



«THE IMPERIAL ROUNDTABLE»

International Roundtable Consultation
RESPONSIBILITY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

Vienna, Hotel Imperial

21 September 2023

Exposé

Participants

Schedule

Program

Abstracts

Curricula vitae



EXPOSÉ

In a Declaration on the abolition of the slave trade (8 February 1815), the Congress of Vienna invoked the “principles of humanity and universal morality” (*principes d’humanité et de morale universelle*). Since then, numerous international instruments have been adopted highlighting the responsibility of states for the respect and realization of fundamental rights. The Preamble to the Charter of the United Nations Organization also testifies to this commitment.

After the end of the Cold War, powerful states repeatedly invoked the “responsibility to protect” to justify the use of force against other states. In many instances, however, those who claim to act on the basis of a moral or legal responsibility refuse to bear the responsibility, or to be held accountable, for the consequences of their actions. This has been particularly obvious in cases where *unilateral* interventions resulted in “régime change,” triggering or intensifying domestic conflicts and provoking wider regional destabilization. It has also been obvious in *multilateral* coercive measures, mandated or “authorized” by the United Nations Security Council.

Under the current system of international relations, invocation of “responsibility” has, more often than not, been determined by considerations of power politics, and accountability for the consequences, whether intended or not, has been almost non-existent. The United Nations Charter effectively puts the main *enforcers* of the law – the Security Council’s permanent members – *above* the law. The Council’s coercive measures under Chapter VII of the Charter are not subject to legal scrutiny, and they cannot be revised or suspended against the will of a permanent member.

Instead of making states more conscious of their obligations, the “Draft Articles on the Responsibility of States for Internationally Wrongful Acts” were often used by powerful actors to justify unilateral action, including extraterritorial sanctions, against adversaries or competitors. Also, in its present rudimentary state, the system of international criminal justice is prone to systemic politicization.

Since the end of the Cold War period, the International Progress Organization (I.P.O.) has been dealing with issues of transnational democracy, the international rule of law, and the role of the United Nations Organization. Among the projects were conferences and roundtables on “Democracy in International Relations” (1985), “The Question of Terrorism” (1987), “The United Nations and International Democracy” (1994), “The Use of Force in International Relations: Challenges to Collective Security” (2005), and “The ‘Global War on Terror’ and the Question of World Order” (2007). The I.P.O. also hosted the Second International Conference on a More Democratic United Nations (CAMDUN-2) in Vienna, in 1991.

Following the 50th anniversary of its foundation, the International Progress Organization would like to discuss the dual aspect of responsibility in international relations: as *obligation* on the part of states and as *accountability* at individual and state level.

PARTICIPANTS

Berdal Aral

Professor, Faculty of Political Science, International Relations, International Politics
Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul (TURKEY)

Christopher Black

International Criminal Lawyer, former Defense Counsel at International Criminal Tribunal for
Rwanda & International Criminal Court, Toronto (CANADA)

Ramachandra Byrappa

Associate Professor, Department of Modern and Recent History, Eötvös Loránd University,
Member, HIIA – Hungarian Institute for International Affairs
Budapest (HUNGARY)

Hamid Dabashi

Professor of Iranian Studies and Comparative Literature, Columbia University, New York (USA)

Alfred de Zayas

Dr. juris, Senior Lawyer, Office of the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights (1981-2003),
United Nations Independent Expert on the Promotion of a Democratic and Equitable
International Order (2012-2018) (USA)

Seán Fleming

PhD, Research Fellow, School of Politics and International Relations,
University of Nottingham (UNITED KINGDOM)

Zhipeng He

Professor, School of Law, Jilin University; member of the Council, Chinese Society of
International Law, Changchun (CHINA)

Ögmundur Jónasson

Former Minister of Interior, former Minister of Health, Representative of Iceland, European
Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Reykjavík (ICELAND)

Fabian Klose

Professor of International History and Historical Peace and Conflict Research, Department of
History, University of Cologne (GERMANY)

Hans Köchler

em. Professor of Political Philosophy and Philosophical Anthropology,
President, International Progress Organization, Vienna (AUSTRIA)

Anthony F. Lang, Jr

Professor, Chair in International Political Theory, School of International Relations,
University of St Andrews (UNITED KINGDOM)

Anja Matwijkiw

Fulbright Distinguished Chair of International Law, Raul Wallenberg Institute (Sweden),
Professor of Ethics & Human Rights, Indiana University Northwest, Gary, Indiana (USA)

Dušan Proroković

Senior Research Fellow, International Institute of Politics and Economics, Head of the Center for
Eurasian Studies, Belgrade (SERBIA)

Lyal S. Sunga

Visiting Professor, The American University of Rome; Raoul Wallenberg Institute, Lund, Sweden,
expert consultant for United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights; Rome (ITALY)

I.P.O. CONFERENCE TEAM

Davide Sirna (program assistant) (academic team member)

Joël Christoph (editorial matters) (academic team member)

Lukas Köchler (logistics & audiovisual)

Ramazan Ersoy (I.P.O. head office)

SCHEDULE

Wednesday, 20 September 2023, 19:30

Informal dinner reception (Hotel Imperial, Ringstrasse Salon)

Thursday, 21 September 2023

Individual breakfast (Café Imperial): from 07:00

Roundtable at Salon Imperial

Coffee: 8:30-09:00

Session I: 9:00-10:30

Coffee break

Session II: 11:00-12:30

Lunch (Ringstrasse Salon): 13:00-14:00

Session III: 14:30-16:00

Coffee break

Session IV: 16:30-18:00

Viennese dinner (Hotel Sacher, Salon Metternich): 20:00

PROGRAM

SESSION I

Hans Köchler

Introductory Remarks

Anthony F. Lang

Responsibility as a Universal Value

Seán Fleming

Punitive Sanctions and Damages Against States

Hamid Dabashi

As Monopoly of Violence, States are the Singular Threat to Human Survival

SESSION II

Fabian Klose

Human Security and Responsibility to Protect in Historical Perspective

Ramachandra Byrappa

Resilience and Responsibility in the UN and the Feudal Infiltration

Berdal Aral

To What Extent are the UN Security Council's Effective Resolutions Carried Out 'Responsibly'?

Christopher Black

International Organizations and Global Power Politics

SESSION III

Anja Matwijken

Jus cogens Norms and (Positive) Human Rights

Alfred-Maurice de Zayas

Unilateral Coercive Measures in the Light of International Law

Lyal Sunga

Is the ICC Indictment of President Vladimir Putin for War Crimes a Step in the Right Direction for the International Rule of Law or Instead a Deeply Unfair Manifestation of Realpolitik, Western Hypocrisy and Double Standards?

SESSION IV

Zhipeng He

"Impossible Trinity for Great Powers" in International Rule of Law

Dušan Proroković

Intergovernmental Organizations and Great Powers in the Multipolar World: The Issue of Confidence and the Impact on International Relations

Ögmundur Jónasson

Time to Step Out of a Colonial World – Why International Institutional Frameworks Must Be Reconstructed

ABSTRACTS

Berdal Aral

TO WHAT EXTENT ARE THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL'S EFFECTIVE RESOLUTIONS CARRIED OUT 'RESPONSIBLY'?

This presentation, in the context of international responsibility, draws on the problematic aspects of the 'effective' resolutions of the UN Security Council as they are implemented in practice since the end of the Cold War. This study, being aware of the problematical aspects of the Council in terms of its structure, composition, decision-making that privileges permanent members additionally enjoying the right of veto, its lack of fair representation of members of international society, as well as the proclivity of some of its permanent members to engage in horse trading behind closed doors on the eve of some historic resolutions envisaging effective action, this study focuses only on the *actual performance* of the UN Security Council and its implications from the perspective of general international law and, in particular, the law of international responsibility.

This study looks into situations when, contrary to the wording, substance and/or spirit of a particular resolution adopted by the Security Council, the instances in which the 'coalition of the willing' went beyond the resolution during the conduct of the military operation, thus committing an *ultra vires* act. It also draws on cases in which the Security Council, when adopting resolutions that envision sanctions, define a particular situation as a breach of, or threat to, international peace and security, or provide for military enforcement action, apparently acted as prosecutor, judge and executive power which is contrary to the well-known principle of the separation of powers. This presentation also focuses on situations in which the Security Council sought to 'legalize' military occupation undertaken unilaterally by some states by passing *ex post facto* resolutions that addressed the occupying powers as 'Authority', as was the case with the US/British occupation of Afghanistan (2001) and Iraq (2003).

Based on the Council's performance since the early 1990s, this presentation first endeavours to find out the conditions in which the Security Council inclined to act promptly and adopt 'necessary measures' when international peace and security has been breached, threatened or an act of aggression has been committed. It also draws on the problematical aspects of the Council's 30-plus years of record by delving into the particular features of its *effective* resolutions and their consequences from the perspective of international responsibility.

This presentation proceeds upon a panoply of questions that are intended to elaborate on the implications of UN Security Council resolutions containing effective measures for the sovereignty, security and welfare of targeted states: To what extent are the norms of international law and human rights taken into consideration when a particular modality of effective action, based on a Security Council resolution, is decided? Are the wordings and substance of 'effective' Security Council resolutions generally in conformity with international law and justice? To what extent have economic, financial and/or diplomatic sanctions imposed by the Security Council infringed the sovereignty, economic self-determination and the human rights of the people in the targeted state?

Christopher Black

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GLOBAL POWER POLITICS

1. The proliferation of international organizations as an expression of the accelerating attempts of transnational capital to control the world for its benefit. Military, economic, financial social, health, and human rights organizations as well as criminal tribunals are an intersecting web of quasi-legal structures unaccountable to anyone but which make sovereign nations and individuals accountable to them, and despite some good work, result in the limitation of democracy and sovereignty of nation states.
2. The United Nations, with its Security Council, ancillary committees, organizations and bureaus is one of the central organizations in this complex web.
3. Military alliances such as NATO provide nation states with a means of evading accountability for hegemonic aggression by assigning the overall group with responsibility, as if the alliance were an independent state while at the same time the overall group evades responsibility by claiming it is an agent of its member states and an “international world order” or “international community” existing outside the UN.
4. My focus: the ad hoc criminal tribunals whose existence is ultra vires the UN Charter and against whom no victim of their actions and decisions can seek redress of any kind. Examples to be discussed include the death of Milošević, and political detention of General Ndindiliyimana, and as well the ICC, e.g. Gbagbo, despite the existence of UN General Assembly Resolution 56/83 and following draft resolution re. fixing of responsibility of international organizations. The consequence is that the tribunals are a law unto themselves, and a tool of the hegemon that effectively controls their actions and procedures.

Ramachandra Byrappa

RESILIENCE AND RESPONSIBILITY IN THE UN AND THE FEUDAL INFILTRATION

The foundational philosophy of the United Nations was conceptualized to strengthen the individual against a whole host of threats, and to safeguard the “Four Freedoms”. Institutions are needed when and where individual responsibility fails. From this perspective, there is nothing more important than strong institutions in the building of a resilient world. In recent years the COVID-19 pandemic has laid bare the weaknesses of an unresponsive and irresponsible institutional hierarchy, at various levels. Individuals are forced to face a myriad of dangers alone, devoid of all sovereignty and resources that go with it. One reason for this is that the United Nations sits at the crossroads of two historically antagonistic world trends: the market and the feudal conceptions of the world. It is an age-old dialectical struggle between the two. The nation state was a latecomer to this battle and tried to gain strength by reducing the power of both by securing greater space for the individual according to the norms established by the French Revolution. But the market and the feudal tendencies pushed state structures to a junior position. This was inevitable as feudal Britain and not France became the preponderant power, making a timely accommodation of the market contingency. This gave rise to an unprecedented expansionism of market feudalism worldwide. The consequent international system was guided by feudal affinities, where Britain reserved the role of the primary “Feudal Lord” in an ocean of disconnected feudalities. Thus, the future decolonization would create an overwhelming mass of “feudal states” in the world system.

The ambition of the United States after WWII was to shatter the feudal clutch and replace it with a legal framework respectful of the human being. But the premature death of Franklin Roosevelt and the loss of post-war consensus meant that the whole United Nations project was trapped into the Cold-War confrontation. Thus, the American Century or the Age of the Common Man succumbed to the feudal heritage of the British Empire. In the ensuing competition for gaining ideological support came the urgency of creating nation-states because only they could become members of the United Nations. Unwittingly the United Nations became the prime instigator of the feudal consolidation over the state in many instances. As a quick fix solution, it promoted “conglomerate states”. Rather than liberating the “common man”, the new “Four Freedoms” enlightenment was thus tortured to fit the feudal frame. These feudal structures maintain their power on the masses by playing the “particularities” of one against the other, in the process reducing the chances of one humanity being created, where the common man regains his sovereignty. Under the forced impulsion from the United States, the United Nations tried to reduce the growth of feudalism by a market-led revolution and a world integration under it. But the last thirty years have witnessed an explosion of feudal comeback with enhanced brutality against both the individual and the United Nation’s institutional role. My contribution, as a historian and as an economist, will be to concentrate on dissecting the feudal infiltration into the domain of international organizations, international norms and the institutional hierarchy in general.

Hamid Dabashi

**AS MONOPOLY OF VIOLENCE, STATES ARE THE SINGULAR THREAT TO
HUMAN SURVIVAL**

Over the last two hundred years since the dubious coupling of nations and states into the fragile concept of nation-states, the latter has shown no sense of responsibility or accountability except to the principle of self-preservation. The interest of the state has historically trumped all other considerations in both national affairs and international relations. Unless and until we decouple the interests of the state and the survival of the nations they systematically abuse and fail to represent – even in the most democratic cases – we will never have the necessary epistemic shift in our understanding of global polity and national sovereignty to address the overwhelming environmental calamities, internecine wars, colonial conquests and sectarian violence we as the community of nations collectively face.

Alfred de Zayas

UNILATERAL COERCIVE MEASURES IN THE LIGHT OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

Unilateral Coercive measures (UCMs) are practised as a geopolitical weapon to destabilize other countries. UCMs entail violations of multiple principles of customary international law, anchored in the UN Charter (articles 1-2), the OAS Charter (articles 19-20), international conventions and countless resolutions of the Security Council and General Assembly. Among the principles violated are the sovereign equality of States, the self-determination of peoples, the prohibition of interference in the internal affairs of other states, freedom of navigation, freedom of commerce etc.

The UN General Assembly condemns UCMs every year, most recent in Resolution 77/214 of 15 December 2022 (<https://www.un.org/en/ga/77/resolutions.shtml>). Similarly, the UN Human Rights Council condemns them in yearly resolutions, most recently Res. 52/13 of 3 April 2023. In the year 2000 the UN Sub-Commission on the Promotion and Protection of Human Rights adopted a detailed thematic study outlining the incompatibility of UCMs with international law and in particular with human rights law. This is also reflected in General Comment Nr. 8 of the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, in the thematic report of High Commissioner Navi Pillay (Doc. A/19/33 of January 2012), and in the yearly reports of the UN Rapporteurs on UCMs since 2015, Dr. Idriss Jazairy and Professor Alena Douhan (<https://www.ohchr.org/en/unilateral-coercive-measures>).

In the specific case of the illegal US embargo against Cuba, the General Assembly has adopted 30 Resolutions condemning the UCMs and demanding that they be lifted, the most recent resolution on 3 November 2022 by a vote of 185 in favour, 2 against and 2 abstentions. Notwithstanding the near universality of the condemnation, UCMs are still in place and have proliferated against Cuba, Iran, Nicaragua, Russia, Syria, Venezuela, etc. Approximately one third of the world population suffers under such “sanctions”. However, it is inappropriate to use the term sanctions, because the only legal sanctions are those imposed by the UN Security Council under Chapter VII. Moreover, the term “sanctions” implies that the sanctioning country has legal or moral authority to impose them, which is not the case. The US has no authority to “punish” other states. The UN Draft Code on Responsibility of States defines the limited situations in which “retorsion” or “countermeasures” can be adopted. The conditions for the legality of UCMs against the above countries are entirely lacking.

Notwithstanding their illegality, a number of States (mostly in the “collective West”) try to justify UCMs on the false pretense of “human rights violations” by the targeted countries. This constitutes a kind of sacrilege against the sanctity of life, a weaponization of human rights for geopolitical purposes, an Orwellian destruction of language. It should be remembered that UCMs kill in the tens of thousands, as documented by several scholars and researchers, including Prof. Jeffrey Sachs of Columbia University in New York. As UN Independent Expert, I requested UNICEF, UNHCR, FAO and WHO to quantify the harm, but to my knowledge, they have thus far failed to document the lethal impact of UCMs on the most vulnerable. In any event, the frequency of the sanctions does not make them legal (*ex injuria non oritur jus*). What we see here is a gross violation of international law in total impunity, because the UN lacks appropriate enforcement mechanisms.

The UN General Assembly should adopt a resolution pursuant to Art. 96 of the UN Charter to elevate the legal question of the illegality of UCMs to the ICJ for an advisory opinion. The Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court should open an investigation to establish whether UCMs should be considered as a crime against humanity for purposes of article 7 of the Statute of Rome. Finally, to the extent that UCMs are a form of non-conventional warfare or hybrid warfare, they constitute the illegal use of force, prohibited in article 2(4) of the UN Charter. There is no reason why the language of Art. 2(4) should be limited to the use of military force. Since the civil and penal responsibility of states is engaged, the ICJ should estimate the level of reparations due to the populations harmed.

Seán Fleming

PUNITIVE SANCTIONS AND DAMAGES AGAINST STATES

Under international law, the responsibility of states is reparative rather than punitive. States can be held responsible, but only individuals can be held *criminally* responsible. As the Nuremberg Tribunal famously declared, "Crimes against international law are committed by men, not by abstract entities." However, some international lawyers and international relations scholars have proposed that criminal responsibility should apply to states as well as individuals. This would open up the possibility of punitive economic sanctions and punitive damages against states in cases of aggression and genocide. This paper surveys the problems with punishing states. First, the idea of state crime depends on controversial philosophical assumptions. Second, there is currently no international judicial body that has criminal jurisdiction over states. Third, in the absence of strict judicial control, states could use punitive sanctions and damages to justify disproportionate and vengeful forms of retaliation. I conclude that reparative system of state responsibility – imperfect as it is – is more conducive to peace, order, and restraint.

Zhipeng He

**“IMPOSSIBLE TRINITY FOR GREAT POWERS”
IN INTERNATIONAL RULE OF LAW**

The process of promoting rule of law in international society endows great powers of more expectations. However, in the change and evolution of international relations and the shaping and operation of international rule of law, the great powers are facing with an “impossible trinity” of their own core interests, global ethics, and allies’ expectations. A great power could not at the same time satisfy the pursuit and guarantee of its own kernel interests, advocating and promoting the global common ethics, and meeting and satisfying the allies’ will. This “impossible trinity” is formed by the anarchism of contemporary world order, the non-central status quo of international laws, the scarcity of global resources, the priority of a state to ensure its own security and development, and the states could not entrust each other. Such “impossible trinity” of great powers means not only a value-duality sway between unilateral benefit and multilateral benefit for a state in international law, but also means that there exists a time-space discontinuity in the discourse of international laws for humanity’s common value, interest-pursuit of a state, and the wills between allies. In view of the status quo of international rule of law, one should not have a higher expectation on the value-setting of international rule of law, while viewing on the mode of national development, there must be a good balance between national interests and global common interests, and, at the same time, the allies for international strategy should be chosen very carefully.

Ögmundur Jónasson

TIME TO STEP OUT OF A COLONIAL WORLD – WHY INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS MUST BE RECONSTRUCTED

I begin by recalling the reaction of Mother Theresa in response to the American billionaire who encountered her tending the sick in the gutters of Kolkata. When he exclaimed in horror, that he would not do this for a million dollars, there came her reply, 'Neither would I'. Of course, not only a million dollars, but trillions of dollars are required to alleviate the ills of the world. But even if we had at our disposal all the billions needed the question would remain what should be the guiding principles and values.

Here the institutional world has been divided since the cold war period on whether to draw a line between civil and political rights on the one hand and social, economic and cultural rights on the other. This dividing line materialized in different conventions on human rights operated within the framework of the United Nations. It is not unlikely that these conventions will gradually become fully integrated.

But changes in conventions, institutions and frameworks do not take us far unless there is social and political support, and here some fundamental changes have been taking place in the world, and not in a positive direction; changes that do not make the work of the social engineer easy. All around the globe, democracy is on the defensive, struggling against capitalism; morality is being undermined by markets, cooperation is giving way to competition, empathy to indifference, principled politics to politics without principles, humanism to geopolitical interests, Aristotle to Machiavelli.

I am a western European, born in the middle of the last century, and I am part of a generation that believed in progress. The world had just witnessed the war to end all wars. Of course there were backlashes, wars and calamities, but nevertheless it was thought only to be a question of time when the world would come to its senses; do away with weapons of mass destruction and instead of investment in arms and warfare, education would be ensured for all, rule of law would prevail and society would become more democratic, more equitable and more just, which in turn would make us all more secure. In short, this is the future we wanted and predicted and hearts were full of hope.

Now the future we wanted has not materialized and instead of hope, we have disillusion. Some people might say I am being too dramatic. But the evidence is before our eyes. There is a continuing collapse in trust in the political systems that govern our countries and decreasing trust in the capabilities and the integrity of international institutions. The United Nations and its institutions, which carried the hopes of our generation, are failing and powerless. The reasons for this lie in part with the institutional framework for the United Nations which was constructed on the basis of a world map drawn up by colonial powers and then maintained by superpower manipulations in more recent times, and of late, attempts by global capitalism to put itself at the helm. Here of course I am referring to the World Economic Forum and increased reliance of UN institutions on business support.

In my talk I outline some ways in which the restructuring of world institutions could take place, where instead of being subjected to geopolitical manipulations by the possessors of military might in the Security Council and elsewhere, we could move closer to the spirit whereby *the responsibility to protect* the oppressed of this world is on humanitarian grounds and socially just.

Fabian Klose

HUMAN SECURITY AND RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT IN HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE

Since 2001 the concepts of “human security” and “responsibility to protect” has become increasingly influential as a framework in international relations for addressing global inequalities and vulnerabilities. The influential work and reports of the *Commission on Human Security* (in 2003) and the *International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty* (in 2001) are significant examples for this development. Centered on the well being of people rather than nation-states, these approaches take a comprehensive view of global challenges — and their solutions. Emphasizing the complex links between extreme poverty, violence and armed conflict, hunger, natural hazards and climate change, adverse health outcomes, and other threats to human welfare and fundamental human rights, they also demand that we address these issues in a holistic fashion.

However, studying crucial reports on “human security” and “responsibility to protect” it is rather surprising that historical dimensions are very often neglected or even completely missing. For instance, the 400 pages *Supplementary Volume of the ICISS Report* only refers very briefly on two pages to the history of the idea of humanitarian intervention, even though this concept has a long and deep history of over 200 years. As “human security” and “responsibility to protect” become paradigms that are more dominant in international affairs, it is essential for policymakers, practitioners, and scholars to understand its historical evolution and its current uses. When and where did the idea of both entangled concepts originate? Why and how did a constellation of issues related to human well-being coalesce into our modern understanding of “human security”? And finally, how might we constructively critique these concepts, both as a theory and as practiced, in contemporary global affairs? In tackling these questions, the aim is to sharpen the historical understanding of both concepts in order to critically engage with them and develop them further.

Anthony F. Lang

ABSTRACT RESPONSIBILITY AS A UNIVERSAL VALUE

In contemporary politics and ethics, there is great scepticism as to whether or not there can be universal values. Unlike centuries past, when well-defined ethical and religious systems of thought provided an authoritative answer to this question, in the contemporary order no such authority or clarity exists. For some, the diversity of thought around ethical questions has opened up authoritarian systems of thought, religious traditions, and political orders in which certain questions could not be asked and certain practices were simply unacceptable. For others, this collapse of a shared ethical framework has led to violence, conflict, injustice, and the violation of rights in different contexts.

This paper does not seek to provide a single answer to this question, for it has long vexed the international community. Instead, it proposes a new way by which we might think about universal values through an engagement with global and international institutional frameworks. The concept of responsibility has appeared in numerous contexts in global and international politics. The Responsibility to Protect and the Draft Articles on State Responsibility are two more formal statements of what this idea means. It has also appeared in International Criminal Law, International Human Rights Law, and International Humanitarian Law, though without specificity as to its meaning. As such, there exists a discourse of responsibility at the global level, which has emerged in fits and starts and continues to inform our ways of thinking and acting in global affairs.

In this paper, I consider how responsibility as an idea might provide one example of a universal value. Because of its dual meaning – as an obligation to act and as a way to be held accountable – the concept works at multiple levels. The specific idea I develop in this paper is the idea of responsibility as a ‘response’; that is, the way that responsibility requires a dialectical interaction among agents in order to function effectively. This emphasis on dialogue, or more accurately the Ancient Greek idea of logos, requires the use of reason and communication in contested areas of global politics. Even in cases of criminal law, for instance, there is still required a dialogue in a courtroom, where evidence and counter argument take place. For this paper, I seek to use the idea of logos as a way to highlight how responsibility might function as one of the few universal values.

Anja Matwijkiw

***JUS COGENS* NORMS AND (POSITIVE) HUMAN RIGHTS**

The title of the paper is “When Human Needs and Peremptory Norms Are (Still) Made to Separate: A Call for Ethics Enhancements in the Era of Globalization and COVID-19”. Thematically, the paper discusses the values of peace, security and justice in the context of legal doctrine and with a specific view to human rights that arguably correspond with *jus cogens* norms or – to accommodate the International Law Commission’s 2017 terminological shift – peremptory norms. Prior to a comparative analysis of contemporary trends as regards legal doctrine, the paper outlines the relevant parameters for the responsibility to protect (R2P). While international criminal justice is one of the tools for a prevention-focused R2P approach, the question about the nature and scope of *jus cogens* norms is controversial, meaning that different doctrines have different interpretations, thereby also affecting the type of human rights that arguably correspond to the norms. So-called “affirmative” or – to resort to the traditional terminology – positive human rights, so the comparative analysis of legal doctrines show, are targeted by American Legal Process Theory (ALPT) and, for the same reason, precluded beforehand. Other doctrines may not share such an agenda, but still tilt the weight-scales against social/economic/cultural human rights as candidates. Yet, other doctrines may defend their inclusion but lack a credentials-checking framework for rights *per se*. From the perspective of Stakeholder Jurisprudence, all three responses are inadequate for one and the same reason: no general rights theory is provided. In particular, there is a tendency to reason along the lines of the triple thesis “argument”, which is not a valid form of argument. If it is true that *jus cogens* norms “cannot mandate” positive human rights, then this one-dimensional outcome cannot but affect the fora that address the most serious crimes, including the International Criminal Court (ICC). For skeptics and critics, the outcome is anchored in archaic ideas – for it is *already too late* for conservative thought. Admittedly, the area of case law may be a battleground for conflicting perceptions. However, only some conceptualizations (of rights) can be substantiated – by law. Given that these are consistent with positive human rights, ethical pressure should be applied to abandon what is commonly called the “historical coherence” premise for the ICC. In particular, in circumstances where environmental and economic stakes adversely affect human life or health, the future relevancy of the ICC depends on a broad crime-typology.

The stance of the author is that positive human rights are too easily dismissed, as a consequence of the fact that legal theorists take too much for granted. Furthermore, the author is of the opinion that unless the United Nations clarifies the premises and implications of its human rights philosophy, states will continue to have access to convenient excuses that contribute to business-as-usual outcomes. Finally, the ICC should not be obstructed from playing the role it can and indeed should in an era characterized by challenges that mix different harms in ways that result in serious and systematic victimization. While the global COVID-19 pandemic is a legally controversial issue, a couple of learning lessons, that may guide progress as regards the response to core crimes, can be derived. They highlight an emphasis on ethics, a call for realignment of some factors and/or criteria if and when important public interests are at stake. In the case of the

ICC, the factors and/or criteria encompass root causes of conflict, together with dispelling myths that undermine positive human rights.

The theme/topic contains aspects and components that fall under category (1): “responsibility of states (individual and collective) on the basis of the UN Charter (discussed in regard to the Coronavirus pandemic”); category (3): “national interest and state responsibility”; and category (6): “accountability at individual and state level (with emphasis on the role of the International Criminal Court and the International Court of Justice, respectively.”

Dušan Proroković

**INTERGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS AND GREAT POWERS IN THE
MULTIPOLAR WORLD: THE ISSUE OF CONFIDENCE AND THE IMPACT
ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS**

The transformation of the structure of the world political system from unipolar to multipolar brings great changes and turbulence in international relations. Where are the international organizations in all this? On the one hand, trust in certain international organizations weakened during the pandemic. The statement of the US Secretary of State that the USA may never again fund the World Health Organization has opened this question too! The distrust of states - key players in world politics (among whom the US certainly is) in the honesty and functionality of international (or more precisely, intergovernmental) organizations can undermine their credibility and lead to a dramatic decline in confidence. Whom can they serve and what is the purpose of those institutions in general? At the same time, the rule that states are selfish was confirmed, i.e. that there is not much solidarity even in organizations like the EU, which further endangers their reputation. On the other hand, it is also shown that some international organizations are tragically dysfunctional, and therefore cannot influence the resolution of current crises and that they are in need of reform. This is primarily the case with the UN. On the third side, some international organizations such as the Council of Europe or the OSCE are becoming victims of a fierce confrontation between the key actors of international relations, as a result of which the question of their further purpose is open. Nevertheless, despite all the problems faced by international organizations at this historical stage, it should be underlined that some other intergovernmental organizations are increasing their own influence (such as the Shanghai Cooperation Organization or BRICS, for example). This research is devoted to the analysis of the current moment characterized by conflicts between the great powers (the USA and key Western European states on the one hand and the non-Western bloc led by Russia and China on the other) and the resulting decline in trust in international organizations, as well as the consequences of that approach. The presented theses practically confirm the postulates of the theory of neorealism in international relations (predominance of the principle of self-help, establishment of the balance of power, selfishness of states in an anarchic international environment).

Lyal Sunga

IS THE ICC INDICTMENT OF PRESIDENT VLADIMIR PUTIN FOR WAR CRIMES A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION FOR THE INTERNATIONAL RULE OF LAW OR INSTEAD A DEEPLY UNFAIR MANIFESTATION OF REALPOLITIK, WESTERN HYPOCRISY AND DOUBLE STANDARDS?

The Charter of the United Nations reaffirms the basic principle that every State, regardless of its population size, wealth, natural resources, geo-strategic influence or military strength, is sovereign and equal to every other. Strict sovereign equality among States obviously conflicts with the privileged position the Charter grants the five permanent Members of the UN Security Council (China, France, Russia, United Kingdom and the United States) because of the power of each permanent Member to veto any Council draft resolution to determine the existence of any threat to or breach of the peace, or act of aggression. The legal authority of each of the Security Council permanent members to block action to address a threat to international peace and security, even if all other 192 members of the UN supported such action, grievously offends the international rule of law, and not just in theory. In practice, since 1945, each of the permanent Members have liberally disregarded the interests of the international community as a whole by casting vetoes wherever convenient to protect themselves and their friends from condemnation or coercive measures the Security Council otherwise could have taken against lawbreaker States in lines with Charter articles 39, 41 and 42, despite the *nemo iudex in sua causa* principle that 'no one can be a judge in his own cause'. Not only have the Council permanent members routinely stymied collective security action to stop armed conflict that has cost millions of lives since 1945, but in effect, they have placed themselves beyond the rules of State responsibility and international criminal law, which impose consequences for breaking the law. Despite a perennially blocked UN collective security apparatus, and the continued irresponsibility of the more powerful of States, the international community has made remarkable progress in developing a system of international criminal justice, most evident in the establishment of the International Criminal Court. In March 2023, the ICC for the first time issued an arrest warrant for the serving Head of State of a permanent member of the Security Council, namely, Russian President Vladimir Putin for war crimes allegedly perpetrated in Ukrainian territory. Given the Security Council's failure to intervene in so many armed conflicts from 1945 to the present because of permanent member veto, including the 2003 illegal invasion of Iraq, many, not least Vladimir Putin himself, no doubt consider the ICC's action an obvious expression of western hypocrisy, double standards, and the inevitable culmination of vicious anti-Russian bias. This situation begs the question: is the ICC indictment of President Vladimir Putin for war crimes a step in the right direction for the international rule of law or instead a deeply unfair manifestation of realpolitik, western hypocrisy and double standards?

CURRICULA VITAE



Berdal Aral

Professor Berdal Aral completed his PhD on “Turkey and International Society from a Critical Legal Perspective” in 1994 at the University of Glasgow. His main areas of interest, both in his scholarship and teaching, include international law and human rights. He has written four books in Turkish, namely “The Right of Self-Defence under International Law” (1999), “Collective Rights as Third Generation Human Rights” (2010), “From Global Security to Global Hegemony: The UN System and the Muslim World” (2016), and “Perpetual Betrayal: The Palestinian Problem and International Law under Imperialism’s Shadow” (2019). He has also published numerous articles, both in English and Turkish, on the topics mentioned above, as well as on international organizations, the search for integration in the Muslim world, and Turkish foreign policy. He wrote an entry for Oxford Bibliographies on International Law in Turkish, which was published online in 2021. Among the journals in which his articles have appeared are *European Journal of International Law*, *Human Rights Quarterly*, and *Journal of the History of International Law*. Prof. Aral currently teaches at the Department of International Relations at Istanbul Medeniyet University.



Christopher Black

Christopher Black is a Canadian lawyer with 40 years experience, specializing in international and criminal law. He spent ten years as former associate counsel with the Air Canada-CN Corporate Group, and the TransCanada Pipelines Oil and Gas Group dealing with regulatory tribunals nationally and internationally, then practiced as trial counsel before the Canadian courts dealing with all levels of criminal cases, including several murder cases. For the past 20 years he has acted on behalf of accused held by the ICTY in the case of President Milosevic (and was Chair of his international legal team) and by the ICTR, where he defended General Augustin Ndindiliyimana, Chief of Staff, Rwanda Gendarmerie (acquitted on multiple counts of genocide in 2014). He is on the defence counsel list at the International Criminal Court and is a member of the Ontario Law Society, the International Criminal Bar Association and the National Lawyers Guild of the United States.



Ramachandra Byrappa

Ramachandra Byrappa left India at an early age to pursue his studies in Western Europe. He won scholarships to study in France and later completed his A-levels in Oxford. With a keen interest for international relations he moved to the University of Kent to do his BA. After a brief study of economics at the University of Düsseldorf he moved to the prestigious Institut d'Etudes Politiques (Science Po') in Paris where he completed a Master's Degree in Economics and Finance. After occupying various management positions, he returned to the academic world by attaining a PhD at the Eötvös Loránd University (Budapest) in 2014, and soon after started teaching contemporary Asian History and Geopolitics at the same establishment. Between 2017 and 2021 he also lectured on modern India at Pázmány Péter Catholic University, Budapest. In 2023 he was appointed as member of the Hungarian Institute of International Affairs (HIIA). His main academic interests are: structural resilience of institutions, civilizational compatibility, British Empire, geopolitics of Eurasia, Diasporas and frontierism.



Hamid Dabashi

Hamid Dabashi is the Hagop Kevorkian Professor of Iranian Studies and Comparative Literature at Columbia University. He received a dual Ph.D. in Sociology of Culture and Islamic Studies from the University of Pennsylvania in 1984, followed by a postdoctoral fellowship at Harvard University. He wrote his doctoral dissertation on Max Weber's theory of charismatic authority with Philip Rieff (1922-2006), the most distinguished Freudian cultural critic of his time. Professor Dabashi has taught and delivered lectures in many North American, European, Arab, and Iranian universities.

Professor Dabashi is currently the Director of Undergraduate Studies (since 2020) at MESAAS. He has in the past chaired the Department, and been its Director of Graduate Studies. He is a founding member of the Institute for Comparative Literature and Society, a founding member of Center for Palestine Studies, and he has chaired the Columbia College Committee on the Core. He is the founder of Dramas of Nation: A Palestine film project.

Professor Dabashi has written more than two-dozen books, edited four, and contributed chapters to many more. He is also the author of over 100 essays, articles and book reviews on subjects ranging from Iranian and Islamic Studies, comparative literature, world cinema, and the philosophy of art (trans-aesthetics). His books and articles have been translated into numerous languages, including Japanese, German, French, Spanish, Danish, Russian, Hebrew, Italian, Arabic, Korean, Persian, Portuguese, Polish, Turkish, Urdu and Catalan.

His books include *Authority in Islam* (1989); *Theology of Discontent* (1993); *Truth and Narrative* (1999); *Staging a Revolution: The Art of Persuasion in the Islamic Republic of Iran* (2000); *Close Up: Iranian Cinema, Past, Present, Future* (2001); *Masters and Masterpieces of Iranian Cinema* (2007); *Iran: A People Interrupted* (2007); and an edited volume, *Dreams of a Nation: On Palestinian Cinema* (2006).

Among his most recent books are *Islamic Liberation Theology: Resisting the Empire* (Routledge, 2008); *Post-Orientalism: Knowledge and Power in Time of Terror* (Transaction Publishers, 2009); *Shi'ism: A Religion of Protest* (Harvard, 2011); *The World of Persia Literary Humanism* (Harvard, 2014); *Can Non-Europeans Think?* (Zed Books, 2015); *Persophilia: Persian Culture on the Global Scene* (Harvard, 2015); *Iran without Borders: Towards a Critique of the Postcolonial Nation* (Verso, 2016); *Iran: Rebirth of a Nation* (Routledge, 2017); *The Shahnameh: The Persian Epic as World Literature* (Columbia, 2019); *On Edward Said: Remembrance of Things Past* (Haymarket, 2020); and *The Future of Two Illusions: Islam after the West* (University of California Press, 2022).



Alfred de Zayas

Alfred-Maurice de Zayas is a former UN Independent Expert on the Promotion of a Democratic and Equitable International Order (2012-18), senior lawyer with the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, Secretary of the UN Human Rights Committee and Chief of the Petitions Department. Zayas grew up in Chicago, studied history and law, holds a J.D. from Harvard Law School and a Dr. phil. in modern history from the University of Göttingen. He was a Fulbright Graduate Fellow in Germany. Retired member of the New York and Florida Bar, author of 9 books and more than 200 scholarly articles. President of PEN International, Centre Suisse Romand, 2006-9 and again 2013-17. He is a winner of a 2022 International Book Award for his book, Building a Just World Order, in the category of Law.



Zhipeng He

Prof. HE Zhipeng is Ph.D. in law (Jilin University, China) and professor of law at Jilin University. He acts as standing council member of the Chinese Society of International Law, standing council member of the China Society for Human Rights Studies, as well as Vice President of the China Society of International Economic Law.

Research interests: International law; human rights; legal education.

Books (selected): *A Chinese Theory of International Law*, Springer, 2020 (English); *Protecting National Interest: The Power of International Law*, Law Press China, 2018 (Chinese); *International Rule of Law*, Peking University Press, 2016; *International Rule of Law on Economic Issues*, Higher Education Press, 2015; *Textbook of International Law*, Tsinghua University Press, 2014; *Fundamentals on Philosophy of International Law*, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2013; *Basic Theories of Rights: Reflections and Reconstructions*, Peking University Press, 2012; *Basic Theories in International Economic Law*, Social Sciences Academic Press, 2010; *Theoretical Issues of Human Rights Globalization*, Science Publisher, 2008; *European Union Law: Historical Process and Institutional Framework*, Jilin University Press, 2007; *Right to Development and the System of the EU*, Jilin University Press, 2007; *Legal Regulation of Globalized Economy*, Tsinghua University Press, 2006.



Seán Fleming

Sean Fleming is a Research Fellow in the School of Politics and International Relations at the University of Nottingham. He was previously a Junior Research Fellow at Christ's College, Cambridge. His book, *Leviathan on a Leash: A Theory of State Responsibility* (Princeton, 2020), explores the ethics of reparations, sovereign debts, treaties, and sanctions. He has published articles and chapters on a range of related topics, including state crimes, treaty repudiation, and theories of collective action, Thomas Hobbes's political thought, and the international law of state responsibility.



Ögmundur Jónasson

Reykjavík, Iceland, 1948, is a historian from Edinburgh University. He was foreign news correspondent at Icelandic State TV for a decade, leader of the public service unions in Iceland, and active in international trade union work for over twenty years, Member of Parliament from 1995 to 2016, held several ministerial posts, headed the Constitutional and Supervisory Committee of the Icelandic Parliament after leaving government and until his retirement in 2016. At present, he is Honorary Associate of the Parliamentary Assembly of the Council of Europe and represents Iceland in the European Commission against Racism and Intolerance. He has been a part time lecturer in history at the University of Iceland and all his working life he has been and still is a prolific writer and commentator.



Fabian Klose

February 2017: Habilitation in Modern History at the LMU Munich, Germany. July 2007: Ph.D. Degree in Modern History at the LMU Munich, Germany, Dissertation *summa cum laude*, supervised by Prof. Martin H. Geyer

“Menschenrechte im Schatten kolonialer Gewalt. Die Dekolonisierungskriege in Kenia und Algerien 1945–1962.”

February 2003: M.A. Degree in Modern History at the LMU Munich, Germany

Since April 2019: Chair Professor of International History and Peace and Conflict Studies (19th and 20th Centuries), University of Cologne, Germany.

October 2018 – July 2019: Professor of Modern History at the History Department of the LMU Munich, Germany (sabbatical replacement for Prof. Martin Geyer).

September 2018: Carl-Erdmann-Award for Habilitationsschrift “In the Cause of Humanity – Eine Geschichte der humanitären Intervention im langen 19. Jahrhundert.”

March 2018: Visiting Professor at the Centre d’Histoire, Sciences Po Paris, France.

March 2017 – October 2018: Privatdozent at the LMU Munich, Germany.

Since July 2014: Academy Leader (together with Prof. Johannes Paulmann and Prof. Andrew Thompson) of the Global Humanitarianism Research.



Hans Köchler

Dr. Hans Köchler is University Professor emeritus of Philosophy and former Chairman of the Department of Philosophy at the University of Innsbruck, Austria. He is the founder and President of the International Progress Organization (I.P.O.), an NGO in consultative status with the United Nations. In 2000-2002, he served as international observer, appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, at the Scottish Court in the Netherlands ("Lockerbie Trial"). Köchler is the author of numerous articles and books on political and legal philosophy, the theory of international relations and the United Nations, conflict resolution, as well as issues of cultural hermeneutics and intercultural dialogue. He serves as editor of the series "Studies in International Relations" and member of the Editorial Board of several journals, including "Culture and Dialogue," "Geopolitica," and "Indian Yearbook of International Law and Policy." Köchler is the recipient of numerous honors and awards such as an Honorary Professorship of Pamukkale University (Turkey), an honorary doctor degree of Mindanao State University, the medal "Apostle of International Understanding" (India), the Honorary Medal of the International Peace Bureau (Geneva), and the Gusi Peace Prize (Philippines).



Anthony F. Lang

Anthony F Lang, Jr is a Professor of International Political Theory in the School of International Relations at the University of St Andrews. He received his BA in philosophy from the University of Notre Dame in 1990 and his MA and PhD in political science from Johns Hopkins University in 1996. He was an assistant professor of political science at the American University in Cairo, Egypt from 1996-2000. From 2000-2003, he served as a programme officer at the Carnegie Council for Ethics in International Affairs, where he directed programs on ethics and the use of force, religion and US foreign policy, and ethics in higher education. Prior to arriving in St Andrews in 2004, he taught courses at Yale University, Bard College and Albright College. He is currently the editor of the *Journal of International Political Theory* and was one of the founding editors of *Global Constitutionalism* and serves on the editorial boards of *Ethics & International Affairs* and *Human Rights Review*. He has been active in the International Studies Association (ISA) serving as the President of the International Ethics section in 2003-2004 and Chair of the Academic Freedom Committee from 2016-2018, along with service in the Human Rights Section as the Programme Chair. He created the Centre for Global Constitutionalism (now the Centre for Law and Global Governance) at the University of St Andrews. He has served as a consultant to the UNODC on ethics in higher education and the UK Ministry of Defence on the legal and ethical use of force. He has published three single authored books and edited or co-edited ten others and published numerous articles and book chapters. His scholarship sits at the intersection of politics, law and ethics at the global level. He has written about global constitutionalism, universal values, the just war tradition, political responsibility, international law, Middle East politics, and human rights. His publications can be found at: <https://www.st-andrews.ac.uk/international-relations/people/al51>. He tweets @ProfTonyLang.



Anja Matwijkiw

Education: University of Chicago, IL, USA, PostDoc, Franke Institute for the Humanities, 1998-2002 / University of Cambridge, England, UK, Ph.D. in Philosophy, 1997 / University of Copenhagen, Denmark, Magisterkonferens in Philosophy, 1989. Academic Area/s of Specialization: Human Rights, Ethics, (Philosophy of) Law at the National and International Levels, Post-Conflict Justice. Areas of Competence: Social and Political Philosophy, International Relations.

Academic positions: Lund University, Faculty of Law & Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law, Sweden, U.S. Fulbright Distinguished Chair of Public International Law, 2019-2020 / Indiana University, IN, USA, Professor, Indiana University Graduate School & Philosophy Program, Indiana University Northwest, 2015-present / Copenhagen University Law School, Denmark, Visiting Researcher, iCourts – The Danish National Research Foundation’s Centre of Excellence for International Courts, University of Copenhagen, Denmark, 2016-2017 / DePaul University College of Law, Chicago, IL, USA, Research Assistant to M. Cherif Bassiouni (task assignment on philosophical aspects of justice concepts, related to the project: *Globalization: A Theory of Justice*), the Law School, July-Aug. 2010 / University of Chicago, IL, USA, 2000-2003:

- Instructor, Graham School of General Studies (GSGS), Oct. 2001-Aug. 2002.
- Visiting Lecturer, Human Rights Program, Center for Gender Studies, and Department of Philosophy, January 2001-Aug. 2002.
- Faculty Advisor, Center for International Studies, March 2001-December 2003.
- Teaching Assistant for Jacqueline Bhabha, Center for International Studies and the Human Rights Program, March 2000/2001-June 2000/2001 (Spring Quarter/s).

Saint Xavier University, IL, USA, Adjunct Professor, Department of Philosophy, 2002 / Elmhurst College, IL, USA, Adjunct Professor, Department of Philosophy, 2002 / University of Cambridge, England, UK, Carlsberg Researcher, Lucy Cavendish College, 1993-1995; Carlsberg Research Fellow, Lucy Cavendish College, 1990-1991.

- Member of the Governing Body, 1990-1991.



Dušan Proroković

Head of the Center for Eurasian Studies at Institute of International Politics and Economics, Belgrade; Associate Professor at Faculty of Diplomacy and Security, Serbia.

Major publications: *Kosovo: Interethnic and Political Relations* (2011); *Geopolitics of Serbia: Position and Perspectives at the Beginning of the 21st Century* (2012); *German Geopolitics and Balkans: Goals of Middle European Continentalism* (2014); *The Era of Multipolarity* (2017).



Lyal S. Sunga

Former Senior Human Rights Officer at the UN Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights in Geneva, Switzerland, specializes in international criminal law, international human rights law and humanitarian law and currently teaches at John Cabot University in Rome, Italy, and serves as Affiliated Professor at the Raoul Wallenberg Institute of Human Rights and Humanitarian Law in Lund, Sweden. He has conducted monitoring, investigation, reporting, technical cooperation, education and training over the last 30 years in around 60 countries over more than 30 years, mainly in Africa, Asia, the Middle East and Europe, on international criminal law, international human rights law and humanitarian law issues.

ACADEMIC TEAM MEMBERS



Joël Christoph

EDUCATION

Ph.D. in Economics, European University Institute, French government doctoral scholarship 2021/08 – Present / **M.Res. in Economics**, European University Institute 2021/08 - 2022/08 / **M.Sc. in Economics**, Barcelona School of Economics 2020/09 - 2021/06 / **M.Law in Politics**, Tsinghua University-Johns Hopkins University SAIS 2019/08 - 2020/07 / **B.Sc. in Economics with a Year Abroad**, University College London 2015/09 - 2019/07 / **University of California Exchange Abroad Program & Summer Mandarin Scholarship** 2017/09 - 2018/08 / **European Baccalaureate**, European School of Munich 2006/09 - 2014/07

EXPERIENCE

Ph.D. Researcher, European University Institute 2021/08 – Present / **Director**, Effective Thesis 2023/08 – Present / **Research Manager**, Existential Risk Alliance 2023/06 - 2023/08 / **Short-term Consultant**, World Bank 2022/12 - 2023/06 / **Junior Consultant**, International Energy Agency 2023/04 - 2023/05 / **Founder and Managing Director**, Endeema 2021/06 - 2022/12 / **Research Fellow**, Nuclear Non-Proliferation Education and Research Center 2022/07 - 2022/08 / **Summer Research Fellow**, Swiss Existential Risk Initiative 2022/06 - 2022/08 / **Summer Research Fellow**, University of Oxford's Future of Humanity Institute 2020/07 - 2020/08 / **Young Ambassador & Research Intern**, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace 2019/10 - 2020/06 / **Long-term Research Intern**, Energy Aspects 2019/07 - 2019/08 / **Innovation Fellow**, UCL Arena Centre for Research-based Education 2018/12 - 2019/06

SELECT PUBLICATIONS

Cybersecurity on the Edge? Policy, Privacy, and the Networked Future. 2023. InterMedia, the IIC journal.

Towards Reliable Misinformation Mitigation: Generalization, Uncertainty, and GPT-4. 2023. Arxiv.

Small Modular Reactors and Nuclear Non-Proliferation. 2022. In 2022 NEREC Annual Report, pp. 213-226.

The Planet, Europe and I: What All of Us Can Do to Save Our Planet. 2020. IAI Commentaries, 20 (65), Rome.



Davide Sirna

Geopolitical Analyst, IARI (Istituto Analisi Relazioni Internazionali), Rome, Italy

* Master of Arts (Cultural Diplomacy – International Business), Institute for Cultural Diplomacy, Berlin / University of Furtwangen, Germany (MA thesis: “Cosmopolitan Leadership”).

* Master of Arts (International Relations and European Studies), Centre international de formation européenne (CIFE), Nice (Master thesis: “From Istanbul to Ventotene: How to Tackle Populism in the Case of EU-Turkey relations”).

* BA (Languages/Translation and Economics), Università SSML (Scuola Superiore Mediatori Linguistici), Pisa, Italy (Bachelor thesis in Spanish: “La recaída populista”).

Intern, PPE (European People’s Party Group), European Parliament, Brussels (2016); Political Intern, Royal Embassy of Denmark, Madrid (2020); Internship student, Dante Alighieri Society, Berlin, Germany (2021); Communication Specialist, Council of American States in Europe (2022-2023); Ambassador’s personal assistant, Embassy of Cuba, Copenhagen (2022-2023); Moderator, Associazione Diplomatici, United Nations simulation, New York/Rome (2023).

Selected publications: <https://iari.site/author/davide-sirna/>.



1972 – 2022

IN THE HALF CENTURY SINCE ITS FOUNDING, THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS ORGANIZATION HAS WITNESSED, AND CONSECUTIVELY COMMENTED ON, MAJOR TECTONIC SHIFTS IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS. A DRAMATIC CHANGE OF GEOPOLITICS OCCURRED WITH THE END OF GLOBAL BIPOLARITY AND THE END OF THE COLD WAR IN THE YEARS AFTER 1989. THE "UNIPOLAR MOMENT" OF THE TURN OF THE MILLENNIUM, PREMATURELY CELEBRATED BY SOME AS THE DAWN OF A "NEW WORLD ORDER," HAS INSTEAD LED TO THE GRADUAL EMERGENCE OF A NEW MULTIPOLAR CONSTELLATION, DIFFERENT FROM THE BALANCE OF POWER THAT HAD MADE POSSIBLE THE FOUNDATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS AFTER WORLD WAR II. THIS DEVELOPMENT IS NOW, IN 2022, THREATENED BY MAJOR SYSTEMIC RISKS FOR GLOBAL ORDER AND PEACE.

AMIDST ALL THE TURMOIL AND UPHEAVALS OF THE LAST FIFTY YEARS, THE FOCUS OF THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS ORGANIZATION HAS REMAINED THE SAME: NAMELY, TO CONTRIBUTE TO A MORE CRITICAL *SELF-AWARENESS* OF HUMANKIND AS BASIS FOR *PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE* AMONG STATES, CIVILIZATIONS, AND PEOPLES.

IN THE PAST DECADES, THE INTERNATIONAL PROGRESS ORGANIZATION HAS EVOLVED INTO A GLOBAL THINK TANK DEALING WITH CRUCIAL ISSUES OF GLOBAL PEACE AND JUSTICE. IN SEVERAL INSTANCES, THE ORGANIZATION WAS THE FIRST TO IDENTIFY PROBLEMS AND PROPOSE SOLUTIONS – IN SOME CASES DECADES BEFORE THE MAINSTREAM CATCHED UP WITH THE IDEAS:

- * IN 1972, WE IDENTIFIED, AND ANALYZED, "*DIALOGUE AMONG CIVILIZATIONS*" AS CORE ISSUE OF PEACEFUL CO-EXISTENCE, AND APPROACHED THE UN AS WELL AS UNESCO IN THAT REGARD.
- * IN 1980, THE I.P.O. PUBLISHED AN ANALYSIS ON "*HUMAN RIGHTS AND INTERNATIONAL LAW*," SUGGESTING THAT THE BASIC NORMS OF HUMAN RIGHTS SHOULD BE DEFINED AS FOUNDATION ALSO OF THE LEGITIMACY OF INTERNATIONAL LAW, AND CALLING FOR NORMATIVE CONSISTENCY OF THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM IN THAT REGARD.
- * IN 1985, WE CONVENED AN INTERNATIONAL MEETING OF EXPERTS IN NEW YORK CITY ON "*DEMOCRACY IN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS*," FOCUSING ON THE NEED TO APPLY DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES ALSO IN RELATIONS BETWEEN STATES. THIS LED US TO FORMULATING SPECIFIC PROPOSALS, IN 1991, FOR *REFORM OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL*, ESPECIALLY IN REGARD TO THE VOTING PROCEDURE AND THE CONCEPT OF PERMANENT MEMBERSHIP.
- * IN 1991, THE I.P.O. RAISED THE ISSUE OF "*ECONOMIC SANCTIONS AND HUMAN RIGHTS*." AT A MEETING OF THE UN COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS IN GENEVA, OUR ORGANIZATION WAS THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL VOICE TO STATE THAT SANCTIONS IMPOSED BY THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL MUST CONFORM TO HUMAN RIGHTS AS *JUS COGENS* OF GENERAL INTERNATIONAL LAW.
- * IN 1991, WE PUBLISHED THE FIRST CRITICAL ASSESSMENT OF THE "*NEW WORLD ORDER*" THAT WAS PREMATURELY DECLARED AFTER THE END OF THE COLD WAR – AND THAT HAS PROVEN UN-SUSTAINABLE IN THE FOLLOWING DECADES.
- * IN THE YEARS FROM 2000 TO 2007, THE I.P.O. FOCUSED ON THE CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR A SYSTEM OF *INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE*, IDENTIFYING MAJOR DIFFICULTIES IN REGARD TO POWER POLITICS AND THE ASSERTION OF NATIONAL INTERESTS. OUR INITIATIVE STEMMED FROM THE NOMINATION, BY THE SECRETARY-GENERAL OF THE UNITED NATIONS, OF TWO OF OUR DELEGATES AS INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS AT THE SCOTTISH COURT IN THE NETHERLANDS (LOCKERBIE TRIAL). THE ANALYTICAL OBSERVER REPORTS BY THE I.P.O. HAD A CONSIDERABLE IMPACT ON DEBATES OVER INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL JUSTICE AND ON THE CONCEPT OF "INTERNATIONAL OBSERVER" IN INTERNATIONAL TRIALS.

