**1. The Concept of Democratic Elections**

Elections are the central institution of democratic representative governments. Why? Because, in a democracy, the authority of the government derives solely from the consent of the governed. The principal mechanism for translating that consent into governmental authority is the holding of free and fair elections.All modern democracies hold elections, but not all elections are democratic. Right-wing dictatorships, Marxist regimes, and single-party governments also stage elections to give their rule the aura of legitimacy. In such elections, there may be only one candidate or a list of candidates, with no alternative choices. Such elections may offer several candidates for each office, but ensure through intimidation or rigging that only the government-approved candidate is chosen. Other elections may offer genuine choices--but only within the incumbent party. These are not democratic elections.

**What Are Democratic Elections?**
Jeane Kirkpatrick, scholar and former U.S. ambassador to the United Nations, has offered this definition: "Democratic elections are not merely symbolic....They are competitive, periodic, inclusive, definitive elections in which the chief decision-makers in a government are selected by citizens who enjoy broad freedom to criticize government, to publish their criticism and to present alternatives."What do Kirkpatrick's criteria mean? Democratic elections are competitive. Opposition parties and candidates must enjoy the freedom of speech, assembly, and movement necessary to voice their criticisms of the government openly and to bring alternative policies and candidates to the voters. Simply permitting the opposition access to the ballot is not enough. Elections in which the opposition is barred from the airwaves, has its rallies harassed or its newspapers censored, are not democratic. The party in power may enjoy the advantages of incumbency, but the rules and conduct of the election contest must be fair.

Democratic elections are ***periodic***. Democracies do not elect dictators or presidents-for-life. Elected officials are accountable to the people, and they must return to the voters at prescribed intervals to seek their mandate to continue in office. This means that officials in a democracy must accept the risk of being voted out of office..Democratic elections are ***inclusive*.** The definition of citizen and voter must be large enough to include a large proportion of the adult population. A government chosen by a small, exclusive group is not a democracy--no matter how democratic its internal workings may appear. One of the great dramas of democracy throughout history has been the struggle of excluded groups--whether racial, ethnic, or religious minorities, or women--to win full citizenship, and with it the right to vote and hold office. In the United States, for example, only white male property holders enjoyed the right to elect and be elected when the Constitution was signed in 1787. The property qualification disappeared by the early 19th century, and women won the right to vote in 1920. Black Americans, however, did not enjoy full voting rights in the southern United States until the civil rights movement of the 1960s. And finally, in 1971, younger citizens were given the right to vote when the United States lowered the voting age from 21 to 18.Democratic elections are ***definitive*.** They determine the leadership of the government. Subject to the laws and constitution of the country, popularly elected representatives hold the reins of power. They are not simply figureheads or symbolic leaders.Finally, democratic elections are not limited to selecting candidates. Voters can also be asked to decide policy issues directly through referendums and initiatives that are placed on the ballot. In the United States, for example, state legislatures can decide to "refer," or place, an issue directly before the voters. In the case of an initiative, citizens themselves can gather a prescribed number of signatures (usually a percentage of the number of registered voters in that state) and require that an issue be placed on the next ballot--even over the objections of the state legislature or governor. In a state such as California, voters confront dozens of legislative initiatives each time they vote--on issues ranging from environmental pollution to automobile insurance costs.

**2. Human Rights Bill**

The International Bill of Human Rights is an informal name given to two international treaties and one General Assembly resolution established by the United Nations. It consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (adopted in 1948), the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966) with its two Optional Protocols and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966).1 The two covenants entered into force in 1976, after a sufficient number of countries had ratified them.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) is a declaration adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on December 10, 1948 at the Palais de Chaillot in Paris. The Declaration has been translated into over 300 languages and dialects, making it the most widely translated document in the world[1]. The Declaration arose directly from the experience of the Second World War and represents the first global expression of rights to which all human beings are entitled. It consists of 30 articles which have been elaborated in subsequent international treaties, regional human rights instruments, national constitutions and laws. The International Bill of Human Rights consists of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, and the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and its two Optional Protocols. In 1966 the General Assembly adopted the two detailed Covenants, which complete the International Bill of Human Rights. The Universal Declaration was adopted by the General Assembly on 10 December 1948 by a vote of 48 in favor, 0 against, with 8 abstentions (all the Soviet Bloc states, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Ukraine, USSR, as well as Yugoslavia, South Africa and Saudi Arabia). n addition to the covenants in the International Bill of Human Rights, the United Nations has adopted more than twenty principal treaties further elaborating human rights. These include conventions to prevent and prohibit specific abuses such as torture and genocide and to protect specific vulnerable populations such as refugees (Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 1951), women (Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 1979), and children (Convention on the Rights of the Child, 1989). Other conventions cover racial discrimination, prevention of genocide, political rights of women, [prohibition of slavery](http://www.humanrights.com/what-are-human-rights/videos/no-slavery.html) and torture.

Each of these treaties has established a committee of experts to monitor implementation of the treaty provisions by its State parties.

**3. Nuclear Free World**

Seventy years ago the world was free of nuclear weapons, but after the production of some 140,000 of these artifacts of mass destruction, there seems to be a significant shift in the role some Governments have assigned to them. They are no longer generally considered to be the best means to ensure national security. Nuclear weapons are intrinsically dangerous and pose an unparalleled threat to the very existence of humankind. They do not enhance a country's security but, rather, imperil the survival of all nations, which should be the point of departure of nuclear disarmament efforts.

To dwell on the potential danger that they may fall into the wrong hands is to misconstrue the argument for their elimination. They should be banned because they are immoral -- and probably illegal -- tools of destruction. Since their use would likely be fatal for all, they cannot even be considered instruments of war.The twin questions of nuclear weapons and nuclear energy have been on the agenda of the United Nations since its beginning: the dawn of the atomic age coincided with its birth. The UN Charter, however, makes no mention of nuclear weapons for the simple reason that it was adopted at the San Francisco conference three weeks before the first test and six weeks before their use in Hiroshima and Nagasaki. In its very first resolution -- 1 (I) of 24 January 1946 -- the Assembly established the Atomic Energy Commission, composed of the Security Council members and Canada, and requested that it submit specific proposals for ensuring the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes only, for the elimination of atomic and other weapons of mass destruction and for the establishment of a system of safeguards, including inspections, to prevent violations and evasions. After the USSR's first nuclear test in 1949, the United Kingdom followed in 1952, France in 1960, China in 1964, India in 1974 and Pakistan in 1998. Israel also acquired nuclear weapons as did South Africa, which later surrendered its stockpile. In 1952 the US achieved a qualitative leap in the nuclear-arms race when it detonated its first thermonuclear device. A year later the USSR followed suit. After the USSR's collapse, Belarus, Kazakhstan and Ukraine became for a time de facto NWS. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea has also tested a nuclear device. In addition, there are many countries that possess the scientific know-how, technology and fissile material that would allow them to play the nuclear card in a relatively short time. In the early 1960s the US and the USSR finally agreed to lead disarmament talks at the Geneva Eighteen-Nation Disarmament Committee (endc) meeting. Calls for an end to nuclear tests, especially in the atmosphere, and a stop to further horizontal proliferation were instrumental in getting the endc going in 1962. Not surprisingly, the first order of business was a treaty to ban nuclear-weapons tests in the atmosphere, under water and in outer space. The 1963 Partial Test-Ban Treaty was agreed upon rather quickly. It did not contain verification measures and it prohibited activities which the endc's three participating nuclear-weapon States -- the UK, the US and the USSR (France refused to take its seat at the table) -- were ready to forego. Underground testing would continue for over 30 years. Today, the cold war has disappeared but thousands of those weapons have not. In a strange turn of history, the threat of global nuclear war has gone down, but the risk of a nuclear attack has gone up. More nations have acquired these weapons. Testing has continued. Black markets trade in nuclear secrets and nuclear materials. The technology to build a bomb has spread. Terrorists are determined to buy, build or steal one. Our efforts to contain these dangers are centred on a global non-proliferation regime, but as more people and nations break the rules, we could reach the point where the centre cannot hold."

Admitting that the goal of a nuclear-weapons-free world would not be easy to achieve, he then described the steps the United States was ready to take:

\* reduce the role of nuclear weapons in its national security strategy
\* negotiate a new Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia this year to reduce warheads and stockpiles
\* ratify the CTBT
\* conclude a treaty that verifiably ends the production of fissile materials intended for use in nuclear weapons
\* strengthen the NPT as a basis for cooperation in the peaceful uses of nuclear energy
\* ensure that terrorists never acquire a nuclear weapon
\* promote a new international effort to secure all vulnerable nuclear material around the world within four years.

**4.The 8 Stages of Genocide**

Genocide is a process that develops in eight stages that are predictable but not inexorable. At each stage, preventive measures can stop it. The process is not linear.  Logically, later stages must be preceded by earlier stages.  But all stages continue to operate throughout the process.

**1. CLASSIFICATION:** All cultures have categories to distinguish people into “us and them” by ethnicity, race, religion, or nationality: German and Jew, Hutu and Tutsi. Ottoman Turks (Muslims) & Armenians (non-Muslim, Christians)

**2. SYMBOLIZATION:** We give names or other symbols to the classifications. Christian qualities of Armenians = second-class citizens called gavours, infidels, or unbelievers .Most armenians were christian so hey started calling all non muslims "Infidels". So they have high taxes and given less rights.

**3. DEHUMANIZATION:** One group denies the humanity of the other group. Members of it are equated with animals, vermin, insects or diseases. The Armenians were isolated.  They were forbidden from public places and weren't allowed to participate in public events.

**4. ORGANIZATION:** Genocide is always organized, usually by the state, often using militias to provide deniability of state responsibility .Sometimes organization is informal or decentralized. The Committee of Union and Progress formed a militia and organized a list of Armenians to be exterminated, singling out politicians, intellectuals, and particular men.

**5. POLARIZATION:** Extremists drive the groups apart. Hate groups broadcast polarizing propaganda. Laws may forbid intermarriage or social interaction. The Committee of Union and Progress formed a militia and organized a list of Armenians to be exterminated, singling out politicians, intellectuals, and particular men.

**6. PREPARATION**: Victims are identified and separated out because of their ethnic or religious identity. Death lists are drawn up. Members of victim groups are forced to wear identifying symbols. The Committee of Union and Progress formed a militia and organized a list of Armenians to be exterminated, singling out politicians, intellectuals, and particular men.

**7. EXTERMINATION** begins, and quickly becomes the mass killing legally called “genocide.” It is “extermination” to the killers because they do not believe their victims to be fully human. The Committee of Union and Progress formed a militia and organized a list of Armenians to be exterminated, singling out politicians, intellectuals, and particular men.

**8. DENIAL** is the eighth stage that always follows a genocide. It is among the surest indicators of further genocidal massacres. The perpetrators of genocide dig up the mass graves, burn the bodies, try to cover up the evidence and intimidate the witnesses. They deny that they committed any crimes, and often blame what happened on the victims. The Committee of Union and Progress formed a militia and organized a list of Armenians to be exterminated, singling out politicians, intellectuals, and particular men.

**5.Current Situation in the Middle East**

The Middle East is trapped in a cycle of war and is suffering from lack of collective security. The historic Palestinians-Israel problem, [the power struggle between Iran and Saudi Arabia](http://nationalinterest.org/commentary/iran-saudi-arabia-power-struggle-way-forward-9964), the utterly destructive [policy of Turkey toward the threat posed by the Islamic State](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/akbar-ganji/turkey-a-model-for-the-is_b_5345793.html) (also known as ISIS and ISIL), the [sectarian Shiite-Sunni war](http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2013/11/co-opting-struggle-democracy-20131121113428919732.html), and the rapid rise of terrorist groups in Iraq, Syria, and Libya, and to a lesser extent in Yemen, political instability in Lebanon due to its parliament’s inability to elect the next president five months after the term of the last president expired, and other developments have all contributed to the historically catastrophic suffering of the people of the region. The main problems in the Middle East are dictatorship, repression, corruption, discrimination, humiliation, and the double standards of the West toward some nations in that region. Under such conditions, any strategy for peace must consider the following factors: One, one must view the region as a whole, not as a collection of states, because all problems everywhere are tied together. [Without a comprehensive plan for the entire region](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/akbar-ganji/obama-isis-strategy_b_5811920.html?utm_hp_ref=world) peace and security will not be achieved, and the terrorist groups will not disappear. Allowing the Palestinians to have their own viable state is part of this view. Secretary of State John Kerry correctly said on October 17 that confronting terrorism requires solving the Israel-Palestinians problems, adding, “There wasn’t a leader I met with in the region who didn’t raise with me spontaneously the need to try to get peace between Israel and thePalestinians, because it was a cause of recruitment and of street anger and agitation,” referring to hisrecent visit to Cairo that raised $5.4 billion for Hamas in Gaza.

Two, terrorist groups, such as the Islamic State, [cannot be eliminated by military means](http://www.huffingtonpost.com/akbar-ganji/confronting-isis-has-no-m_b_5910772.html), or at least by military means alone. The vast majority of 1.5 billion Muslims is moderate and rejects Islamic fundamentalism. Muslim intellectuals have presented interpretations of the Islamic teachings that are fully compatible with democracy and respect for human rights, hence building a modern Islam. The problem is that repressive regimes support fundamentalism, and crack down on modern Islam. Third, given the preoccupation with the Islamic State, every peace plan for Syria has been forgotten, and everyone is thinking in military terms. But, to achieve real peace and defeat the Islamic State, three steps must be taken in Syria. One is an immediate ceasefire between the Syrian government and the moderate groups. Second is marginalizing the radical groups by choking off their financial resources, blocking transfer of weapons. Fourth, Iran must play a direct role in fighting with the Islamic State. The power struggle between Iran and Saudi Arabia benefit no one. The two countries, plus Turkey, must set aside their claim to leadership of the Islamic world. Similar to the fundamentalists, the leaders of these three nations have used Islam as a tool for power and war. Spreading the sectarian Shiite-Sunni war is a result of such a view.

Fifth, Iran cannot fully participate in the struggle against the Islamic State, unless two major issues are addressed first. Iran’s democratic movement is deeply concerned about Iran becoming another Syria or Iraq. Iranians want a compromise with the West over Iran’s nuclear program, which will lead to improved relations with the United States, and lifting of the crippling economic sanctions against Iran. In other words, under the current conditions in the Middle East, many Iranians prefer for now the stability and security of their nation under the current regime to Iran becoming another Iraq or Syria. But, if the relations with the U.S. improve, Iranian’ struggle for democracy will become more powerful. Thus, this is the ideal time for reaching a compromise over Iran’s nuclear program, so that the focus can be shifted to fighting terrorism and achieving peace in the entire Middle East.

**6. Relations between Armenia and Turkey**

Since gaining independence in 1991 Armenia has faced tough challenges in building relations with two of its four neighbors — Azerbaijan and Turkey. Relations with Azerbaijan were mainly influenced by Karabakh conflict. Armenia was supporting Nagorno Karabakh Armenians to defend themselves against Azerbaijani aggression. The end of hostilities in 1994 and the signature of a ceasefire agreement did not bring up peace, and negotiations are still underway, for the last 23 years, to find a mutually accepted settlement.

Turkey recognized Armenian independence in late 1991. In the period of late 1991-April 1993 some border crossing points were operating on Armenia- Turkey border and Turkey was one of the routes for Armenia to receive international humanitarian aid. Nevertheless, Turkey did not establish diplomatic relations with Yerevan. The key factors influencing Turkey's negative attitude towards Armenia were issues of Armenian Genocide and hostilities in Karabakh.

One of the key factors is the influencing Turkey's policy was Karabakh conflict. Turkey was fully supporting Azerbaijan's position and demanding from Armenia to cease its assistance to Karabakh Armenians. In April 1993 Turkey closed Armenia-Turkey border crossing points as a response to the successful Armenian operations in Karabakh. The situation remained unchanged till 2008 when Armenia and Turkey launched bilateral normalization process with Swiss mediation which resulted in signature of two Turkish-Armenian Protocols — one on establishing diplomatic relations and second on developing bilateral relations - in Zurich in October 2009. For Armenia, the key asset was the de facto break of Azerbaijani-Turkish tandem. The opening of Armenia-Turkey relations would also play an important role in bolstering Armenia's economy which suffered from 2008 international crisis with 14 percent GDP decline in 2009. It would also provide more flexibility for Armenia's foreign policy. Turkey through normalizing relations with Armenia was hoping to gradually increase its influence in the region. This was also part of Turkey's "Zero problems with neighbors" foreign policy.

Nevertheless, immediately after signing Protocols Turkey changed its position and put any advance in Karabakh negotiations as a precondition for Protocols ratification. One of the main reasons for Turkey's behavior could be Turkish domestic politics. The ruling Justice and Development party (AKP) and its leader Prime Minister Erdogan was in need of nationalistic voters in upcoming 2011 Parliamentary elections. Armenia was ready to ratify Protocols with no preconditions. The Swiss authorities and other international players were supporting Armenia's approach but with no effect. Given the developments of last 8 years there is no hope for any breakthrough in Armenia-Turkey relations in at least short term (2-3 years) perspective. In his speech at the UN General Assembly on September 19, 2017 President Sargsyan emphasized that the leadership of Turkey were mistaken if it thought that Armenian-Turkish Protocols could be held hostage forever and ratified only at the most opportune occasion from Turkey's point of view. He mentioned that Armenia would declare those two Protocols null and void and would enter the spring of 2018 without them. Armenia's vision is clear. Turkey's behavior with consistent rejection to live up to its obligations only deepens the lack of trust between two parties and can't be tolerated more.

**7. Nagorno-Karabakh Conflict**

## Pre-soviet era

Nagorno-Karabakh conflict began in 1917, during the formation of three ethnic republics of Transcaucasia - Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia, as a result of the collapse of the Russian Empire. The population of Nagorno-Karabakh, 95 percent of which were Armenians, convened its first congress, which proclaimed Nagorno-Karabakh an independent political unit, elected the National Council and the Government. In 1918-1920 Nagorno-Karabakh had all the trappings of statehood, including the army and the legitimate authority.

In response to the peace initiatives of the people of Nagorno-Karabakh, Azerbaijani Democratic Republic launched a military action. From May 1918 to April 1920, Azerbaijan and military units of Turkey, which supported Azerbaijan, used violence and carried out massacres against the Armenian population (in March 1920 about 40,000 Armenians were killed and deported only in Shushi). But it was not possible to make the people of Nagorno-Karabakh obey Azerbaijan's power in this way.In August, 1919, in order to prevent military conflict, Karabakh and Azerbaijan, signed a preliminary agreement by which they agreed to discuss the problem of the status of the region at Paris Peace Conference.

Response of the international community is memorable. The League of Nations rejected the request for Azerbaijan's membership, citing the fact that it is difficult to define clear boundaries and territories under the sovereignty of this state. Among other contentious issues there was the issue of the status of Nagorno-Karabakh. Because of the sovietization of the region the issue fell out of the agenda of international organizations.

## Nagorno-Karabakh in the soviet period (1920-1990)

The establishment of Soviet rule in Transcaucasia was accompanied by the creation of a new political system. Nagorno-Karabakh has been recognized a disputed territory between Armenia and Azerbaijan also by Soviet Russia. The National Council of Azerbaijan SSR, on the basis of the agreement between the Azerbaijan Revcom and the governments of Azerbaijan SSR and Armenian SSR, the Declaration of June 12, 1921, proclaimed Nagorno-Karabakh an integral part of the Armenian SSR. on July 4, 1921, in the capital of Georgia, Tbilisi, the Caucasian Bureau of the Communist Party of Russia convened a plenary session, during which the fact that Nagorno-Karabakh is part of the Armenian SSR was reconfirmed. However, under the dictation of Moscow and Stalin's direct interference, on the night of July 5 the decision of the previous day was reviewed and the forced decision of incorporating Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan and forming on its territory an autonomous oblast was made. July 7, 1923, by decision of the Central Executive Revolutionary Committee of Azerbaijan SSR the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast was formed, within Azerbaijan SSR, by which, in fact, the Karabakh conflict was not resolved, but temporarily frozen. During the entire period of being of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast within Azerbaijan SSR, the leadership of this republic had been regularly and consistently violating the rights and interests of the Armenian population. Discrimination from Azerbaijan towards Nagorno-Karabakh had its impact on the population of Karabakh and became the main reason of latter’s migration. The people of NKAO and authorities of Armenian SSR had sent lots of applications to the Soviet central authorities asking about the reconsideration of the decision on incorporating Nagorno-Karabakh to Azerbaijan, which were ignored or rejected.

## Current stage of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict

The current phase of Nagorno-Karabakh conflict began in 1988, when in response to the self-determination claims of NK population the Azeri authorities organized massacres and ethnic cleansing of the Armenian population on the entire territory of Azerbaijan, particularly in Sumgait, Baku and Kirovabad.

On December 10, 1991 NK population declared the establishment of the Nagorno Karabakh Republic (NKR) by plebiscite, which fully complies with both international law norms and the letter and spirit of the USSR laws of that time. Thus, on the territory of the former Azerbaijani SSR two equal state formations were created - Nagorno-Karabakh Republic and the Republic of Azerbaijan.

In Nagorno-Karabakh and surrounding areas populated by Armenians the policy pursued by Azerbaijani authorities turned into overt aggression and large scale military actions against the Republic of Nagorno-Karabakh, which resulted in tens of thousands killed and caused considerable material damageBecause of the war Azerbaijan occupied the whole region of Shahumyan, and the eastern parts of Martakert and Martuni regions of Nagorno-Karabakh. Neighboring districts went under the control of Nagorno-Karabakh armed forces, which played a role of a security buffer to block the further firing from the Azeri side towards Nagorno-Karabakh settlements.

In May, 1994 Azerbaijan, Nagorno-Karabakh and Armenia signed a ceasefire, which, despite violations, is still effective. Conflict settlement negotiations are held in the framework of the OSCE Minsk Group Co-Chairmanship (Russia, USA, France). In the last decade, several options for the settlement proposed by the Co-Chairs were rejected by Azerbaijan. "Paris Principles" in 2001 Madrid proposals presented by Co-Chairs in November, 2007.

## Position of Armenia on Nagorno-Karabakh conflict

Armenia believes that the improvement of the peace process efficiency is impossible without full participation of the conflict party Nagorno-Karabakh in the negotiations. Armenia believes that the conflict settlement should be based on the following principles:

* Nagorno-Karabakh conflict settlement must be based on recognition of the Nagorno-Karabakh people's right to self-determination;
* Nagorno-Karabakh should have uninterrupted land communication with Armenia, under jurisdiction of the Armenian side;
* the security of Nagorno-Karabakh should be internationally guaranteed.

.

**8. The Phenomenon of the Islamic State**

IS can trace its roots back to the late Abu Musab al-Zarqawi, a Jordanian. In 2004, a year after the US-led invasion of Iraq, Zarqawi pledged allegiance to Osama Bin Laden and formed al-Qaeda in Iraq (AQI), which became a major force in the insurgency. After Zarqawi's death in 2006, AQI created an umbrella organisation, Islamic State in Iraq (ISI). ISI was steadily weakened by the US troop surge and the creation of Sahwa (Awakening) councils by Sunni Arab tribesmen who rejected its brutality. In April 2013, Baghdadi announced the merger of his forces in Iraq and Syria and the creation of "Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant" (Isis). The leaders of al-Nusra and al-Qaeda rejected the move, but fighters loyal to Baghdadi split from al-Nusra and helped Isis remain in Syria. In June 2014 Isis declared the creation of a caliphate and changed its name to "Islamic State".ISIS became recognized around the world for carrying out heinous acts of violence, including public executions, rapes, beheadings and crucifixions. The group has earned an nefarious reputation for videotaping brutal killings and displaying them online. ISIS has also claimed responsibility for hundreds of terrorist attacks in the Middle East and around the world. Some of the most well-known attacks on Western soil that were linked to ISIS include:

* November 2015, Paris Attacks: In a series of attacks, bombers and shooters terrorized the streets of Paris, killing 130 people.
* December 2015, San Bernardino Attack: A married couple opened fire at the Inland Regional Center in California and killed 14 people.
* March 2016, Brussels Bombings: Bombings at Brussels Airport in Belgium and a nearby Metro station killed 32 people.
* June 2016, Pulse Nightclub Shooting: A gunman opened fire inside a gay nightclub in Orlando, Fla., and killed 49 people.
* July 2016, Nice Attack: A terrorist driving a truck mowed down a crowd of people in the French Riviera town, killing 86.
* December 2016, Berlin Attack: A man hijacked and drove a truck into a Christmas market in Berlin, killing himself and 11 others.
* May 2017, Manchester Attack: A single suicide bomber killed 22 people during an Ariana Grande concert at the Manchester Arena in England.

ISIS has been called the richest terrorist organization in the world. While estimates vary, the group was said to have made $2 billion in 2014 alone. Much of ISIS’s money has come from seizing control of banks, oil refineries and other assets in the territories it occupies. In response to ISIS violence, various countries—including the United States, France, the United Kingdom, Russia, several Arab nations and other countries—have initiated efforts to defeat the terrorist group. In 2014, ISIS controlled around [**34,000 square miles**](http://www.cnn.com/2017/11/17/middleeast/iraq-isis-rawa/index.html) of territory in Iraq and Syria. In 2017 ISIS lost its last stronghold in Iraq.  Iraqi troops and US-led coalition forces retook **[Rawa](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/last-iraqi-town-held-by-isis-recaptured-officials-say/)** — a small town in northwestern Iraq —after about [**five hours**](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/last-iraqi-town-held-by-isis-recaptured-officials-say/) of fighting. ISIS has now effectively lost all of its territory in Iraq, even though some of the group’s militants still operate in the country’s western rural areas near the border with Syria. It’s more than likely that ISIS will continue to plague Iraq, Syria, and much of the world, even as it loses land. ISIS may carry this strategy forward into Syria, too. The group lost the capital of its so-called caliphate, **[Raqqa](https://www.nytimes.com/2017/10/17/world/middleeast/isis-syria-raqqa.html)**, in October, but it still controls [**parts of urban areas**](https://www.newsdeeply.com/syria/community/2017/11/13/isis-may-soon-be-defeated-but-terror-continues-in-deir-ezzor) in eastern Syria. As my colleague Yochi Dreazen [**notes**](https://www.vox.com/videos/2017/8/14/16125970/isis-syria-after-iraq-mosul), ISIS may turn into more of an idea as it loses more territory. That idea may continue to inspire ISIS followers in various countries to stage attacks — especially in [**Europe**](https://www.vox.com/world/2016/7/15/12198266/nice-attack-lone-wolf) and the United States.

**9. Functions and Types of Diplomatic Mission**

A diplomatic mission is a group of people from one [state](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sovereign_state) or an international [inter-governmental organisation](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Inter-governmental_organisation) (such as the[United Nations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations)) present in another state to represent the sending state/organisation officially in the receiving state. A country may have several different types of diplomatic missions in another country.

 A permanent diplomatic mission is typically known as an embassy, and the head of the mission is known as an [ambassador](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ambassador). A diplomatic mission located in the capital city of another country which generally offer a full range of services, including consular services. Between members of the Commonwealth of Nations their diplomatic missions are not called embassies, but High Commissions, as Commonwealth nations share a special diplomatic relationship, and their heads are [high commissioners](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High_Commissioner_%28Commonwealth%29). This is because ambassadors are exchanged between foreign countries, but since the beginning of the Commonwealth, member countries have nominally maintained that they are not foreign to one another .

A [consulate](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Consul_%28representative%29) is similar to (but not the same as) a diplomatic office, but with focus on dealing with individual persons and businesses, as defined by the [Vienna Convention on Consular Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vienna_Convention_on_Consular_Relations). A consulate or consulate general is generally a representative of the embassy in locales outside of the capital city. Similar services may also be provided at the embassy (to serve the region of the capital) in what is normally called a consular section. In cases of dispute, it is common for a country to [recall](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Letter_of_credence) its head of mission as a sign of its displeasure. This is less drastic than cutting diplomatic relations completely, and the mission will still continue operating more or less normally, but it will now be headed by a [chargé d'affaires](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Charg%C3%A9_d%27affaires) (usually the [deputy chief of mission](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Deputy_chief_of_mission)) who may have limited powers.

The functions of a diplomatic mission consist, inter alia, in representing the sending State in the receiving State; protecting in the receiving State the interests of the sending State and of its nationals, within the limits permitted by international law; negotiating with the Government of the receiving State; ascertaining by all lawful means conditions and developments in the receiving State, and reporting thereon to the Government of the sending State; promoting friendly relations between the sending State and the receiving State, and developing their economic, cultural and scientific relations. The rights and immunities (such as [diplomatic immunity](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Diplomatic_immunity)) of diplomatic missions are codified in the [Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vienna_Convention_on_Diplomatic_Relations). Diplomatic immunity is a principle of international law by which certain foreign government officials are not subject to the jurisdiction of local courts and other authorities and also they have some privileges.

**10. Diplomatic Immunity**

Diplomatic immunity is a principle of international law by which certain foreign government officials are not subject to the jurisdiction of local courts and other authorities. The concept of immunity began with ancient tribes. In order to exchange information, messengers were allowed to travel from tribe to tribe without fear of harm. Today, immunity protects the channels of diplomatic communication by exempting diplomats from local jurisdiction so that they can perform their duties with freedom, independence, and security. Diplomatic immunity is not meant to benefit individuals personally; it is meant to ensure that foreign officials can do their jobs. The [Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961](http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/treaties/diplomatic_relations.htm) and the[Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963](http://www.ediplomat.com/nd/treaties/consular_relations.htm) codified most modern diplomatic and consular practices, including diplomatic immunity. More than 160 nations are parties to these treaties. The conventions provide immunity to persons according to their rank in a diplomatic mission or consular post and according to the need for immunity in performing their duties.  For example, diplomatic agents and members of their immediate families are immune from all criminal prosecution and most civil law suits. Administrative and technical staff members of embassies have a lower level of immunity. Consular officers serving in consulates throughout the country have an even lower level of immunity. Members of an embassy's service staff and consular employees are immune only for acts performed as part of their official duties. The Vienna Convention provides for specific measures that can be taken by both the home and host countries in cases of misuse or abuse of diplomatic privileges and immunities. On the whole, diplomatic privileges and immunities have served as efficient tools facilitating relations between States. No UN Member State has so far proposed rescinding the Convention or re-writing its provisions.

Diplomatic privileges and immunities guarantee that diplomatic agents or members of their immediate family:

* May not be arrested or detained
* May not have their residences entered and searched
* May not be subpoenaed as witnesses
* May not be prosecuted

**11. OSCE: Structure and Functions**

With 57 participating States in North America, Europe and Asia, the OSCE – the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe – is the world’s largest regional security organization. The OSCE works for stability, peace and democracy for more than a billion people, through political dialogue about shared values and through practical work that aims to make a lasting difference.

The OSCE is a forum for political dialogue on a wide range of security issues and a platform for joint action to improve the lives of individuals and communities. The organization uses a comprehensive approach to security that encompasses the politico-military, economic and environmental, and human dimensions. Through this approach, and with its inclusive membership, the OSCE helps bridge differences and build trust between states by co-operating on conflict prevention, crisis management and post-conflict rehabilitation.

With its [Institutions](https://www.osce.org/institutions), expert units and network of [field operations](https://www.osce.org/where), the OSCE addresses issues that have an impact on our common security, including arms control, terrorism, good governance, energy security, human trafficking, democratization, media freedom and national minorities.

The OSCE Office in Yerevan started its activities on 16 February 2000 and discontinued its operations on 31 August 2017. The closure of the OSCE Office in Yerevan follows months of negotiations and extensive efforts by the 2016 German OSCE Chairmanship and the 2017 Austrian OSCE Chairmanship to resolve the deadlock on the extension of the Office’s mandate.

**12. UNO: Structure and Functions**

The United Nations is an international organization founded in 1945 after the Second World War by 51 countries committed to maintaining international peace and security, developing friendly relations among nations and promoting social progress, better living standards and human rights.The United Nations was the second multipurpose international organization established in the 20th century that was worldwide in scope and membership. Its predecessor, the League of Nations, was created by the Treaty of Versailles in 1919 and disbanded in 1946.

Due to its unique international character, and the powers vested in its founding Charter, the Organization can take action on a wide range of issues, and provide a forum for its 193 Member States to express their views, through the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council and other bodies and committees.

**The UN has 4 main purposes :**

* To keep peace throughout the world;
* To develop friendly relations among nations;
* To help nations work together to improve the lives of poor people, to conquer hunger, disease and illiteracy, and to encourage respect for each other’s rights and freedoms;
* To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations to achieve these goals.

**How UN gets Funded :**

The United Nations (UN) is funded by its member states through **compulsory and voluntary contributions.** The size of each state’s compulsory contribution depends mainly on its economic strength, though its state of development and debt situation are also taken into account.

Over and above their compulsory contributions, member states also make voluntary contributions to:

* The Specialized Agencies of the UN System such as the UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Health Organization (WHO)
* UN Programmes and Funds such as the Office of the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the UN Children’s Fund (UNICEF).

**Organisation Structure of UN :**

The Charter of United Nations established six main bodies of the United Nations Organisation: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, The International Court of Justice and the Secretariat.

**1. General Assembly:**

* The General Assembly is the main deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations.

**Function & Powers of Assembly:**

* Consider and approve the **United Nations budget** and establish the financial assessments of Member States;
* Elect the **non-permanent members of the Security Council** and the members of other United Nations councils and organs and, on the recommendation of the Security Council, appoint the Secretary-General;
* Consider and make recommendations on the general principles of cooperation for maintaining international peace and security, including disarmament;

**Security Council:**

* IT has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security.
* It has 15 Members, consisting of 5 permanent members—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States—and 10 non-permanent members.

**Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) :**

* It is the principal organ to coordinate the economic, social and related work of the United Nations and the specialized agencies and institutions.
* Voting in the Council is by simple majority; each member has one vote.

**4. Trusteeship Council :**

* It was established in 1945 by the UN Charter to provide international supervision for 11 Trust Territories placed under the administration of 7 Member States, and ensure that adequate steps were taken to prepare the Territories for self-government and independence.

**The International Court of Justice:**

* It is the UN’s main judicial organ.
* Difference between  **the International Court of Justice (ICJ) and  the International Criminal Court (ICC)**
* **1.**The International Court of Justice has no jurisdiction to try individuals accused of war crimes or crimes against humanity.  As it is not a criminal court, it does not have a prosecutor able to initiate proceedings.
* **2.**International Criminal Court set up under the Rome Statute. It  was established as an independent international organization in 2002 and is not governed by the UN.
* **3.**All UN member states are automatically members of the ICC; Nations must individually become members of the ICJ.

**6. Secretariat:**

* It carries out the day-to-day work of the Organization.
* It services the other principal organs and carries out tasks as varied as the issues dealt with by the UN: administering peacekeeping operations, surveying economic and social trends, preparing studies on human rights, among others.
* It is headed by the Secretary-General, assisted by a staff of international civil servants worldwide.

**13. EU: Structure and Functions**

**European Union (EU)**, [international organization](https://www.britannica.com/topic/international-organization) [comprising](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/comprising) 28 European countries and governing common economic, social, and security policies. The EU was created by the [Maastricht Treaty](https://www.britannica.com/event/Maastricht-Treaty), which entered into force on November 1, 1993. The treaty was designed to [enhance](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/enhance)European political and [economic integration](https://www.britannica.com/topic/economic-integration) by creating a single [currency](https://www.britannica.com/topic/currency) (the [euro](https://www.britannica.com/topic/euro)), a unified foreign and security policy, and common citizenship rights and by advancing cooperation in the areas of immigration, asylum, and judicial affairs. The EU eliminates all border controls between members. That allows the free flow of goods and people, except for random spot checks for crime and drugs. The EU transmits state-of-the-art technologies to its members. The areas that benefit are environmental protection, research and development, and energy.

Public contracts are open to bidders from any member country. Any product manufactured in one country can be sold to any other member without [tariffs](https://www.thebalance.com/tariff-pros-cons-and-examples-3305967) or duties. Taxes are all standardized. Practitioners of most services (law, medicine, tourism, banking, insurance, etc.) can operate in all member countries. As a result, the cost of airfares, the internet, and phone calls have fallen dramatically. Three bodies run the EU. The EU Council represents national governments. The Parliament is elected by the people.

The European Commission is the EU staff. They make sure all members act consistently in regional, agricultural, and social policies. Contributions of €120 billion a year from member states fund the EU.

Here's how the three bodies uphold the laws governing the EU. These are spelled out in a series of treaties and supporting regulations:

1. The EU Council sets the policies and proposes new legislation. The political leadership, or Presidency of the EU, is held by a different leader every six months.
2. The European Parliament debates and approves the laws proposed by the Council. Its members are elected every five years.
3. The European Commission staffs and executes the laws. Jean-Claude Juncker is the President until 2019

On February 24, 2017 [Tigran Sargsyan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tigran_Sargsyan%22%20%5Co%20%22Tigran%20Sargsyan), the Chairman of the [Eurasian Economic Commission](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eurasian_Economic_Commission) stated that Armenia's stance was to cooperate and work with both the [European Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union) and the [Eurasian Union](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eurasian_Union). Sargsyan added that although Armenia is part of the Eurasian Union, a new [European Union Association Agreement](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/European_Union_Association_Agreement) between Armenia and the EU would be finalized shortly.[[22]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenia%E2%80%93European_Union_relations#cite_note-22)

On February 27, 2017 the European Union and Armenia finalized a new agreement on deepening their political and economic ties. The Armenian president, [Serzh Sargsyan](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Serzh_Sargsyan%22%20%5Co%20%22Serzh%20Sargsyan), was in [Brussels](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brussels) and met with European Council President [Donald Tusk](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Donald_Tusk) and other high ranking officials. The Comprehensive and Enhanced Partnership Agreement will expand and broaden the scope of relations between the EU and Armenia,[[23]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenia%E2%80%93European_Union_relations#cite_note-23) but will not be an association agreement.[[24]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Armenia%E2%80%93European_Union_relations#cite_note-24) It was signed by Armenia and all EU member states on 24 November 2017

**14. NATO: Structure and Functions**

NATO is an acronym for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a military alliance established in 1949. Twelve founding members signed the North Atlantic Treaty at the time: Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, the United Kingdom, and the United States. NATO was launched as "part of a broader effort to serve three purposes: deterring Soviet expansionism, forbidding the revival of nationalist militarism in Europe through a strong North American presence on the continent, and encouraging European political integration," its website [says](http://nato.int/cps/en/natohq/declassified_139339.htm).

**What is NATO's goal?**

The alliance [says](http://www.nato.int/nato-welcome/index.html) its "essential purpose is to safeguard the freedom and security of its members through political and military means."

**How many members does NATO have?**

Twenty eight. Greece, Turkey, Germany, Spain, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Albania, and Croatia have all joined.

**How does collective defense work?**

If one NATO member is attacked, it's viewed as attacking the rest of the members. The idea is [expressed](http://www.nato.int/cps/cn/natohq/topics_110496.htm) in Article Five of the North Atlantic Treaty.

NATO members "will assist the Party or Parties so attacked by taking forthwith, individually and in concert with the other Parties, such action as it deems necessary, including the use of armed force," according to the article.

The article was invoked for the first time in the wake of 9/11.

**Where are the NATO headquarters?**

NATO is headquartered in Brussels, Belgium.

**Who is NATO's Secretary General?**

The former Prime Minister of Norway, Jens Stoltenberg, serves as its Secretary General. He's expected to chair committees, direct discussions, and make sure decisions go into effect, according to the alliance.

**How does NATO defense spending work?**

For NATO members, there is a target to spend 2 percent of their gross domestic product (GDP) on defense. Five members - Estonia, Greece, Poland, the United Kingdom, and the United States - meet that goal.

**15. Non-Governmental Organizations**

A non-governmental organization (NGO) is a non-profit, citizen-based group that functions independently of government. NGOs, sometimes called civil societies, are organized on community, national and international levels to serve specific social or political purposes, and are cooperative, rather than commercial, in nature.

Two broad groups of NGOs are [identified by the World Bank](https://www.investopedia.com/articles/03/042303.asp):

* **Operational NGOs**, which focus on development projects.
* **Advocacy NGOs**, which are organized to promote particular causes.

As non-profits, NGOs rely on a variety of sources for funding, including:

* **membership dues**
* **private donations**
* **the sale of goods and services**
* **grants**

Despite their independence from government, [some NGOs rely significantly on government funding.](https://www.investopedia.com/financial-edge/0611/crazy-research-the-u.s.-government-is-funding.aspx) Large NGOs may have budgets in the millions or billions of dollars.

The most difficult question about the independence of NGOs is whether they come under governmental influence. Individual governments do at times try to influence the NGO community in a particular field, by establishing NGOs that promote their policies. This has been recognized by quite common use of the acronym GONGO, to label a government-organized NGO. Also, in more authoritarian societies, NGOs may find it very difficult to act independently and they may not receive acknowledgment from other political actors even when they are acting independently. Nominally NGOs may appear to be independent, when they design their own programs, but government influence can arise indirectly if the program is designed to make it more likely that government grants or contracts will be forthcoming. On the other hand, confident experienced NGOs can appeal for funding for new approaches and in so doing cause government officials to re-assess policy. The best example of this is the way in which NGOs, particularly the International Planned Parenthood Federation, dragged governments into adopting population programs. There is no obvious method to identify the direction of influence, without detailed knowledge of the relationship between an NGO and a government. Environmental NGOs may have either type of funding relationship. Conservation and research groups may happily obtain government funds to support their programs: some are innovative and some are not. Beyond these situations, radical campaigning groups may be unwilling and unable to attract government funds.

 **16. Soft and Hard powers in international relations**

Soft power was a term first coined by Joseph Nye in 1990 . His definition "It is the ability to get what you want through attraction rather than coercion or payments. Despite the increased use of the term soft power, questions still remain as to the validity of soft power as an actual usable form of political power. Criticisms of soft power abound and include recognition that soft power is too fickle and generated from factors many of which are outside the direct control of a government. Soft power can have a positive effect on one group but have a polar opposite effect on another group within the same nation. The term Hard Power is defined as**a** **coercive approach to international political relations**, one that**involves the use of military and economic power to influence or control** the behaviour or interests of other states or political groups. The distinction between Hard Power and Soft Power is thus easily identifiable. While both represent important concepts in international relations and constitute two forms of power exercised by states, they differ in their nature and function.

### • Definition of Hard Power and Soft Power:

• Hard Power represents a coercive approach to international relations and employs the use of military or economic power to achieve certain outcomes. The underlying theme of Hard Power is coercion and states use such power to influence weaker states to comply with their will

• Soft Power, in contrast, represents a subtle, persuasive approach to international relations between states. States utilize Soft Power to “attract and co-opt” other states to desire what they desire. It has the ability to influence the preferences and interests of other states. This persuasive approach is applied through cultural, historical and/or diplomatic means.

### • Concept of hard Power and Soft Power

• In Hard Power the theme is coercion; use force, or provide payment as a means of persuasion.

• In Soft Power, it is attracting and co-opting; indirectly convincing.

### • Examples of Hard Power and Soft Power:

• Hard Power include military intervention or protection, economic sanctions, or reduction of trade barriers.

• Soft Power include cultural, historical, and diplomatic influence.

**17. Humanitarian intervantion**

Humanitarian intervention is a means to prevent or stop a gross violation of human rights in a state, where such state is either incapable or unwilling to protect its own people, or is actively persecuting them. Many scholars identify the 1990s as a ‘decade of humanitarian intervention’, during which the UN authorized several interventions on humanitarian grounds. During the 1990s, even as the Security Council was increasingly willing to authorize humanitarian intervention, the United States and its allies took military action on at least three occasions, for express humanitarian purposes, when the specific action was not authorized by the Security Council. The most important principle in international law is the inviolability of the territorial sovereignty of states. The principle of respect for the territorial integrity of states is well founded as one of the linchpins of the international system, as is the norm prohibiting interference in the internal affairs of other states. Article 2(4) of the UN Charter preserves the territorial integrity and political independence of states by forbidding any use of force, or threat of use of force against either.  There is no legal rule governing the exception of humanitarian intervention to the use of force, as there is for the use of collective security measures and self-defence. Despite the well-founded moral and legal justifications for humanitarian intervention, the practice has traditionally been subject to a large amount of criticism.  Some scholars and politicians have argued that humanitarian intervention is an illegal violation of sovereignty, that it does more harm than good and that it is a form of neo-colonialism. The end of the Cold War has brought about a substantial change in the concept of humanitarian intervention as well as in the practice. This change is rooted in different developments. One of the main factors is the changing nature of the international system. Humanitarian interventions are not only responses to the suffering caused by repressive governments, but also they are directed to situations produced by internal conflicts, state disintegration and state collapses, as a result of which human rights are grossly violated. Apart from increasing UN involvement, multilateralism was another change in the agency the end of the Cold War brought about.23 Many observers have always been suspicious of unilateralism due to the high risk of abuse. As stated before, Cold War conditions made a multilateral intervention difficult to realise, but, in the post-Cold War period, multilateralism became one of the necessary conditions for humanitarian intervention.

Somalia

The multiple UNOSOM operations, combined with UNITAF and Operation Provide Relief in Somalia between 1991 and 1995 saved approximately 22,000 lives in total. Over the course of the crisis, however, a combined approximate figure of 125,000 lives were lost. This wide gap between the number of lives saved and lives lost, and particularly the fact that the number of lives lost outpaced the number saved during the period of intensive intervention, classifies this case as a failure. The US strategic loss in the Battle of Mogadishu cemented perception of the whole US operation as a failure in the public imagination as well. US interests were considered minimal in the case of Somalia, particularly compared to the simultaneous crises that were taking place across the continent. The end of apartheid in South Africa, and the Angolan and Mozambican civil wars had far more effect on US interests. Somalia was economically disconnected from the US, it is geographically distant, and the former US military base at Berbera was dismantled earlier due to obsolescence.
Rwanda

Rwanda is generally considered the prime example of a failure to intervene properly, and the numbers clearly reflect this perception. Despite the relatively large numbers saved by the four intervention missions in Rwanda, the 500,000 to 800,000 who died over the course of the crisis grossly outstrips that figure. Based on these figures, Rwanda is objectively a failure. US apathy to the situation was visible from the outset, and the only concern was that US nationals were evacuated from Rwanda. The case of Somalia loomed large over the decision process, where US soldiers had quite visibly failed to accomplish their goals. Terming the crisis as a genocide was avoided, as it would mandate action by the US government. Therefore, the United States took extraordinary measures to avoid involvement.

**18**. International Sanctions as Punitive Measures

### Sanctions are a tool used by countries or international organizations to persuade a particular government or group of governments to change their policy by restricting trade, investment or other commercial activity. For example, sanctions may be applied to countries which develop [weapons of mass destruction](https://www.thoughtco.com/profile-the-iraq-war-3310430), violate human rights or trade unfairly. The extent of the sanctions often depends on the severity of the violation.​ Types of Sanctions

Trade sanctions are the most common kind and are the least onerous. They could be revocation of preferential treatment such as Most Favored Nation (MFN) status or import quotas against a country not abiding by agreed international rules of trade.

Economic sanctions are punitive in nature and meant to isolate the target. Economic sanctions may include trade embargoes or boycotts, freezing of assets, bans on cash transfers, bans on technology transfer and restrictions on travel. The US Government has placed sanctions against Cuba, North Korea and Iran among other countries.

The impact of sanctions is often felt by poor, innocent civilians and not the intended government officials.

A trade embargo is most likely to affect a subsistence farmer who cannot sell his crops for export or a worker in a factory that is unable to receive raw materials. In most cases, sanctions will exclude humanitarian items such as medicines. During the [Saddam Hussein](https://www.thoughtco.com/saddam-hussein-history-1779934) regime, US economic sanctions against [Iraq](https://www.thoughtco.com/is-iraq-a-democracy-2353046) were often criticized as hurting the people that the American Government wanted to rise up against Saddam.

### Famous Examples of Sanctions

The boycott and near isolation of [South Africa](https://www.thoughtco.com/african-history-4133338) because of its former apartheid policy separating the races is a famous example of economic sanctions. US companies divested themselves of [South African assets](https://www.thoughtco.com/brief-history-of-south-african-apartheid-2834606) in the 1980s. The [UN Security Council](https://www.thoughtco.com/united-nations-security-council-1435435) has supported economic sanctions against North Korea because of its possession of nuclear weapons. Sanctions are not always economic in nature. [President Carter's](https://www.thoughtco.com/jimmy-carter-39th-president-united-states-104751)boycott of the Moscow Olympics in 1980 can be viewed as sanctions in protest against the [Soviet Union's invasion of Afghanistan](https://www.thoughtco.com/history-of-the-taliban-who-they-are-what-they-want-2352797). Currently, the US Government is trying to gather worldwide support for stern economic sanctions against Iran if they fail to cooperate with international inspections of their nuclear program.

19.CNN effect

It is over 20 years since debate over the relationship between TV news coverage of war, and resulting decisions to intervene for what appeared to be humanitarian purposes, occupied a good deal of scholarly and political attention. Back then, it was the newly emerging global media players such as CNN that were seen by many to be the driving force between purportedly humanitarian interventions during crises in countries such as Somalia (1992-1993) and Bosnia (1995).[1] The term the CNN effect came to be understood as shorthand for the notion that mainstream news media in general, not just CNN, were having an increased effect upon foreign policy formulation. It was a series of events during the 1990s that elevated news media to the status of being potentially critical actors, with respect to humanitarian crisis and high-level foreign policy decision-making. Starting with the Kurdish crisis in 1991, and swiftly followed by Operation Restore Hope in Somalia (1992-93), a series of humanitarian crises were associated with an emerging doctrine of so-called humanitarian intervention. The CNN effect debate gained significant attention for a number of reasons. First, the evolution of a doctrine of humanitarian intervention was, for some scholars, a major development and represented an important shift from a statist international society. Because news media were being implicated in this major shift, the suggestion was that media pressure had become a force to be reckoned with. Also, the changing geo-political conditions associated with the passing of the Cold War, which appeared to free up the foreign policy agenda, coupled with the rapid expansion of global news media such as CNN. In Somalia 1992-93, they found that US media reporting of the crisis actually followed the cues of US government officials who had been attempting to draw attention to the crisis there. They concluded that, rather than media driving the intervention, journalists were actually conforming to more traditional patterns of indexing,[7] whereby their coverage was indexed to the viewpoints of US officials who were already persuaded of the need for intervention in Somalia. In sum, political agendas were influencing the media much more than media were influencing politics. At the heart of discussion and debate over the CNN effect, and other similar arguments about the power of media to shape policy responses, is the question of where power lies. The CNN effect of the 1990s highlighted the ability, under certain circumstances, for media to shape policy responses during international crises. There is little doubt that media influence continues to occur, particularly with respect to issues such as aid delivery, as summarised earlier. The question of whether media continues to be able to drive high-level decision making, as was occasionally seen during the 1990s, is more open to question. Since 9-11 Western foreign policy has been driven by a series of very high profile wars in Afghanistan, Iraq, Libya and, now possibly Syria. In most of these cases the role of media appears to have been a more familiar one of manufacturing consent for policies being enacted as part of the ‘war on terror’. At the same time, the chaotic and fragmented media environment may actually have served to reduce the potential of mainstream media to significantly influence policy decisions.

**20. The art of negotiations.**

In politics, both national and local, negotiation can be a brutal career-changing affair. Whilst some negotiation takes a friendly and collaborative approach, many exchanges are based on personal and political gains. Perhaps more than other methods, political negotiation makes most use of social [power](http://changingminds.org/explanations/power/power.htm). Negotiation can take a wide variety of forms, from a multilateral conference of all United Nations members to establish a new international norm (such as the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea) to a meeting of parties to a conflict to end violence or resolve the underlying issue (such as constitutional negotiations in South Africa in 1990-1994 or in Colombia with the FARC on 2012-2015) to a business encounter to make a deal to a face-off between parents (or between parent and child) over the child's proper behavior.

Negotiation theorists generally distinguish between two types of negotiation  The difference in the urage of the two type depends on the mindset of the negotiator but also on the situation: one-off encounters where lasting relationships do not obtain are more likely to produce distributive negotiations whereas lasting relationships are more likely to require integrative negotiating. Different theorists use different labels for the two general types and distinguish them in different ways.

### Distributive negotiation

Distributive negotiation is also sometimes called positional or hard-bargaining negotiation and attempts to distribute a "fixed pie" of benefits. Distributive negotiation operates under zero-sum conditions and implies that any gain one party makes is at the expense of the other and vice versa. For this reason, distributive negotiation is also sometimes called *win-lose* because of the assumption that one person's gain is another person's loss. Distributive negotiation examples include haggling prices on an open market, including the negotiation of the price of a car or a home.

### Integrative negotiation

Integrative negotiation is also called interest-based, merit-based, or principled negotiation. It is a set of techniques that attempts to improve the quality and likelihood of negotiated agreement by taking advantage of the fact that different parties often value various outcomes differently. [[10]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negotiation#cite_note-10). While distributive negotiation assumes there is a fixed amount of value (a "fixed pie") to be divided between the parties, integrative negotiation attempts to create value in the course of the negotiation ("expand the pie") by either "compensating" loss of one item with gains from another ("trade-offs" or [logrolling](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logrolling)), or by constructing or reframing the issues of the conflict in such a way that both parties benefit ("win-win" negotiation)

### Types of negotiators

Three basic kinds of negotiators have been identified by researchers involved in The Harvard Negotiation Project. These types of negotiators are: soft bargainers, hard bargainers, and principled bargainers.

Soft

These people see negotiation as too close to competition, so they choose a gentle style of bargaining. The offers they make are not in their best interests, they yield to others' demands, avoid confrontation, and they maintain good relations with fellow negotiators. Their perception of others is one of friendship, and their goal is agreement. They do not separate the people from the problem, but are soft on both. They avoid contests of wills and insist on agreement, offering solutions and easily trusting others and changing their opinions.

Hard

These people use contentious strategies to influence, utilizing phrases such as "this is my final offer" and "take it or leave it." They make threats, are distrustful of others, insist on their position, and apply pressure to negotiate. They see others as adversaries and their ultimate goal is victory. Additionally, they search for one single answer, and insist you agree on it. They do not separate the people from the problem (as with soft bargainers), but they are hard on both the people involved and the problem.

Principled

Individuals who bargain this way seek integrative solutions, and do so by sidestepping commitment to specific positions. They focus on the problem rather than the intentions, motives, and needs of the people involved. They separate the people from the problem, explore interests, avoid bottom lines, and reach results based on standards independent of personal will. They base their choices on objective criteria rather than power, pressure, self-interest, or an arbitrary decisional procedure. These criteria may be drawn from moral standards, principles of fairness, professional standards, and tradition.

Researchers from The Harvard Negotiation Project recommend that negotiators explore a number of alternatives to the problems they face in order to reach the best solution, but this is often not the case (as when you may be dealing with an individual using soft or hard bargaining tactics)

[Emotions](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Emotion) play an important part in the negotiation process, although it is only in recent years that their effect is being studied. Emotions have the potential to play either a positive or negative role in negotiation. During negotiations, the decision as to whether or not to settle rests in part on emotional factors. Negative emotions can cause intense and even irrational behavior, and can cause conflicts to escalate and negotiations to break down, but may be instrumental in attaining concessions. On the other hand, positive emotions often facilitate reaching an agreement and help to maximize joint gains, but can also be instrumental in attaining concessions. Positive and negative discrete emotions can be strategically displayed to influence task and relational outcomes[[48]](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Negotiation#cite_note-Kopelman,_Rosette,_&_Thompson,_2006-48) and may play out differently across cultural boundaries.