

Compare and contrast an institutional approach to the ratification and enforcement of human rights (for example, through the Hague Courts) with non-institutional approaches (for example, through human rights NGOs, such as Amnesty International).

Human rights – the rights that are thought to be universal and usually protected by laws, such as right to live and safety – are a beautiful concept that, sadly, does not properly always exist everywhere. While the western countries are generally becoming more and more equal for all the people, no matter race, sexuality or gender, some parts of the world struggle to provide the people with basic rights, especially with the current refugee crisis in Europe, caused by restlessness in Middle East. These fundamental human rights are monitored and enforced by many different actors, both international and national, all over the world. The main actors can be divided into two groups: the institutional ones (for example, the International Court of Justice) and the non-institutional ones (for example, Amnesty International and other non-governmental organizations). These two actors have some similarities and no doubt also differences between them, but nevertheless they both play an important role in the field of human rights.

Maybe the most obvious difference between these two actors is their pure nature; institutional actors are official, usually part of some bigger international organizations or states. They usually have their own budgets and usually have numerous states as participants, whereas non-institutional actors are usually non-governmental organizations and therefore a bit more independent, since many NGO's are formed from volunteers and they are usually independent from any nations, making them more neutral. These two things affect greatly the way these two actors work and how they are perceived in global politics. Institutional actors and their decisions are usually seen as rather legitimate, as they often create contracts and laws that are signed by member states. Sanctions can also be set to make nations obey the laws. One example of this is the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. NGO's on the other hand are not as official, but they are able to harness the power of general populations and with their actions affect the general atmosphere. Also, they can cross borders and do things in places where states or institutions cannot go in fear of harming another state's sovereignty and thus creating unwanted tensions. For example, the current status of domestic violence in Russia is an issue that other states, such as Finland, cannot express their opinions on without seeming intrusive, but NGO's such as Amnesty International are able to openly express their disagreement with the current laws and try to work in protection of victims of domestic violence.

Never mind the differences, it is still true that these two actors have played and still do play a major role in human rights. Whereas institutional actors affect more on global, general level with their laws and decisions, non-institutional actors affect often more locally on specific issues or areas. On both areas, they tend to drive for more equal direction and development towards more optimal future for people.