AN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION CASE WITHIN THE FRAMEWORK OF INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM: UNHCR

Dr. Pınar ÇAĞLAYAN[1]

Abstract

Although international organizations emerging in the 19th century purposed to restrict sovereignty areas of nation-states about solving international problems beginning from their establisment, they did not prevent themselves from impact of states. So, they have become a part of international problems mostly caused by states, supporting people suffering from these problems as emergency assistance institutions for a while.

Consequently, international organizations transform from position involved decision-maker, enforcement and legitimacy power against states to international assistance institutions that supporting states in social crisis on account of this impact. In parallel with this, their roles and capacities in solution of international problems also decrease. As a result of this transformation, they have to face more problems in financial and institutional areas. In this study, it is aimed to show this change of international organizations by examining United Nations High Commisioner of Refugees (UNHCR) case.

Keywords: international organizations, UNHCR, refugees, international problems, national interests

[1] Family and Social Policy Expert. pinar.caglayan@aile.gov.tr

ULUSLARARASI SİSTEM ÇERÇEVESİNDE BİR ULUSLARARASI ÖRGÜT ÖRNEĞİ: BMMYK

Öz

19. yüzyılda ortaya çıkmaya başlayan uluslararası örgütler kuruluşlarından itibaren uluslararası sorunların çözümü konusunda ulus devletlerin egemenlik alanlarını daraltmayı amaçlamış olmasına rağmen, devletlerin etkisinden kendilerini koruyamadılar. Bu nedenle, uluslararası örgütler, zamanla bu sorunlardan zarar gören insanlara acil yardım sağlayan kuruluşlar olarak çoğunlukla devletlerin sebep olduğu uluslararası sorunların birer parçası haline geldiler.

Sonuç olarak, uluslararası örgütler, devletlere karşı karar verici, yaptırım uygulayıcı ve hukuki güç sahibi olma pozisyonundan devletlerin etkisi nedeniyle yaşanan sosyal krizlerde onlara destek sağlayan uluslararası yardım kuruluşlarına dönüştüler. Buna paralel olarak, uluslararası problemlerin çözümündeki rolleri ve kapasiteleri de azaldı. Bu dönüşümün bir sonucu olarak ise, finansal ve kurumsal alanlarda daha fazla sorunla karşılaşmak zorunda kaldılar. Bu çalışmada, Birleşmiş Milletler Mülteciler Yüksel Komiserliği (BMMYK) örneği ele alınarak, uluslararası örgütlerin yaşadığı bu değişimin gösterilmesi amaçlanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: uluslararası örgütler, BMMYK, mülteciler, uluslararası sorunlar, ulusal çıkarlar

Introduction

The intensification of relations between states in the nation-state system emerging in the 17th century and necessity of common evaluation of international problems and issues arising over time led to emerge international organizations. The League of Nations established after the First World War, its successor, the United Nations established after World War II and many other social, economic and cultural international organizations began to erode the sovereignty area of the nation-state in accordance with their efficiency and effectiveness levels.

Some scholars claim that at the end of the Cold War globalization was a widespread net of relations among states. The intensification of regional and universal cooperation has made the significance of international organizations increase in terms of international relations. In parallel with this situation, states become more zealous to give their responsibilities which cause some social and economic problems to international organizations. As a result of this tendency of states, international organizations have a legal power and a technical advisor for states and have been respected by states (Joachim, Reinalda and Velbeek, 2008, pp. 1-4).

However, it can be hardly said that states are willing to fulfill their global commitments. On the contrary, adversely, states, especially those powerful in international politics, influence politics and implementations of international organizations. In other words, they have been under the impact of interests, policies and relations of individual states, primarily the western powers. Since the states have been still accepted as the most influential institutions and the main actors in international relations due to the norm of sovereignty, the concept of state has reinforced more (Kalınbayrak, 2013, p. 31).

Consequently, international organizations transform from position involved decision-maker, enforcement and legitimacy power against states to international assistance institutions supporting states in social crisis on account of this impact. In parallel with this, their roles and capacities in solution of international problems also decrease. As a result of this transformation, more problems such as financial or institutional arise. In this study, it is aimed to show the changing role of international organizations by examining United Nations High Commisioner of Refugees (UNHCR) case.

This study basically consists of two sections. In the first section, firstly, refugees as an international problem and the historical role of UNHCR in association with this problem will be mentioned. Secondly, UNHCR will be tackled under the titles of historical change in the defination of problem and its effectiveness and enforcement. In the second section, it will be examined how issues mentioned before cause financial/institutional problems and incapability about supporting refugees in UNHCR.

Refugees as an International Problem and UNHCR as an International Organization

There is no doubt that increasing amount of refugees and asylum seekers is currently one of the most challenging problems in the world. The concept of 'refugee' involves people who migrate from their location in which there are intensely human rights violations, historical conflicts, battles or authoritarian governments to more confidential places or countries. However, this concept shouldn't be defined as a simple humanity matter, since it contains significant social, economic and cultural problems. The flows of refugee are also rigorously associated with international politics. Indeed, the 'figure of the refugee' has

become an inherent part of the international system, illustrating the break-down of the state-citizen-territory relationship idealized by the state system to guarantee international order and justice. As a result, refugees are both consequences and reasons of world politics issues (Betts and Loescher, 2011, p. 1).

In terms of found solutions to the refugee problem increasing after the Second World War it can be said that there are two distinct phases. In the first phase, which endured approximately from 1945 to 1985, the solution of resettlement was practically provided and voluntary repatriation was theoritically approved as a favoured solution. In the second phase, resettlement was accepted as the most proper solution to the refugee problem (Chimni, 2004, p. 55). In this context, UNHCR has a significant role in both resettlement and assistance for refugees and aslyum seekers who located in transit countries.

The UN refugee agency was established after the World War II for supporting Europeans displaced due to conflicts lasting during the war. Afterwards, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees was founded by the United Nations General Assembly on December 14, 1950. In the next year on July 28, 1951, the United Nations Convention concerning the Status of Refugees - the most crucial legitimate instrument of advocating refugees and the fundamental status counselling UNHCR's work - was approved (UNHCR, 2015b, p. 1). The Convention went into effect on 22 April 1954, and it has been transformed by 1967 protocol, that eliminated the some certain geographical and occasional limits of the 1951 Convention (UNHCR, 2011, p. 1). Therefore, by means of both the Convention and the protocol, UNHCR aimed to be seen as a legal authority accepted by states on issues related to refugees.

In 1956 UNHCR faced its first important problem: refugees displaced from Hungary when Soviet military forces intervened with the Hungarian Revolution. In the 1960s, the decolonization of third world states, particularly African countries, caused the substantial number of refugee crises requiring UNHCR interference. Throughout the next two decades, UNHCR had to support refugee crises in Asia and Latin America due to same circumtances. At the end of 20th century, there were permanent refugee problems in Africa and, also new flows of refugees escaping from the set of civil wars in the Balkans to European states (UNHCR, 2015b, p. 1).

In the 21st century UNHCR had been dealing with huge refugee crises in Africa, such as the Democratic Republic of the Congo and Somalia, and in Asia, particulary

Afghan refugee problem. At the same time, UNHCR has been counselling about helping many internally displaced people. In addition to these supporting roles for refugees and internally displaced people, UNHCR has widened its role in advocating stateless people, a largely overlooked group in hazard of being ignored basic rights since they do not have any citizenship. In certain parts of the world including African and Latin American lands, the original 1951 Convention has been enlarged by agreement on regional legal instruments (UNHCR, 2015b, p. 1).

However, UNHCR did not provide a significant impact on the states whose national or international politics for refugees have been decided and implemented by the means of the 1951 Convention and the 1967 protocol. Particularly, the period after the Cold War caused to change international refugee regime Conventions against refugees, in terms of defination of refugee, national security and financial problems.

Majority of High Commissioners have realized that they had to use the power of their expertise, ideas, strategies, and legitimacy to alter the information and value contexts in which states made policy in order to have any impact on the world political arena. The office has tried to project refugee norms against world politics determined by states in accordance with their concerns related to national interests and security. Successful High Commissioners have convinced states to define their national interests in ways compatible with refugee needs. The UNHCR not only promotes the implementation of refugee norms, but it also monitors compliance with international standards. Both the UNHCR Statute and the 1951 Refugee Convention authorize the organization to 'supervise' refugee conventions. This opens up the possibility for the UNHCR to make judgements or observations about state behaviour under refugee law and to challenge state policies when they endanger refugees. For most of its history, the Office has acted as a 'teacher' of refugee norms. Most of the UNHCR's tactics have mainly involved persuasion and socialization in order to hold states accountable to their previously stated policies or principles. Past High Commissioners have frequently reminded western states that as liberal democracies and open societies they are obliged to adhere to human rights norms in their asylum and refugee admissions policies. Because the UNHCR has specialized knowledge and expertise about refugee law, states often referred to the Office on asylum matters. This was particularly the case before the 1980s when the UNHCR had a monopoly and proper legal authority on information about refugee law and refugee movements. During the early decades of its establishment, UNHCR started to have maximum legitimacy, concurrently trying to define the

refugee concept for countries, persuading governments that refugee problems were resolvable, prescribing several regulations for solutions relating to refugee problems, and monitoring refugee-oriented implementations realized by states. However, in recent decades, as a result of increasing restrictionism on the parts of states, the UNHCR has lost its monopoly and legal authority on information and expertise. Consequently, its authority and legitimacy in the realm of asylum has declined (Loescher, 2001, p. 5).

According to Loescher, despite its authority and legitimacy declining in time, the UNHCR has not just been an agent in world politics but still a principal actor. This has been particularly true in situations where there has been a coincidence of humanitarian factors with political ones.

> While the UNHCR is constrained by states, the notion that it is a passive mechanism with no independent agenda of its own is not borne out by the empirical evidence of the past half-century. For example, it seems clear that the autonomy and authority of the UNHCR in world politics have grown over time and the Office has become a purposeful actor in its own right with independent interests and capabilities. This was especially the case in the formative phase of the organization but it is also the case that the UNHCR has not been solely an instrument of state interests in the last decade of the twentieth century. Rather it is more correct to say that UNHCR policy and practice have been driven both by state interests and by the Office acting independently or evolving in ways not expected nor necessarily sanctioned by states. (2001, p. 6).

Therefore, on contrary to goal of UNHCR purposing a noteworty role on states' decisions and implementations for refugees, states affect UNHCR's politics and implementations in accordance with their interests and politics. This effect chiefly reveals the defination of the refugee problem and enforcement levels of UNHCR on the states.

The Historical Change in the Definition of the Problem

The change in the definition of problems to be solved by international organizations is in association with many national and international variables and these variables tend to modify over time. For instance, in 1945 the problem the World Bank was to eliminiate was how immediately to reanimate Europe economy devastated by war. By 1955 the problem the Bank was to remove was

how most forcibly to accelerate industrial improvement in developing countries (Haas, 1990, p. 3).

There have been three main phases in dealing with the issue of refugees in the twentieth century; the inter-war, the cold war and the post-cold war. Each reveals different ways of coping with the contradictions inherent in the nation-state system. But if new groups of people from different regions are now becoming refugees, normative understandings of who the refugee is and how to deal with them have not developed in a vacuum. Rather, we can distinguish a continuum from the early inter-war days. Comparing and contrasting state responses to the refugee in these periods allows for a better understanding of the refugee question (Haddad, 2008, pp. 5-6).

When the UNHCR was established in January 1951, there was a remarkable symmetry in world politics. In the conflict between communism and capitalist democracy, each camp's view of good and evil was unquestionably identifiable. From its founding, the UNHCR was enmeshed in the international politics of the East-West conflict and refugees were perceived as elements of power in the bipolar rivalry. In some respects, Cold War politics made life easy for the UNHCR and for western governments. In a Manichaean political world, there was a clarity and simplicity in deciding refugee status. Recognizing persecution and identifying its perpetrators caused no headaches and the support for refugees, who escaped from communist regimes, was mostly utilized to justify prevailing faith corresponding with the failures of second world countries and the generosity of the west. The UNHCR proved that the west was able to cope with flows of refugee derived from Eastern Europe for their relocation in the 'free/democratic world' as an agency, especially after the 1956 Hungarian Revolution. Hence, international refugee policy driven by UNHCR not only secured lots of people who were come under pressure of communist dictatorships, but it also clearly served the political purposes and interests of the United States and its allied states (Loescher, 2001, pp. 6-7).

Throughout the period lasting from the 1960s to 1970s, the Cold War expanded from cross-borders of Europe into the third world countries. Decolonization movements, as well as post-independence civil conflicts and wars, particularly in African states, caused substantial numbers of refugees to appear and highlighted the strategic significance of strifes emerged in countries which located outside Europe. Both the East and West gave Africa and Asia their attention, trying

to reduce the benefits of their ideological and strategic counterforces gaining political superiority in these places. The US and USSR competed with each other to improve the social, economic and strategical facilities of their regional allied states by means of economic assistance, political support and military force and constructed a range of client groups involving not only governments but also rebellious movements. At the same time, the United States became aware of refugee problems in developing countries as a result of inconsistency revealing on account of the fact that Soviet Union could exploit it for its own interests in widening hegemony both in the third world and the second world. Therefore, during Cold War contention, western governments became to realize the importance of supporting refugees as a nucleus proportion of their international policies in fresh independent/decolonized states, using foreign aid as one of the fundamental instruments in this East–West race for effectiveness. International movement on the refugee matter was also seen as a path to handle results of inconsistency in the third/second world. Simultaneously, majority of fresh independent African and Asian states obtained the statue of membership for the United Nations. This situation made it possible for the UN to accept resolutions that authorized the UNHCR to support a wide category of people displaced by conflict outside of Europe. Consequently, during the 1980s virtually all of the UNHCR's activity occurred in the developing world (Loescher, 2001, pp. 9-10).

In the early years of 1990s, as soon as the Cold War terminated after USSR and East Block's decomposition, international system properly transformed in terms of international interests, politics and priorities. In this new epoch, humanitarian issues had a historically noteworthy role in international arena. Flows of refugee acquired a new degree of political significance in the discourse associated with global and regional security and were viewed as a subject of current discussions in political and military foundation such as the UN Security Council and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). Newly increasing importance of refugee movements in terms of security policies combined with broad globalization of media coverage and the international community was forced to be aware of refugee issues in emergency. In the early 1990s, a political consensus prevailed for the first time since 1945, which enabled the UN Security Council to support collective interventionist policies previously thought to be impossible. At the same time, without a clear ideological divide in the post-Cold War conflicts, the major powers, including the United States, were reluctant to become directly involved. This was particularly true in Africa where their strategic interests were

limited. Refugees were no longer of symbolic or instrumental value to the US. Rather, refugees were perceived increasingly as burdens, particularly if they made a claim for asylum in the west. In parallel with this, states began to obtain more restrictive practices and advocated a different national and international refugee policy aiming to remove reasons of refugee flows by means of implementations including conflict resolution, negotiations, and peacekeeping. Simultanously, states perceived these displaced people as a disaster, particularly, greatly imposed by the media, and therefore permanently have tendency to charge the UNHCR and other international agencies with providing humanitarian aid.

> For the world's most powerful states, the provision of humanitarian assistance was financially and politically a relatively low risk option because it satisfied the demands of the media and public opinion for some kind of action to alleviate human suffering. But it was also used repeatedly by governments as an excuse for refusing to take more decisive forms of political and military intervention (Loescher, 2001, pp. 13-14).

Since the end of the Cold War, and particularly after the terror attacks of September 11, 2001 in the US, refugee movements have incresingly been portrayed by state policy makers, the media, and even the UNHCR, as a threat to security. This situation has been used to widen the extent of the restrictive rules of the Convention, and refugees has not been allowed to access to their status acquired though international refugee regime. These developments required a background of greater cooperation between the refugee and migration institutions and intelligence and law enforcement agencies. UNHCR cherished this new-found centrality in humanitarian politics: it relabelled itself as a humanitarian organization rather than a refugee agency, and defined its work according to the contributions it made as part of the UN family in promoting international peace and security. Consequently, UNHCR has been reorganized as a leading agency in terms of protection, camp coordination and management and emergency shelter for internal displaced people derived from regions in which conflicts and wars emerged (Hammerstad, 2011, pp. 239-249; UNHCR, 2006, pp. 1-3)[1].

According to Haddad, currently, refugees represent a permanent feature of the international landscape. They are the human reminder of the failings of modern international society. Much has been written about domestic concerns refugees

---

[1] For more details related to security and other discourses for refugee, see Peter Nyers (2006), *Rethinking Refugees: Beyond States of Emergency,* Routledge Taylor&Francis Group, New York.

raise, the potential burden on national economies that they pose and the threat to national identity and security that they can invoke, but the international aspect is frequently overlooked. It is important to understand how the refugee is located at the intersection between the international and the domestic, since in this respect the refugee acts to challenge not only questions of belonging and identity, but also disciplinary distinctions. Within an international system made up of dichotomies and grey areas between the internal and external, the refugee brings to the fore the clash between pluralism and solidarism, communutarianism and cosmopolitanism, sovereign rights and human rights (2008, p. 3). In parallel with these dichotomies that international system and nation states emerge, the new role of UNHCR is to be an emergency agent that support states in social crisis refugees defined as a threat to international system cause.

Effectiveness/Enforcement

Effectiveness is a concept relating to the influence of global decision-making policies and alternately portrayed as the degree to which a rule induces alters in behaviour that provide the fundamental objectives of the rule, the degree to which it develops the state of the fundamental problem or the degree to which it meets its policy goals. Enforcement or complience power (and respectively implementation) is also a measurement that provides effectiveness level of an international organization (Dai, 2007, p. 2).

We are therefore confronted with three critical puzzles on international organizations in general. First, do international organizations force states' compliance with treaties in international order based on sovereignty of nation-state? If so, how? Second, when international organizations do not have independent monitoring capabilities and consequently also lack the ability to enforce complience, what drives states' compliance (or non-compliance) with international commitments? Third, limited in both monitoring and enforcement, how do weak international organizations influence states' compliance? Specifically, how international institutions influence sovereign behaviour? (Dai, 2007, pp. 2-3).

If the concept of implementation is briefly mentioned, it is assumed that practices pursue the approvement of international agreements, however this does not always corresponds to that states comply with those agreements. A lack of effectiveness or inadequate compliance can require measures to increase the influence of these agreements at the domestic level (implementation) and prompt

them to propose a new agreement (agenda setting) or to make some modifications to agreements (decision making) (Dai, 2007, p. 4).

However, even though particularly legitimacy power of international organizations is theoritically an assumption for states in terms of democracy and human rights mostly in western discourse, there is practically a dilemma taking impact of international organizations on states in terms of effectiveness/ enforcement and implementation into account. Because, states lead international organizations to emerge and tend to be decision-makers in accordance with their interests, national and international politics.

At the height of the Cold War, American leaders considered refugee policy too important to permit the United Nations to control it and they did not want their freedom of action in the refugee field to be constrained by the UN. To this end, the United States sought to limit severely the functional scope and independence of the UNHCR and instead created two other US-led organizations which were parallel to and outside the purview of the United Nations. These were the International Committee of European Migration (ICEM) and the US Escapee Program. The United States was also instrumental in establishing specially created UN agencies in the Middle East and the Korean Peninsula, which handled refugee populations that were located in strategic conflict areas where US geopolitical interests were significant. The United States funded all of these organizations much more generously than it did in the past. The denial of American financial and diplomatic support directly affected the UNHCR's ability to define an independent role and to implement its goals and programmes. Even five years after foundation, and despite large refugee flows around the world, governments deliberately kept the UNHCR small and confined it to providing legal protection for displaced persons who had not been resettled by the International Refugee Organization (IRO) (Loescher, 2001, pp. 7-8).

The UNHCR also has endemic political problems. The High Commissioner has the almost impossible task of trying to influence states to protect and find solutions for refugees without challenging the prerogative of states to deal independently with their own internal affairs. The UNHCR was created by UN member states to be both a strictly non-political agency and an advocate for refugees. From its beginning, it was clear that the agency's role would be an intensely political one. As defined in the 1951 Refugee Convention, refugees are people who have a well-founded fear of persecution and cannot return to their home countries for fear

of placing their lives in jeopardy. The UNHCR's primary mandate is to protect refugees from government repression. This often requires the Office to directly challenge governments and places the agency in a conflictive relationship with states. However, the UNHCR is not just an advocacy organization; it also exists to facilitate state policies towards refugees. States did not establish the UNHCR from purely altruistic motives, but from a desire to promote regional and international stability and to serve the interests of governments. Governments created the Office to help them resolve problems related to refugees who were perceived to create domestic instability, to generate interstate tensions, and to threaten international security. The UNHCR is an intergovernmental organization and part of the UN system and therefore cannot always act in a strictly neutral fashion. Thus the UNHCR often walks a tightrope, maintaining a perilous balance between the protection of refugees and the sovereign prerogatives and interests of states (Loescher, 2001, p. 2).

The impact of states on UNHCR mostly reveals ultimate solutions for refugee problems. For instance, state pressure to promote repatriation was accompanied by new thinking about repatriation within the UNHCR. To respond to the new international political environment of the early 1990s (defining refugees as a national threat), repatriation became a central part of the UNHCR's new global strategy of preventive protection. In the UNHCR's eyes it was far better for most refugees to return home at the earliest opportunity to benefit from the UNHCR's repatriation programmes than to remain in refugee camps that could offer them no future. The Office posited that conditions in the home country did not have to improve substantially but only enough to allow refugees to return home in safety. This shift in terminology made it much more likely that the UNHCR would promote repatriations under less than strict conditions of voluntary repatriation. For the UNHCR this was a dramatic shift from its traditional position that repatriation had to be a strictly voluntary decision on the part of refugees:

> Rather, it would now be the UNHCR and states that would make the assessment as to whether conditions were safe enough for refugees to return. Moreover, there was a growing view that refugee safety did not necessarily and always outweigh the security interests of states or broader peace building and conflict resolution goals. Thus, in the early 1990s, repatriation came to be perceived as part of the Office's emphasis on preventive protection and encouraging the responsibility of countries of origin toward their own citizens (Loescher, 2001, p. 17).

In spite of the fact that repatriation did not always serve refugees' interests, UNHCR is forced to choose repatriation implementations by states. When there are circumtances making repatriation impossible, namely in civil war, UNHCR is transformed to an international assistance organization which is responsible for promoting basic needs of refugees and asylum seekers who have to live in refugee camps or certain cities under worse conditions than their home in host countries.

However, this supporter role of UNHCR encounters with several institutional and financial problems so that the number of refugees and in parallel with this, their needs significantly increase and states are reluctant to provide those requirements.

Institutional and Financial Problems/Incapability of UNHCR on Supporting Refugees and Asylum Seekers

Institutional and financial problems of UNHCR are basically associated with structure of United Nations (UN) and also problems mentioned above have been the most important problems of UN starting from its establishment.

The most important institutional problem in UN is the superiority of the five permanent members of the Security Council (USA, China, France, Great Britain, and Russia) and their authorizations in the field of maintenance of international peace and security. Actually, there is no voting in the UN Security Council for the amendment of the Agreement. However, for a decision it is required 2/3 majority of the member states in the General Assembly and five permanent members of UN Security Council have to be in this majority. So, there wouldn't be any changes if they make a refusal. The financial crisis is a big obstacle in front of the UN's work and is a very important issue because, although it seems like an administrative problem, in fact it is also the result of the competition between the General Assembly held by the control of the developing states and the five permanent members of the Security Council in terms of works and priorities United Nations undertakes and considers. The five permanent members of the Security Council with Germany and Japan meet a large part of the UN peacekeeping budget and expenses. Therefore, when five permanent members want financial support to UN, they need to use it as a weapon (Keskin, 2005, pp. 130-145).

The majority of UN's budget is spent for peacekeeping operations. The UN's budget—including all the costs of peacekeeping operations—is larger than those

of two-thirds of the world's countries. Similarly, the members of NAM are highly invested in the interests of the UN as such (Muravchik, 2005, pp. 89-90).

> The reasons for the decline are to be found in the duality of the United Nations, which comprises Governments on the one hand and the Secretariat on the other. The dominant states were not prepared to cross, that of calling the established order into question. The rich states are willing to bestir themselves to help the weakest, but not to change arrangements that suit their interests. This attitude is currently being carried to extremes, as illustrated by the rich countries' insistence that the fight against hunger or poverty is exclusively a matter for developing countries, and their refusal to consider the exogenous causes of hunger and poverty. Aid, which is in any case modest, does not help to redress the systemic injustice. All are united in bewailing the decline in the quality of the Secretariat – many exceptions notwithstanding - which is due, on the one hand, to recruitment constraints and procedures, and on the other to states' relative lack of interest in the Organization. Moreover, pressure from states makes the leadership of the United Nations less inclined to present studies and proposals that buck the dominant intellectual trend. For the Secretariat has the double duty of sewing member states and offering up new ideas. If the Secretariat fails to perform the latter function, the Organization as a whole is weakened, or at least loses its creativity (UNIHP, 2005, p. 14).

Similarly, the Executive Office of UNHCR formulates policies, ensures effective management and accountability, and oversees UNHCR's activities worldwide. Its main role is to craft a clear and consistent corporate vision, operational priorities and strategies, in consultation with senior management. It engages directly with donors and states at a high level to secure political and financial support for UNHCR (UNHCR, 2014a, p. 1). Hence, as long as states are unwilling to provide financial support due to their interests, UNHCR may encounter with shortage of financial opportunities.

On the other hand, this significant change in the dealing with refugee issues involves an increased focus on working in countries to decline the probability of massive refugee flows across borders. In addition to this, the UNHCR is also permanently demanded to participate in comprehensive and integrated UN peacekeeping or peacemaking operations that contained political and military actors of the UN. As a response of this, the UNHCR expands its services to a much

larger range of people who required to be assisted such as returnees, internally displaced people, war-affected populations, the victims of mass expulsions, and unsuccessful asylum-seekers, as well as refugees. For instance, 'war-affected populations'—people who have not been displaced but require humanitarian assistance and protection—comprised a vast proportion of the UNHCR's beneficiary population during the height of the 1990s Bosnian conflict. As a result, the numbers of displaced people and war-affected populations supported by UNHCR increase significantly. Namely, the number of people concerned by UNHCR increased from 15 million in 1990 to a peak of 26 million in 1996 (Loescher, 2001, p. 15). Today, despite determining how many of the refugees and asylum seekers described above remain in Western Europe is by no means an easy task and on one hand, although few data is available concerning the number of refugees who eventually return to their country of origin or who leave their country of asylum in order to take up residence in another state (Crisp, 1999, p. 3), it is not taken into account the fact that the number of refugees, asylum seekers, internal displaced people, stateless people and other dramatically increase consistently. Consequently, the UNHCR expands from a refugee organization into a more broadly-based operational agency driven by emergencies.

When UNHCR's programme plans for the 2014-2015 biennium are examined, it can be said that they are designed to illustrate below:

> what –under the global needs assessment planning and prioritization process- has been planned for particular groups of people of concern. The identified needs that can be covered if full and flexible funding is made available and needs that may not met if funding falls short of the ExCom-approved budget (potential gap). The estimation of a potential gap is based on the country operation's own assessment of the likely impact of a global funding shortfall. It should be understood that in some cases, targets for activities or delivery of services may not be reached for reasons other than a funding shortfall, e.g. lack of access to people of concern, cases not reported, changing circumtances, security problems, insufficient capacity to implement all programmes planned etc (UNHCR, 2014a, p. 3).

Furthermore, increasing humanitarian action to respond to refugee crises coincides with a weakening of traditional protection and asylum mechanisms in most states. In the face of growing numbers of illegal migrants and abuse of asylum procedures, western governments become increasingly reluctant to grant

asylum. They enter into force several rules including some constraints and limits for providing to control on immigration which declines the extent of appeals from decisions on refugee eligibility and puts barriers to those displaced by war and demanding statue of refugee and persecution as well as those looking for jobs and new homes. The inhibitions for crossing borders to prevent their territory from unwanted refugee and migrant flows become much more extended practices than it was during the Cold War. In place of asylum, various forms of 'temporary protection' are utilized to deal with those fleeing war and ethnic cleansing. Thus, at the end of the twentieth century, refugees become a symbol of system overload, instead of a symbol of what was always best in the western liberal tradition. The trend towards excluding asylum-seekers spread to governments in the south as well as the north. For developing countries, the growing numbers of displaced people entering already overloaded economies presented problems that threaten governmental authority. Since the economic, environmental, social, and security costs of hosting refugees increased dramatically, the majority of governments around the world come into action to remove refugees from their country and to lead refugees to and in some cases involuntary—the repatriation. Shrinking donor government support for long-term refugee assistance, coupled with diminishing levels of official development assistance, and the imposition of structural adaptation programmes on many poorer and less stable states, fortified this attitude and contributed to the hostility towards refugees (Loescher, 2001, pp. 15-16).

Consequently, today, UNHCR defines its own missions that it provides emergency assistance that has various forms, but a legal authority arranging international refugee regime. Firstly, it promotes clean water, sanitation and health care as well as shelter needs and other supporting materials covered by life-saving emergency assistance. Other emergency assistances include refugee registration, reinforcement and counselling on asylum applications, and education. These emergency and crucial assistances enlarge to people coming back to their home, arranging transport by air, sea and land and giving returnees a leg up in the form of assistance packages. The agency is also involved in local integration or reintegration programmes, including income-generation projects, restoration of infrastructure and other assistance (UNHCR, 2015a, p. 1).

Conclusion

When UNHCR was established in 1951, it was aimed to arrange international refugee regime conditions and be legitimate power for states. 1951 Convention and 1967 Protocol prepared in accordance with international human law were products of this aim. UNHCR tried to force states that they complied with rules of these agreements and were respectful to international refugee rights in their national and international implementations.

However, conversely, changes in international system and behaviors of states according to their interests, national and international politics have played an essential role on UNHCR's decisions and implementations over time. Especially, after the Cold War, refugees have been seemed as a burden and threat to national security by states and they have been more reluctant to protect refugees in their own areas. Instead, they have begun to enter several restrictions related to migration into force and prefered to help refugees on condition that they stay in their homeland, even in war areas.

Consequently, these changes cause UNHCR transform from an international organization possessing political and decision-maker power to an international assistance organization to support the states on helping refugees.

The future is likely to represent a period of massive displacement in which most regions of the world will experience forced population movements. So, implementations of UNHCR as an assistance organization will become more insufficient for refugees. It may be alter the role of UNHCR in accordance with changes of international politics and states' interests. However, it hardly seems to be said that states will have less influence on international organizations such as UNHCR and these organizations will not only work as assistance organizations but also be the important actors on solutions of international problems.

References

Betts, A. and Loescher, G. (2011). Refugees in international relations. A. Betts and G. Loescher. (Ed.), *In refugees in international relations* (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Biehl Öztuzcu, K. S. (2008). *Governing through uncertainty: 'refugeeness' in Turkey* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Boğaziçi Üniversitesi: İstanbul.

Bull, H. (2011). Foreword. A. Betts and G. Loescher. (Ed.), *In refugees in international relations* (pp. vii-xiii). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Chimni, B. S. (2004). From resettlement to involuntary repatriation: towards a critical history of durable solutions to refugee problems. *Refugee Survey Quarterly*, *23*(3)*,* pp. 55-73.

Crisp, J. (1999). *Policy challenges of the new diasporas: Migrant networks and their impact on asylum flows and regimes*. Geneva: UNHCR Policy Research Unit Press.

Dai, X. (2007). *International institutions and national policies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haas, E. B. (1990). *When knowledge is power: Three models of change in international organizations.* California: University of California Press.

Haddad, E. (2008). *The refugee in international society: Between sovereigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hammerstad, A. (2011). UNHCR and the Securitization of Forced Migration. A. Betts and G. Loescher. (Ed.), *In refugees in international relations* (pp. 238-260). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Joachim, J., Reinalda, B. and Velbeek, B. (Ed.) (2008). *International organizations and implementation: Enforcers, managers, authorities.* New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.

Kalınbayrak, B.N. (2013). *A post-structuralist approach to the UN based international refugee regime* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Hacettepe Üniversitesi, Ankara.

Keskin, F. (2005). *BM ve Türkiye: Uluslararası barış ve güvenliğe ilişkin sorunlar*. Ankara: Ekin Yayınları.

Loescher, G. (2001). *The UNHCR and the world politics: A perilous path*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Muravchik, J. (2005). *The future of the united nations: Understanding the past to chart a way forward*. Washington: The AEI Press.

Nyers, P. (2006). *Rethinking refugees: beyond states of emergency*. New York: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.

UNHCR (2006). *The state of the world's refugees: Human displacement in the new millenium*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

UNHCR (2011). *Convention and protocol relating to the status of refugees*. New York: UNHCR.

UNHCR (2014a). *Global appeal 2015 update: Headquarters (operational support and management)*. Retrieved from www.unhcr.org/5461e60f0.pdf, on 20.12.2014.

UNHCR (2014b). *UNHCR global appeal 2015 update: Turkey*. Retrieved from www.unhcr.org/5461e60c52.html, on 20.12.2014.

UNHCR (2015a). A *helping hand*. Retrieved from www.unhcr.org.tr/?lang=en&page=59, on 07.04.2015.

UNHCR (2015b), A *global humanitarian organization of humble origins*. Retrieved from http://www.unhcr.org/pages/49c3646cbc.html, on 07.04.2015.

UNIHP (2005). Reflections on United Nations development ideas. *Proceedings of the Conference* (pp. 5-16). Geneva: UNIHP.

Whittaker, D. J. (2006). *Asylum seekers and refugees in the comtemporary world*. London: Routledge Taylor&Francis Group.