy outputs on matters of extreme sensitivity (Andrei 2).

The inflammatory situation in the Middle East between Israel and Hamas has exposed the policy driving power the US, as a world hegemon, possesses when protecting Israel from the sometimes unfriendly resolutions passing through the Security Council (Klausner qtd. in Andrei 2). Another interesting case is the war in Iraq launched by the US and its allies against the will of the UN, a case which proves all institutionalists wrong (Gordon and Shapiro qtd. in Andrei 2). Therefore, it is now clear that when talking about international institutions, one is correct to define them as ‘arenas for acting out power relationships’ (Mearsheimer qtd. in Andrei 2), arenas which are dominated by the main economic and implicitly military power.

It is also the case with the International Monetary Fund, which, as a result of the Bretton Woods agreement, can be thought of as serving the interests of the United States, as evidenced by the higher voting quota the United States holds within this financial institution and the background of the elites who govern it. With China's rise as an economic and military power, US bureaucrats are already available to accommodate China within the IMF, WTO, and WB and thus prevent the creation, under the influence of the government in Beijing, of other international financial institutions that may not serve the West's economic interests to the extent that the Breton Woods institutions do (Andrei 2).

With the rise of the Cold War-era political, economic, and primarily ideological divides between the West and East, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization was formed in response to the Warsaw Pact. The formation of this alliance demonstrates the

importance of the concept of 'balance of power (Baylis qtd. in Andrei 2). When attempting to comprehend international relations, initially a military alliance aimed solely at protecting Western Europe and North America from the imperialist USSR's military and ideological threats, but also a hypothetical "resurgent Germany," (Williams qtd. in Andrei 2).

It has survived and mutated to the present day into an international institution concerned not only with the security of its members, but also with the defence of the democratic political system. This NATO metamorphosis confirms Walt's hypotheses that some alliances "may contain or acquire institutional capabilities that can be used for tasks beyond those for which they were originally designed." (Williams qtd. in Andrei 2). Despite this radical transformation, NATO remains a military alliance that, by definition, exacerbates other states' security dilemmas (Andrei 2).

This viewpoint is shared by International Relations theorists such as Wright, Holsti, and Kaplan, they have proposed that "alliances tend to generate counter alliances, which generate further mistrust and tensions, leading to arms races and the further polarization of the alliance structure. This is the case for the rocket defence shield the United States plans on installing in Eastern Europe to protect its NATO allies from possible attacks coming from Iran (Andrei 2-3). In this specific case, we have the right to say that this international institution is once again threatening global peace and security. This is supported by theorists such as Kimball, who contend that "alliance formation decisions are endogenous to conflict initiation decisions." (Kimball qtd. in Andrei 3).

## 1.4 The failures of the United Nations Peacekeeping Missions

The failure of the United Nations has been multifaceted and cannot be attributed to a single cause. It is due in part to a failure of leadership, as well as poor management, discipline, widespread inefficiency, as well as a deeply ingrained culture of corruption. It is also due to a lack of moral clarity on the international stage—a refusal to confront genocide or totalitarian regimes, as well as a ready willingness to accommodate tyrants and dictators. It has led to a loss of faith in the United Nations' ability to defend even its own Universal Declaration of Human Rights, let alone protect the world's most vulnerable people, such as ethnic cleansing victims and refugees seeking refuge under the U.N. flag (Gardiner 40).

Whatever the causes of the United Nations' failure and weakness, there is no doubt that it is an organization in crisis, unsure of its future, mired in scandal, lacking direction, and morally ambiguous in outlook. In other words, it is a world body that is increasingly unprepared for the demands of the twenty-first century and will become irrelevant unless it undergoes a transformation. The United Nations today is best described as a sickly patient needing a blood transfusion (Gardiner 7). Since the second half of the twentieth century, there have been numerous wars, some of which are still ongoing, all under the close monitoring of the United Nations.

The United Nations (UN) was established in 1945 as an international umbrella organization with several goals, the primary of which was to prevent war and maintain peace in disputed areas. However, the UN has failed several times worldwide, primarily due to the right to veto held by five countries. Here are some of the most egregious examples of the UN's ineffectiveness (Twelve times the UN has failed the world).

### 1.4.1 Israeli Occupation (1948-Now)

The Middle East situation is a hotly debated topic among the international community at the United Nations. It is one of the most contentious issues the organization has had to deal with thus far, has been the subject of 76 percent of all General Assembly country-specific resolutions and 6 per cent of UN Security Council resolutions (UNSC) (Kolom qtd. in Crockett 3). The majority of these resolutions are critical of the Israeli state, most notably UN Security Council Resolution 1544, which called on Israel to respect its obligations under international humanitarian law and to stop demolishing Palestinian homes, which violated that law. Others, such as John Mearsheimer, criticize Israel's offensive nature toward Hamas, exploring the notion that Israel "intended to create an open-air prison for the Palestinians in Gaza and inflict great pain on them until they complied with their wishes (Kolom qtd in Crockett 3).

Mearsheimer was also critical of Israel's 2006 war with Lebanon, describing Israeli forces as overconfident in their abilities, which hampered their efforts and resulted in "major setbacks" in the region and devastation for the Lebanese people (qtd. in Crockett 3). There was a call for the UN to intervene or act, but UN efforts to control or stabilize the situation failed. This resulted in harsh criticism of the organization's ability to make the world a more peaceful. At the time, the UN Secretary-General addressed the issue, saying, "Just as we have learnt that the world cannot stand aside when gross and systematic violations of human rights are taking place, we have also learned that, if it is to enjoy the sustained support of the world's

peoples, an intervention must be based on legitimate and universal principles." We need to better adapt our international system to a world with new actors, new responsibilities, and new opportunities for peace and progress (Kofi Annan qtd. in Crockett 3).

Furthermore, the UN has been chastised for unfairly condemning Israel and engaging in armed conflict, while Israel has been accused of targeting UN personnel. According to a report by the United States Institute for Peace, Israel is denied its rights as a member of the United Nations. "Every year, UN bodies are required to produce at least 25 reports on alleged Israeli violations of human rights (Crockett 3). "This is not a legitimate critique of states with similar or worse human rights records. It is demonization of the Jewish state" (Bayefsky qtd. in Crockett 3). The United States is concerned that unbalanced criticism of Israel as the cruel, immoral, and discriminatory state portrayed in the UN will cause audiences to associate negative attributes with Jews in general, fueling anti-Semitism (Rickman qtd. in Crockett 4). This sparked much debate and criticism of the United Nations system, which was perceived to be impartial, ultimately failing in its purpose of being an objective hand to ensure the establishment of world peace (Crockett 4). "I know that in the Jewish community at large, it has sometimes seemed as if the United Nations serves all the world's peoples except one: the Jews (...) though it may appear otherwise at times, the United Nations is not just a political body, and there is more on its agenda than Middle East issues," Kofi Annan continued. And, while your influence will be critical in advancing the peace process, the UN and the Jewish community can do much more together." (Rickman qtd. in Crockett 4).

In light of the preceding, it is clear that the Middle East situation is fragile and unstable. Many scholars, including Mearsheimer and Walt, condemn and analyze

israel's flaws and mistakes, while others examine the United Nations' failures and inability to remain impartial in the face of the situation. Regardless of the reason for the region's political unrest, the ultimate reflection of failure is in the United Nations' institutional framework, which was unable, despite numerous initiatives and plans, to secure a peace agreement between conflicting countries (Crockett 4).

Palestinians have been fighting against what a UN investigator once described as Israel's ethnic cleansing since the establishing of the Jewish state in 1948. Between 1947 and 1949, at least 15,000 Palestinians were killed, and 750,000 of a population of 1.9 million were forced to seek refuge far from their homelands. Between 2000 and 2014, over 7,000 Palestinians and 1,100 Israelis were killed in the conflict (Twelve times the UN has failed the world). So, if institutions like the United Nations are fundamentally flawed and fail to achieve their goals, why do they still exist? Would the international order remain the same if no institutionalized forms of global governance existed? The rhetoric depicted in international institutions' charters is frequently unequalled in the application, but it varies widely and is impossible to judge (Williams qtd. in Crockett 4).

#### **1.4.2 Somali Civil War (1991-Now)**

Somalia's long-time leader, Mohamed Siad Barre, was deposed in 1991, and the former British protectorate of Somaliland declared unilateral independence. Militiamen from the United Somali Congress occupied the presidential palace, but coup leaders could not form a unified government, resulting in a civil war that killed thousands of civilians (Pushkina 271).



UNOSOM II (United Nations Operation in Somalia) followed UNOSOM I, a smaller observation mission, and UNITAF, a United Nations-authorized enforcement mission led by the United States. The goal of UNITAF was to restore security, and UNOSOM II was supposed to take over for UNITAF. The force had a strength of 28,000 personnel when it was deployed in March 1993, including 22,000 troops, civilian staff, and 8,000 logistics officers (Diprizio qtd. in Pushkina 271).

As a continuation of its initial UNITAF mission, this mission, received strong popular support in the United States. The short mission's duration was dominated by an intense pursuit of Mohammad Farah Aidid, a Somali warlord who had expressed interest in running for president. However, this focus diverted attention from the mission's primary goal, resulting in significant civilian casualties (271). As a result, Somali citizens began to side with the warlords rather than the peacekeepers. The infamous "Battle of Mogadishu" in 1993, made famous by the film "Black Hawk Down," resulted in the deaths of 18 American soldiers and effectively ended the country's support for peacekeeping (271). After suffering heavy casualties, UNOSOM II withdrew completely from Somalia in March 1995. The majority of UNOSOM's mandate remained unfinished.

The mission failed to reduce violence because there was civil war resurgent during its presence, with heavy casualties and several civilian massacres (271). Furthermore, clashes between the United Nations and Aideed resulted in the deaths of 6,000 Somalis in Mogadishu (Thakur and Patman qtd. in Pushkina 271). The mission also failed to alleviate human suffering; flagrant human rights violations were widespread, despite marginal refugee returns (around 3,000 people had returned from Kenya) ('The Blue Helmets' qtd. in Pushkina 271). There were also

outflows of refugees. Overall, the mission may have aided in the escalation of conflict. The presence of UN peacekeeping forces appeared to raise significant tensions between the conflict's parties, particularly after heavy-handed peacekeeper attempts to track down and eliminate warlords resulted in a significant number of civilian casualties. This enabled militants to exploit public sentiment against UN forces, resulting in a significant drop in trust and confidence in UNOSOM. A series of attacks on peacekeepers eventually revealed that their position in Somalia had become untenable (271-272). Thus leaving Somalia still one of the darkest failures of UN peace efforts (272).

### **1.4.3 Rwandan Civil War (1994)**

Rwanda, a small country with a primarily agricultural economy, had one of the highest population densities in Africa by the early 1990s. The Hutu made up about 85 per cent of the population, with the rest being Tutsi and a small number of Twa, a Pygmy group who was Rwanda's original inhabitants. Rwanda, part of German East Africa from 1897 to 1918, became a trusteeship of Belgium under a League of Nations mandate following World War I, along with neighbouring Burundi. The colonial period in Rwanda, when the ruling Belgians favoured the minority Tutsis over the Hutus, exacerbated the tendency of the few to oppress the many, leaving a legacy of tension that erupted into violence even before Rwanda gained independence (Rwandan Genocide).

On April 7, 1994, violence fueled the start of the worst genocide since World War II: the slaughter of an estimated 500,000 to 1 million innocent civilians, Tutsis and moderate Hutus. Following the first wave of massacres, Rwandan forces successfully discouraged international intervention by assassinating ten Belgian peacekeeping

officers. The Tutsis, a minority group comprising approximately 10% of Rwanda's population, received no assistance from the international community, despite the United Nations later admitting that a mere 5,000 soldiers deployed at the outset would have prevented the slaughter (Violence erupts in Rwanda, foreshadowing genocide). UNAMIR (United Nations Missions in Rwanda) is widely regarded as a failed mission in terms of mandate implementation (though the mandate had several incarnations, the mission barely accomplished any of them) and genocide prevention. Many have argued that this was due less to the failure of peacekeepers to serve the goals of international peace and security and more to the failure of the United Nations Security Council and the United Nations to act in a timely and appropriate manner.

The mission started from October 1993 to March 1996. The mission was organized following the end of Rwanda's civil war, which began in 1990. The signing of the Arusha accords was a ceasefire compromise reached between the Rwandan government's warring parties, which were primarily Hutus, and the Tutsi-dominated rebel forces formally known as the Rwandan Patriotic Front (RPF) (Pushkina 269). The UNAMIR mandate also included the peaceful supervision of new elections, the monitoring of the repatriation of Rwandan refugees who had fled the country, assistance in the coordination of humanitarian relief, and the investigation of some police and gendarmerie activities (UN Security Council qtd. in Pushkina 270). Its authorized strength was 2,500 personnel, but this number was not reached for several months (270). The UN peacekeepers did little to avert one of history's most infamous tragedies. On April 6, 1994, a plane carrying Rwandan President Habyarimana was shot down, killing both him and Burundi's president, who was also on board. This marked

the start of the Rwandan genocide, which killed approximately 800,000 Rwandan Tutsis and Hutu moderates over 100 days. Romeo Dallaire, the commander of UNAMIR, had learned that the government was planning to exterminate the minority group as early as January 1994 (Dallaire et al qtd. in Pushkina 270). The government, dominated by Hutus, was rapidly arming militias in secret arms caches. According to reports, Dallaire requested access to the weapons caches, but was denied due to exceeding the mandate (Ibid qtd. in Pushkina 270).

As stated by The Blue Helmets, large-scale refugee and IDP outflows occurred, with approximately 2 million fleeing to other countries and up to 2 million internally displaced (qtd. in Pushkina 270). It should be noted, however, that despite UN Security Council force reductions and the lack of an enforcement mandate, the 2000 peacekeepers who remained in the country managed to protect approximately 15,000 civilians from the massacres. However, in general, the conflict significantly destabilized the regional situation, and the case of Rwanda was one of the most visible failures of United Nations peacekeeping operations (270).

#### **1.4.4 The Congo Peacekeeping Scandal**

The United Nations' failure to protect human rights has been exacerbated by several peacekeeping scandals ranging from Bosnia to Burundi to Sierra Leone. The Democratic Republic of the Congo, the UN's second-largest peacekeeping mission, with 16,000 peacekeepers, has seen by far the most abuse (Gardiner 42-43).

Rape and forced prostitution of women and young girls have been committed across the country, including inside a refugee camp in Bunia, northeastern Congo. Among those accused are United Nations military and civilian personnel from Nepal,

Morocco, Tunisia, Uruguay, South Africa, Pakistan, and France. The victims are defenceless refugees, many of whom are children, who have already been brutalized and terrorized by years of war and have turned to the United Nations for safety and protection (43).

"Acts of gross misconduct have occurred," according to UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan. Sexual exploitation by UN personnel in the Congo as "significant, widespread, and ongoing" in a draft UN report. "We are shocked, outraged, and sickened by it," said William Lacy Swing, Annan's Special Representative to the Congo. Peacekeepers who swore to help those in need, particularly victims of sexual violence, have instead caused significant harm (43).

The sexual abuse scandal in the Congo calls the United Nations' professed commitment to fundamental human rights into question. The United Nations peacekeepers and civilian personnel who work along side them should be symbols of the international community's commitment to protecting the weak and innocent during times of war. Exploiting some of the world's most vulnerable people—refugees in a war-torn country—is a heinous crime and a massive breach of trust (43).

## **1.5 War making and State making as an Organized Crime**

What distinguished state-produced violence from violence delivered by anyone else? Enough to distinguish between "legitimate" and "illegitimate" force credible in the long run. Eventually, state personnel carried out violence on a larger scale, more effectively, and efficiently, with more significant approval from their subject populations and more willing collaboration from neighbouring authorities than did personnel from other organizations. However, it took a long time for that set of

distinctions to be established. Many parties shared the right to use violence, the practice of using it routinely to achieve their goals, or both at the same time early in the state-making process (Tilly 4-5).

The agents of states typically engage in four different activities under the umbrella of organized violence:

1. **WARMING UP:** eliminating or neutralizing their adversaries outside territories where they have straightforward and continuous priority as force wielders.
2. **STATE MAKING:** eradicating or neutralizing their competitors within those territories.
3. **PROTECTION:** eliminating or neutralizing their clients' adversaries
4. **EXTRACTION:** the acquisition of the means to carry out the first three activities: war-making, state-making, and protection (Tilly 15).

War making, state making, protection, and extraction each take various forms. For example, extraction can range from outright plunder to regular tribute to bureaucratized taxation. Nonetheless, all four depend on the state's proclivity to monopolize concentrated means of coercion. From the standpoint of those who dominate the state, each of them generally reinforces the others if carried out effectively. Thus, a state that successfully eliminates its internal rivals improves its ability to extract resources, wage war, and protect its most loyal supporters (16).

Each of the significant uses of violence resulted in its distinct forms of organization. Warfare produced armies, navies, and support services. State-making created long-lasting tools for surveillance and control within the territory. Protection

was founded on the organization of war making and state making, but, it was supplemented by an apparatus through which the protected demanded the protection that was due to them, most notably through courts and representative assemblies. The fiscal and accounting structures were created as a result of extraction. Much of the distinctive structure of European states can be attributed to the organization and deployment of violence (16).

To a greater extent, states formed recently through decolonization or territorial reallocations by dominant states acquired their military organization from outside, lacking the same internal forging of mutual constraints between rulers and ruled. To the extent that outside states continue to supply military goods and expertise in exchange for commodities, military alliances, or both, the new states harbour influential, unconstrained organizations that frequently eclipse all other organizations within their territories.

In this sense that outside states protect their borders, the leaders of those military organizations wield extraordinary power within them. The advantages of military power become enormous, as do the incentives to seize power over the entire state due to that advantage. Despite the vital role that warfare played in the formation of European states, the old European national states rarely experienced the great disparity between the military organization and all other forms of organization that appears to be the fate of client states throughout the modern world (21).

## **1.6 Conclusion**

The current chapter attempted to investigate issues concerning international institutions, specifically the United Nations, and how they acted in such tangible and serious situations. Despite its significant role in serving humanity, it has failed to achieve one

of its most crucial objectives, which is to maintain peace and security. The United Nations demonstrates that when it comes to actions, states prioritize their national and, in some cases, regional interests over the common goal of strengthening human rights worldwide, undermining the legitimacy of the entire United Nations system, as it is impossible to ignore the wars that it has performed poorly to limit and confront peace solutions. Moreover, in certain occasions, her intervention exacerbated tensions, as in Palestine, Somalia, Rwanda, and other parts of the world. As a result, many material and human losses occurred, as well as long-term ethnic conflicts. Thus, the promises of the United Nations, one of the most influential organizations promoting and advocating for peace, were reduced to ink on paper.



# **General Conclusion**

This research seeks to identify false promises made by international institutions. Those institutions have developed a set of principles and goals to serve humanity and assist it in overcoming external or internal crises. Admittedly, the entire world had only seen the designation. In terms of actions, they were the polar opposite of what they had previously stated. In this regard, the research focuses on studying the basic human rights of 'peace and security,' as well as how institutions act to embody them in reality.

What institutions have failed to account for in their phoney effort to serve man is the reality of chaos. Politics in this world is defined by insanity. People's normalizing judgments, for example, are a form of control emanating from specific standards. As a result, humans become a "case" that can be manipulated. The same madness existed in Rwanda before it arrived in Syria. All institutions have done nothing to stop this madness.

As the world changed, people's interests shifted to the establishing of various institutions in various domains. They all carry a flag that says "man is our priority" and "it is our duty to promote peace and security for him." Until their goals are complete and their legal system prevails, they have adopted the means of war to achieve so-called sovereignty. Furthermore, the war began to have its legitimacy and justifications. This view has led to the inspiration of various intrusive theories, such as those on which the mandate system was founded under the League of Nations, and the guardianship system in the Charter of the United Nations, which aimed to place certain peoples under the authority and supervision of the great powers because of their ineligibility to govern themselves so that the great powers can exercise the civilized task of ensuring the

political, economic and social progress of those peoples. Throughout this civilization, colonists impose their hegemony on African and Asian countries with the guidance of institutions.

Most international institutions are simply projects dressed in humanitarian garb, which is nothing new in the history of international law. This is a distinguished security project that resulted in the emergence of new imperialism, as defined by the description of defensive imperialism aimed at securing its interests, aspirations, and dreams. It has thus adapted international legal principles and provisions to its benefit. Human rights have become a justification for seizing and occupying states. Surprisingly, the human rights argument has become the foundation for demolition and construction, resulting in a process governed by standards consistent with the new imperialist visions.

# **Works Cited**

## Works Cited

- Andrei, Dumitrache. "Are International Institutions Necessary for Global Peace and Security?" E-International Relations, June 2011, pp. 1–5, [www.e-ir.info/pdf/8968](http://www.e-ir.info/pdf/8968).
- Crockett, Sophie. "Can International Institutions Help Make the World More Peaceful?" E-International Relations, March 22 2011, pp. 1–6. <https://www.e-ir.info/2011/03/22/can-international-institutions-help-make-the-world-more-peaceful/>, [www.e-ir.info/pdf/7762](http://www.e-ir.info/pdf/7762).
- Elshaikh, Eman M. "International Institutions." Khan Academy, [www.khanacademy.org/humanities/whp-1750/xcabef9ed3fc7da7b:unit-9-globalization/xcabef9ed3fc7da7b:9-3-economic-interactions-in-an-age-of-intense-globalization/a/read-international-institutions-beta1750](http://www.khanacademy.org/humanities/whp-1750/xcabef9ed3fc7da7b:unit-9-globalization/xcabef9ed3fc7da7b:9-3-economic-interactions-in-an-age-of-intense-globalization/a/read-international-institutions-beta1750). Accessed 25 May 2022.
- Fearon, James D. "Bargaining, Enforcement, and International Cooperation." International Organization, vol. 52, no. 2, 1998, pp. 269–305. JSTOR, [www.jstor.org/stable/2601276](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2601276).
- Gardiner, Nile. "The Decline and Fall of the United Nations." Macalester International, vol. 19, no. 9, Summer 2017, pp. 35–60. : [http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl\\_core.ac.uk/download/pdf/46721757.pdf](http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/macintl_core.ac.uk/download/pdf/46721757.pdf).
- Gilad, Sharon. "Institution." Encyclopedia Britannica, Britannica, 28 Dec. 2015, [www.britannica.com/topic/institution](http://www.britannica.com/topic/institution). History.com Editors. "Rwandan Genocide." HISTORY, A&E Television Networks, 14 Oct. 2009, [www.history.com/topics/africa/rwandan-genocide](http://www.history.com/topics/africa/rwandan-genocide).
- "Violence Erupts in Rwanda, Foreshadowing Genocide." HISTORY, A&E Television Networks, 24 Nov. 2009, [www.history.com/this-day-in-history/civil-war-erupts-in-rwanda](http://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/civil-war-erupts-in-rwanda). international peace institute. "Human Rights and Sustaining Peace."

- International Peace Institute, Dec. 2017, pp. 1–8, [www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/1712\\_Human-Rights-and-Sustaining-Peace.pdf](http://www.ipinst.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/1712_Human-Rights-and-Sustaining-Peace.pdf).
- Kenneth, Oye. “Explaining Cooperation Under Anarchy: Hypotheses and Strategies.” *World Politics*, vol. 38, no. 1, 1986, pp. 1–24, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2010349>.
- Keohane Martin, Robert O. Lisa L. “The Promise of Institutional Theory.” *International Security*, vol. 20, no. 1, 1995, pp. 39–51. JSTOR, <https://doi.org/10.2307/2539214https://www.jstor.org/stable/2539214>.
- Mearsheimer, John. “The False Promise of International Institutions.” *International Security*, vol. 19, no. 3, 1994, pp. 5–49. JSTOR, [doi.org/10.2307/2539078](https://doi.org/10.2307/2539078).
- office of the united nations high commissioner for human rights. “An Introduction to the Core Human Rights Treaties and the Treaty Bodies.” *The United Nations Human Rights Treaty System*, vol. no 3, no. fact sheet 30, 2005, pp. 1–52. <https://documentations.wiki/pEabJ/0440463-factsheetinside-qxd.html>, [www.refworld.org/pdfid/479477490.pdf](http://www.refworld.org/pdfid/479477490.pdf).
- Peace, dignity and equality on a healthy planet. “\* Universal Declaration of Human Rights.” United Nations, Accessed 22/05/22, pp. 1–8. Udhhr, [www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/2021/03/udhr.pdf](http://www.un.org/sites/un2.un.org/files/2021/03/udhr.pdf).
- Piechowiak, Marek. “What Are Human Rights? The Concept of Human Rights and Its Extra-Legal Justification.” *Google Scholar*, 1999, pp. 3–14, [philarchive.org/archive/PIEWAH](http://philarchive.org/archive/PIEWAH).
- Poast, Paul. “Does Issue Linkage Work? Evidence from European Alliance Negotiations.” *International Organization*, vol. 66, no. 2, 2012, pp. 277–310, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020818312000069>. Pushkina, D. B. “Successes and Failures of United Nations Peace Operations.” *Vestnik of Saint Petersburg University. History*, 2020, vol. 65, no. 1, Mar. 2020, pp. 261–77.

- Research Repository Saint Petersburg State University, [hdl.handle.net/11701/17514](https://hdl.handle.net/11701/17514). the united nations , geneva. “National Institutions for the Promotion and Protection of Human.” Fact Sheet, no. no.19, 1993, pp. 1–9. FactSheet19en.pdf, [www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/FactSheet19en.pdf](http://www.ohchr.org/sites/default/files/Documents/Publications/FactSheet19en.pdf).
- Tilly, Charles, editor. War Making and State Making. CRSO Working Paper, vol. 256, Center for Research on Social Organization, University of Michigan, 1982.
- “Twelve Times the UN Has Failed the World.” TRTWORLD, News/Americas, 28 Nov. 2018, [www.trtworld.com/americas/twelve-times-the-un-has-failed-the-world-21666](http://www.trtworld.com/americas/twelve-times-the-un-has-failed-the-world-21666).

تدور مذكرة البحث هاته حول الوعود الغامضة التي قدمتها المؤسسات الدولية وموقفها تجاه البشر. حيث تجسد من خلالها التأثير المتناقض للمؤسسات وكيف وعدت بحماية الإنسان و كذا توفير الظروف المعيشية المثلى له. لكن و مع مرور الوقت تغيرت أولويات المؤسسات إلى أهداف خاصة ، كان الدفاع عن حقوق الإنسان و صون السلام والأمن مجرد ذرائع لأهداف أخرى. وعلاوة على ذلك، يبدو أن تدخل المؤسسات في الصراع كان مدفوعا أساسا بالرغبة في زيادة سيطرتها وتأثيرها على أكبر عدد من البلدان. وقد أصبحت الوعود التي تصدرها المنظمات الدولية مجرد حبر على ورق

## Le résumé

Ce document de recherche porte sur les promesses vagues faites par les institutions internationales et leur attitude envers les humains. Il illustre l'influence contradictoire des institutions et la façon dont elles ont promis de protéger l'homme et de lui offrir des conditions de vie optimales. Et si les priorités des institutions ont évolué au fil du temps, la défense des droits de l'homme et le maintien de la paix et de la sécurité n'étaient que des prétextes à d'autres objectifs. En outre, l'intervention des institutions dans le conflit semble avoir été motivée principalement par le désir d'accroître leur contrôle et leur influence sur le plus grand nombre de pays. Enfin, les organisations internationales de maintien de la paix ont réduit leurs promesses à de l'encre sur du papier.

## Summary

This research paper is about the vague promises made by international institutions and their attitude toward humans. It exemplifies the contradictory influence of institutions and how they promised to protect man and provide him with optimal living conditions. And while the institutions' priorities shifted over time, the defense of human rights and the maintenance of peace and security were merely pretexts for other goals. Furthermore, the institutions' intervention in the conflict appears to have been motivated primarily by a desire to increase their control and influence over the greatest number of countries. And international peacekeeping organizations have reduced their promises to ink on paper.