Chapter IV

Interactions and Objectives of International Non-Governmental Organizations

Part I

4.1. Introduction
International non governmental organizations have a key role and are significant due to the scope of activities and their effects on global policy. They are playing their strategic roles in different scopes like peace, human rights and poverty. This issue is possible on the one hand via their stipulation to local places and cultures and, on the other hand, with their critical approach to global institutions. With recent progress in the information networks, and also communication technologies, an increasingly related INGO society is finding noticeable range for information and networking, common in various levels (Madon, 2000).

Here we should note that the meaning of internal level of interaction is that the INGOs have some interactions between themselves. So, this is obvious that external level of interaction is the relationship out of the scope of the sole INGOs, and includes especially the relationship among INGOs and states. We should mention that despite the merit of INGOs in respect of their multi-level reach, their assistance to date stays limited more to small-range success stories (Madon, 2000).
This chapter aims at emphasizing the necessity for INGOs to learn from the framework in their will to influence broader policy-making and to make a global stable peace. It is argued that, as their role changes from theoretical work to international advocacy, in matters such as peace, INGOs will have to strengthen institutional structures and learning skills, to achieve a greater peace, in the contemporary era (Madon, 2000).

4.2. INGOs in the World Politics
Some analyses about INGOs’ behavior concentrate on the value motivation of them for describing their strength and treatment. These analyses mention that advocacy networks afford a moral authority on the basis of the centrality of principled values and ideas, in motivating their structuring. The treatment of INGOs is related to their mission and is also with respect to their proper role; non-governmental players performance as experts, awareness and finally, as professionals distinct of governments. Also INGOs sometimes try to influence the political processes. INGOs see their clean role (self-defined) for following their specific goals in a defined way, by approaching a politically neutral perspective with respect to a party or a regime and performance with whosoever is in power and governing for attaining their objectives.

The idea that the role of INGOs is different, impartial, and also less political is common between all INGOs. Some analysts have argued that, having knowledge about the international norms that incite the principled actors, can provide analysts more knowledge on their behavior. On the other hand, others have recommended that we see the behavior of INGOs as specific types of players.
The logic behind looking at value-motivated actors differently has a long tradition in sociology. Weber, for instance, distinguishes between associative relationships based on free market exchange or self-interested commitment to a long-run course of action from associations of individuals motivated by an adherence to a set of common absolute values. This logic also finds support among analysts in political psychology who suggest that the rational reasoning central to decision-making in science and economics, which puts a premium on flexibility and functionality, may be prominent and accepted in ‘secular’ tradeoffs (between money, services, promotions) but less likely to come into play and more likely to be frowned upon when, decision-makers feel that they are protecting ‘sacred’ values (such as honor, justice, life) (Avant, 2004).

Most of analyses about INGOs’ behavior, concentrate on their advocacy role and assume that the norms and values upon which they are constructed, fit together easily in a united plan. INGO’s activities can reinforce its reputation as a professional and reliable actor, and also are in consistent with the persuasive tactics issues and its selfless performance in the international community, as the broader scope. However, when INGOs fulfill policy, they often face tragic choices –or matters and situations where various members of the family of global norms and values to which are committed conflict. Fulfilling the policy needs a physical appearance and indicates requirement of security, but also this fact that INGOs are performing policy, begins in some unwillingness, weakness, inability of governments to fulfill their role particularly in structuring the peace.
NGOs like Amnesty International, can serve as focal points for the mobilization and articulation of interests shared by many people living in different countries. They play five distinct roles in international relations: consciousness raising or value promotion; agenda setting; lobbying to shape the terms of the instructions given to delegates at multilateral and INGOs forums, and to implement international commitments; monitoring; and direct action (for example, Green Peace boats obstructing the entry of nuclear ships into New Zealand ports). Amnesty International eschews direct action, but does engage in the other four types of activities (Diehl, 2005).

As the world grows more interdependent and transactions across state borders increase through the movement of people, information, and traded products, it is likely that world politics nonetheless will be increasingly affected by the activities of both IGO and NGO nonstate actors. Even though nonstate actors are unlikely to join together in a common cause to pressure the international community for radical reforms, their activities (however divided) are more than 350 years in determining the global system’s architecture and rules. Since the peace of Westphalia in 1648, states and especially great powers have ruled supreme. Nonstate actors were largely pawns at the states’ mercy, to be moved at the states’ will (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004).

I) The Relationship of International Non-Governmental Organizations with the United Nations

Here we should mention the procedure of foundation of United Nations. The Atlantic Charter of August 14, 1941, a joint declaration by U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt and British Prime Minister Winston Churchill called for
collaboration on economic issues and a permanent system of security was the foundation for the Declaration by the United Nations in January 1942. Twenty six nations affirmed the principles of the Atlantic Charter and agreed to create a new universal organization to replace the League of Nations. The UN Charter was then drafted in two sets of meetings between August and October 1944 at Dumbarton Oaks in Washington, D.C.

The participants agreed that the organizations would be based on the principle of the sovereign equality of members, with all “peace-loving” states eligible for membership, thereby excluding the axis powers Germany, Italy, Japan, and Spain. It was also agreed that decisions on security issues would require unanimity of the permanent members of the Security Council, the great powers. There was also consensus on broadening the scope of the new organization beyond that of the League, and President Roosevelt early on sought to ensure domestic support for U.S. participation (Karns and Mingst, 2005).

When the United Nations conference on International Organization convened in San Francisco on April 25, 1945, delegates from the fifty participating states modified and finalized what had already been negotiated among the great powers. On July 28, 1945, with Senate approval, the United States became the first country to ratify the charter. It took only three months for a sufficient number of countries to ratify the document (Karns and Mingst, 2005).

Here we should pay attention to the fact that the UN operations for peacekeeping are very important and very effective. UN along with some
important non-governmental organizations, such as Red Cross and Red Crescent, in reducing the tensions and stabilizing the peace, in the tumultuous regions of the world, often act effectively. On the other hand, UN peacekeeping operations show a different range of the operations in various years (see figure 4.1). INGOs have a permanent increasing role in both national and international steps such as effects in promoting human rights, democracy, peace and peacekeeping in the critical situations, environmental issues, development, ensuring the survival of victims of wars and natural disasters and so on.

Figure 4.1 Number of UN Peacekeeping Operations


As we can prolong this list of activities we can generalize this list equally for the role of the organizations and agencies of the United Nations and other important INGOs. The relationship among UN system and the INGOs
has been one of the considerable phenomena after World War II till now. These relationships have been studied inadequately, along with insufficient attention to how they can and should improve still further in the first decade of the 21st century. Healthier, cleaner, more peaceful and safer world are the most important goals of the UN and also are the aims of the community of non-governmental organizations (Diehl, 2005).

One of the most important INGOs related to UN and especially its agencies is the Amnesty International. Amnesty International is a limited actor in its own rights. The United Nations is a sovereignty-bound actor; Amnesty International is a sovereignty-free actor. The lofty proclamations of human rights in the UN Charter suggest an expansive interest; the enabling causes reveal a more restrictive authority. The powers of NGOs like Amnesty International, although no more extensive, can be utilized more effectively, because, they are free of some of the types of inhibitions that impede the functioning of INGOs which are subject to capture by member governments (Diehl, 2005).

Sixty years after foundation of the UN, international institutions generally referred to as international non-governmental organizations (INGOs) - have become the most important actors of the international scene. The appearance during the recent years of these organizations is one of the most controversial global factors in the 21st century. INGOs have become an important third sector in the international community paralleling, although not yet par, the increasing role of international governmental organizations in the political environment and the sharp globalization in the spheres of cultural and economical. In fact, NGOs are a necessary part of the
legitimacy, and without them which no international action and intention for action can be meaningful.

Article 71 of the UN charter, must be seen as the beginning point of INGO in coordination with the UN, and its adoption in San Francisco came about broadly; it is commonly accepted because of the eagerness of U.S. to create a public sponsorship of the new world member, including a great number of NGO leaders in the U.S. mission to the conference. Article 71, states that the economic and socials council (ECOSOC) could create suitable arrangements for consultation with INGOs.

Another significant moment in the history of relationships of NGO/UN was the establishment of the Conference of Non-Governmental Organizations in 1948, for Consultative situation of the Economic and Social Council that generally is famous as CONGO. More than 60 years, this coordinating body has acted as NGO’s watchdog. In 1990s, the NGO relation with the United Nations moved more dramatically and increased the limelight. Participation in the UN conference on environment and development in 1992, (a conference at which, UN sought more participations and involvement of INGO in the global issues) can be assessed in this direction.

The traditional boundaries of the established consultative system - including its screening processes and criteria - were essentially ignored, and hundreds of organizations not previously associated with the UN were encouraged to make their voices heard. In turn, the NGO role in implementing the objectives of the conference was given important
emphasis in the agenda adopted at Rio. Ex-UN secretary-General Boutros Ghali, addressing NGO representatives at the UN in September 1994, made this very clear when he said: "I want you to consider this your home. Until recently, these words might have caused astonishment. The United Nations was considered to be a forum for sovereign states alone. Within the space of a few short years, this attitude has changed. Non-governmental organizations are now considered full participants in international life (Rice and Ritchie, 1995).

The underlying reasons for this profound change have been suggested earlier. But transformation of the UN/INGO relationship has not come easily. Disputed issues have emerged during the past five years and some remain unresolved even today. Before examining these issues, however, it is important to recall the variety of relationships which have developed over the years and the benefits - to both the UN and the NGOs - which the experience of earlier decades has made indisputable. Of course the INGO/UN relationship has not been a one-way street; non-governmental organizations serve their own purposes when they urge UN action or educate the public about the UN activities. And the UN framework has also proved itself to be of a great value as a mechanism around which cooperation can be built (Rice and Ritchie, 1995).

A) UN Peacebuilding Operations
Peacebuilding entered the UN lexicon and international practice with former UN Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali’s Agenda for Peace, published in 1992. Boutros-Ghali distinguishes four sequential but overlapping activities in the conflict management cycle: preventive
diplomacy, peacekeeping, peacemaking and peacebuilding. He describes peacebuilding as “action to identify and support structures which will tend to strengthen and solidify peace in order to avoid a relapse into conflict”. This highlights the dual and sometimes conflicting task of peacebuilding: to obtain security and an end to hostilities on the one hand, and on the other to engage in the parallel longer term process of consolidating peace (by reconciling people and groups, reforming or rebuilding institutions, structures and economies) to diminish the possibility of a relapse into violence (Atwood and Tanner, 2007).  

The UN’s role has changed over the years in response to new phases of the conflict and changes in the global environment. Essentially, there has been a shift from the bi-polar approaches of the Cold War years to multi-polar approaches in the post Cold War years. The “Good Offices Mission” of the late 1980s and early 1990s became the UN Special Mission to Afghanistan (UNSMA) in 1996. Since 1997, more attention has been focused on the regional dimensions of the conflict with the initiation of the 6+ 2 talks (the six neighboring powers plus the US and Russia).  

The last century, the bloodiest ever, re-emphasized the destructiveness of war whether they are large or small. With the threat of global war much diminished, small-scale wars rage on. These brutal wars are affecting huge populations. Ironically, the end of the Cold War has given way to greater regional instability. Additionally the rise of global information makes us more aware of suffering people cause by these conflicts. With this increased awareness, people will call for their governments, regional organizations,
and the United Nations to find solutions (Langholtz; Kondoch and Wells, 2003).

As these international decision-makers wrestle with what needs to be done, they must make a thorough assessment of the situation, and make the right decision. The critical factor in determining what needs to be done is to analyze the willingness of the parties to the dispute to resolve their differences peacefully. If that consent is relatively high, a United Nations peacekeeping force is probably the right answer (Langholtz; Kondoch and Wells, 2003).

Regional organizations and nations with the capability to respond to challenges to world peace have a clear and challenging responsibility to prepare for the next call. Regional organizations need to improve their capability to manage peace operations and nations, with the will and ability, need to seriously consider committing military forces to places outside their sphere of interest.

Peacebuilding activities may seemlessly follow peacekeeping operations that have been halted due to an expiry of mandate. They build on the foundations laid down by the peacekeeping operation and address the root causes of the respective conflicts. In the past, incoherent and un-integrated strategies for addressing post-conflict situations have often leaded to fragmented international assistance. The Security Council has thus asked the international community for closer, long-term collaboration between regional and sub-regional organizations, donor countries and international financial institutions. A collective approach allows for coherent financing of
peacebuilding projects as well as strengthening of mechanisms that promote self-reliance by improving capacity building activities (Kotze, 2006).\textsuperscript{5}

Expansion of UN peacekeeping activity has created numerous difficulties for the United Nations as an organization and for the member states participating in the peacekeeping operations. In the post-Cold War World, the UN was increasingly called on to respond to ‘challengers of a different king, with no peace to keep and humanitarian concerns raising demands for intervention with no clear guidelines on how to proceed’. The concept of peacekeeping expanded to include peacemaking, peacebuilding, and peace enforcement operations- often designated ‘second-generation’ peacekeeping operations because they include military, political, social and humanitarian aspects seldom present in traditional peacekeeping operations (Sorenson and Wood, 2005).\textsuperscript{6}

The UN is also bound by international humanitarian law as general international law. International organizations are bound by the obligations under general international law which are attendant to their functions. The organizations are bound by international law because they partake of personality under this system. Their obligations are circumscribed by the principle of functionality that is to say by the question of whether the obligations are necessary for the effective exercise of the organization’s functions. The application of international humanitarian law to UN peace support operations engaged in armed conflict is necessary in the sense that the unrestrained conduct of armed conflict is unthinkable, and would destroy the element of crude reciprocity that protect personnel in peace support operations (Zwanenburg, 2005).\textsuperscript{7}
Post-conflict interventions seek to address two overall objectives: to facilitate a transition to sustainable peace after the guns have gone silent and to support economic and social reconstruction. Not surprisingly, the enormous complexity of peacemaking, provision of urgent humanitarian assistance to war-torn communities, the entrenched actor interests and overlapping mandates of the international development agencies tend to divert attention, more often than not, from embracing a common post-conflict intervention framework (Rugumamu, 2009).8

Here we should note to basic principles of UN peacekeeping operations. Although the practice of United Nations peacekeeping has evolved significantly over the past six decades, three basic principles have traditionally served and continue to set United Nations peacekeeping operations apart as a tool for maintaining international peace and security:

- Consent of the parties
- Impartiality
- Non-use of force except in self-defense and defense of the mandate

These principles are inter-related and mutually reinforcing. It is important that their meaning and relationship to each other are clearly understood by all those involved in the planning and conduct of United Nations peacekeeping operations, so that they are applied effectively. Taken together, they provide a navigation aid, or compass, for practitioners both in the field and at United Nations Headquarters (Guehenno, 2008).9

In 2008, civilian deployments (including civilian police and non-uniformed civilian staff) passed 20,000 for the first time recorded by SIPRI.
This reflects the increased emphasis on conflict transformation and state building—which are essentially civilian tasks—evident in many current operations mandates (see figure 4.2). Nevertheless, civilians accounted for only 11.6 percent of international peace operation personnel in 2008 (see figures 4.3 and 4.4).10

Figure 4.2 Civilian Police Deployed in UN Peace Operations: 2005-2007


Figure 4.3 Military Personnel Deployed in UN and Non-UN Missions: 31 October 2007

Source: Annual review of global peace operations, center on international cooperation, New York University, 2008, p. 3.
The UN is today the main deployer of peace operation personnel. Every year from 2004 to 2008, the UN accounted for more than half of all deployments, up from 16 per cent in 1999.\textsuperscript{11} (See figure 4.5).
B) The Consultative Relationship

One indication of the interaction between NGOs and intergovernmental organizations is the provision for consultative status of NGOs with United Nations agencies. The most sought-after consultative status is granted by the Economic and Social Council. The breadth of ECOSOC’s mandate explains the large number of NGOs that have been granted consultative status, including nearly 700 organizations divided into three categories according to the extent of their involvement in ECOSOC’s program (LeRoy Bennett, 1988).

All of the specialized agencies except the Universal Postal Union and the financial group also enter into consultative agreements with NGOs. The number of NGOs that have such a relationship varies from 15 organizations for the World Meteorological Organization to more than 400 for UNESCO. The United Nations Children’s Fund, the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, and the International Atomic Energy Agency also grant consultative status to substantial numbers of NGOs (LeRoy Bennett, 1988).

The relationships between United Nations agencies and hundreds of NGOs, demonstrate the impossibility of effectively separating public from private organizations. The working arrangements involve bonds of mutual support and interdependence. Lines of information, research, and administration flow back and forth between the United Nations and private agencies. The pattern is one of cooperation and division of labor for common ends rather than a sharp cleavage between public and private
sectors. Transnational interactions operate extensively through these channels (LeRoy Bennett, 1988).

In spite of many methods of interaction between non-governmental world and intergovernmental world, the consultative connection and relationship is the focal point of this interaction. In the early 90s, the existing model of this connection was explored with increasing scrutiny. So, in 1993, ECOSOC structured a special working group to test and examine this relation and submit the results and deductions in 1996. The focal point of this examination, of course was the status of NGOs at UN. The most important point was the criteria of resolution of 1296 of UN that states:

"The organization shall be concerned with matters falling within the competence of the Economic and Social Council... The aims and purposes of the organization shall be in conformity with the spirit, purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations... The organization shall undertake to support the work of the United Nations and to promote knowledge of its principles and activities... The organization shall be of representative character and of recognized international standing... The organization shall have an established headquarters, with an executive officer. It shall have a democratically adopted constitution... which shall provide for determination of policy... by a representative body... The basic resources of the organization shall be derived in the main part from contributions of the national affiliates... or from individual members" (Rice and Ritchie, 1995).

Four UN organizations have become visible players in most complex humanitarian emergencies that describe their functions, and mandates will
describe most if not all of the operational work of the entire UN system in relief operations. They are the World Food Program, the office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP) (Diehl, 2005). Rice and Ritchie comment on this Resolution as follows:

“Resolution 1296, as previously noted, also includes provisions for classifying organizations into three categories. In category I, organizations are large, representative bodies with interest and competence in a broad range of topics; Category II comprises those with competence in only some of the ECOSOC issues; while organizations listed on the Roster are those who can make occasional useful contributions to the work of the Council. Each category has different rights, with the ability to intervene much greater at the top than at the bottom” (Rice and Ritchie, 1995). They scrutinize on the criterion of NGOs and believe that:

“The established practice, for an organization seeking accreditation in accordance with these standards has been for it to submit an application to ECOSOC’s Committee on Non-Governmental Organizations. Once approved by the Committee, ECOSOC’s subsequent approval has, in most cases; been pro forma (The same procedure has been followed with respect to the quadrennial reports which each accredited organization is required to submit. On the basis of these reports, or lack of them, the Committee can recommend to ECOSOC the removal of organizations not meeting the criteria)” (Rice and Ritchie, 1995).

The involvement of the UN or any IGO, NGO, individual, state or coalition of states, or ad hoc group in efforts to find a peaceful settlement of a conflict is a third-party intervention. Some high-profile situations such as
the former Yugoslavia or the Middle East generate multiple third-party efforts. Sometimes these efforts occur sequentially; sometimes they are simultaneous; but they are often messy and rife with questions of who does what, when, and where. The post-Cold War era witnessed an explosion of conflicts, of peacemaking efforts, and of systematic efforts by scholars and practitioners working together to study and draw lessons from them (Karns and Mingst, 2005).

II) International Nongovernmental Organizations Relationship
Either as an accusation or as an excuse, it is often noted that some NGOs have acted and operated widely with extremely inadequate resources. And this has happened in those cases where NGOs possess equipment. The rational solution to this matter is some means and measurement in sharing facilities and equipment for obtaining benefit from the best means and equipment. Centers that are in Geneva and New York, where some of organizations have central offices in the same place and even in the same building, but there is no insistence for sharing the office services (Fowler, 1997).

We should pay attention to the fact that this issue is about non-governmental organizations. The notion of partnership between Northern and southern NGOs stems from the 1970s, when it expressed an ideological aspiration of international solidarity in the development cause. In the 25 years since then, the term has been used and abused as a blanket covering all sorts of relationships between all sorts of agencies (Fowler, 1997).
Not only this has eroded the usefulness of the term but also the current trends towards contraction in the aid system are turning NGOs away from the concept, especially in the South, where Northern counterparts are seen to have moved away from this principle, in the words of one European NGO manager, the age of solidarity has come to an end, and the age of pragmatism and efficiency has begun (Fowler, 1997). Because, the study of transnational relations is relatively new, some of the terminology applied to this area is little understood and sometimes lacks precision. To guide the student in distinguishing between interstate and transnational relations, a few definitions are in order. Not all scholars would subscribe to the same use of terms, but the definitions adopted here are based on those used in the summer 1971 issue of international organization (LeRoy Bennett, 1988).

The basic term used by Keohane and Nye, is transnational interaction. A transnational interaction is the movement of tangible or intangible items across state boundaries when at least one actor is not an agent of a government or an international organization. This definition focuses on the activities of nongovernmental organizations and individuals involved in the transfer of goods, money, credit, information, or persons from one country to another. States or intergovernmental organizations may be involved in transnational interactions, but they need not be, since the interaction may be between nongovernmental organizations or individuals only (LeRoy Bennett, 1988).
III) International Nongovernmental Organizations Relationship  
(Independency of Relationship in the International Arena)

Nongovernmental organizations do not operate in a vacuum hermetically sealed off from each other or from governments and intergovernmental organizations. One of the major purposes of focusing greater attention on the study of nongovernmental actors is to assess the interactions between them and government, so that the political process may be examined in its fullest dimensions. Knowledge of the importance of these interactions is at an elementary stage, but preliminary investigations indicate a complex pattern of relationships warranting further study (LeRoy Bennett, 1988). One indication of the interaction between NGOs and intergovernmental organizations is the provision for consultative status of NGOs with United Nations agencies. We can list some of the relationships as under:

1- Permanent bilateral working relationships between INGOs as friends.
2- Temporary organizational relationships (for example in the common committee) for attaining the purposes of a temporary meeting.
3- In the conferences of NGOs for different objectives (such as consultative status).
4- NGOs grouping other international NGOs. These issues can be separated as:

- NGOs grouping of the regional NGOs in the same issue scope.
- NGOs that are working with National and International NGOs.
- NGOs that are working only with INGOs.

The NGO-NGO connection in the scope of NGO grouping is permanently threatened by the matter of security independency of each NGO.
or INGO and avoiding any possibility of majority decisions for support of specific NGO. Some NGOs believe that this is one of the ineffectiveness issues of the UN system. We can draw a conclusion of this discussion and talk about the concept of super NGO in the 21st century. These organizations are the members of an organizational system and we need to attain the new approaches. We should note that, we are witnessing a wave in the increase of the numbers of IGOs and particularly INGOs in the world. Figure 4.6 displays this growing pattern (see figure 4.6).

*Figure 4.6*  Growth Pattern of IGOs and INGOs (1891-2004)

Source: Margaret P. Karns and Karen A Mingst, international organizations, the politics and processes of global governance, US, Lynne Rienner, 2005, p.11.
IV) The Interactions between INGOs and States (External Level)

NGOs have performed their tasks as an alternative actor in peace and development, along with no subordinating to states and even trying to inflict their influence on the state policy for making the society better in situation. In 1980s, when neo-liberal stance became popular, the World Bank inflicted some special structural Adjustment Policies on many LDCs. Obviously, the goal of this program was to prevent and also warn the state to leave the interventionist stance in NGOs system. NGOs activities are in the micro level and states activities are in macro level.

Presently, according to public international law, only states are able to occupy and administer the inhabitable parts of the earth’s surface. Thus, intergovernmental organizations are obliged, if they wish to occupy a given point on the globe, to make “headquarters agreements” with the government on whose territory they have chosen to settle. As they have no territorial basis, NGOs are bound, in order to function, to take refuge in the territory of one of some states which control the earth’s surface. As a result, they are subject to the regulations and jurisdiction of the authorities which agree to have them. A major contradiction at once, emerges between an NGO’s international vocation, which is its raison d’être, and the national legal status in which it is confined (Merle, 1988).

States want to maintain the main role of service-providers for the population of the country or in other words the public sector. INGOs work for strengthening the poor people and also to advocate the shifts and changes in policy in favor of poor. States will be scared because, their role possibly will be injured, but we believe that in our era this scare has been discolored.
For example, most African governments encounter some difficulties to make welfare of their citizens and handling the development issues. In the aftermath, this stance affords a perspective to the governments to see the NGOs as a threat and provider of political tension, especially, among states and even among the NGO sector.

In global politics, interest group pluralism is growing as citizens increasingly participate in NGOs in order to gain power in the global institutions that shape people’s daily lives. Inspired by this trend many people see NGOs as a democratic force in world politics that can empower individuals by giving them a voice in the decisions leading to transformation in international affairs. NGOs, many believe, can exert influence over the direction of global conditions. This viewpoint, maintains that alongside the necessary and imperfect interstate institutional framework, there is developing an informal political process that supplements the formal process of cooperative relations among states. The organizations and the multiple channels of access across borders, Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye (2001) explain, are able to put increasing leverage on state. The combination of private transgovernmental, and transnational actors is creating an incipient, albeit imperfect, civil society at the global level (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004).

As the world grows more interdependent, and transactions across state borders increase through the movement of people, information, and traded products, it is likely that world politics nonetheless will be increasingly affected by the activities of both IGO and NGO nonstate actors. Even though, nonstate actors are unlikely to join together in a common cause to
pressure the international community for radical reforms, their activities (however divided) are likely to challenge the iron like grip that sovereign states have exercise for more than 350 years in determining the global system’s architecture and rules. Kegley and Wittkopf talks about the growing influence of NGOs and IGOs as partners and independent actors. They conclude that:

“IGOs and NGOs are both seeking to change the face of international affairs and reshape the global agenda (as a coalition of 160 NGOs from all regions did in October 1998 when they met in Toronto to organize to control the shipment of small arms that they believed were causing misery and destruction world-wide). These global actors were collectively interested in turning the world of states upside down” (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004).

They mention the gale of globalizations and territorial issues of the states and draw conclusions about interdependence world. They say:

“The question for the twenty-first century is whether the nation-state system will survive, given the challenges from IGOs, NGOs, and the gales of globalization to their continuing domination. Consider one among many assessments:

Even if a few states can still defend their territory against an invading army, not even the most powerful can protect its people and cities against a devastating surprise attack by guided missiles and none can control the flow of images and ideas that shape human tastes and values. The globalized presence of Madonna, McDonald’s, and Mickey Mouse make a mockery of sovereignty as exclusive territorial control. A few governments do their best to insulate their populations from such influences, but their efforts are growing less effective and run counter to democratizing demands that are
growing more difficult to resist….Interdependence and the interpenetration of domestic and international politics, the mobility and globalization of capital and information, and the rising influence of transnational social movements and organizations are among the factors that make it anachronistic to analyze politics as if territorial supremacy continues to be a generalized condition or a useful fiction” (Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004). (See figure 4.7).

NGOs must think about what they like to achieve and more importantly, how they may attain their goals within the present conditions. It is difficult for some NGOs to find informal relation and connection with their governments in some region of the world, especially eastern and southern regions. So, the NGO parts in these regions have not been organized and coordinated for filling the gap among governments and NGOs in considerably large.

Figure 4.7  The Number of States and IGOs Since 1990

Furthermore, it is correct to think that making an unofficial relationship is unrealistic and, to some extent, ineffective. Also there had been a vast increase in the number of INGOs since 1950. Figure 4.8 displays this vast increase (see figure 4.8).

![Figure 4.8 The Number of NGOs Since 1950](image)


Decentralized world authority among states both facilitates transnational organizing, because centralized barriers to rational voluntarism are weak, and forces transnational organizations to focus their attention on states. In mobilizing around and elaborating world-cultural principles, INGOs lobby and harangue states to act on those principles. In some sectors and with respect to some issues, INGOs clearly succeed in these efforts, inducing states to use their legal-bureaucratic authority to enforce INGO conceptions and rules (Diehl, 2005). John Boli and George Thomas in their joint work
under the name of “INGOs and the organization of world culture” mention the indirect effects of INGOs on states. They argue that:

“More indirect effects of INGOs on states are evident in sectors where INGO-generated standards, methods, and models provide rationales and means by which states are able to meet their responsibilities. Berman (1988) offers a telling example in his discussion of international commercial law: rules made by the International Chamber of Commerce form the legal basis upon which national courts make decisions in disputes regarding trade contracts, bills of lading, and financial instruments” (Diehl, 2005).

It is correct to say that the status of INGOs to states is extremely difficult to be common. They must contemplate about what is the trait of states in relation with the INGOs or specifically NGOs, and also the states think about how INGOs can achieve the goals without harming the legitimacy of states. It is significant to emphasize the diversity of steps and stages where INGOs are working. What INGOs compel to do is, to realize each environment and to seek out the pragmatic way for attaining their aims, sometimes displaying their willingness to compromise so that they do not neglect their main objectives.

So, establishment of the relationship with states is essential for INGOs, and it does not matter how reluctant and how troublesome it will be or it is. In this method of act, it is very difficult to create the effective relationship among NGOs, particularly INGOs, and states, but also to create the neutral connection among NGOs and donors could be harder because it will follow the considerable question about funding and the source of funding.
When a state wants to get a greater weight for poverty reduction, combating environmental degradation and also strengthening the peace issues, probably it finds the available development mechanisms insufficient. Economic policy, affording the services and infrastructure mechanisms of regulations mechanisms are sometimes targeted into direction of vulnerable groups. The power of the voluntary sector varies between countries. Although, a powerful and active voluntary sector cannot warrantee a high scale of interaction between different organizations, probably, it can be said that there is a rigid divide among voluntary organizations and the private and public sectors.

We should pay attention to the point that where the interaction is strong and in high range, the climate is most favorable for reducing the poverty and also other social primaries, although, cause and effect can be hard to separate. Whether an active and powerful nongovernmental organization (NGO) sector encourages governments to follow such primaries and priorities, or assists them for attaining their aims, this instrument of the modern society has a potential significance which has been largely forgotten or neglected.

Traditional NGO action has focused on giving services or supplying side such as: providing development programs, delivering services, assisting official bodies to increase the spread of their own programs. Some of the activities and pioneering work of operational NGOs now is focusing on what can be named the demand side: maneuvering into a negotiating position, helping communities articulate their preferences, advocacy and networking skills for amplifying the available power of weak and poor people and so on.
It is important to draw a distinction between non-membership and membership NGOs.

INGOs play an important role in peacebuilding and peacemaking and democratization processes. They often provide services which are related as priorities by members. The differences among the two types of organization and also the relationships among them deserve study. Indeed, the variety among particulars of international level and local or community-based is important. Some countries especially in third world, where macro level INGOs have not been actively welcomed, have some active community-based NGOs.

The NGO community considerably differs from country to country. NGOs focus on matters which are important to the countries, for example, environmental concerns, peacemaking and its maintenance, poverty and so on. The considerable issue is the relationship between international organizations and national NGOs which can be defined by the features of the particular country. In some countries, intermediary organizations provide an operational and intellectual conduction. Here we will mention the factors of a healthy state-NGO interaction; the barriers of this interaction from NGO sides and government sides; also the elements that can assist to foster a more enabling environment movement.

A) Some Potential Contribution of NGOs
NGOs have become important actors in development assistance for at least three reasons:
• First, because of their scale. In 1989, they contributed US$6.4 billion to developing countries (including $2.2 billion of official funds), representing some 12 percent of total development assistance (Clark, 1993).

• Second, because of their style of work. Many NGOs have demonstrated an ability to reach poor people, work in inaccessible areas, innovate, or in other ways achieve things which are difficult for official agencies (Clark, 1993).

• Third, many of them represent poorer people. Many NGOs have close links with poor communities. Some are membership organizations of poor or vulnerable people. Others are skilled at participatory approaches (Clark, 1993).

Moreover, their resources are largely additional, they complement the development effort of others, and they can help to make the development process more accountable, transparent and participatory. They not only "fill in the gaps" but they also act as a response to failures in the public and private sectors (Clark, 1993). NGOs are attractive for donors, because, of various reasons such as NGOs actions as compliment of state actions, responsibility to some failures of public life and private life and so on.

B) Relationship of States and NGOs as a Healthy Model

The relationship as healthy relationship is only conceivable when NGOs and states share their common goals. If the government’s actions to war reduction are frail, NGOs will collaborate for frustrating or even counter-productive of war. On the other hand, we know that, repressive governments are wary of NGOs which assist the poor part or victimized people. Where
the states have positive social cultural instructions and where NGOs are positively effective, there is a talent for making and keeping a collaborative relationship. Clark in his research on the relationship of states and NGOs says:

“Conversely, dialogue with NGOs may not be very productive when the state-NGO relationship is too cozy. In such situations NGOs tend to accept uncritically both the government’s information and the government's role in coordinating all development activities, including those of NGOs. The NGOs are largely content to fill in gaps as directed by the authorities and rely on such commissions for their raison d'etre. They do not question state activities, and therefore fail to inject the grassroots perspective. A degree of financial autonomy of the NGO sector is necessary to ensure their independence” (Clark, 1993). Clark’s view about the alternative role of the NGOs is as follows:

“NGOs are often described as offering "development alternatives" but this is misleading. The dictionary defines "alternative" as meaning "either of two or more possible courses; ...mutually exclusive." The population of any country does not have a choice between the development model offered by government and that by NGOs. NGOs can play an important role in helping certain population groups, or filling in the gaps in state services, or in pressing for a change in the national development strategy, but they do not offer realistic alternative pathways. Their innovations may test out new approaches, but these only become sustainable or of significant scale if they influence national development” (Clark, 1993).

While both sides see that their ways of solutions are not rivaling alternatives, but are complementary assistance, the eventual collaborations
are a welcome. However, they have various objectives. Official aid agencies can obviously have a main clash with NGO sector by affording support. These agencies are able to affect the relationship of NGOs and state for upholding and enhancing the political power that sometimes is necessary for acceptable engagement. Some realize that especially in the framework of governance issues, supporting the increasing growth of NGO sector is a significant assistance to the peace and development.

One way of managing the relationship with NGOs is to use a protocol. A protocol is a publicly available statement containing the information about an advocacy body, which a government, corporation or foundation can use to establish the standing of such a body. The information should be available by way of a register. The benefit of a protocol is that it enhances the openness of the relationship and the accountability of both parties to their constituencies. It also provides a protection for bodies that wish to deny access to groups because they lack standing.\(^{13}\) (See figure 4.9).

*Figure 4.9 NGOs and States Interactions*

According to this model, State A blocks redress to organizations within it; they activate network, whose members pressure their own states and (if relevant) a third-party organization, which in turn pressure State A.\(^\text{14}\)

C) Some Important Barriers for a Healthy State-NGO Relationship

We should pay attention to some major factors which impair the relationship among NGOs and governments. Some of the most important barriers are as under:

I. Policy about environmental issues. NGOs often are the components of opposition camp of the government or ruling party, and they see themselves as the only legitimate voice of the people on the earth.

II. NGOs preference for isolation hence unwillingness to dialogue with government, and poor coordination with one another. Some NGOs prefer to keep well separated from the government orbit to avoid drawing attention and therefore outside control, to their activities. However, by keeping a low profile they may actually be making themselves more vulnerable to government attack, as illustrated by the case of the Savings Development Movement (SDM) in Zimbabwe an effective but little known NGO whose operations were temporarily suspended and whose board was amended by the government because of the alleged corruption (Clark, 1993).

III. NGOs encounter to some jealousy on obtaining and exploiting the resources.

IV. The multiple pressures on successful NGOs from the main donors to get more funds for activities leading to a shortness and decline in performance. This has been at the expense of both its original agenda and
its relationship with NGOs. Consequently this matter undermines their advocacy effectiveness versus governments.

V. The capacity of NGOs. Some NGOs’ projects cannot be as effective as announces. Also we can generalize this to the accountability of NGOs to the grassroots, and strategic planning for peace or development.

VI. The public sector’s capacity. The government’s onus for improving services, elimination of discrimination and eradication of poverty often is not effective and there are many shortages in battling to these factors, because much of the issues are not under the government control.

VII. Jealousy in political issues. Governments believe that a healthier NGO sector can support the political opposition. So, the ways and methods that NGOs can survive and operate for their goals is a very important issue.

VIII. Relying and dependences on foreign donors. The governments sometimes are suspicious about foreign funds and see it as guided by foreign hands.

D) Fostering an Effective Environment

How can governments make a policy environment toward empowering the NGOs sector? Significantly, this issue depends on the initial relationship among NGO sector and governments. Clark expresses his views about the forms of relationship in the following way:

“The first form of relationship is where NGOs are in a dependent-client position vis-à-vis the government; in which NGOs implement state-prepared programs and/or receive funding through the state (a dependency of money,
ideas and resources). Examples include Tanzania (especially during the 1980s) and China. The second type of relationship is adversarial in which there are no common starting points and no wish from either side to search out areas of agreement. Examples include Zaire, Kenya and Pinochet's Chile. The third and most constructive relationship emerging in certain liberal democracies is a collaborationist one; a genuine partnership to tackle mutually agreed problems, coupled with energetic but constructive debate on areas of disagreement. Examples include India and Brazil. Each example that has been offered runs the risk of being an over-generalization. As with companies in the private sector, individual NGOs differ enormously from one another and hence there is a variety of state-NGO relationships. The illustrations here are of national patterns.”

States have different instruments for usage and also to influence the health of the NGO section. We can mention several subjects of the policy instrument used by governments as: partnership, active encouragement and control. John Clark in his research about this type of relationship believes that the policy instruments used can be in eight levels. Five important rubrics of these instruments are as follows:

a. factors of governance (encouraging public debate and consultation, and the right to organize interest groups);
b. NGO regulations and the legal framework (for example, regarding registration and reporting, auditing and accounting requirements);
c. NGO incentives (including taxation policies on income or local fund-raising, duties of imports, subsidies for NGOs, etc.);
d. Collaboration (use of NGOs in program/project implementation);
e. Involvement in policy-making (serving on committees, assisting with public consultations);

f. Public disclosure of information (NGOs serving as a conduit to inform the public about development schemes which effect them) (Clark, 1993).

A constructive policy environment can assist to create whole wider than the sum of the parts, via judicious apply of the above mentioned policy instruments. This might indicate some parts of the roles of NGOs in the scope of governmental programs. As the most important instrument for fostering and enabling the scope of the activity between NGOs and governments, Clark talks about the official support.

V) NGOs Interactions with Peacekeepers (Local and International)

At the first glance, the perceptions of INGOs about missions for peacekeeping are very little from the local NGOs. INGOs occupy a significant status. So the visibility is very important. Uniforms, vehicles, means and instruments) are particular issues here. Peacekeepers such as Green Peace, Red Cross and Red Crescent are perceived by the INGOs present in a country as rivals or competitors, and even sometimes, disloyal competitors. The positive effect of INGOs can be seen in the Myanmar and China disastrous earthquakes. These countries were hit by earthquake in May 2008, and witnessed many dead, injured and mayhem along with economical costs.

International Red Cross and Red Crescent was the most important INGO that was active in these disasters. This presence was very effective. But in
opposition to this, in some operations, in the peace issues, peacekeepers arrive with UN soldiers. Hundreds of organizations are present in the main cities and particularly in the capital.

These INGOs inflict costs and time consumption and also occupy the free spaces that local NGOs can effectively use. This presence imposes other local issues for the host country such as a large increase in the wages and salaries, increase in the rent of houses and shops and so on. So, these matters can be seen as a serious problem in the long term that can effectively prevent the positive roles of local NGOs.
Part II

4.3. INGOs’ Objectives

INGOs have been founded for various objectives. Some of these objectives consist of the social and political aims of the organizations’ members. Furthermore, we can mention the general objectives of INGOs such as the improving the peace subjects in the critical situations, environmental matters, promotion of the human rights, and reduction of poverty or other announced goals. The NGOs sometimes seek to reorient peace and developmental priorities in the direction of reducing or eliminating poverty (Avant, 2004).

Some of unshared objectives can create friction but they are not necessarily incompatible. Recent analyses have questioned the usefulness of examining value-motivated actors differently. Cooley and Ron argue that principled motivations do not translate easily into outcomes. To achieve their goals, INGOs need access to resources-often dispersed by donor states- and their competition for these, can lead them to dysfunctional outcomes that sometimes undermine their principles. See and Prakash argue that however lofty INGO motivations are, they also concerned with material objectives- for their constituencies or their personal benefit- and thus should not be studied as a different category (Avant, 2004).

The dilemmas of ends that INGOs face in the course of their interaction with the UN concern two issues in particular: long-term versus short-term objectives and INGOs’ views on human rights violations versus those of the victims. Some of the most prevalent goals are as under:
1. Eradication of poverty and hunger.

- Empowering the societies, providing assistance to the people for getting responsibility toward participation in the poverty eradication programs, and to use their available power and potentials to reach a better world.
- It is necessary that with the programming toward stable employment, technical and professional trainings, in the informal training section, widening the cooperation units and establishing the local and national funds toward of capital accumulation for reducing the poverty is needed.

2. Access to primary and general education.

- Thinking about successive learning through internet and TV and other mass Medias, is a necessity and it should be contemplated with the critical thought emphasis, resolving skills and the methods of effective relationship. We cannot be satisfied only with the data transfer.
- It is recommended to afford the new approaches in the primary education and training the life skills to the children.

3. Publicizing (widening) and advertising of sexual equality and empowering.

- Formulation of a supervising mechanism for realizing the sexual equality is recommended.
• The objectives of millennium development are not sufficient for observing the women’s rights and we should note some other more details.

4. Reducing the scale of death of children.

• More subjects should be noted for reduction of this death toll.
• It is necessary to pay more attention to the children situation in the deprived areas of the world.

5. Improving the health of mothers.

• We recommend a developmental pattern toward increasing the breeding of the mothers. It should be transferred from mothers to the girls for attaining a stable development.

6. Battling with AIDS, Malaria and other diseases.

• Training method for reducing the AIDS is the best method. This is one of the most important tasks of the INGOs.
• Fulfilling the joint programs by the INGOs should be observed.

7. Warranting for maintenance of the environment.

• This guaranteeing should be in the different levels of local, national and global. Heightening of the public opinion in some areas of the world should be observed.
• Looking at the supervising roles of INGOs in the environmental issues shows that, these roles should be more institutionalized,
especially about the Green Peace International that is the most important INGO in environmental issues in the contemporary era.

- The Green Peace International must transmit its available experiences in the national, regional and international levels to other environmental NGOs along with affording some training.


- Increase in the cooperation and coordination of regional INGOs is very important.
- For better effectiveness of INGOs, in some regions of the third world, the cooperation of INGOs and UN agencies should be noted and new mechanism for empowering these mechanisms should be observed.

Empowering the people of the deprived regions of the world by developing their rights and development, is one of the main goals of the millennium peace. Amnesty International in reality has performed its roles effectively and is continuously maintaining the human rights. Amnesty International continuously has issued declarations to create awareness in the world about the oppressed people of the world in various regions.

4.4. Main Goals of International Organizations

Most peace processes aim to establish or re-establish democratic regimes. In contributing to these processes, NGOs must deploy complex capabilities from monitoring to active consultation and implementation. The coordination of peacekeeping and peacebuilding cannot be easily reconciled
with the very different tasks extant during a conflict. Furthermore, the short-term goals of NGOs and IGOs are often at odds with long-term goals.

Finally, legally-mandated neutrality for NGOs under international humanitarian law may have to be renounced to limit the sovereignty of rights-violating states which perpetuates armed injustice and impunity. One function of NGOs is to render these apparent tradeoffs less stark. Instead, the interstices between these paradoxes and dilemmas can be partly, though not completely served by a greater reliance on the varying roles and capabilities of NGOs.\(^\text{16}\)

NGOs often operate with unclear mandates regarding peacebuilding. A lack of clarity on their own values and objectives can pose problems when organizations have to negotiate dilemmas of justice and peace, humanitarian need and political concerns, capacity building and rapid reaction, which are the daily currency of working in conflict situations. Identifying their own mission and approach is particularly a challenge for newer and smaller organizations, as they still need to gain experience in realizing the implications of their choices. Many organizations with a commitment to peacebuilding still have not been able to build the appropriate institutional structures to implement such work. The particular nature of peacebuilding, which involves both invisible, incremental, long-term work and rapid, high-risk, potentially high impact interventions, poses challenges to every organization (Leonhardt; Ardon; Karuru and Sherriff, 2002).\(^\text{17}\)

Structures to be reviewed include decision-making processes, the distribution of responsibility among the organization, team composition,
incentive systems, standards of operation and safety procedures. This can also mean changing organizational cultures to encourage field staff to take more responsibility for designing and adapting programs that take better account of local (conflict) circumstances. Larger organizations have made positive experiences with establishing institutional focal points for promoting the idea of peacebuilding and providing support to field staff.\textsuperscript{18}

There was consensus on the importance of conflict analysis and planning capacity to enable NGOs to become more proactive and strategic in their peacebuilding work. While setting clear peacebuilding objectives is critical for NGOs to enhance program effectiveness, there is no blueprint for peacebuilding. It became clear that rather than ambitiously trying to “bring about peace”, NGOs should have an appreciation of the relation of their specific field of work to the wider peace and conflict picture, while maintaining an awareness of their limitations and positive and negative impact. Staff should not be intimidated by setting unrealistically high peacebuilding goals, but rather aim for realistic “good-enough” solutions (Leonhardt; Ardon; Karuru and Sherriff, 2002).

There was great interest in tools to support this type of analysis and reflection among the NGOs consulted. Other organizations experimented with entering partnerships with local researchers, specialist organizations or external providers of specialist expertise to help them operationalize peacebuilding according to the specific needs of their client groups as well as their own mission and capacities.\textsuperscript{19}
We can list some of the main goals of INGOs as follows:

1. Creating the scientific and cultural currents. INGOs presently are very active in these areas.
2. Giving the consultancy affairs to the official and governmental institutions, designers and executers of different levels (Micro and Macro).
3. Awareness of public opinion about the current issues of the world, such as peace, poverty, development and so on.
4. Supervising the governmental treaties and general functions of various players in international community.
5. Networking among people and governments, without any motivation for granting the political power. This factor is very effective.
6. Affording the necessary reports for UN and even for its specialized agencies. In this direction, INGOs can pressurize governments for observing human rights, eradication of poverty, improving the peaceful situation between different groups and so on.
7. Effectiveness in fulfilling the governmental projects.

Here we should mention the objectives of the Amnesty International, Green Peace and Red Cross. These Nongovernmental Organizations have separated specific purposes as we will hint them later on.
4.5. Objectives of the Amnesty International, Green Peace and Red Cross

A) Amnesty International
In the first days of the twenty-first century AI started a new campaign against the torture. In 2001, Irene Khan was appointed Secretary General of Amnesty International. In its 40th anniversary year, Amnesty International changed its Statute to incorporate into its mission, work for economic, social and cultural rights thus committing itself to advance both the universality and indivisibility of all human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration. Amnesty International’s Stop Torture website won a Revolution Award, which recognized the best in digital marketing. In 2007 Amnesty International launched a global petition calling on Sudan’s government to protect civilians in Darfur and launched a CD featuring 30 world-class musicians to mobilize support, called Make Some Noise: The Campaign to Save Darfur.20

The United Nations General Assembly adopted the Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. Following intense campaigning by Amnesty International and its partners in the World Coalition Against the Death Penalty, the UN General Assembly Third Committee's 62nd session adopted resolution L29 calling for a global moratorium on executions. Amnesty International has more than 2.2 million members, supporters and subscribers in over 150 countries and territories in every region of the world.21
Working with and for individuals the world over, Amnesty campaigns so that every person may enjoy all of the human rights enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. AI undertakes research and takes action aimed at preventing and ending grave abuses of these rights, demanding that all governments and other powerful entities respect the rule of law. It means AI campaigns globally and locally wherever it can make a difference. For example, it takes action to:

- Stop violence against women
- Defend the rights and dignity of those trapped in poverty
- Abolish the death penalty
- Oppose torture and combat terror with justice
- Free prisoners of conscience
- Protect the rights of refugees and migrants
- Regulate the global arms trade

Thousands of Amnesty International members respond to urgent action appeals on behalf of individuals at immediate risk. Publicity through the news media and the internet takes our message in many languages to millions of people. Campaigning can change people’s lives of victims and survivors of human rights abuses, of human rights activists and defenders and even of the abusers.

B) Green Peace

Green Peace is an independent global campaigning organization that acts to change attitudes and behavior, to protect and conserve the environment and to promote peace by:
1. **Catalyzing an energy revolution** to address the number one threat facing our planet: climate change. 2. **Defending our oceans** by challenging wasteful and destructive fishing, and creating a global network of marine reserves. 3. **Protecting the world’s ancient forests** and the animals, plants and people that depend on them. 4. **Working for disarmament and peace** by tackling the causes of conflict and calling for the elimination of all nuclear weapons. 5. **Creating a toxic free future** with safer alternatives to hazardous chemicals in today's products and manufacturing. 6. **Campaigning for sustainable agriculture** by rejecting genetically engineered organisms, protecting biodiversity and encouraging socially responsible farming.24

Nuclear weapons are a problem today. There are approximately 30,000 nuclear weapons in the world, belonging to nine countries: US, Russian Federation, UK, France, China, Israel, India, Pakistan and North Korea. More than one thousand five hundred of them are ready to launch at a moment's notice, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. Although some may consider them an unfortunate relic from the Cold War, the truth is that the nuclear weapons states are clinging to them as hard as they can, reinventing new roles and designs for them, and recently even proposals for "smaller useable" weapons. And all this despite plenty of speeches, promises and legally binding treaties to get rid of them! As well as the devastating impacts of the nuclear bombs on the cities and peoples of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, over 2,000 nuclear weapons tests have left a legacy of global and regional contamination.25
C) Red Cross

The most important principles of the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement are as follows: **Humanity**: The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement, born of a desire to bring assistance without discrimination to the wounded on the battlefield, endeavors, in its international and national capacity, to prevent and alleviate human suffering wherever it may be found. Its purpose is to protect human life and health and to ensure respect for the human being.²⁶

It promotes mutual understanding, friendship, cooperation and lasting peace amongst all people. **Neutrality**: In order to continue to enjoy the confidence of all, the movement may not take sides in hostilities or engage at any time in controversies of a political, racial, religious or ideological nature. **Voluntary Service**: It is a voluntary relief movement not prompted in any manner by desire for gain. **Impartiality**: It makes no discrimination as to nationality, race, religious beliefs, class or political opinions. It endeavors to relieve the suffering of individuals, being guided solely by their needs, and to give priority to the most urgent cases of distress.²⁷

**Independence**: The Movement is independent. The National Societies, while auxiliaries in the humanitarian services of their governments and subject to the laws of their respective countries, must always maintain their autonomy so that they may be able at all times to act in accordance with the principles of the Movement. **Unity**: There can be only one Red Cross or one Red Crescent Society in any one country. It must be open to all. It must carry its humanitarian work throughout its territory. **Universality**: The International Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement in which all Societies
have equal status and share equal responsibilities and duties in helping each other, is worldwide.\textsuperscript{28}

Five important tasks fulfilled by Red Cross and Red Crescent can be listed as follows:

- Promotion of values and humanitarian principles.
- To support health care project locally.
- To prevent war by issuing regular reports
- Peacemaking and peacekeeping in the critical situation.
- To support the youth related activities nationally.
- Preparing national societies through the education of voluntary members for eventual disaster and also relief supplies.

4.6. Conclusion

Rather than working directly within the structures, INGOs intend to influence, they are trying to increase their impact by lobbying government and other structures from outside. This has become a popular activity for INGOs around the world as part of their efforts to focus on advocacy work. These INGOs strategies [Amnesty International, Red Cross and Green Peace] range from direct lobbying of key individuals within bilateral and multilateral agencies, through staff exchanges and working together in the field of publications, conferences and participation in joint committees (Madon, 2000). Multidimensional UN operations for peace are not only working for peace, but they gather it with some structures and rules for creating a rule of law.
The role of NGOs as “soft” actors also poses a challenge to the realist paradigm in international relations. The state-centric approach can be so dominant that NGOs like Amnesty International do not even merit a mention in some textbooks (e.g. Kegley and Wittkopf, 2004). True, state governments remain the focus of human rights activity by both the UN and Amnesty International. Both organizations are effective through changing government policy rather than by direct action. But this reduces realism to a formal, juridical conception more than a substantive one (Diehl, 2005).

Some challenges for UN peace missions in their will for improving the peace are not only to adapt international values and norms to changing framework or reconstruct the local rules and laws with international peace subjects and even human rights standards. It is a plan that can be built through compromising along with some successive attempts. One of the main challenges of peacebuilding for international NGOs and peacekeepers is, to establish some situations and conditions for facilitating peace and for making conductive environment for effective interaction and dialogue. We think this is the process that cannot always be found in the mission places.

So, they should be found in extreme situations globally, especially in the places where human rights are denied. Finally, to get a chance to succeed in contributing to create a peace strategy consistent with the roles of Amnesty International, Green Peace and Red Cross, any outsider needs to reshape and reconsider the political face and dimensions of such plans for peacemaking and its maintenance.
INGOs like Amnesty International, Red Cross and Green Peace, that we in this case study have concentrated on, are pursuing any possibility for performing the tasks in the best. Each of these organizations separately has the world authority in performing the operations. On the other hand, IGOs authority obviously is different from the INGOs authority. These different organizations along with the dominant elements of the international arena (states) are sovereign elements of the international system (see figure 4.10).

INGOs operate in a world in which actors are expected to be self interested; they are agents of the self. Prevailing political, economic, and social theories assume that states, organizations, and individuals -the dominant, most highly reified social entities in world culture- both can and do act rationally to advance their interests. Of all the conceivable possibilities, their primary interests actually cover a rather narrow range: wealth, prestige, prominence, power, development. Promotion of these interests is not only expected but wholly legitimate in world culture, as long as the means used to promote them accord with rational legal and moral prescriptions.
Credentialing and certification
Professional standing and expertise
Organizations position
Moral and spiritual charisma
Authority of science, technic, etc.

Source: John Boli, and George M Thomas, constructing world culture; international nongovernmental organizations, Stanford, California, 1999, p. 286.
Regarding the activities of INGOs, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that the conditions where INGOs such as Amnesty International, Green Peace and Red Cross, are working are so diverse and complex that they have to redefine and reframe their plans case by case in the world. For example, the Thailand government is relatively open-minded to activities of INGOs that it seems to be easier for them to fulfill what they like to perform without any distinction in their labor and even their network.

On the other hand, we should note that INGOs will have some difficulty in Thailand about their legitimacy in the future because of rising the power of indigenous INGOs and even groups to contest with the government in the same terms as envoys in the civil society. We should remember that, INGOs gain more legitimacy in the countries and situations where the governments are coercive and the system is dictatorship and the influence of civil society extremely is weak. In the aftermath of this, in southern countries, INGOs can clearly obtain even more public legitimacy than INGOs in the north.
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