

Aristotle's Virtues of Justice, Liberality, and Friendship and How they Reduce the
Problems of Global Governance and Contribute Positively to its Goals

Rebekah Vaughn

Thesis submitted to the faculty of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
In
Political Science

Chair: Fabian Wendt
Edward Weisband
Laura Zanotti

April 16, 2025
Blacksburg, Virginia

Key Words: common good, generosity, justice, friendship, global governance, human
flourishing, prudence, and love

Aristotle's Virtues of Justice, Liberality, and Friendship and How they Reduce the
Problems of Global Governance and Contribute Positively to its Goals

Rebekah Vaughn

ABSTRACT

This Project focuses on the intersection between Virtue Ethics and Global Governance. Virtue Ethics focuses on the character and actions of those in power, specifically in the administration of moral and intellectual virtues. Global governance addresses the problems of authority, legitimation, and contestation, as seen from the perspective of author Michael Zürn. In the primary text, Zürn argues for the existence of such issues as legitimation, contestation, fragmentation, and politicization. The virtues of justice, friendship, and generosity can alleviate each of these problems. Through genuine friendship, not driven by self-interest, the problems associated with certain authority relationships are alleviated. Justice seeks to mitigate the issues of a lack of a shared social purpose in legitimation narratives. Generosity in aiming to give to the right sources alleviates the problems of social capital and trade regulations. Each of these virtues contributes to the primary goal of the project, which is to enhance the common good and promote human flourishing within the governance system.

Aristotle's Virtues of Justice, Liberality, and Friendship and How they Reduce the
Problems of Global Governance and Contribute Positively to its Goals

Rebekah Vaughn

GENERAL AUDIENCE ABSTRACT

Virtue Ethics, as understood by Aristotle, is the moral theory that contributes to the global governance system as understood by Michael Zurn. This project leverages the virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity to address issues in the governance system, including the pursuit of power, love of wealth, and authority, as well as a lack of reputation within institutions. Each virtue is about mitigating the problems through a focus on virtuous giving, friendships based on love, and proportionate justice. The virtues aim to increase concern for the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose. While concern for the common good is not always evident in the governance system, the virtues aim for an overall human flourishing through each of their tenets.

Acknowledgements

I would like to acknowledge and thank the Baptist Collegiate Ministries at Virginia Tech, specifically the members of the 2024-2025 “red family” for contributing to this project. The people at this ministry have been a crucial support during the duration of writing this project. Without the people at this ministry and my Savior Jesus Christ I could not have finished this project.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	v
Section 1: Explanation of the Common Good and Human Flourishing.....	ix
Section 2: The Importance of Prudence and Love as Ethical Motivations.....	xvi
Section 3: Examination of Essential Texts.....	xviii
Section 4: The Integration of Zürn’s Work and Virtue Ethics.....	xxv
Section 5: Outline of Project.....	xxvii
Section 6: Limitations.....	xxxi
Section 7: Why is this project important?.....	xxxiii
Chapter 1: Friendship.....	1
Section 1: Unvirtuous Friendships and Zürn’s Authority Relationships.....	3
Section 2: Virtuous Friendships and Zürn’s Authority Relationships.....	7
Section 3: Friendship and Legitimation Problems.....	9
Section 4: Case study: The United Nations, The National Security Council.....	16
Section 5: Conclusion.....	25
Chapter 2: Justice.....	28
Section 1: Authority Relationships and the Types of Justice.....	33
Section 2: Hierarchies in the Governance System and Justice.....	37
Section 3: Political Justice and the Common Good.....	40
Section 4: Sovereignty and the Separation of Powers.....	45
Section 5: Case Study: The Kyoto Protocols and The Paris Agreement.....	49
Section 6: Conclusion.....	56
Chapter 3: Generosity.....	59

Section 1: Legitimacy and Generosity.....	63
Section 2: Social Capital and its Influence on the Governance System.....	66
Section 3: Regulation of Resources and Trade.....	69
Section 4: Case Study: Amnesty International.....	72
Section 5: Conclusion.....	76
Conclusion.....	78
Section 1: The pursuit of the Common Good and Human Flourishing, as seen by the Virtues.....	82
Section 2: Future Directions.....	83

Introduction

The global governance system is challenging to define as it encompasses institutions, countries, international leaders, and their subsequent issues. It is an ambiguous idea often used by all actors and institutions involved in the dynamics of states and international goals. Lawrence Finkelstein argues the idea intends to “reflects the great changes that have been occurring both in the dynamics of relations in the world of states and in understandings of those dynamics.”¹ The dynamics of states continuously change, as do their actors. The changing environment increases calls for collaboration and interconnectedness among states to further each state's goals. The global governance system constantly changes what is a part of it and who has the most influence.

Governance, as defined by Finkelstein, means “Global governance, thus, is any purposeful activity intended to “control” or influence someone else that either occurs in the arena occupied by nations or, occurring at other levels, projects influence into that arena.”² Control and influence are central characteristics of the governance system, especially those with the most significant influence over others. The definition of global governance should be broad, as it does not concern one specific government but anyone capable of influencing someone else in the global arena. James Rouna defines global governance as “the conduct of global governance, but they are only part of the full picture. Or at least in this analysis, global governance is “conceived to include systems of rule at all levels of human activity- from the family to the international organization-

¹ Finkelstein, Lawrence S. “What Is Global Governance?” *Global Governance* 1, no. 3 (1995): 367–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800120>. Pg. 367

² Finkelstein, Lawrence S., What Is Global Governance, pg. 368

in which the pursuit of goals through the exercise of control has transnational repercussion.”³ The pursuit of goals at all levels of activity is a defining characteristic of the governance system.

Global governance can be applied to multiple sectors as long as influence over actors is the priority. Governance does include the commands of governments, but in a broader sense, it consists of any channels through which influence flows. Micheal Zürn, the central piece of literature for this project, states that global governance is “the exercise of authority across national borders as well as consented norms and rules beyond the nation states, both of them justified with reference to common goods or transnational problems.”⁴ The Governance system, according to Zürn, has many different aspects, but the influence of norms as a system of rule is its main characteristic.

The characteristics of the global governance system, due to its broad definition, also encompass many different things. The idea of commands and a flow of control is central to the governance system. The flow of control or chain of commands in institutions can incorporate hierarchies, interdependence, incoherence, and innovation.⁵ Dingworth argues global governance is a little less broad than much of the literature, defining it as an “observable political program expressing a normative perspective on how political institutions should react to reduced control capacity.”⁶ In that sense, governance is inherently political, primarily concerned with control and authority. Global governance, in response to a rapidly changing world, is a conceptual framework for observable political phenomena.⁷

³ Rosenau, James N. “Governance in the Twenty-First Century.” *Global Governance* 1, no. 1 (1995): 13–43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800099>. Pg. 13

⁴ Zürn, Micheal. *Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018. Pg. 3-4

⁵ Rosenau, James N., *Governance in the Twenty-First Century*

⁶ Dingwerth, Klaus, and Philipp Pattberg. “Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics.” *Global Governance* 12, no. 2 (2006): 185–203. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800609>. Pg. 189

⁷ Dingwerth, Klaus, and Philipp Pattberg, *Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics*, pg. 190

Virtue ethics theory is the second component of this project, primarily Aristotle's. Virtue ethics theory, at its core, focuses on right living and good character above making decisions for duty alone. Tännsjö states virtue ethics focuses on “Instead of asking what it is that makes a right action right we ought to focus on the question: what kind of person ought I to be.”⁸ Virtue ethics is not primarily about actions or direct laws but the very personality of a person and how personality can benefit others. Virtue ethics focuses on traits of character acquired through habit and training. Dependence on habit and education is essential for virtue ethics theory, as virtues are not intrinsic to a person. Through virtue ethics, actions are right because virtuous people perform them.⁹ Actions are not good because of the action itself but the motivation and character of the person performing them. Virtue ethics, while having many traditions and thinkers attached to it, stems from a desire to rest in the intermediate or middle of the virtue, otherwise known as the mean. The goal of virtue is to abstain from the excess and deficiency of each virtue. Abstaining from vice by habit, not nature. There also tend to be many different lists of virtue. However, most delve into two categories: intellectual or thought and moral or character.

Virtue ethics aims to show what characteristics are desirable, focusing on what ought to be done.¹⁰ Virtue ethics do not always focus on existing actions or laws but on how actors should improve upon them through behavior. The virtues aim to tell right from wrong, acting as a guide for evil actions. The virtuous person knows how to behave in difficult situations, as each virtue acts as a guide for moral action.¹¹ Virtues are not skills or achievements but traits of character.¹²

⁸ Tännsjö, Torbjörn. “Virtue Ethics.” In *Understanding Ethics*, NED-New edition, 3., 95–112. Edinburgh University Press, 2013. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctt1g0b1qd.9>. Pg. 95

⁹ Tännsjö, Torbjörn. “Virtue Ethics., pg. 97

¹⁰ IBID

¹¹ Klabbbers J. *Virtue in Global Governance: Judgment and Discretion*. Cambridge University Press; 2022, pg. 17

¹² IBID

Virtue, above all, especially according to Aristotle, aims for a purpose or end goal.¹³ The good of virtue is acting towards its chief end, which connects to humanity's chief purpose.

The virtue ethics perspective that this project will focus on comes from Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.¹⁴ Aristotle argues that virtue is the primary way to obtain right living and goodness. Virtue is the goal of political life which commands direct action.¹⁵ Virtue is not the actions themselves but a cue to action through character traits. Virtue is not a state or a feeling but traits that command action. Virtue acts by following intermediate habitation, deviating from the excess or deficiency of the vice.¹⁶ The excess of virtue or deficiency is avoided in moderation by education, training, and habits. Aristotle states every person has an equal ability to obtain all the virtues, but few will accomplish this. Complete virtue is still the goal of the political community, even if not everyone obtains it.

Aristotle divides virtues into two categories: moral and intellectual.¹⁷ Moral virtues aim to increase pleasure or at least moderate it.¹⁸ Moral virtues focus on controlling feelings of longing and desire, focusing on virtues less associated with direct skill, such as scientific achievement. Contrary to moral virtues, most intellectual virtues do not follow the mean and excess rule but only have a vice. Virtues aim to be voluntary acts to increase freedom of action through moderation.¹⁹ Moderation is not a control mechanism meant to restrict the person but the desire of each virtuous person to increase flourishing. Each virtue is acquired by habitation or training, never by innate

¹³ Dimmock, Mark, and Andrew Fisher. "Aristotelian Virtue Ethics." In *Ethics for A-Level*, 1st ed., 49–63. Open Book Publishers, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1wc7r6j.7>. Pg. 50

¹⁴ *Nicomachean Ethics*. 2nd ed. Translated by Terence Irwin.: Hackett Publishing company

¹⁵ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1095b33

¹⁶ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1104a25-26

¹⁷ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1106a30

¹⁸ IBID

¹⁹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1114a25

nature. No matter the type of virtue, the primary goal is to pursue the truth and decrease overall pain.²⁰

Section 1: Explanation of the Common Good and Human Flourishing

The theory behind the common good and human flourishing is essential to explore as it is this project's driving force of change and motivation. The idea of a common good was once vital to political theory and governance. “The common good was once a central problem in political theory because it provided a framework for thinking about the relationship between individual interests and the interests of the community.”²¹ The common good is a uniting factor for the larger political community and each individual citizen's desire.

However, concern for the common good has decreased among scholars as “...the common good is always someones bad.”²² The notion of a common good, while essential to this project, is a heavily debated concept. Many scholars argue the idea of a common good while a good idea, is impractical and illogical. International leaders pursuing a collective common good seems idealistic at best and at worst a road to international dictatorship. Leaders may also be hesitant to pursue a common good when it may not a first look beneficial for their citizens. There can also be many definitions of the common good, it can be the common good for a singular state, international order, and individuals. The common good is a complicated notion and is often neglected due to it being considered impractical or even inefficient.

“In recent times, however, many who draw their inspiration from matters of fact have decided that this traditional goal of the state is only an idol.”²³ In this sense, Diggs states, the idea

²⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1104b10,14

²¹ Smith, Thomas W. “Aristotle on the Conditions for and Limits of the Common Good.” *The American Political Science Review* 93, no. 3 (1999): 625–36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2585578>. Pg. 625

²² IBID

²³ Diggs, B. J. “The Common Good as Reason for Political Action.” *Ethics* 83, no. 4 (1973): 283–93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2379966>. Pg. 284

of a public interest or common good is deemed too impractical. Diggs also points out that many deny the common good due to diverse public interests or the fact that all must share the same interest. Those that are for the common good may also turn out to be tyrants or dictators. While all those involved in the debate make valid critiques, the common good is too heavily implemented in moral tradition, essential for a solidified ethical framework, and needed for a governmental goal.

The idea that the common good is difficult to obtain or define does not and should not stop leaders from pursuing it. Diggs states "...held quite particular views of what the common good consists in, and of what government should do to promote it, they nevertheless agreed that it is the end of government, that it is a good of all the citizens, and that no government should become the perverted servant of special interests..."²⁴ Diggs points out that many philosophers argued for the notion of a common good being the ultimate goal of government even if it looked different in execution. "The view I wish to defend is that "the common good," under whatever name, is a fundamental concept of social morality."²⁵ The common good cannot be separated from moral and ethical concerns.

If leadership whether or individual states or international institutions should have a concern for the common good in order to further both national and international ethical interests. Diggs argues there is no common good that every person can recognize or fully promote, however, "...the allocation of benefits and burdens is a result of forces of competing self-interests; and if no one has unlimited power, so that each person receives some benefits in return for some burdens, then one may be led to speak of the enterprise as serving the "common good" or "common interest" of the participants."²⁶ A fair distribution of benefits is essential to the common good, limited power,

²⁴ Diggs, *The Common Good as Reason for Political Action*, Pg. 283

²⁵ Diggs, *The Common Good as Reason for Political Action*, pg. 284

²⁶ Diggs, *The Common Good as Reason for Political Action*, pg. 286

and a common understanding of moral goals. The notion of a common good or public interest is closely connected to Aristotle's idea of human flourishing both as a driving force for the political communities collective interest.

Others argue for both the individuality of human flourishing and the fact that science cannot produce evidence of one central idea of flourishing.²⁷ According to some, there may be no empirical evidence for the common good as it applies to a collective political community. Essential, the common good for the political community is what applies to everyone and is objectively beneficial.²⁸ However, the view of the common good being solely what benefits everyone comes with many consequences, such as decreased concern for natural rights, which makes the notion of the common good appealing as a way of connecting the individual and community.²⁹ While the common good is not without its concerns, it is primarily a way for a central desire or purpose for the entire political community. According to Aristotle, every community is political, as all people have political aims and desires.

The political community can be connected to Aristotle's idea of the state. "For all practical purposes the process is not complete; self-sufficiency has been reached, and while the state came about as a means of securing life itself; it continues in being to secure the good life."³⁰ Every state exists by nature whose aim is perfection. Essentially, the political community contains everyone who is by nature political and aims for self-sufficiency and perfection. The political community is intimately connected with Aristotle's idea of human flourishing and the common good. While this

²⁷ Smith, Aristotle on the Conditions for a Limits of the Common Good, pg. 625

²⁸ Douglass, Bruce. "The Common Good and the Public Interest." *Political Theory* 8, no. 1 (1980): 103–17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/190769>. Pg. 104

²⁹ Smith, Aristotle on the conditions for and limits of the common good, pg. 625

³⁰ The Politics, 1252b27, 1-3

may seem like an idealistic point of view, it is valuable to still regard the political communities' goal as human flourishing and not just regulatory sustainment.

Smith states, "A common good would have to be made present in some irreducibly unique political community. There is no common good in the abstract. There are only common goods present in particular contingent regimes."³¹ The common good is not in an idea but in the political and individual actions of the community, whether that be a political or non-political community. The common good is not one central action or idea but continued and collective actions toward a central goal of flourishing. Smith also states that there can be a variety of common goods depending on culture, purpose, and location; however, each good must align with the virtues and achieve a virtuous purpose.³²

From another perspective, "One characteristic feature of natural law theories of politics and jurisprudence is their appeal to the common good to ground normative claims about law, authority, and obligation."³³ The common good can effectively change and adapt norms and laws for the betterment of the political community. An appeal to the common good through the perspective of adapting norms allows for claims about the significance of political actions. The common good is inherently political as "It was presented as a goal for the state-indeed as the goal. It was a symbol for the whole range of governmental activity. The state had no other purpose than to serve the common good; presumably everything a good ruler did would be directed toward this end."³⁴ If acting virtuously, the entire purpose of the states should be to advance the common good. The common good can unite the purposes of the individual and the community, which is essential

³¹ Smith, Aristotle on the conditions for and limits of the common good, pg. 633

³² Smith, Aristotle on the conditions for and limits of the common good, pg. 633-634

³³ Duke, George. "The Distinctive Common Good." *The Review of Politics* 78, no. 2 (2016): 227–50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24889973>. Pg. 227

³⁴ Douglass, Bruce. "The Common Good and the Public Interest." pg. 104

for a functioning political state. “The assumption was that if society were functioning properly, the common good and the good of the individual would normally coincide.”³⁵ It was thus the government's responsibility to ensure the dedication to the common good and that it reflected society's purposes.

The concept of a shared purpose, human flourishing, or common good is an essential component of the governance system. Dingwerth argues that the system relies on the collective or individual pursuit of goals.³⁶ The collective pursuit of goals is crucial for the just function of any political community, especially the global governance system. Finkelstein states that governance is about directing resources to advance a public purpose and to influence new national decisions and behaviors.³⁷ Actors in governance should direct resources toward a common purpose influenced by society's behaviors. Rousseau argues that governance is not progressing towards a single world order but needs some measure of coherence and a common goal.³⁸

Dingworth adds that an essential component of global governance is "...the creation of networks, from the local to the global level, based on a shared problem-solving orientation, a fair balance of interests and a workable canon of shared norms and values as a basis for institutional structures for the handling of problems and conflicts.”³⁹ The common good is central to global governance as it is the idea of shared interests, norms, and values in connection with a concern for human rights, global conflict, and good policy. Micheal Zürn argues that the common good is crucial for global governance. He states that the global common good is presupposed in global

³⁵ Douglass, Bruce. “The Common Good and the Public Interest.” pg. 104

³⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1104b10,14

³⁷ Finkelstein, Lawrence S., What Is Global Governance, pg. 371

³⁸ Rosenau, James N., Governance in the Twenty-First Century, pg. 18

³⁹ Dingwerth, Klaus, and Philipp Pattberg, Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics, pg. 195

governance with devotion to global public goods and state actors' influence on global goals.⁴⁰ The common good is central to Zürn's idea of a governance system, especially global public goods and their benefits to the political community.

This project needs to explore the connections between the common good as seen in the political community and Aristotle's idea of human flourishing. "Otherwise put, the idea is: if you are virtuous, you will flourish or be happy."⁴¹ Happiness or human flourishing is the purpose of individuals and the collective political community. A good society focuses on flourishing, which directly applies to what is considered a good law. "Good" laws are laws that promote a good society, in which people flourish. "Bad" laws have the opposite effect, in which case there is "something wrong" with the laws."⁴² Flourishing goes beyond law, though, "To flourish is not just to be healthy and happy but to have good character and act rightly."⁴³ According to Aristotle, flourishing cannot be separated from virtue, as it is the chief end of virtue.

Aristotle aims to increase what he calls "human flourishing" through virtue ethics.⁴⁴ Human flourishing or happiness is the complete goal of human life. Following the complete virtues is how human flourishing is accomplished. Happiness is the complete goal or purpose of the political community, achieved through unity with the virtues.⁴⁵ Happiness is complete, self-sufficient, and the most choiceworthy of goods.⁴⁶ Happiness is everyone's end goal, accomplished through virtuous behavior. The community aims to achieve happiness in every action through

⁴⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 8

⁴¹ Hamilton, Christopher. "Virtue and Human Flourishing." In *Living Philosophy: Reflections on Life, Meaning and Morality*, 25–35. Edinburgh University Press, 2001. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcr9xw.6>. Pg. 26

⁴² Harman, Gilbert. "Human Flourishing, Ethics, and Liberty." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12, no. 4 (1983): 307–22. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265376>. Pg. 308

⁴³ Gilbert, Human Flourishing, ethics, and liberty, pg. 315

⁴⁴ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097a-1098b

⁴⁵ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1106a13

⁴⁶ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097b15,17;20-22

moderation and the habit of the virtues. Dimmock states, “This state of flourishing is the chief end of human existence and, following reason, the virtues always link back to the purpose of man.”⁴⁷

According to Aristotle, happiness and virtue ethics cannot be separated in theory or action.

“...for those whom politics marks a collective enterprise in pursuit of the common good, the virtues may be far more relevant or take on different characteristics.”⁴⁸ Pursuing the common good is intimately connected to the importance of the virtues as they encourage focusing less on the governance system's pursuit of power. The governance system is about struggle, as Zürn argues. Still, it is also about caring for the common world. Global governance has many problems, but the pursuit of the common good is essential to law-making and ethical behavior. The notions of the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose are closely connected through increasing good laws, overall ethical action, and decreasing love of power. The common good, human flourishing, and sacred social purpose are the best contributors to good governance and will be essential to reducing the problems identified by Zürn.

The common good is seen in Aristotle's understanding of human flourishing and illustrated further in each virtue, in addition, virtues encourage the pursuit of power to be toward the common good. Virtues through prudence encourage democratic processes and political leaders' characteristics to model the common good. Aristotle illustrates the process of becoming more just, generous, and increasing friendship through the concept of habituation. Political leaders can become more virtuous not through one virtuous act but many of them over a lifetime. Virtue is a character trait not a single action, even in political situations or institutions, virtue must be seen

⁴⁷ Dimmock, Mark, and Andrew Fisher. “Aristotelian Virtue Ethics.” In *Ethics for A-Level*, 1st ed., 49–63. Open Book Publishers, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt1wc7r6j.7>. Pg. 53

⁴⁸ Klabbers, *Virtue in Governance*, pg. 105

continually and practiced continually. The process of increasing the common good and human flourishing through virtue is a lengthy one, but worth doing.

Section 2: The Importance of Prudence and Love as Ethical Motivations

This project relies heavily on the concepts of produce and love as motivations and driving factors for the pursuit of the common good and implementation of each individual virtue. Aristotle defines prudence as "...a state grasping the truth, involving reason, concerned with action about things that are good or bad for a human being."⁴⁹ He further defines it as "...whenever they calculate well to promote some excellent end, in an area, where this is no craft."⁵⁰ Prudence is highly concerned with the truth and action. Aristotle's version of prudence is concerned with deliberation, knowledge of the good, and longevity.

While Aristotle's definition of prudence carries some weight in the current political world, there are many political concerns with the notion of prudence. Different political scholars argue the notion of prudence gives way to realism. Hariman argues prudence can lead into realism focused on material conditions of state power and suspicions of verbal intentions and agreements.⁵¹ Realism has been the dominant source of thought and morality for decades now, according to Hariman.⁵² Hariman further argues to avoid realist critiques of prudence, one must return to a traditional understanding of the term. Prudence is then defined as "The core ideas are: the political actor must strive to achieve what is good both for the individual and for the community; doing so requires the capacity for adaptive response to contingent events; this amalgam of ends and means is developed through deliberation; and it culminates in character rather than technical

⁴⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1140a29-30

⁵⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1140b5-6

⁵¹ Hariman, Robert, and Francis A. Beer. "What Would Be Prudent? Forms of Reasoning in World Politics." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 299–330. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41939457>. Pg. 1

⁵² Hariman, What would be prudent, pg. 2

knowledge.”⁵³ Prudence is grounded in the collective pursuit of goals, flexibility, and personal character.

Prudence is bound by reason and ethical distribution. Aristotle states “That is why we allow only reason, not a human being, to be ruler, for a human being awards himself too many goods and become a tyrant; a ruler, however, is a guardian of the just, and hence of the equal (and so must award himself too many goods).”⁵⁴ Aristotle argues for reason to be the guiding force of leadership, not self-interest or love of resources. This is the essential part of prudence; in that it guides rulers to make decisions by reason and not personal interest. Prudence centered on a collective pursuit of goals and benefits is the goal of leadership, and not love of power or resources.

An important point to make about prudence is that it must be done in accordance with the other virtues, in moderation, and through habituation. Prudence while a driving force for ethical motivation, should not be the only virtue impacting the common good. Prudence needs to work in accordance with friendship, justice, generosity, and bravery. Prudence by itself can give way to realist and tyrannical concerns but in union with the principles of other virtues such as desire for mutual benefits, concordance, and decreased love of wealth. Aristotle also calls attention to the crucial notions of habituation and moderation that are needed for virtue. Virtue is not part of one’s initial nature but developed through habit and moderation of the vice. Prudence must be learned and deeply connected to the other virtues to contribute to the common good.

Love is the crucial motivator for the pursuit of the common good. Without love one can only do political action for self-interest, power, and advantage. Aristotle mentions love of your fellow man as an essential aspect of friendship, but it is a central aspect of all moral frameworks.

⁵³ Hariman, What would be prudent, pg. 3

⁵⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a35-1134b3

Aristotle uses the Greek word “Philia” as his Greek word for love, often translated as friendship.⁵⁵ While there can be some disagreements about this, Aristotle’s use of the word is separate from strong emotion but more on the pragmatic end. However, in agreement with a pursuit of the common good, prudence, and union with the other virtues the love this project is centered on is closer to the definition of “Agape” meaning brotherly love.⁵⁶ Agape argues for an intrinsic love based on personal character and membership in the community which is a better definition for the political community as it focuses more than just duty or utility concerns.

Love according to Aristotle primarily is discussed in the friendship chapter and it has been heavily debated, “In this sense, to love a person for his own sake is not necessarily to have any special motive or attitude oneself, but to be attracted to something about him, namely, his good character.”⁵⁷ Love in Aristotle’s definition is based on character not a common characteristic or advantageous motivation. Friendship is further based on the idea that “Decent people who are friends, in his view - even if they are only civic friends – ‘wish for what is just and advantageous, and also pursue it in common.’”⁵⁸ Love is essentially the ability to care for others based on intrinsic value and wishing for the others good separately from your own advantage. Love as a intrinsic care for others based on character is crucial to human flourishing, the common good, and a shared social purpose as without love motivations for ethics and political good are temporary, self-interested, and based on advantage.

Section 3: Examination of Essential Texts

⁵⁵ KONSTAN, DAVID. “Love.” In *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, 169–84. University of Toronto Press, 2006. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442674370.12>. Pg. 3

⁵⁶ Konstan, Love, pg. 1

⁵⁷ Kelly Rogers. “Aristotle on Loving Another for His Own Sake.” *Phronesis* 39, no. 3 (1994): 291–302. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4182479>. Pg. 2-3

⁵⁸ Rogers, Aristotle on Loving another for His Own Sake, pg. 4

Aristotle examines the concept of human flourishing and the virtues primarily in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. In *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle explores happiness and breaks down the moral and intellectual virtues. The goal of every decision is to pursue the good as an action in connection with one chief purpose.⁵⁹ Pursuing good action and happiness means pursuing the soul's virtues as an activity.⁶⁰ Humanity can acquire virtues through habitation because it is in our nature to do so. It is humanity's nature to pursue virtues, but they are not innate to our nature but acquired. The virtues increase through habitation, such as education, training, or accountability.

Virtues are praiseworthy states, further divided into virtues of thought or intellectual and moral or character.⁶¹ Virtues of thought arise from teaching; hence, they need experience and time to develop. Virtues of character primarily result from habit, not working against nature or by it.⁶² “To sum up: virtue is about pleasures and pains; the actions that are its sources also increase it or, if they are done badly, ruin it; and its activity is about the same actions as those that are its sources.”⁶³ Each virtue is sought with correct reason, aiming to increase pleasure and reduce pain.⁶⁴ Virtues are about moderation between pleasure and pain, not living an excessive life.

As Aristotle defines them, virtues are not feelings or capacities but states.⁶⁵ A virtuous state is the ability of a person to perform their function well within moderation. Virtues then must ride in the intermediate, which Aristotle states is “...what is equidistant from extremity... neither superfluous nor deficient...”⁶⁶ The intermediate or mean is praiseworthy, avoiding each side of

⁵⁹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1097a15-20

⁶⁰ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1102a5-10

⁶¹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1103a5-10

⁶² *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1103a25-26

⁶³ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1104b10; 15

⁶⁴ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1104b5

⁶⁵ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 105b20;10,13-14

⁶⁶ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1106a30-31

the vice. The mean of each virtue is desirable for each person, as some struggle more with one extreme or deficiency. For example, in the character virtues, with fear and over-confidence, the mean is bravery.⁶⁷ Another main component of virtue is that they are voluntary actions; they can only receive blame or praise if they are voluntary.⁶⁸ Aristotle states both ignorance and force fall under the category of involuntary and cannot be virtuous actions.⁶⁹ Someone cannot lay claim to a virtuous action if it is achieved through force. Other essential components of virtue include making sound decisions, deliberation, and wishing for the good. Virtue, therefore, is within the power of the person, as is vice, both involving voluntary decisions and deliberation.⁷⁰

The virtues focused in this project are friendship, justice, and generosity, which are explained in depth in chapters one, two, and three. Friendship concerns everyone and is necessary for life and human flourishing.⁷¹ Friendship contains the characteristics of proportionality, concord, and reciprocated goodwill. Friendship has three types: complete friendship, friendship for utility, and friendship between unequals. Justice does not have a deficiency or excess; it only has a vice, injustice.⁷² Justice contains many subtypes: political justice, justice by nature and law, justice of exchange, justice of rectification, and justice of distribution. Generosity focuses on wealth, with a deficiency of wastefulness and an excess of ungenerosity.⁷³ Generosity aims to decrease the love of wealth and aim for virtuous giving. The goal for a generous person is to take and give to the right sources and avoid taking and giving to the wrong sources. Of the deficiency and excess, wastefulness is avoided by habituation, while ungenerosity is challenging to overcome.

⁶⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1107b

⁶⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1109b30-31

⁶⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1110b5,6-7

⁷⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1113b4-6

⁷¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1155a5-10

⁷² Nicomachean Ethics, 1135a15-20

⁷³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1119b23-25

The second main body of work this project will focus on is “A Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation” by Micheal Zürn.⁷⁴ Zürn presents the theory for global governance and its problems. The governance system, as defined by Zürn, is a “political system that builds on normative principles and reflexive authorities.”⁷⁵ Zürn argues the global governance system contains three components: “...a functionally differentiated global political system, Weber’s sociology of domination, and historical institutionalism.”⁷⁶ Zürn’s governance system fundamentally differs from other systems of world society as it closely follows patterns of authority. Zürn’s system is based on scientific realism as the system is mediated by perception and is incredibly complicated.⁷⁷ The system also includes elements of hierarchy and power struggles.⁷⁸

Zürn’s system builds upon established principles and the influences of many different authorities. Zürn’s system illustrates the exercise of authority across multiple states, exploring norms, rules, and justification. The governance system contains power inequalities, distributional struggles, and hierarchies. According to Zürn, governance includes the common good, though those in authority do not always serve the common good.⁷⁹ Governance includes national, transnational, and regional governance, though Zürn focuses primarily on national and transnational.⁸⁰

While the governance system struggles with power dynamics, it demands change. Zürn states the problems of the governance system point to “internal tensions or contradictions that fuel

⁷⁴ Zürn, Micheal. *Theory of Global Governance: Authority, Legitimacy, and Contestation*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2018.

⁷⁵ Global Governance, Zürn, pg. 3-4

⁷⁶ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 14

⁷⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 15

⁷⁸ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 9-10

⁷⁹ IBID

⁸⁰ Global Governance, Zürn, pg. 5

conflict and demands for change.”⁸¹ Tension and conflict either lead to intense change or lack thereof, creating more problems in the system. Power struggles and issues of self-interest by states do not stop those not in authority from changing the system to their benefit. Zürn attempts to address the problems in the governance system, which are mainly based on patterns of authority. Authority and its associated problems are essential to Zürn’s theory. Zürn’s system is full of issues stemming from power struggles, such as weak separation of powers, legitimation, authority issues, and contestation. Zürn wishes to go beyond a post-internationalist understanding of governance to answer these issues.

Zürn’s governance system concerns different spheres of authority, which all require legitimation. The authority-legitimation link, as Zürn calls it, is what many of the issues in the governance system stem from. Zürn argues legitimation is “...that limitations of autonomy for individual actors through rules require justification.”⁸² Zürn defines authority as “...the logic of deference as a form of power”.⁸³ Authority is based on the acceptance of a decision or an interpretation because it comes from a specific source.”⁸⁴ Authority is founded on subordinates adapting their beliefs and behaviors to a superior power; how that behavior is adapted is debatable. “International and transnational institutions undermine contest that gives rise to delegitimation and, therefore, are evaluated against normative standards.”⁸⁵ Zürn argues for different authority relationships that deal with legitimacy problems such as epistemic, contractual, political, and

⁸¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 14

⁸² Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 62

⁸³ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 38

⁸⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 38

⁸⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 9

inscribed. Legitimacy problems create even more issues, such as contestation, weak separation of powers, and politicization.⁸⁶

Another central issue to Zürn's theory stems from legitimacy problems in contestation. Contestation can frequently be caused by societal factors or neglectful leadership. Zürn addresses the problem of contestation in that it comes in the form of politicization, taking place at the transnational level. Contestation can take the form of state or national; state, however, is more central to Zürn's theory. Contestation gives way to many other issues, such as politicization, fragmentation, and lack of separation of powers. Contestation and legitimacy issues can lead to a decline or a deepening of governance, depending on the challenges.⁸⁷

Decline and deepening are often the consequences seen in the governance system, from legitimacy issues and lack of political change. A deepening is an attempt at re-legitimation, such as increased transparency or added reforms. If leaders respond rightly, deepening can occur, and many positive benefits can come.⁸⁸ A deepening in governance can be taken advantage of if one in authority wishes to improve legitimacy, often due to social pressures. Decline and deepening are both attempts to regain legitimacy. A decline is deadlocking negotiating, which usually fails due to increased politicization.⁸⁹ deepening can often be avoided; however, decline is significantly more complex to reduce.

The problems of contestation, legitimacy, and decline or deepening are seen more often in the governance system that emerged after the 1990s due to many political changes. After the 1990s, authorities started experiencing more legitimation problems due to differences in enforcement and

⁸⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 11

⁸⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg.13

⁸⁸ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 196

⁸⁹ IBID

integrity. Authorities began to lack integrity and, therefore, legitimacy after many of the events in the 1990s, such as the end of the Cold War and economic advancement. Due to the authority-legitimation link, rising political authorities will experience issues such as politicization and sovereignty.⁹⁰ To increase legitimation, Zürn introduces different narratives, such as fairness, participatory, and legal narratives, all built on a shared social purpose. The lack of a shared social purpose is central to the problems in the governance system, as, without one, there is no legitimacy for each authority.

Zürn addresses many other issues in the governance system; however, he believes they can be improved if not ignored. Zürn acknowledges it is difficult to push through the problems in the system; he presents four potential models of global order that many put their faith in.⁹¹ Zürn argues for a few ways of helping the problems seen in the governance system. Still, none will have a substantial or long-term impact. While Zürn presents potential ways to reduce many of the problems in the governance system, they are not foolproof. Each solution Zürn presents has flaws, such as implementing norms, power bias, opportunity, force, and global reach.⁹² Zürn argues that the governance system can become better without so many of these problems. He argues not more for the moral viability of each model but for the empirical credibility. Each model presented for the improving of the system has moral issues such as government overreach, implementation, and concern for individual rights. While Zürn agrees with efforts to mitigate the problems of the governance system, none of the ways he presents mainly act in pursuit of the common good and involves much government overreach. In attempting to have those in authority reduce the problems

⁹⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 105

⁹¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 231

⁹² *Global Governance*, Zürn, pg. 219

in global governance and pursue the common good, a better solution for these problems must be presented.

Section 4: The Integration of Zürn's work and Virtue Ethics

The integration of virtue ethics and Zürn's theory is essential to promoting the common good and human flourishing, which is the goal of this project. "If rules need people to apply them, it would seem to follow that there is merit in looking into the character traits of persons in positions of leadership in international affairs and this, in turn, usually means turning to ethics."⁹³ Ethics can be combined with international affairs to encourage ethical principles. Virtue ethics presents a solution for reducing the problems in the governance system by pursuing the common good.

As discussed by Zürn, virtue ethics offers a practical way to steer international institutions toward more virtuous actions. When implemented in the governance system, virtue ethics would see leaders in authority leveraging specific virtues to enhance their institutions and citizens. The aim of virtue ethics is to lead people towards a better way of living, to control their worst impulses, and to live in the intermediate between excess and deficiency. This ethical framework, particularly due to its aim for the intermediate and goal of human flourishing, can effectively address the issues Zürn identifies in the governance system. Each virtue further contributes to the goal of increasing the common good, thereby minimizing the problems Zürn identifies.

While the common good is often violated, a concern for it does exist in the governance system.⁹⁴ The common good is different than public goods and concerns international rights and obligations to shared interests.⁹⁵ Zürn argues that the common good is a global goal that

⁹³ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 18

⁹⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 8

⁹⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 8

participating states and actors can understand, which is different from public goods.⁹⁶ States are not final and absolute authorities but compete with each other, and public authority depends largely on recognition.⁹⁷ Recognition, self-interest, and lack of concern for international rights are frequently the concerns of international authorities; however, the common good and human flourishing call for a different type of action. Zürn's ideas on how to fix the problems of the governance system neglect the common good and human flourishing, which he acknowledges.

While Aristotle discusses ten virtues of thought and character, particular virtues are more relevant to the discussion of global governance and its problems. The virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity can give insight into global governance issues, as seen by Zürn, and strengthen his potential solutions. Having authority leaders implement the virtues increases the pursuit of human flourishing and the common good while reducing the problems Zürn addresses in the governance system. These virtues can address the main issues in the governance system that Zürn points out, particularly authority relations, contestation, and legitimacy. Arguing for virtue ethics and global governance bases them on moral viability and empirical credibility.

In support for international relations integrating with virtue ethics theory, it is worth exploring the importance of prudential reasoning in implementing ethics and the governance system. Prudence is essential to Aristotle's administration of the virtues, as without prudence no statements can maintain authority. Prudence is associated with careful decision making and thinking before doing.⁹⁸ Prudence according to Aristotle is the central virtue, as it helps decide when to be courageous, honest, or moderate.⁹⁹ Prudence can be associated with forced decisions or purity; however, it is essential for guiding the other virtues. Prudence is the reason why we do

⁹⁶ IBID

⁹⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 9-10

⁹⁸ Klabbers, Virtue in Global Governance, pg. 118

⁹⁹ IBID

things not in our own self-interest, "...we do those things (if we do them at all) because we think we should be doing them, for the greater good of society..."¹⁰⁰ Prudence can aid statesmen and institutions in determining what decisions further contribute to the common good and human flourishing.

Prudence can often be attached to realism and a perspective based in inflexibility. However, an understanding of prudence is crucial for enforcing virtuous actions. As Klabbers states, "...practical wisdom is 'essential for orchestrating the other virtues.'"¹⁰¹ For example, one may recognize the need for justice when someone is stolen from, but without prudence political leaders may not understand how exactly to restore justice. Essentially, prudence aids in administering the virtues through virtuous decision making. "Prudence relates to the 'intelligent management of the component needed for living a good human life.'"¹⁰² As Klabbers states, one cannot determine how one should be generous without prudence, it is the same with all other virtues. Prudence is the central virtue that leads to peace and enforcing the common good. Virtue cannot operate with prudence, and without virtue prudence has nothing to deliberate over.

Section 5: Outline of project

This project explores the virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity and their contributions to the global governance system and its problems. "Some suggest that regulatory changes are all that is needed. Others suggest the need to change the economic system by developing a new global economic ethic. The first is too limited, the second too utopian."¹⁰³ In connection with this idea, this project attempts to find a middle ground between utopian virtue

¹⁰⁰ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 119

¹⁰¹ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 118

¹⁰² Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 119

¹⁰³ Moore, Geoff. "The Virtue of Governance, the Governance of Virtue." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (2012): 293–318. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23223727>. Pg. 293

ethics and only regulatory solutions. This project will address the problems in the governance system and enhance Zürn's goals through Aristotle's virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity. By applying these virtues, those in authority can alleviate the current problems in the global governance system, such as legitimization issues, reflexive and political authority relationships, contestation, lack of separation of powers, sovereignty, fragmentation, social capital dependence, and unjust hierarchies. More importantly, the virtues will help those in authority achieve global governance goals, such as pursuing the common good, establishing a strong separation of powers, reducing power struggles, legitimation, and mitigating polarization. This stress on the potential of Aristotle's virtues to achieve these goals should inspire and motivate our audience and those in authority.

The virtue of friendship, which is explored in chapter one, according to Aristotle, is the backbone of political life and what is needed for man to lead a sufficient life, leading to human flourishing.¹⁰⁴ Aristotle explores different types of friendships and their impact on the political community. For friendship to endure, complete or virtuous friendship must be based on goodwill, concord, mutual benefit, and equality between equal people, as seen in Chapter One, Section Three. A few examples of unequal friendships are still beneficial, but they will eventually break as unequal friendships thrive on advantage and utility and not goodwill. Zürn's authority relationships are central to the problem in the governance system, and contracted, inscribed, and political are all based on utility reflecting unequal relationships, as seen in chapter one, section two.

However, epistemic relationships are based on shared knowledge, understanding, and are based on moral integrity and recognition, more closely resembling complete friendships. The

¹⁰⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1155a5-7

virtue of friendships reduces politicization, contestation, delegitimation, weak separation of power, and lack of coordination in these authority relationships through seeking complete friendships that contain goodwill, mutual benefit, and concord, as in chapter one, section four. The virtue of friendship is seen through the United Nations Security Council, in which different countries with different ideals seek to collaborate for the sake of a shared social purpose and the common good, illustrated in chapter one, section five. While the Council does not work along the guidelines of friendship most of the time, its tenants still align with the virtue.

Justice seeks to understand what makes people just agents, such as lawfulness, fairness, and maintaining happiness for all in the political community.¹⁰⁵ Complete justice, which Aristotle explores first, is not overarching in the law and always aims for the overall happiness of the community. Justice is then divided into different types: distributive, justice of exchange, special justice, justice of rectification, political justice, and justice by nature and by law, as seen in chapter two, section two. Political justice connects to pursuing the common good through a shared social purpose in a legitimation narrative, as seen in chapter two, section four.

Justice in distribution in Zürn's writings is seen through the burdens enforced by authorities, particularly in unjust relations in climate change. Justice in distribution can be illustrated through different legitimation narratives, such as fairness and participatory narrative, which are founded on pursuing a shared social purpose. International institutions' lack of coordination, restitution, and trade is seen through the justice of exchange in Chapters Two, Sections Four and Five. The Kyoto Protocols and the Paris Agreement are examples of distributive justice and justice in exchange. Both seek to prioritize distribution over regulation through

¹⁰⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b15-19

financial efficiency, long-term standards, and fair redistribution, as seen in chapter two, section six.

Generosity's primary goal pertains to wealth and how to use it well. The goal is to distribute resources in ways that benefit others and to err away from wastefulness and ungenerosity. The goal is to give and take from the right sources. Giving away resources frees someone from fear, competition, and survival. Generosity discourages a strong motive in the governance system, which is self-interest. Unjust hierarchies and authority relationships are often maintained by self-interest and economic competition, highly motivated by a love of wealth. Zürn also addresses the issue of legitimacy, and many institutions are considered legitimate by wealth and not by virtue, as explored in chapter three, section two.

In conjunction with governance, generosity illustrates that international institutions should focus less on competition and self-interest dependent on social capital. A decreased dependence on social capital would reduce unjust hierarchies and legitimacy problems, such as a lack of a shared social purpose, as explored in chapter three, section three. The goal of a generous person is not to make more money; therefore, international institutions should not receive goods and services from the wrong sources, which does not benefit citizens or the common good in the long term, as explored in chapter three, section four.

While connected in some part to the problems Zürn addresses in the governance system, each virtue demonstrates examples from current international institutions to illustrate the connections more realistically. The United Nations Security Council, through collaboration, mutual goodwill, and common advantage through the UN charter and collaboration of countries with different viewpoints as seen in friendship. The damage of unequal friendships can be seen in the council through different relationships if they are sought through motives of purely advantage

and utility instead of the common good. The Council aims to collaborate with other countries with similar interests in the common good, increasing legitimacy and human flourishing, as seen in Chapter One, Section Five.

Justice as a virtue, especially distributive justice, focuses on distribution issues regarding climate struggle and lack of equal distribution in the governance system. Illustrating the issue of climate justice, countries with few resources often take more responsibility for the consequences of climate change than the countries that do the damage. In arguing for agreements such as the Kyoto Protocols and Paris Agreements, Aristotle's justice can be seen in tandem with Zürn's argument for legitimation through a shared social purpose advancing toward the common good, as seen in chapter two, section six.

Amnesty International, an epistemic authority legitimized through a strong reputation and trusted knowledge, is shown in generosity, as seen in chapter three, section five. Amnesty International is a Non-Governmental Organization that focuses on at-risk populations in crisis around the globe. Not taking money from any government, illustrating the concept of taking money from the right sources, and reducing politicization is central to Amnesty International. They also allow transparency with all giving, where givers can direct donations to a more specific cause or see annual reports of where money is received. These actions illustrate the concept of giving to the right sources and reducing the problems of politicization and delegitimization because of a lack of shared social purpose.

Section 6: Limitations

This project can only cover three virtues; further research should cover virtues such as truth-telling, bravery, and prudence. Truth-telling has become a rarity in the political system, as

lying is often seen as a necessity.¹⁰⁶ Truth-telling is crucial for the political system as it would motivate those in authority to distribute resources honestly. Honesty regarding trade, collaboration, and political ideals is paramount. Having political leaders who value the virtue of truth-telling would be essential, as lying and concealing the truth is too often a norm in politics.¹⁰⁷

Bravery, as it is choosing rightly despite fear, would motivate the implementation of other virtues and dismantle unjust hierarchies. Bravery involves more than just bravery concerning military matters; it involves all elements of life. Bravery would encourage the ability to choose the virtuous path in governance regardless of fear or risk. Bravery is also essential for maintaining other virtues in the face of political manipulation and risk. Prudence concerns truth and reason above scientific decisions. Prudence is concerned with careful decision-making and avoiding unnecessary risks.¹⁰⁸ Prudence is arguably one of Aristotle's chief virtues; without it, no sound decisions can be made. Prudence is needed for any statesman as it can discern between just and unjust choices, specifically in relationships, for goods and services, and aid with generous giving. Prudence would encourage those in authority to prioritize just decisions over survival, competition, and self-interest.

This project also does not address how to implement virtuous leaders or how to keep them in power. Instead, it discusses the importance of implementing virtues and illustrates them in action. This project's next step, or similar ones, would be to demonstrate how virtuous leaders should obtain and keep power. Further discussion on implementing virtuous leaders is worth exploring through education, initiatives, and ethical codes. Power through ethical codes set by voting patterns is how virtuous leaders could be implemented. The threat of removal from power

¹⁰⁶ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg.114

¹⁰⁷ Klabbers, *Virtue in global governance*, pg. 114

¹⁰⁸ Klabbers, *Virtue in global governance*, pg. 119

or descent into tyranny is often insufficient to keep a person virtuous. However, ensuring ethical leaders come into power and stay in power is essentially under the power of the citizens.

Section 7: Why is this project important?

Aristotle's virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity reduced the problems in the global governance system that Zürn argues for and provided a better solution than the ones discussed by Zürn, contributing further to the common good. However, the need for ethical leaders to help with the current issues in the system may be an obvious concept. International institutions should engage in friendship, acts of justice, and be generous, especially with all the problems illustrated by Zürn. Each virtue is essential to the global governance system and the pursuit of the common good and human flourishing; however, it is worth discussing the critique that each virtue is merely what international institutions should do, not instructions for moral action.

Aristotle's virtues are primarily about pursuing human flourishing or happiness, and the goal of governance is often about the opposite: survival and self-interest. If governance is purely about survival, happiness will become less of a priority, primarily if no higher goal exists. However, according to Klabbers, virtue ethics plays a role in governance regardless of a higher goal being involved, as excellence in human activity and "internal goods are worth striving for..."¹⁰⁹ Zürn argues for the existence of the pursuit of the common good in the global governance system, other priorities just often overpower it. The excellence of human activity would only make that common good stronger. Klabbers states, "...for those to whom politics marks a collective enterprise in pursuit of the common good, the virtues may be far more relevant or take on different characteristics."¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 95

¹¹⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 11

Politics is not only about struggle and wealth but about the common good and human flourishing.¹¹¹ David Estland argues for the pursuit of the understanding of virtues, particularly justice even if full justice cannot be realized. "...view that inquiry in political philosophy could have significant value only as a guide to practical political action, and that understanding true justice would necessarily have practical value, at least as an ideal arrangement to be approximated."¹¹² Even if full justice and virtue is a standard set to high, it is one that should be tried to reach.¹¹³ The study of virtue is valuable, even if idealistic, as one should aim to be virtuous in all situations.

While this project is less of a practical guide to political action, the goal of understanding and implementing the virtues is still worth exploring. The reminder that people and institutions should be virtuous will only increase the common good and reduce the problems in the system. This project does not necessarily focus on practical laws and legalistic framework for leadership but provides motivation for leadership to pursue ethical goals. This project illustrates the importance of virtue and virtuous outcomes for the political community and individual. It also illustrates what problems can be prevented with virtuous leadership in place. Without a concern for virtue ethics politics become heavily focused on power, survival, self-interest, and wealth. Virtue ethics contains the desire for love, public interest, fair distribution of resources, and increased giving. It is important to note that these desires are idealistic, optimistic, and often considered impractical however, that in no way decreases their importance. Caring for your fellow man based upon

¹¹¹ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 105

¹¹² Estland, David. "Utopophobia: On the Limits (If Any) of Political Philosophy." Princeton University Press. https://press.princeton.edu/books/hardcover/9780691147161/utopophobia?srltid=AfmBOoqiUQXCcQKERO_Pmg5fk7QUP2T06O_N28bfzmiBA8uRq5Mz7Vvh.

¹¹³ IBID

intrinsic character, relationships based on concord, proportionate justice, and transparent giving will always be impractical, but they are also essential for human flourishing and political good.

Friendship

Aristotle's section on friendship is one of the most significant virtues in the Nicomachean Ethics as he states that friendship is "...most necessary for our life."¹¹⁴ Friendship is a translation of the word "philia," meaning familial relationships.¹¹⁵ He argues everyone needs friends no matter their position in life or how much power they hold. Friendship should not be overlooked as it prevents people in the city-state from warring against each other, working hand in hand with justice.¹¹⁶ People are highly praised for friendship and for contributing to others' prosperity. Friendship can also aid people in poverty and areas of weakness.¹¹⁷

Ideal friendship, argues Aristotle, is between people near perfect in virtue.¹¹⁸ The essential competent of friendship is that "friendships generate self-knowledge that is importantly necessary for maintaining and cultivating virtue."¹¹⁹ It is similar virtue recognized by others as the grounds for friendship. Friendship, as understood by Cocking is "...account of relations between friendship and virtue where the shared activity of ideal friendship is imagined to maintain and generate virtue and a morally valuable life."¹²⁰ Friendship's primary goal is to generate virtue and value. Friendship, according to Aristotle, is "reciprocated goodwill."¹²¹ In this sense, friendship is jointly

¹¹⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1155a25-1

¹¹⁵ Kraut, Aristotle's Ethics, Sandford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

¹¹⁶ Miller, Aristotle's Political Theory, Sandford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

¹¹⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1155a10-6

¹¹⁸ Cocking, Dean. "Aristotle, Friendship and Virtue." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 68, no. 267 (1) (2014): 83-90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24776785>. Pg. 83

¹¹⁹ Cocking, Aristotle, friendship, and virtue, pg. 84

¹²⁰ Cocking, Aristotle, friendship, and virtue, pg. 85

¹²¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1155b30-4

wishing good things for the other party without self-interest getting in the way. Friendship is bound within the notion of human flourishing, which is essential for understanding virtue.¹²²

Aristotle explores three types of friendships and how they apply to different relationships: parent to child, equal to unequal, and between various governments. These three types of friendships correspond to their objects of love.¹²³ Friendship between the family is natural, while friendship among low-income people is seen as a refuge. Even though friendship reciprocates goodwill, goodwill does not exist in all three types of friendship.¹²⁴ Reciprocated goodwill means that both parties are aware of the goodwill and wish it to each other. Friendships with a goal only for the sake of the friends' pleasure will dissolve quickly, but friendships based on the other's good will be complete and enduring.

A complete friendship between virtuous people will benefit the political community the most. Complete friendship is “friendship of good people similar in virtue, for they wish goods in the same way to each other insofar as they are good, and they are good in their own right.”¹²⁵ Friendship concerns both parties being good without qualification and being advantageous but for the other person. Friendship connects with shared activity in the political community. “Aristotle's argument here is in terms of the reciprocity of our shared activity with others being importantly necessary to what it is to maintain and generate virtue and to pursuing a worthwhile life.”¹²⁶ Shared activity and reciprocity are essential to many virtues but crucial in friendship, as it is based on connected lives.

¹²² Cooper, John M. “Aristotle on the Forms of Friendship.” *The Review of Metaphysics* 30, no. 4 (1977): 619–48. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20126987>. Pg. 619

¹²³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1156a5,9-10

¹²⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1156a5-2

¹²⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1156b,6-10

¹²⁶ Cocking, Aristotle, friendship, and virtue, pg. 87

Unequal friendships aim to maintain pleasure and advantage; hence, they can often dissolve. Friendships based only on pleasure and advantage will not last, as the people involved do not love solely for who the person is. Friendships based on advantage, according to Aristotle, are more often found among the old, while those of youth pursue those of pleasure.¹²⁷ In the political community, friendship among unequals is unlikely as superiority in both power and virtue is not usually found.¹²⁸ Those in the political community must work to ensure friendship among superiors and those under them, involves reciprocity, is not for advantage only, and is enduring.

Section 1: Unvirtuous Friendship and Zürn's Authority Relationships

Friendship as a virtue defines how Aristotle views relationships through reciprocity, advantage, and utility. A complete friendship between individuals prioritizing others' goodwill is the goal; however, unvirtuous friendships that are only based on utility are more often the norm. Zürn's relationships in the governance system are primarily friendships of utility and advantage, thus not enduring. Zürn discusses relationships in global governance; his focus is primarily on authority, contestation, and legitimacy. Zürn's authority relationships are bound by self-interest, force, love of power, and changing loyalties. Authority relationships that prioritize self-interest and lack of loyalty lead to many of the problems in the governance system.

Zürn addresses the issue of contestation, where states are power-laden and leading to institutional inequality. Politicization is also a significant issue for Zürn, in which unpolitical matters are made political. Politicization and contestation focus on utility instead of mutual goodwill. The virtue of friendship reduces each of these issues by establishing virtuous authority relationships, providing another motive for goodwill, and protecting individual rights instead of

¹²⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1165a25-30

¹²⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1158a35-3

utility, survival, and lack of limitation to sovereignty.¹²⁹ Friendship also contributes to the common good and human flourishing by decreasing these problems, primarily contestation and protecting individual rights.

Zürn's understanding of authority relationships stems from previous teachings of two relationships that branch into two types: contracted and inscribed. Contracted authority relationships are reason-based and focused mainly on institutions and law.¹³⁰ Inscribed authority relationships are not based on freedom and autonomy but on production and the distribution of social capital. Zürn's authority relationships are primarily reflexive, which still have epistemic foundations. These relationships are based on the logic of action and not appropriateness. Contracted and inscribed, while not inherently Zürn's idea, play a role in the governance system.

According to Zürn, there are two types of reflective authorities, political and epistemic, which are each founded on the understanding of epistemic constructions.¹³¹ Political authorities are based on the ability to make decisions, while epistemic authorities are based on the ability to make interpretations based on relevant knowledge. Political authority relationships are based on the idea that there needs to be institutions making decisions to further the common good. Political authorities' decisions are often bound by force and give way to shifting loyalties. Epistemic authorities are governed by reputation, operating through expert knowledge and moral integrity. Each type of relationship can connect to Aristotle's types of friendship. Contracted and inscribed relationships mimic unvirtuous friendships, as they rely on advantage to sustain themselves. While epistemic relationships are similar to virtuous friendships in that they rely on relevant knowledge and have a stronger connection to furthering the common good than any other authority

¹²⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 35

¹³⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 41

¹³¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 51

relationship. Friendship as a virtue encourages a more significant contribution to the common good through sustainable authority relationships based on goodwill.

Friendship, as a complete virtue, should be based on mutual goodwill and proportionality. The goal of a virtuous friendship is love and goodwill for both parties for who the person or community is, not for pleasure. Political friendships should also be based on mutual love and goodwill. Friendships based on utility or pleasure alone are easily dissolved; these types of friendships are similar to contracted authority relationships.¹³² Contracted authority relationships are worth exploring even though they are not based on Zürn's understanding of authority but on those he criticizes. Contracted authorities hold only as long as the contract benefits both sides.¹³³ If authority relationships are based on contracts, the authority will pursue friendship based purely on mutual utility, which is inherently unstable.

Friendships are based on utility and contracted authority relationships. Authority in these relationships only exists as long as one authority recognizes an obligation to obey, resting on the legitimacy of the original command. The friendship dissolves when the friendship no longer becomes useful, or the command is no longer legitimate. Once the commands lose weight, so will the friendship, which is not based on mutual benefits but force. For example, Zürn argues, "... the smaller partners recognize US leadership in certain issue areas return for protection and the provision of collective goods."¹³⁴ Relationships are based on the collection of goods and are often one-sided, meaning once those goods decrease, so does the relationship. The relationship only exists if the interests are well defined, meaning a utility friendship, such as many US-based trade relations with other countries, will dissolve quickly. Those relations may cease to benefit the US

¹³² Nicomachean Ethics, 1156a20

¹³³ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 41

¹³⁴ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 42

or other countries with tariffs increasing. In the political community, the superior state often has fewer consequences from dissolved relationships. However, the “lesser” state may have relied on that friendship even if it is no longer helpful to another party.

Contracted authority relationships are reason and legitimacy-based. They hold only as long as the contract benefits both sides.¹³⁵ Organizations in contracted relationships form a social contract based on mutual interest. These relationships have advantages, such as mutual recognition and reduced contestation between international authorities. However, contracted authority is based on excess voluntarism and can lose sight of just hierarchies established within governance institutions.¹³⁶ Contracted authorities will only continue if the resources are mutually beneficial, hence the value of utility in the relationship. Aristotle warns of friendship that is purely for utility and pleasure, not for who the person is.¹³⁷ Aristotle states friendships for pleasure alone dissolve quickly, especially if resources or benefits do not remain the same. Often, in contracted authority relationships, one institution falls short in providing goods and services, or the interest of one state is no longer there. The cause of the relationship or friendship is removed and, therefore, dissolved. The friendship is short-lived and does not benefit the larger common good in the governance system. Long-lasting friendships that are not mainly based on advantage increasingly contribute to the common good.

Inscribed authority relationships also have motives similar to those of contracted relationships and will dissolve quickly.¹³⁸ Inscribed relationships are based on a social order of production, not freedom or autonomy. They place a heavy emphasis on social capital and social

¹³⁵ IBID

¹³⁶ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 42

¹³⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, pg. 1156a15

¹³⁸ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 43

order. Inscribed relationships follow the rules of advantage as their foundation is social capital and production. Those in these relationships know what is expected of them based on a shared understanding of social order. While these relationships are more virtuous than contracted, the moment the social order is violated, they would dissolve. As Zürn points out, the danger of internalization would lead to a relationship based on utility and advantage and, therefore, a short-term friendship.¹³⁹

Political authorities are one of the two sub-types of Zürn's understanding of authority, followed by epistemic, which both stem from reflexive authority. Political authorities make binding decisions for the common good, often using force.¹⁴⁰ They frequently take the form of international institutions that can circumvent consent through majority votes or dominance of power. These international institutions can become prey to changing loyalties and easy potential exit strategies from relationships.¹⁴¹ Political authority relationships rely on the power of majorities and unjust force, thus being bound to the goal of advantage. Many political authority relationships are unvirtuous due to fragmentation (lack of coordination) or lack of loyalty to established relationships.¹⁴² Aristotle states, "Those who are friends for utility dissolve the friendship as soon as the advantage is removed; for they were never friends of each other, but what was expedient for them."¹⁴³ Expediency can be derived from fragmentation and extended loyalties produced by political authorities, leading to short-term friendships. Contracted, inscribed, and political authority relationships can all lead to unvirtuous friendships that eventually dissolve and contribute little to the common good.

¹³⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 45

¹⁴⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 51

¹⁴¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 52

¹⁴² Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 51,57

¹⁴³ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1157a15-15-17

Section 2: Virtuous friendships and Zürn's authority relationships

According to Aristotle, virtuous friendships or complete friendships are between virtuous people who wish for resources in the same way.¹⁴⁴ These friendships last as long as they are good and benefit both parties. The goal of a virtuous friendship is that good is achieved purely for the person's sake, not for their own advantage. Goodness in a virtuous friendship is based on reciprocity and concord, not pleasure. The virtuous do not choose fortune first but shared activity with the goal of human flourishing. "The virtuous would not choose it since the reciprocity of the expression of virtue through our activity with others is importantly necessary to maintaining and generating one's virtue."¹⁴⁵ Aristotle states that these friendships are rare and take time to develop.¹⁴⁶ Complete friendships are rarer in the governance system but are the most beneficial relationship to the common good and human flourishing.

Zürn argues for another type of relationship that comes from reflexive relationships: epistemic authority relationships. Epistemic authority relationships are the foundation of many parts of the governance system and most closely resemble virtuous friendships. Epistemic authority relationships provide interpretations that structure the behavior of others.¹⁴⁷ They rely on expert knowledge and moral integrity to convince people factually; in summary, it is governance by reputation. Relying on reputation and moral integrity to produce decisions and behavior patterns is the best way to maintain virtuous friendships. Organizations with epistemic relations can include Greenpeace, The Red Cross, and parts of the United Nations. Organizations such as these will monitor norms and will attempt to be non-partisan.¹⁴⁸ The number of epistemic authorities has

¹⁴⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1156b5-8-10

¹⁴⁵ Cocking, Aristotle, friendship, and virtue, pg. 87

¹⁴⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1156b25-26

¹⁴⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 52

¹⁴⁸ IBID

increased dramatically, according to Zürn, potentially due to the reliance on authority based on knowledge and morality instead of contractual or social obligation.¹⁴⁹

Complete friendship involves what is loveable and choice-worthy between good people.¹⁵⁰ Complete friendships are closest to the goals of the common good and human flourishing. “For it is only here that he directly expresses himself on the nature, and importance to a flourishing human life, of taking an interest in other persons, merely as such and for their own sake.”¹⁵¹ Those “good people” will then decide to become friends not based on pleasure or advantage but for mutual goodwill for each person. Complete friendship is based on the desire for goodwill for the other person. Organizations that strive for authority by reputation and moral integrity will have relationships based on goodwill. Goodwill, as defined by Aristotle, is trusting the other person's reputation and that they are not involved in the friendship for utility or advantage. Implementing virtuous friendship involves prioritizing epistemic authority relationships over contracted and inscribed. Authority relationships should be based on goodwill, moral integrity, and sound reputation. Complete friendship contrasts with friendships most often displayed in the governance system, such as contracted and inscribed relationships, shifting the focus to friendship based on mutual goodwill.

Section 3: Friendship and Legitimation Problems

The governance system contains many issues from different authority relationships and their position in the normative order. These authority relationships produce many of the problems in the governance system due to their main focus on economic competition, self-interest, and love of power. Virtuous friendship reduces many issues in the governance system, such as contestation,

¹⁴⁹ IBID

¹⁵⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1157b25-26

¹⁵¹ Cooper, Aristotle on the forms of friendship, pg. 622

legitimation, politicization, lack of coordination, and weak separation of powers. Virtuous or complete friendship encourages private citizens or, when translated to institutions, to have relationships based on mutual goodwill, equality and proportionality (but not similarity), and honorable distribution of goods.

Institutions in authority struggle with a significant problem in the governance system: legitimation. Authority and legitimation are connected by the idea that institutions cannot act in authority without justification (legitimation).¹⁵² Legitimation becomes the defining component of any government needing to justify its roles in a larger context. Legitimation beliefs are based on the need to sustain socially constructed systems such as norms, values, and beliefs.¹⁵³ Legitimation directly results from features of authority that their audience cares about. According to Zürn, legitimacy is based on “...the outcome of a social process where individuals' prior beliefs interact with legitimation and delegation.”¹⁵⁴

Authority and legitimacy are based on willingness to follow, argues Zürn.¹⁵⁵ Zürn makes it clear that legitimacy is not the primary social goal or purpose; instead, it is dependent on shared social purposes. “Legitimation usually involves the claim that the social purpose-which is the reason authority was institutionalized in the first place-is being pursued with impartiality.”¹⁵⁶ Legitimation without a shared social purpose can lead to a biased authority, reflecting political inequality and unjust hierarchies.¹⁵⁷ An “impartial pursuit of collective norms is the foundation for

¹⁵² Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 62

¹⁵³ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 67

¹⁵⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 67

¹⁵⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 65

¹⁵⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 68

¹⁵⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 85

legitimacy.”¹⁵⁸ Further consequences stem from legitimation problems, such as lack of a shared social purpose, contestation, and politicization.

Consequences of the authority-legitimation link led to either contestation or politicization by both societal and state actions.¹⁵⁹ Contestation between states occurs when international institutions become overwhelmed with power due to distributional problems.¹⁶⁰ Two consequences arise from contestation between state actors: institutionalized inequality and sovereign equality. Powerful actors create international institutions with a specific social purpose, pre-determining distributional issues.¹⁶¹

International authorities can give way to institutionalized inequality by allowing weaker states to create a power base with gridlocks against existing institutions.¹⁶² These gridlocks can lead to a decline or a deepening of global governance and create more hierarchical inequality. Institutionalized equality from the beginning, connected with no separation of powers, will lead to a shift in power distribution. Sovereign equality is created when powerful actors do not use their dominance to institutionalize inequality and power dynamics crash within authority spheres.¹⁶³ This most often occurs when the rules of an institution do not control the outcomes and procedures of that institution.¹⁶⁴ Powerful states may give the weaker ones a voice, but if change does not occur, power may shift and potentially be lost.

The powerful states delegitimize the existing institutions by redistributing institutional power. The new, suddenly powerful, weaker states may attempt to decrease delegitimation by

¹⁵⁸ IBID

¹⁵⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 95

¹⁶⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 96

¹⁶¹ IBID

¹⁶² IBID

¹⁶³ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 97

¹⁶⁴ IBID

incorporating or ignoring the new actors. However, if demands for change are not met, then it can lead to challenges of authority and eventually a decline or deepening of governance. A lack of cooperation and friendship marks both sovereign equality and institutionalized inequality. Pre-determined decisions characterize institutionalized inequality, whereas friendship demands freedom of choice between parties. Friendship also brings about the return of goods proportionate to worth and equality in outcome. Sovereign equality calls for relationships based on power, which can quickly lead to more problems instead of basing it on proportionality. Sovereign equality is based on love of power, not goodwill and concord between parties, as friendship is.

Another problem Zürn discusses that contributes to legitimacy issues is the lack of a shared social purpose. The lack of a shared social purpose is arguably the most significant legitimacy problem and is closely connected to the notion of the common good. Legitimacy is an “...institutional virtue that remains dependent on some shared goals or social purpose.”¹⁶⁵ Zürn provides different ways to pursue a shared social purpose and increase legitimacy, but they require minimal coherence. “Faith in legitimacy dissipates immediately if the rulers are perceived as being exclusively self-serving.”¹⁶⁶ The shared social purpose of institutions should be impartial and consist of common goals. If the authority focuses on self-interest and power, legitimacy will decrease as there is no pursuit of a shared social purpose. Due to a need for a shared social purpose, authorities must produce the belief that they serve a common good.¹⁶⁷ The common good is essential to a shared social purpose, as is human flourishing. Complete friendships rest on the idea of mutually beneficial goals with a lack of utility; this idea is central to the common good and

¹⁶⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 67

¹⁶⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 68

¹⁶⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 69

social purpose needed for legitimacy. A shared social purpose in authority is essential to pursuing the common good, human flourishing, and complete friendships.

The goal of an authority is not a direct acceptance of their authority but support for values broadly shared within a community and the extent to which an authority inputs those values. Zürn presents many ways to increase legitimacy; however, each way either needs to be blended or contradicts each other. Institutions cannot use all the ways to pursue legitimation, causing the idealization of one particular way and a lack of authority.¹⁶⁸ Zürn argues that any legitimation process consists of impartiality and social purpose.¹⁶⁹ If leadership implements friendships as a shared social purpose instead of shared economic value and mutual self-interest. Legitimation problems will decrease as the components of friendship, such as mutual goodwill, proportionality, and Zürn's requirement of impartiality and minimal fairness.

Impartiality is supported by the idea of friendship between equals that gives way to equal benefits. Impartiality is central to legitimation and is also key to complete friendships. Impartiality goes beyond minimal fairness to treat cases alike, as does friendship between equals for the mutual benefit of exchanging services.¹⁷⁰ Legitimation will fade if the authority is seen serving special interests; friendship is meant to serve both parties proportionately, prolonging legitimation. Proportionality, reciprocity, and impartiality are all components of complete friendship, which increase legitimacy and a shared social purpose. In connection with the virtue of justice, social purpose is further sustained by friendship, which is a state of concord and goodwill for those in

¹⁶⁸ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 77

¹⁶⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 68

¹⁷⁰ *IBID*, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1162b10-14

the political community. Friendship calls those in the relationship to just action, creating an underlying social purpose that Zürn needs for legitimacy.¹⁷¹

A growing problem in the governance system is public resistance to international institutions and their administration, which is also known as politicization.¹⁷² Politicization is essentially one actor moving something into another space, precisely a political space.¹⁷³ Politicization consists of wishing for more international authority while also challenging existing authority. Zürn argues that there are a few examples of politicization in international institutions, such as the United Kingdom Independence Party, the Association for the Taxation of Financial Transactions and Citizens, and the German AfD.¹⁷⁴ Public resistance to the ideals of international institutions and also more intensive utilization of institutions are both examples of politicization. It can also involve moving something into the political sphere that was previously unpolitical.¹⁷⁵ Politicization can lead to a temporary broadening of legitimation narratives through international economic institutions. Politicization is moving something into the realm of public choice, where the polarization of an issue and decision collectivization often occur.¹⁷⁶ Complete politicization consists of three elements: "...the growing salience of issues, involving a polarization of opinion, and expansion of actors and audience engaged."¹⁷⁷

The main problem with politicization is that collaboration and friendship become a political tool, not based on mutual goodwill. Political decisions are being made for necessity survival and

¹⁷¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 69

¹⁷² Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 137

¹⁷³ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 139

¹⁷⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 137

¹⁷⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 139

¹⁷⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 140

¹⁷⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 140

not for choice and nature.¹⁷⁸ Institutions are accused of entering into collaborations for purely political and even selfish reasons, not for the benefit of the common good and mutual goodwill. Complete friendship is most often separate from the dangers of politicization in that the parties' priorities are goodwill, love, concord, and mutual benefit. Complete friendship also allows for more freedom of choice between parties, decreasing the choices that moved into the political sphere for unjust reasons. There will be less politicization due to friendship among virtuous leaders and in overtly virtuous institutions.

Legitimation problems continue with coordination issues and a lack of separation of powers. Institutions in authority also struggle with coordination between themselves.¹⁷⁹ Zürn argues that a constitutionalized system can potentially make all final decisions when conflict arises, becoming a system of rule not based on free choice. This system of rule relies on force and is systematic. Coordination is a foundational aspect of the governance system; however, due to force and lack of separation of powers make this challenging. Lack of coordination between authorities gives way to one institution having to make decisions.

Lack of coordination and cooperation can lead to conflicts only being resolved by competition, which can produce fragmentation.¹⁸⁰ Cooperation and friendship reduced the danger of fragmentation in conflict. Virtuous friendship is a state of good and equal people, encouraging cooperation. Aristotle states, "Reciprocal loving requires decision, and decision comes from a state; and (good people) wish to the beloved for his own sake in accord with their state, not their feeling."¹⁸¹ In this sense, decisions do not come from one particular institution but from many

¹⁷⁸ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 139

¹⁷⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 55

¹⁸⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 57

¹⁸¹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1157b30-31-32

involved in coordination. Intuitions with an understanding of the rules of virtuous friendship would give way to better coordination and further equality among intuitions.

According to Zürn, different types or spheres of authority can interact with each other in various ways, creating balance and dominance issues.¹⁸² The process by which different authorities balance each other out is called the “separation of powers.” Separation of powers is similar to the rule of law, forming the modern constitutional state. Separation of powers is part of the program to decentralize political rule by delegitimizing it. The executive and legislative branches of government must be equally limited by law and collectively.¹⁸³ Separation of powers ensures equality and that each branch follows its law. Laws must be applied consistently, and all cases must be treated alike, ensuring equality and proportionality.

While some separation of powers is seen in international institutions, laws are often made to protect individual actors and apply political influence. While justice can also prevent weak separation of powers, friendship can act as a check between each power to secure the rule of law. Friendship ensures just action and a lack of selfishness among political leaders and those in complete friendship. Friendship sees the separation of powers as good enforcing it through the proportionality of state power. Friendship also benefits the community and renews honor, even among unequal friendships. Friendship is formed based on trust, laws must be upheld, and their outcome must be ensured, ensuring the rule of law.¹⁸⁴ Complete friendship aids in the problems of contestation, legitimation, politicization, lack of coordination, and weak separation of powers due to its aim of goodwill, concord, proportionate exchange of goods, and mutual state of love.

Section 4: Case study: The United Nations, the National Security Counsel

¹⁸² Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 58

¹⁸³ IBID

¹⁸⁴ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1162b30-31

Authority relationships have many issues, though some have fewer problems of legitimacy than others and more closely resemble complete friendships such as epistemic authority relationships. Epistemic authority relationships have increased over the years, according to Zürn.¹⁸⁵ They are the authorities that provide “interpretations that structure the behavior of others.”¹⁸⁶ Epistemic authority relationships rest on expert knowledge, moral integrity, and governance by reputation. Epistemic authorities are founded on reputation and not necessarily the ability to convince people based on fact.

Governance through strong reputations is the foundation of institutions such as non-profits, environmental organizations, and some political organizations. Zürn argues epistemic institutions can be organizations such as Greenpeace, Amnesty International, and The United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.¹⁸⁷ Organizations such as these are influential and credible, relying primarily on their reputation.¹⁸⁸ These organizations aim to monitor norms supported by complete friendship, increase the shared social purpose, contribute to the common good, and reduce authority problems. Zürn’s example of the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs as an epistemic authority can branch to other parts of the United Nations, such as the National Security Council.

The United Nations Security Council can seek to have collaboration and cooperation with different countries and other organizations, allowing for complete friendship, in certain situations and for limited time. The Security Council aims to demonstrate moral integrity and governance through reputation through friendships based on mutual goodwill and endurance. Presidency in the

¹⁸⁵Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 52

¹⁸⁶ IBID

¹⁸⁷ IBID

¹⁸⁸ IBID

council votes based on contributions to international peace and order. Often, the presidency is awarded based on financial or leadership contributions to peacekeeping operations. The council seeks to resolve conflict through negotiation, arbitration, and other peaceful means, with peacekeeping missions being the more drastic ways of resolving conflict. Resolving conflict through peaceful means is essentially the council's purpose, which is done through collaboration and cooperation, meaning friendship.

The United Nations Security Council consists of fifteen members: five permanent and ten non-permanent.¹⁸⁹ The non-permanent members are elected for two years, and every country has one representative and vote. The permanent members are the US, Great Britain, Russia, China, and France. Each member of the Council enforces the idea that conflict can resolve itself through cooperation. Each representative understands that they are responsible for carrying out international peace and security and that the council can act on their behalf. While the organization is based on sovereign equality, the goal is to pursue all obligations set forth by the charter in good faith.¹⁹⁰ The purpose is to impose notions on each of the 193 countries to increase peace. The council seeks to address threats to national security, foster negotiations, authorize the use of force, and impose sanctions.¹⁹¹ Members of the organization should also ensure that states, not members of organizations, fulfill the principles set forth by the charter.¹⁹² Overall, the social purpose of the Council is to reduce conflict through peaceful means and collaboration, thus increasing the common good.

¹⁸⁹ "United Nations Charter, Chapter V: The Security Council." United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>.

¹⁹⁰ "United Nations Charter, Chapter II: Membership." United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>.

¹⁹¹ "The UN Security Council." The Council on Foreign Relationships. Last modified September 9, 2024. <https://www.cfr.org/background/un-security-council>.

¹⁹² IBID

The Council has changed little since its founding, raising concerns about the Council's ability to handle global crises and the need for reform. As stated in the purposes and principles section, "...the United Nations aims to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect and to develop harmonizing actions for common ends."¹⁹³ Many countries do not see themselves as having common ends, deviating from the social purpose of the Council. Additionally, many countries with permanent membership do not have "friendly relations" but must aim to promote peace and security. Many believe the Council fails to represent many regions of the world, and the use of the veto power increases functionality concerns.¹⁹⁴ The Security Council attempts to maintain friendship and collaboration under intense disagreements over human rights, economic constraints, and territorial problems. Often, collaboration is based on immediate need and economic competition, not long-term benefits and mutual goodwill for private citizens. Collaboration and friendship must continue to protect peace, which is the Council's ideal social purpose and common good.

Zürn states, "Hence, otherwise powerful members such as the United States or states from the European Union (EU) face a coalition institutional winner-materially weak but formally empowered, ensuring that institution is not easily adaptable to great power demands."¹⁹⁵ The council cannot often adapt to power demands without increased collaboration. Many states in the Security Council use their previous background to sustain power instead of maintaining collaboration, primarily due to the "one-state, one-vote principle."¹⁹⁶ The Security Council frequently breaches beyond its charter, moving beyond sovereign equality and towards global

¹⁹³ "United Nations Charter, Chapter I: Purposes and Principles." United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>.

¹⁹⁴ "The UN Security Council." The Council on Foreign Relationships.

¹⁹⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 97

¹⁹⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 97

responsibility.¹⁹⁷ It is essential for these states to move beyond sovereign equality and towards global responsibility intertwined with complete friendship and a shared social purpose. Peace and security can be enhanced when friendship and collaboration are pursued in a regulated but virtuous state.

Trent argues, "It has been said that there has not been a single day since the Second World War when there has not been deadly political conflict somewhere in the world. Often, this calls for action by the United Nations."¹⁹⁸ "...the assumption that the United Nations is in principle an organization dedicated to the promotion of international peace."¹⁹⁹ This assumption is that the Security Council is an organization of peace and is central to participating nations. The Security Council has had to increase action in international conflict; therefore, there is an increased need for collaboration between its members. Many countries have continued to have strained relationships due to conflicts with individual rights or previous history.

Currently, relations between the United States and China are strained at best, and ties between Russia and the rest of the members are arguably entirely broken. Relationships between Israel and the rest of the members, including the United States continued use of its veto power to protect Israel, have increased conflict with the rest of the members. In the Security Council, the agents are representatives for each country, acting in the interest of each citizen. The representatives must strive to maintain a virtuous friendship with other representatives so that each citizen can rely on them. Without collaboration and friendship between each representative, no conflict will be resolved, thus decreasing the council's primary social purpose. Friendships will

¹⁹⁷ Trent, John, and Laura Schnurr. "Peace and Security: Fixing the Security Council." In *A United Nations Renaissance: What the UN Is, and What It Could Be*, 1st ed., 56–70. Verlag Barbara Budrich, 2018. <https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvdf03xp.7>. Pg. 56

¹⁹⁸ Trent, Peace and Security: Fixing the Security Council, pg. 58

¹⁹⁹ Claude, Inis L. "The United Nations, the United States, and the Maintenance of Peace." *International Organization* 23, no. 3 (1969): 621–36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706073>. Pg. 621

break when sought for advantage, survival, and economic competition, unlike ones sought for goodwill, benefits on both sides, and concord. The friendship between representatives needs to be sought for mutual goodwill and the common good, not the self-interest of each individual representative; otherwise, the common good will not increase.

Relationships in the United Nations have fluctuated between friendship and friction, often due to changing administrations and different desires for how conflict should be handled.²⁰⁰ However, friendship is usually sustained due to concern for peace and the common good. Other nations frequently hesitate to maintain friendships due to human rights issues or strained economic relationships. However, assumptions should not be made as friendship and collaboration are the backbone of the National Security Council, and without them, no resolutions would have been possible. Complete friendship is needed for the Council to reduce conflict, sustain collaboration, and increase peace and the common good.

Examples of friendship between nations, regardless of tension, are essential to increasing the common good. Recently, progress has been made in building a friendship with China. According to Aristotle, a friendship between China and the United States is not virtuous in the sense that China and the United States are not equal in good and power.²⁰¹ The United States is arguably more concerned about human rights than China and has more significant concerns for the common good, thus not making them equal. While a friendship between the US and China is not a complete friendship, it is not the goal in Aristotle's eyes. However, it is still helpful to explore as it shows an example of a type of authority relationship and friendship that exists in the governance system, and the characteristics of the virtue can still be useful. It is considered a

²⁰⁰ Howard, Lise Morjé. "Sources of Change in United States-United Nations Relations." *Global Governance* 16, no. 4 (2010): 485–503. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29764963>. Pg. 485

²⁰¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1162b10-11-13

friendship between unequals, but this type of friendship can still be helpful to the governance system, political community, and common good.

Wuthnow argues China has had mixed corroborative narratives but has increased responses to human rights issues, for example, "...pressuring Zimbabwe by reducing development aid and forging links with opposition parties."²⁰² Wuthnow also states that adapting to a cooperative approach is in China's best interest. While China's authority rests on inscribed and contracted authorities and less on epistemic, its representative becomes an epistemic authority during Security Council meetings. China's ability to pass resolutions and collaborate with other countries is based on its reputation, and these decisions cannot be made solely on utility. As Aristotle states, friendship for utility is liable to an accusation, but complete friendship wishes for an equal exchange of goods. Complete friendship would advocate for a proportionate exchange of goods and services regardless of previous history and continued conflict between relationships, especially that of the United States and China.

Complete friendship contains the characteristic of goodwill, and it must be mutual and more than mere well-wishing but actively assisting the other.²⁰³ The distinction between collaboration and complete friendship is that the state should actively assist in mutual benefit, even if they are of an unequal nature or status. Complete friendship calls for reciprocity concerning goods and goodwill, not for utility. As Wuthnow states, in practice, this can look like this, "...working within structures such as the Security Council reinforces the practice of multilateralism and, at least in principle, encourages the United States to put faith in these processes rather than seeking unilateral answers to problems over which China would like to

²⁰² Wuthnow, Joel. "China and the Processes of Cooperation in UN Security Council Deliberations." *The Chinese Journal of International Politics* 3, no. 1 (2010): 55–77. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/48615780>. Pg. 58

²⁰³ TRACY, THEODORE. "Perfect Friendship in Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics.'" *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 65–75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23061134>. Pg. 66

exercise influence.”²⁰⁴ Friendship between the United States and China should rely on processes of equal exchange, not singular decisions made by one power. The Security Council allows states like China and the US, while they may be unequal in Aristotle’s definition of virtue, to exercise opinion and action in acts of friendship to produce more for the common good. The Security Council also offers a platform for two unequals in virtue bodies to collaborate on decisions of peace to increase the common good and human flourishing.

When the rules of virtuous friendships are not followed, they dissolve quickly and do little for the common good. Virtuous friendships require the pursuit of mutually beneficial activities and proportionate exchange of goods and ideas. Friendship not based on these ideals will be short-lived. For example, in Israeli-US relations previously, the friendship was the strongest Israel possessed. Most of the United States' veto power was used to prevent resolutions per Israeli conflict; however, this has ceased in recent years.²⁰⁵ Still, due to Israelis seeking the relationship solely for their own utility, it is under immense strain, among other reasons. The United States has condemned many of Israeli actions and pulled back foreign aid due to its border disputes and other actions, states Schiff.²⁰⁶ It was once noted that the United States would leave the Security Council if Israel were asked to go; that statement would arguably not stand due to recent changes in the friendship. The friendship was to the Israeli advantage and minimal advantage of the United States. Thus, the priority of the friendship decreased.

Another friendship under strain is that of the United States and Mexico. Friendship between the United States and Mexico has become under increased strain in recent years due to increased tension amongst leaders. Even though they are neighbors, the friendship between the two countries

²⁰⁴ Wuthnow, China and the Processes of Cooperation in UN Security Council Deliberations, pg. 58-59

²⁰⁵ "The UN Security Council." The Council on Foreign Relationships.

²⁰⁶ Schiff, Ze'ev. "U.S. and Israel: Friendship Under Strain." *The National Interest*, no. 10 (1987): 3–12. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/42894477>. Pg. 4

is decreasing due to the large influx of immigrants and tense relations due to miscommunication and discrimination. Instead of solving the problem together, the two countries are making it worse. Pastor argues there are limits to friendship, such as the Mexican memory of US interventions and differences in size and power.²⁰⁷ The history of the United States' involvement, which does not always go in Mexico's favor, has made it difficult for the country to work with the United States. However, relations are growing due to trade and production needs. The United States will need to work with Mexican leadership in order to foster a better trade relationship and solve the immigration problem. Both countries can benefit from each other's goodwill and proportionate exchange of goods if they look beyond the previous lack of connections in virtue.

An example of a virtuous friendship that may seem out of the box is the enduring friendship between Pakistan and China. According to Ashish Shukla, "Both the countries have moved forward from the initial cold years to the present-day commitment of a long-term strategic partnership."²⁰⁸ This friendship has been able to move beyond complicated history to produce a strategic partnership based on mutual goodwill and not utility. Due to the strained relationship between India and Britain, Pakistan looked to other partnerships with China, and China responded similarly.

In May 2013, on the 62nd anniversary of Pakistan-China diplomatic relations, Li Keqiang "said: ... Only friendship based on shared values lasts a lifetime. What we have between China and Pakistan is a friendship based on shared values."²⁰⁹ These two countries created a friendship based

²⁰⁷ Pastor, Robert A., and Jorge Castaneda. "Pastor, Robert A., and Jorge G. Castañeda," *Limits to Friendship: The United States and Mexico*. Toronto: Random House, 1998.
https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YHCv0cbOkfIC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=friendship,+national+security+council&ots=2eOx_m1wV1&sig=p9Olba0nMunWJMewAkPqstd4Shw#v=onepage&q=friendship%2C%20national%20se. Pg. 98

²⁰⁸ Shukla, Ashish. "Pakistan-China Relations: A Case Study of All-Weather Friendship." *Himalayan and Central Asian Studies* 17, no. 3/4 (2013): 206. Pg. 4

²⁰⁹ Shukla, Pakistan-China Relations, Pg. 4

on mutual goodwill and not singular advantage. While neither China nor Pakistan acts virtuously as a whole, they fit the definition of virtuous friendship and fulfilling a shared social purpose, which both reduce legitimacy problems. They have a shared social purpose of increasing diplomatic relations and trade relations for each country, contributing to the global common good. They have shared values, little advantage for China, and it is based on maintaining Pakistan's sovereignty.²¹⁰

Another relationship that mirrors virtuous friendship is between the United States and Vietnam. Due to increasing Chinese pressure on Vietnam, the country has increasingly sought protection and trade from the United States. The United States looks to Vietnam as a democratic front to China. While previously there was much tension between the two countries, the relationship has evolved in recent years. After the emergence of the Paris Agreement, relations improved, and so did the decades following the war. "One of the objectives of the Paris Peace Agreement of 1973, expressed in Article 22, was to "create conditions for establishing a new, equal, and mutually beneficial relationship between the United States and The Democratic Republic of Vietnam."²¹¹ This relationship has become more beneficial for each country due to increased trade relations and a similar social purpose of expanding democracy. These goals follow the rules of virtuous friendship as they are mutually beneficial and proportionate to each party, thus increasing the common good. The United Nations Security Council exemplifies virtuous friendship through increased collaboration and proportionate exchange of goods despite concerns for self-interest and competition. While, this may seem like purely strategy, understanding the

²¹⁰ Shukla, Pakistan-China Relations, Pg. 5

²¹¹ PORTER, GARETH. "The U.S. and Vietnam: Between War and Friendship." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 1977, 325–38. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27908325>. Pg. 325

United Nations actions in the bound of friendship is essential to promotion of peace and increasing the common good.

Section 5: Conclusion

Friendship as a virtue explores the concepts of goodwill, reciprocity, concordance, and endurance. It also illustrates how to create friendships not for utility or advantage but for the mutual benefit of both parties involved. According to Aristotle, the goal of virtuous or complete friendships is to live in a state of love and goodwill that is long-lasting and for the mutual good of each partner. Unvirtuous friendships are those only for one party, advantage, pleasure, and not for the love of the other party. The governance system contains many friendships or, as Zürn calls them, authority relationships. Each authority relationship is built on contracts or utility. However, many authority relationships rest on force, contractual obligations, social capital, or enduring shifting loyalty between states. Authority relationships that mirror unvirtuous friendships between international institutions dissolve quickly and cause consequences for private citizens, the common good, and only increase the problems in the governance system.

Zürn argues for another type of authority relationship, such as epistemic authority relationships grounded in reputation and moral integrity. Epistemic authority relationships more closely mirror complete friendships. Epistemic authorities are based on the recognition that they are producing goodwill for those under them and have a mission of moral integrity. As their foundation is reputation, they cannot rely on advantage but rely on mutual respect for the common good. Their partnerships are founded in a state of concord proportionate distribution of goods.

Epistemic authorities work in complete friendship to reduce problems in the governance system, such as legitimation, contestation, politicization, weak separation of powers, and lack of coordination through increasing cooperation, goodwill, concordance, and proportionate exchange

of goods. Specifically, the United Nations Security Council demonstrates how countries with opposing views can collaborate to accomplish international good. Even though there are many unvirtuous friendships in the Council, they still seek to increase the common good through collaboration. Countries working through complete friendships focus on mutual goodwill and lack of utility despite differing goals and complicated histories. The Security Council aims to illustrate the virtue of friendship through an epistemic authority relationship working for mutual benefit for the common good and proportionate exchange of goods.

Justice

Aristotle's virtue of justice is a moral virtue or a virtue of character. Aristotle's outline for justice concerns the state that makes people just agents and the actions that flow from that state. Injustice, as the vice, is the state that makes us commit injustice and wish what is unjust.²¹² Due to injustice and justice both being a state, there are multiple applications of virtue and vice. Moral virtues are concerned with training passions toward more political freedom. Many moral virtues have a deficiency and excess; justice, however, does not.²¹³ Justice only has the corresponding vice, as one can only be just or unjust, which is a mean between two extremes of inequality. Justice in one sense, according to Aristotle, is all virtue complete.²¹⁴ Justice is a virtue to the highest degree and the complete exercise of it.²¹⁵

Justice is the complete exercise of all virtues and benefits all persons in the community. "For Aristotle, justice was the virtue that brought or held the other virtues together."²¹⁶ Justice can be considered the culmination of all virtues. "For virtue is the same as justice, but what it is to be virtue is not the same as what it is to be justice."²¹⁷ In this sense, one can be just without being courageous or truthful, but one cannot be courageous or truthful without being just.²¹⁸ Justice and virtue are explicitly connected. What is just is what "...produces and maintains happiness and its parts for a political community."²¹⁹ Justice should always contribute to the most significant amount

²¹² Nicomachean Ethics, 1129a,8-9

²¹³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b30-10

²¹⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b6

²¹⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b7

²¹⁶ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 116

²¹⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1130a10,11-13

²¹⁸ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 116

²¹⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b23-25

of happiness or human flourishing. Justice is the virtue that contributes most to flourishing and the common good by following the law and principles of fairness.

Justice, while a character virtue, will also act in union with the laws of the political community to create more human flourishing and prevent injustice. The correctly established law will act in union with justice, as should governance. Justice benefits both the individual and the political community, as it aims for the common good.²²⁰ Justice is significant in that it is the complete exercise of complete virtue. Aristotle then argues for complete justice, where the lawful person will follow all laws that aim at the common benefit of all and maintain happiness in the political community.²²¹ Complete justice concerning others is those that follow correctly established laws.²²²

Justice is divided into different sections. Injustice divides into the lawless and the unfair and the just into the lawful and the fair. Injustice is founded on the principle of overreaching and unfairness in that they overreach for goods.²²³ Lawlessness is connected to injustice as the laws aim for the common benefits of all, and injustice acts against the common benefit of all. Injustice is not concerned with what is good or being good but adds qualifications to everything. The unjust person can choose to have more or less resources depending on the qualifications. Aristotle states that an unjust person has the central characteristic of unfairness as he acts against the greater good. Injustice is the disproportionate excess and deficiency in what is beneficial or harmful, which connects to what is unjust.²²⁴ Justice is the intermediate between doing injustice and suffering

²²⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1130a3

²²¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129a15-18-19

²²² Nicomachean Ethics, 1129b25-1129b

²²³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129a25,30, 34-35

²²⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a5-10

injustice; this is the crux of justice.²²⁵ Justice, however, is more complicated than the other virtues, making use of all the types needed.²²⁶

Aristotle then further divides justice into different categories: special justice, distributive, justice in rectification, justice in exchange, political justice, and justice by nature and by law.²²⁷ Special injustice is concerned with honor, wealth, or safety, where the goal is to make a profit and the pleasure that comes from it.²²⁸ Special justice seeks to understand injustice as part of a whole, the same as special justice. Special justice spills into the lawful and the fair or the lawless and the unfair; thus, fairness is essential to justice.

A crucial principle of Aristotle's justice is in distributive justice, which follows that justice must be intermediate and equal.²²⁹ Distributive justice follows from part of justice and the intermediate of the equal. Justice must be distributed equally between equal people, which applies to honor and wealth. The concept of equality referred to by Aristotle is illustrated by numeric proportions between equal in virtue people. Distributive justice also concerns what is worthy, which differs between groups, as that applies to how things distribute. Justice in rectification concerns transactions, both voluntary and involuntary. Justice regarding transactions speaks of equality with numerical proportion. According to Aristotle, justice in rectification is how to proportionally restore funds proportionally, often through a judge, frequently discussing terms like "loss" and "profit."²³⁰ Justice in rectification is the intermediate between loss and profit. Justice, in exchange, covers the topic of reciprocity, which is neither distributive nor rectification but

²²⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1133b30-31

²²⁶ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 117

²²⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1130a15-16

²²⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1130b-5

²²⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1130b, 15-16

²³⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1131b25-30

maintained by direct proportionality, especially in matters of currency.²³¹ The primary goal of this type of justice is the restoration of goods in an intermediate way.

Justice of exchange, or that which concerns reciprocity, seeks to use communities of exchange in proportionate exchange.²³² According to Aristotle, communities are held together by proportionality. Currency has the component of need; justice of exchange is supposed to proportionality equalize need. Need and exchange hold communities together, making justice of exchange central to good function in the community.²³³

In political justice, one can distinguish between acts of injustice and being unjust.²³⁴ Political justice covers many topics, but mainly, it belongs to those who share a “common life aiming at self-sufficiency...”²³⁵ Those who are able to aim for a common life together are those who are either proportionately or numerically equal. Political justice connects to rulers and masters and how they just allow reason to rule and not over-reward themselves. Political justice contributes to the ruler and the household as it concerns the common life and flourishing of the political community. Justice by nature and by law concerns the difference between universal and particular justice, between what is merely legal and what is understood to be unjust by nature.²³⁶ There are lawful actions that apply to both universal actions and particular actions; however, both are just in a different sense.

Aristotle again calls attention to the fact that acts of injustice are different from being unjust. Aristotle determines that being unjust and acts of injustice as defined by voluntary and

²³¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1132b25-27

²³² Nicomachean Ethics, 1132n5-25

²³³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1133b-5

²³⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a20-25

²³⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a25-28-30

²³⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1135a5-8-9

involuntary actions. He concludes that the agent must be blamed if an action is voluntary.²³⁷ However, if an action is involuntary, it is more complicated, for many more factors are in play, such as ignorance or force.²³⁸ Actors just and unjust actions can be done through ignorance, but that does not make the person just or unjust. An action both committed and caused by ignorance can be pardoned.²³⁹ It is vital to note Aristotle states that doing justice is not easy; it requires effort and more virtue. Aristotle also makes a case for decency being closely related to justice, as this person has the law on their side and understands universal justice.²⁴⁰ The decent is not associated with legal justice but a rectification of it.²⁴¹ Aristotle closes the discussion on justice with an argument against injustice to oneself.²⁴² Every kind of injustice to oneself is unjust, but those that violate the law are, it is a connection to particular justice, not the universal.

While each type of justice can contribute to improving the global governance system, distributive justice, justice in exchange, and political justice are especially relevant to the problems Zürich addresses in this context. Distributive justice, justice of exchange, and political justice also contribute the most to the common good and human flourishing in the governance system. Justice in rectification addresses the issues of fair exchange, the unequal balance of goods and services between authorities, and the problem of increased dependence on social capital. Political justice aids in the issues of legitimization and hierarchical authorities. Justice of exchange addresses authority, sovereignty, and the lack of separation of powers in global governance. Justice, as a whole, speaks to the problems of legitimization, unequal authorities, sovereignty, and goods and

²³⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1135a20-21

²³⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1135a30-32-33

²³⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1136a5-9

²⁴⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1137b25-28-29

²⁴¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1137b10,13-14

²⁴² Nicomachean Ethics, 1138a15:20-21

services. Justice also contributed to the common good and human flourishing by reducing legitimation problems and contributing to a shared social purpose. “We ought to exclusively direct our principles at subspheres of global politics: disaggregating global justice for a disaggregated world.”²⁴³ Arguing for a new global justice perspective should be implemented not directly but in different spheres of politics, as Zürn argues.

Section 1: Authority relationships and the types of justice

Justice in rectification concerns fairness and equality, as justice acts as an intermediate between suffering and direct harm.²⁴⁴ Justice of rectification is specific to currency and transactions. Justice of rectification requires proportionate equal shares for equal people in trade based upon what was previously agreed upon. Distribution of goods in the governance system, according to Zürn, is driven by the production of wealth.²⁴⁵ Distribution of goods, according to Aristotle, acts in accord with proportion through common assets and common funds.²⁴⁶

According to Zürn, authority is based on the interpretation of power and influence over others.²⁴⁷ Authority relationships often enforce power and obedience in ways that will influence goods and services. Authority relationships indirectly affect the production of wealth and distribution of goods by influencing the behavior of consumers. Goods and services are no longer distributed proportionately but based on a relationship with the acknowledged authority. Justice in rectification looks at differences in the harm inflicted, treating both parties as equals. This type of justice works to find the intermediate between loss and profit. Justice of rectification looks at the

²⁴³ Bres, Helena de. “Disaggregating Global Justice.” *Social Theory and Practice* 39, no. 3 (2013): 422–48.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23558604>. Pg. 422

²⁴⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1131a15-3

²⁴⁵ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 131

²⁴⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1131b25-30

²⁴⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 38

influence of authority relationships and changes it to proportionality instead of based on a relationship of obedience.

Reflexive authority is based on requests and a logic of action, not the logic of appearances or consequences. The two types of authority that stem from reflective authority are epistemic and political.²⁴⁸ Reflexive authority is based on the knowledge order that reproduces an authority relationship, not on a just transaction of shares between parties.²⁴⁹ Reflective authorities are based on the notion that their authority is deserved.²⁵⁰ In this sense, it is closer to a just authority as it authority is deserved, not from force or manipulation. Authority relationships continue to impact the governance system through both manipulation of force and earned loyalty. Still, they must be considered from the regulation perspective, as distribution-based systems often do not function well in the governance system. Justice in distribution and rectification can apply to regulatory authorities in goods and services and just exchange.

Justice continues to influence authority relationships, such as epistemic and political authority. Political authorities have increased in number in recent decades, significantly affecting the decisions of major countries. The growing political authority in the governance system increases the dependence on loyalty through manipulation. Powerful political authorities operate on joint evaluation and shifting loyalties, furthering the authority's potential. Often, these authorities will put pressure on other authorities to not act against their interests “in order to keep the option open of shifting loyalty.”²⁵¹ Changing loyalties often means that authority relationships fluctuate and become unstable as they are based on pressure and force. Justice is not based on

²⁴⁸Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 45

²⁴⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 50

²⁵⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 45

²⁵¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 50

changing loyalties but on an equal exchange of currency and proportionate ideas. Justice must be intermediate and proportionate, not depending on whichever country at the time is more closely connected.²⁵² Justice contains “...a corrective function: it responds to the deficiency of motivation.”²⁵³ Justice calls for political and epistemic authorities to correct their behavior toward actions of equal exchange.

The goal of justice in rectification is to restore equal shares, which are often lacking in authority relationships. Justice in rectification seeks to bring authority relationships back to being based on proportionality and equal exchange, not forced manipulation. Justice in rectification, combined with political and reflexive authority relationships, contributes more to the common good and human flourishing.

Political authority relationships frequently lack loyalty and increased evaluation of other authority relationships, showing the need to enforce their rules harder. However, political authority's legitimation does not rest on force alone, calling for a need for equal exchange justice. Political authorities are defined by majority-centered votes and international dominance, enforcing the need for justice based on intermediate proportionality. Political authorities' authority rests on the more powerful states as they open their options to weaker states based on governing trade relations. Justice in rectification is not based on unequal trade relations and forced obedience but on equal proportions of exchange.

According to Aristotle, justice calls for a proportionate exchange of goods and services in the justice of exchange and rectification. Justice should also be proportionately distributed equally regarding goods. In the governance system, impartiality is central to the delegitimization narrative

²⁵² Nicomachean Ethics, 1131a15-16

²⁵³ Klabbers, *Virtue in Global Governance*, pg. 117

in that it “goes beyond that in including a sense of minimal fairness according in which like cases are treated alike.”²⁵⁴ Impartiality extends from Zürn’s idea of a shared social purpose and also the common good through increasing legitimacy and having just goals. Impartiality can influence legitimacy in different ways, such as legality, but impartiality must fuse with a social purpose.²⁵⁵ Impartiality must unite with shared goals and procedures on how to achieve it; authorities must produce the belief that they serve the common good; otherwise, neither justice nor legitimization will occur. The problem that arises is that impartiality with a shared social purpose is difficult to achieve, and issues of unequal distribution, unproportionate exchange, and lack of striving for the common good make it very difficult for both legitimization and justice.

It is worth noting that justice in exchange is proportionate rather than directly equal. According to Aristotle, justice in exchange “...holds people together; for a city is maintained by proportionate reciprocity.”²⁵⁶ Justice in exchange differs from distributive justice and justice of reciprocity in that it focuses not only on currency or goods and services but also on how proportionality can be applied in every setting. A shared social purpose and commitment to the common good in the political community are crucial to justice in exchange. Proportionate exchange is justice for everyone involved in trade involving equal people. Justice in exchange applies to goods and services; however, impartiality still impacts common goods. Justice of exchange can unite with impartiality to create a shared social purpose and increase legitimization. Legitimation strategies aim to develop the idea that authority is founded in transparency, the rule of law, and the achievement of common goods.²⁵⁷ Justice of exchange requires obedience to the

²⁵⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 68

²⁵⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 69

²⁵⁶ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1132b,34-35

²⁵⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 69

rule of law and transparent exchange, which impacts the shared social purpose and the common good. The achievement of the common good and a shared social purpose increases legitimization through the justice of exchange, further decreasing the problems in the governance system.

Epistemic authority relationships more closely embody the virtue of justice as they rely on knowledge and moral integrity.²⁵⁸ These authorities are based on the idea that knowledge is unequally distributed but relies on reputation.²⁵⁹ Epistemic authorities can be institutions such as The Red Cross, Greenpeace, and the Salvation Army. Epistemic authority relationships, as they are motivated by moral integrity, are founded on justice's characteristics of proportionality and reciprocity. Authorities that rely on reputation and moral integrity are more likely to rely on impartiality, proportionality in goods and services, and a shared social purpose that will seek to embody both justices of exchange and rectification.

Section 2: Hierarchies in the Governance System and Justice

Hierarchies are essential pieces of the governance system and are often neither fair nor just. Hierarchies, while critical to the functions of authority relationships without the virtue of justice, will be unproportionate and, therefore, unjust. If an authority relationship persists and takes on objectification or institutionalization, it can become a form of hierarchy.²⁶⁰ It is worth noting that while Aristotle does argue for proportionality and fair exchange, he does argue in favor of hierarchies in many places. As stated earlier, Aristotle's version of equality differs from the modern version, contributing to his understanding of hierarchy.

In *Politics*, Aristotle argues in favor of many different types of hierarchies, calling them “a universal moral pattern.” In a significant example, Aristotle defends slavery, arguing that the

²⁵⁸ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 52

²⁵⁹ IBID

²⁶⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 48

rational is the master of the irrational and that some souls are superior to other souls.²⁶¹ Aristotle argues that not everyone is on an equal playing field, and some cannot possess all the virtues. Aristotle also claims that justice does not necessarily mean equality; justice is prescribed only to those who are equal, as Aristotle states inequality is also just.²⁶² Aristotle's version of equality is not all-encompassing for every people group, as is his version of justice. In this understanding of justice, hierarchies in many forms can be just even when acting unjustly to specific groups of people. However, many of Aristotle's principles of justice can still be applied despite many of his outdated and unjust ideas.

If those in authority take more than their fair share, it can lead to unjust hierarchies and further prioritizing some actors over others. Hierarchies and power inequalities control world politics, states Zürn. Zürn argues that the global governance system contains "at least some pockets of hierarchy."²⁶³ Zürn defines hierarchy as rule by rank and authority according to standards. Hierarchies are then enforced by the division of labor, which includes specialization. Specialization can become mutual dependence, which becomes interdependence. Hierarchical authority regulates interdependence as a core part of global governance.

Hierarchies can be used to regulate order but can also significantly contribute to injustice. Hierarchies frequently have distributional consequences on societal power. Distributional consequences often occur when those in authority act in deficiency and excess of justice without qualification, causing those in the state to suffer injustice. The established hierarchies were based on once-equal parties, suggesting they could become equal again through a fresh distribution of

²⁶¹ The Politics, 1254b32,36-37

²⁶² The Politics, 1280a7,15-16

²⁶³ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 7

justice. The hierarchies often struggle with the authority and dominance established within the global governance system, which focuses on an unbalanced distribution of goods.

An authority relationship is objectified if the knowledge order impacting it becomes the dominant worldview.²⁶⁴ Objectified authority is broadly accepted by the involved actors and external audiences. An authority that is seen as objectified can give rise to exclusion issues. An authority relationship becomes institutionalized when decisions are a priori delegated.²⁶⁵ A priori delegated authority decision involves authority that is institutionalized when decisions are pooled together and often include costs. Governments are particularly susceptible to both dangers, leading to intense hierarchies.²⁶⁶ Not all hierarchies are unjust, and some levels of government hierarchy are essential, but with objectification and institutionalization, hierarchies lack informed perspective and can produce coercion. Hierarchies with these issues are primarily unjust because they rely solely on a dominant worldview and methods of exclusion. According to Zürn, the notion of hierarchy is intimately intertwined with power inequalities.²⁶⁷ Power inequalities and hierarchies produce many of the problems in the governance system, according to Zürn. These power inequalities are often sourced by hierarchies that lack the characteristics of justice such as, fairness, equality, and proportionality.

While these ideals are difficult to maintain, Aristotle argues that justice should be proportionate for both parties in personal and financial matters; otherwise, inequality will persist. Inequality, as defined numerically, is still essential to the governance system. Hierarchies can influence the governance system in different ways, though most often through institutionalization

²⁶⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 49

²⁶⁵ IBID

²⁶⁶ IBID

²⁶⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 3

and objectification, which leads to further issues. Still, suppose an institution's leader is motivated by justice; the problems it could produce, such as contestation, resistance, and distributional struggles, can decrease and lead to more efforts toward the common good and human flourishing.

The virtue of justice is concerned with voluntary actions, even concerning the vice of injustice.²⁶⁸ When objectification is involved, the dominant worldview has changed, and the agent is no longer in complete control of their actions. The just agent can no longer be just, as voluntary actions are crucial to justice. In institutionalization, decisions are made without all parties' consent, and again, the agents are not in full control of their actions. Aristotle argues that involuntary actions should be pardoned, especially if committed in ignorance.²⁶⁹ Ignorance and force are part of objectification and institutionalization, which, therefore, makes these hierarchies unjust. This argument for justice pardons those under unjust hierarchies. If a person does something without knowledge and deliberation, it is an act of injustice. Lack of knowledge and deliberation is often how leaders in authority relationships act in unjust hierarchies; Aristotle only goes as far as to call it injustice. Knowledge and deliberation should be part of the hierarchical system; otherwise, they lean towards injustice through lack of freedom of information and choice. Hierarchies are common in the governance system, and although they are not all unjust, they are plagued by objectification and institutionalization and not the fair and proportionate exchange of goods.

Section 3: Political Justice and the Common Good

This section explores the argument for the common good, human flourishing, and the connection between political justice in Zurn's governance system. Justification of global governance presupposed equal goods. "Although many of these justifications certainly are merely

²⁶⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1135a15-16

²⁶⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1136a5

strategic and hypocritical, and the general practice would be meaningless if there were not the presupposition that a global common good exists.²⁷⁰ Both justice and global governance imply the existence of a global common good, though that does not mean the world itself is completely good. The common good does exist in the governance system, but for it to make the most impact, it needs to connect with the virtues.

The connection between Aristotle's political justice and Zürn's pursuit of the common good intertwines to reduce the problems of delegitimation and unjust hierarchies. Aristotle argues that to discuss justice, one must discuss fairness and proportionality, which differs from the modern version of equality, meaning it is numerical and not based on similarity. According to Aristotle, equality is understood differently than it is currently. However, justice's goal should still be political equality, even if people still lack it in certain circumstances. The purpose of justice is to distribute resources, opportunities, goods, and services proportionally, etc., all in a numeric (distributional equality on equal numbers) and proportionate sense.²⁷¹ This version of equality does not mean one person will not have more shares than another, as an unjust hierarchies and regulation issues still exist. The goal is to aim toward a beneficial and proportional distribution of justice for each person.

Political justice, according to Aristotle, is "...those who share in common a life aiming at self-sufficiency, who are free and either proportionately or numerically equal."²⁷² Political justice, in this sense, concerns free and equal people who fit that distinction, according to Aristotle. Political justice makes the distinction between acts of justice and being unjust. Those who share these characteristics are capable of political justice. Political justice also belongs to those who

²⁷⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 7

²⁷¹ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1134a25,28-29

²⁷² *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1134a25-28,29

partake in the law, distinguishing them from the unjust. He points out that in political justice, people who share a common life aiming at self-sufficiency and who are free and equal should experience the same justice.

Political injustice can produce social exclusion, coercion, and an unhealthy relationship with the authority. Injustice, in that sense, moves further away from the common good and legitimation. Aristotle mentions injustice as giving oneself too many things without deserving them or too few things that a person does deserve.²⁷³ Collins states that justice is a principle of “...equality that establishes that there is equality or fairness concerning the common good.”²⁷⁴ However, Collins and Zürn agree that the common advantage can often overtake the devotion to the common good.²⁷⁵ Self-interest and concern for advantage usually overpower political justice; however, for the sake of the common good, authorities need to work to prevent this. Justice belongs to those who are attached to the law, and therefore, reciprocity and proportionality follow from justice.²⁷⁶

Zürn argues that leadership in the governance system often pursues a global common good; however, these institutions frequently have other priorities that overpower it.²⁷⁷ Self-interest, legitimation problems, and economic competition are more frequently important than the common good. However, according to Aristotle, political justice states reason should rule over goods and services, allowing the ruler to profit nothing.²⁷⁸ The authority holder or ruler should not allow love for immense goods and services to overpower reason and justice. The ruler should labor for others'

²⁷³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a30,34-35

²⁷⁴ Collins, Susan D. “Moral Virtue and the Limits of the Political Community in Aristotle’s ‘Nicomachean Ethics.’” *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 1 (2004): 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1519896>. Pg. 53

²⁷⁵ Collins, Moral virtue and the limits of the Political Community, Pg. 56

²⁷⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a30,34-35

²⁷⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 8

²⁷⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a35-1134b

benefit, never taking too many goods. The authority holder should use political justice for the common good, not self-gain. The common good is the sole aim for the politically just as justice is “...another person’s good.”²⁷⁹ Institutions motivated by reason and proportionality will stray from the problems produced by self-interest, competition, and appeal to the common good in legitimation narratives.

For Aristotle, everyone is in a political community and contributes to it, no matter their role. “For the just belongs to those who have the law in their relations.” Justice closely connects to the law and its administration for the common good. The just have the shared goal of being the intermediate between the good and bad in political justice.”²⁸⁰ Power and hierarchy are integral parts of global governance and do not always serve the global common good. Political justice being impacted by the authority of hierarchies must ensure they are administering goods and services proportionally. Hierarchies must be discussed with lawful actions to avoid contestation, conflict, and manipulated resistance. Those under hierarchies must be self-sufficient in order for justice to be proportionate, or authorities can become tyrannical.

According to Zürn, there are many of what he calls “legitimization problems” in global governance.²⁸¹ These involve the spheres of authority and reputation, which are problem fields that point to legitimacy problems in the global governance system. Society must give consent at each level of authority; if a normative stand is broken or changed, consent for authority may be taken away. In other words, if a change is demanded in the form of political justice, society must collectively drive that change. As Aristotle illustrates, qualifications for the rule are essential; if

²⁷⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134b5-6,7

²⁸⁰ IBID

²⁸¹ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 10

justice is not done proportionately, those qualifications may be taken away as the people are unsatisfied with leadership.²⁸²

Different spheres of authority, such as heads of state and the World Health Organization (WHO), often cannot work together, as they are both highly exclusive.²⁸³ Exclusivity contradicts Aristotle's justice, in which rulers must administer justice proportionately or numerically. Institutions must learn to administer justice collectively and proportionately for the sake of the common good. Authority leaders cannot do that if they have a weak separation of powers and only carry out justice within their sphere. The goal would be for just agents to operate within Aristotle's justice system to decrease the problems created in the spheres of authority, such as legitimization issues.

Another struggle of the global governance system regarding the common good and political justice is that powers in the system do not treat all cases of injustice alike. "The exercise of authority thus often leads to decisions and interpretations that violate the regulative idea that like cases should be treated alike."²⁸⁴ Unified Decisions leads to political action by citizens and questioning of authority. In Aristotle's system, injustice is not erased, but those with the necessary qualifications administer the law; it decreases. Those with authority are the primary guardians of the just and the equal. All cases of justice and injustice should be treated without bias.²⁸⁵ Authority holders must treat all cases of justice alike, or they will neglect the common good. Justice done in this fashion can help soften some of the struggles of the system of global governance, as those in authority should not be taking more than "...what is choiceworthy to himself and too little to his

²⁸² Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a25,26

²⁸³ Zürn, Global Governance, pg.10

²⁸⁴ Zürn, Global Governance, pg.11

²⁸⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a19-20

neighbor.”²⁸⁶ Evading the choice worthy of authority holders’ drama contributes dramatically to the common good. Political justice, the common good, and human flourishing connects in their desire to give those in the political community a sufficient and proportionate life, evading the problems of legitimation and injustice.

Section 4: Sovereignty and Separation of Powers

The global governance system rests on principles of sovereignty, and most authority relationships are focused on sovereignty. Zürn understands sovereignty as “A social status that enables states as participants within a community of mutual recognition.”²⁸⁷ A mutual recognition community and social status understanding of sovereignty closely connects to legitimation. The principles of sovereignty are drafted from the Westphalian principle of sovereignty, meaning “...that there is a final and absolute political authority in the political community... and no final and absolute authority exists elsewhere.”²⁸⁸ Three components stem from the Westphalian principles of sovereignty: all political communities are directed towards a notion of common goods, which points to the rights of an individual by questioning the absolute authority of political communities, and questions the idea that there are no authorities beyond the state.²⁸⁹ The notion of the common good, individual rights, and state actors being independent members of a state are all tied to Westphalian sovereignty. Each of these items qualifies international authority sovereignty, for there must be some degree of concern for the rights and duties of individuals for sovereignty to continue. Zürn focuses heavily on the role of sovereignty plans in individual rights and the common good.

²⁸⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1134a5

²⁸⁷ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 32

²⁸⁸ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 26

²⁸⁹ IBID

According to Zürn, the central component of the governance system is between resources and producers, but there must still be a concern for the individuals in society.²⁹⁰ The governance system is one of sovereign equality, which means a focus on individual rights, according to Zürn.²⁹¹ The role of individual rights grew over time, especially as both nationalism and external recognition from other states became more critical.²⁹² Individuals are able to stabilize sovereign equality for international states. Individual rights consist of things like freedom of speech, freedom of information, and more, while states' rights consist of things like free trade, fair government, and sovereign borders. Aristotle's principles of injustice also argue for the individual's rights, stating that states cannot enforce their sovereignty without deliberation. Deliberation is essential for sovereignty and maintaining individual rights, which, in turn, impact the common good. Political authorities are not independently sovereign; individuals, societies, other states, and regulations support them.

Aristotle addresses injustice and individual rights by saying, "...the unjust person is spoken of. Both the lawless person and the overreaching and unfair person to be unjust..."²⁹³ The unjust person can misuse sovereignty's purpose and overreach the bounds of the law to create injustice. The unjust primarily overreach the boundaries of sovereignty in pursuit of power. The unjust person will then take more goods and services for either themselves or their states, not understanding that the laws of authority are for the common benefit of all.²⁹⁴

²⁹⁰ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 30

²⁹¹ Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 30

²⁹² Zürn, Global Governance, pg. 32

²⁹³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1129a30-33,34

²⁹⁴ IBID

Modern sovereignty links to two factors: external recognition that the state can govern effectively and internal recognition that the state practices are legitimate.²⁹⁵ However, internal recognition became the more important factor, otherwise known as the people's, right to self-determination. The people's right to decide the law and legitimacy is essential to the notion of sovereignty. Aristotle states that those who are politically just aim to be self-sufficient but proportionate.²⁹⁶ Self-sufficiency and external recognition are crucial factors for states. Zürn states recognition became a conditional concept, but only to an extent. As Aristotle argues, equality and individual rights must come before external recognition, which often justifies states legitimacy. Proportional equality intertwined with concern for individual rights is essential to the common good and human flourishing, leading to decreased sovereignty overreach.

Zürn argues that sovereignty can be suspended if duties and rights are violated.²⁹⁷ Sovereignty guides the struggles of the oppressed, general rights of individuals, and is against foreign determination. The core of injustice for Aristotle is a lawless person who overreaches and is unfair. This person will use whatever tools they have at their disposal to disband individual rights and equality. Often manipulating sovereignty's purpose and acting in self-interest, the unjust leader will choose what benefits them, whether less or more goods, according to Aristotle.²⁹⁸ Self-interest and lack of distribution of resources leave the individual citizens without choiceworthy goods. The common goods must then be in control of leaders who would choose the greater good and not overreach for more than is necessary.

²⁹⁵ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 33

²⁹⁶ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1134a25-28,29

²⁹⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 34

²⁹⁸ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1129a30-33,34

The importance of separation of powers closely connects with the spheres of authority and the doctrine of the rule of law.²⁹⁹ Separation of power also connects to sovereignty and individual rights, as weak separations of power lead to overreach and legitimacy issues. Separation of power is a means of ensuring that the executive and legislative branches follow their own laws. A separation of powers that is working ensures equality among the state. Zürn's current problem he addresses is that "Some separation of powers is seen in global governance, but with the rise of international courts and institutional rules, the separation becomes weaker—judgments from these courts often cross-cut spheres of authority."³⁰⁰ Lack of separation of powers due to new institutions and lack of judgment is responsible for more problems in the governance system. The normative principles behind the separation of powers are bent, strengthening the separation. The legislature is supposed to lay down the rules, while the executive branch is between the individual and the decision-maker, making interpretations.³⁰¹ The people's will binds both the executive and legislative branch of institutions but is open to outside influences. The people's will is crucial to ensuring the separation of powers, as without their input, contestation will occur.

The central problem is that instead of being influenced by people's will, the branches are influenced by executives and regulation, which lacks impartiality. Decisions are also dominated by the few strong states, with little power left for the minority states. Aristotle states it is possible to do injustice without being unjust, such as the executives enforcing the separation of powers.³⁰² The nature of injustice is partiality, awarding to yourself "The excess of what is beneficial,"³⁰³ always seeking to gain more goods to add to one's power. Just institutions will seek an executive

²⁹⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 58

³⁰⁰ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg.59

³⁰¹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 59

³⁰² *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1135a

³⁰³ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1134a10-11

branch operating proportionally in goods and services—a legislative branch operating in reason and will of the people. Each branch operating according to the rules of proportionality and impartiality is essential for the separation of powers. Separation of powers, sovereignty, and concern for individual rights each contribute to the common good and human flourishing, as without them, there would be increased overreach and partiality.

Section 4: Case Study: The Kyoto Protocols and Paris Agreement

Zürn's authority relationships prioritize regulation, trade relationships based on self-interest, and economic competition over the global common good and shared social purpose. These authority relationships are often based on manipulation and contracts, not the common good, which produces greater legitimacy. Increasing legitimacy is accomplished by authority relationships that strive for a shared social purpose impartially. Social purpose is the key to legitimacy through the achievement of common goods, and decisions about goods lead to legitimacy as they are grounded in participation and representation.³⁰⁴ Regulation within the global governance system is prioritized over proportionate distribution of goods and services, dwindling resources, individual rights, and even social justice. Acts of justice can be disproportionately distributed, and some institutions in authority can take more responsibility for ensuring justice is done than other institutions.

Aristotle states, "Hence, the just requires four things at least; the people for whom it is just are two, and the (equal) things involved are two."³⁰⁵ Despite regulation issues, justice can be distributed proportionately in the governance system. In the sense of climate justice, the things involved in distribution proportionally are the consequences of climate change and the resources

³⁰⁴ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 69

³⁰⁵ *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1131a15,19-20

to help. In a just arrangement, those with more resources would take on more of the relief effort regarding resources and social justice. Countries with fewer resources would still participate but less or in different ways.

In climate justice, countries with fewer resources often bear the weight of climate change more but have fewer resources to deal with its consequences. Smaller countries are also usually less responsible for the consequences of climate change. However, larger countries, while having more significant resources, frequently neglect to aid in decreasing the damage done by climate change for one reason or another. For example, China does much of the environmental damage on different fronts yet does little to aid in its consequences.³⁰⁶ The United Nations states, "Climate change is a global emergency that goes beyond national borders. It is an issue that requires international cooperation and coordinated solutions at all levels."³⁰⁷ Climate change will require small and large countries to unite and produce collective solutions to counteract the consequences. Climate justice will require joint cooperation and distribution of roles to ease its impact.

Examining climate justice further, countries often focus on regulating their own relationships neglect the distribution of the responsibilities of climate justice to smaller countries with fewer resources. According to Aristotle, distributing resources to smaller countries "...must be intermediate and equal in the sense that each party receives equal shares."³⁰⁸ For example, countries like the United States, France, and England often give climate justice efforts to countries like Denmark, Finland, and Iceland. China, while responsible for much of the impact of climate

³⁰⁶ "Which countries are the world's biggest carbon polluters?." Climate Change news. Last modified May 17, 2021. <https://climatetrade.com/which-countries-are-the-worlds-biggest-carbon-polluters/#:~:text=Top%2010%20polluters%20Below%2C%20you'll%20discover%20the,driven%20by%20its%20extensive%20use%20of%20coal.>

³⁰⁷ "The Paris Agreement ." The United Nations: Climate Action. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/paris-agreement>.

³⁰⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1131a15, 16-18

change, does little to help.³⁰⁹ Larger countries like the United States and Great Britain tend to withdraw from climate change initiatives, leaving the efforts to smaller countries. The United Nations works through initiatives like the Kyoto Protocols, the Paris Agreement, and The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) to attempt to make countries work together to reduce the consequences of climate change despite tries to prioritize regulation over social purpose, the common good, and human flourishing.

In an effort to Focus on a specific effort to reduce the consequences of climate change, the Kyoto Protocol's goal is to unite different countries through the United Nations to reduce greenhouse gases. The Kyoto Protocol aims to bring both small and large countries in on the efforts to reduce climate change, uniting them behind a shared social purpose. The Kyoto Protocol administers climate justice by "... the Protocol mandated that 37 industrialized nations plus the European Community cut their greenhouse gas emissions by an average of 5 percent below 1990 levels, and established a system to monitor countries' progress."³¹⁰ The Kyoto Protocol was adopted in December 1997, following a complete ratification process in 2005. The Protocols amendment was added in 2012 to present new ways to reduce gas emissions. The purpose of the UN's Convention on Climate Change for the protocols is to encourage industrialized countries and economies in transition to reduce greenhouse gases in agreement with individual targets.³¹¹

The convention's goal is to reduce the lack of proportionality that occurs in climate justice, per Aristotle's ideals. "It only binds developed countries, and places a heavier burden on them

³⁰⁹ "Which countries are the world's biggest carbon polluters?." Climate Change news. Last modified May 17, 2021. <https://climatetrade.com/which-countries-are-the-worlds-biggest-carbon-polluters/#:~:text=Top%2010%20polluters%20Below%2C%20you'll%20discover%20the,driven%20by%20its%20extensive%20use%20of%20coal.>

³¹⁰ "Marking the Kyoto Protocol's 25th anniversary." United Nations: Climate Change. Last modified December 11, 2022. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/marking-kyoto-protocol%E2%80%99s-25th-anniversary.>

³¹¹ Unsplash, Karsten. "What is the Kyoto Protocol?." United Nations: Climate Change. https://unfccc.int/kyoto_protocol.

under the principle of ‘common but differentiated responsibility and respective capabilities.’”³¹²

The protocols aim to illustrate the common good of protecting the environment while utilizing regulation and distribution. The Protocols recognize that larger countries are primarily responsible for the current high levels of GHG emissions in the atmosphere.³¹³ Responsibility between countries gets differentiated depending on capabilities, resources, and passion. Thirty-seven industrialized countries aim for these targets, producing an average of around five percent emission reduction.³¹⁴ The Kyoto Protocols seek to apply the principle that larger countries should bear more responsibility for climate change as they are often more responsible for its consequences.

An essential element of the protocols aims to have larger countries bear more responsibility for climate change by establishing flexible market mechanisms.³¹⁵ The market mechanisms are based on the trade of emission permits, where countries meet their targets primarily through national measures. The goal of these mechanisms is to start the reduction of emissions where it is most cost-effective. Cost concerns and economic competition often keep countries from entering into climate initiatives; the Protocols keep those reasons in mind. Financials and market resources are regulation concerns that frequently get in the way of distributional justice. Greenhouse emissions must be monitored, and precise records of the trades must be kept, ensuring accountability. Accountability and transparency are essential to the participatory narrative of legitimation, which is based on equal opportunity for all those affected by regulation.³¹⁶ The narrative involves standards for each authority, such as those set by the protocols. Accountability,

³¹² IBID

³¹³ IBID

³¹⁴ IBID

³¹⁵ IBID

³¹⁶ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg.72

financial efficiency, and regulation are critical to administrating the protocols and distributing justice.

While the protocols do function as a proportionally distributed climate justice system, most countries do not abide by the protocols. Countries such as Bulgaria, Lithuania, Estonia, and Romania had the same Target as Australia: eight percent. Iceland met a ten percent target, while Canada and the US pulled out eventually. Larger countries such as the United States, Canada, and Australia would need to take on a more significant percentage, and others would need to reenter the protocols. China has never been a part of the protocols, and to contribute more to the greater good, China should reprioritize its goals. The primary aim of the Kyoto Protocol mirrors Aristotle's distributive justice and Zürn's social purpose narrative.

The Kyoto Protocol's distributive system enforces proportionality and reciprocity in justice, increasing the common good and a shared social purpose and decreasing the problems evidenced by regulation in the governance system, such as delegitimation. According to Zürn, "legitimacy is bound to a social purpose or the reason institutions operate or exist."³¹⁷ Each narrative to reduce delegitimation is bound to a shared social purpose; without it, there cannot be legitimacy.³¹⁸ Climate justice itself is a shared social purpose that can increase legitimacy if shown distributionally. The Protocols contribute to delegitimation through the fairness narrative, which "...shifts the focus from procedures to outcomes..." and encourages authorities to be seen "...as responsible for a fair distribution of resources and benefits."³¹⁹ The Kyoto Protocols especially seek to have a fair distribution of resources and benefits through each article. The fairness narrative further contributes to the distribution of resources and a shared social purpose. Based on equal

³¹⁷ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 68

³¹⁸ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 67

³¹⁹ Zürn, *Global Governance*, pg. 73

distribution, the narrative encourages those involved in the protocols to participate in favor of legitimation and the common good.

Reducing the consequences of climate change is a shared social purpose for all countries that feel its effects; however, economic concerns often get in the way. The Kyoto Protocol's registry system, transparent reporting, and cost-effective mechanisms allow larger countries such as the United States and Australia to re-enter or increase their emission reduction goal. The Kyoto Protocol's goal of distributing climate responsibilities among countries with more resources unites Aristotle's distributive justice by pursuing a shared social purpose, the common good, fairness narrative, and participatory narrative, reducing delegitimation.

The Paris Agreement is another protocol focused on a more proportionate distribution of climate justice. The United Nations states, "The Agreement includes commitments from all countries to reduce their emissions and work together to adapt to the impacts of climate change, and calls on countries to strengthen their commitments over time."³²⁰ The Paris Agreement seeks to "...charted a new course in the effort to combat global climate change, requiring countries to make commitments and progressively strengthen them."³²¹ The Paris Agreement, while ambitious, acts in accord with distributional justice. The Paris Agreement was created in December 2015 and entered into effect in November 2016.³²² The goal of the Paris Agreement is a legally binding treaty to reduce the global temperature to less than two degrees Celsius.³²³

³²⁰ The United Nations: Climate Action, The Paris Agreement

³²¹ Hu, Shelia. "Paris Climate Agreement: Everything You Need to Know." NRDC. Last modified January 23, 2025. <https://www.nrdc.org/stories/paris-climate-agreement-everything-you-need-know>.

³²² "The Paris Agreement Related news Related Documents Related links What is the Paris Agreement?." United Nations: Climate Change. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement>

³²³ IBID

The agreement provides a pathway for developed nations to assist developing countries with the consequences of climate change while remaining transparent and realistic.³²⁴ The goals of the Paris Agreement take into account both regulation issues and distribution while still promoting the common good. Global leaders suggest lowering temperatures below 1.5 degrees Celsius would dramatically limit global warming. To limit emissions, greenhouse gas emissions will peak in 2025 and then be reduced by 43% by 2030. The agreement works on a five-year cycle of long-term strategies, slightly different from the Kyoto Protocols. The goal is to unite all nations to combat climate change and its effects.

The agreement unites different countries together to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, submit national climate action plans, and implement long-term stages. The Paris Agreement unites countries through various sectors, such as finance, technology, and capacity building. The agreement provides countries with fewer financial resources than those with more significant resources who can combat climate change, following the reasoning of distributive justice. The Paris Agreement works to establish a technology framework to transfer to policy and implementation arms. The Paris Agreement also recognizes that not all countries have the capacity to deal with the challenges brought on by climate change. Capacity elements were observed in 2023 when the first “global stocktake” was started, and goals were made to increase commitments to renewable energy by 2030.³²⁵ The agreement enforces ways to enhance support for capacity-building actions in developing countries. Enhanced support means the protocols attempts to increase resources and strategies for smaller countries to keep up with the goals.

³²⁴ The United Nations: Climate Action, The Paris Agreement

³²⁵ IBID

Like the Kyoto Protocol, the Paris Agreement reflects the goal of distributive justice and justice of exchange while in pursuit of a shared social purpose, the global common good, and human flourishing through legitimacy narratives. According to Bodansky, the Paris Agreement is unique in that it expects a long-term process, is global, legally binding, and flexible, allowing for a better approach towards climate action.³²⁶ Appealing to a long-term process and flexible regulation allows for distributional justice to contribute more to the common good. While still new, the Paris Agreement provides an appealing approach toward the common good as it does not weigh any one country or sector too heavily. However, it still requires collective action by states with different interests, making the implementation of a shared social purpose of reducing climate change essential.³²⁷ “But to promote stronger action, states ‘nationally determined contributions’ (or NDCs, for short) are complemented by international norms to ensure transparency and accountability and to prod states to progressively ratchet up their efforts.”³²⁸ The agreement adopts a “bottom-up” approach that is core to distributive justice, encouraging larger states to be accountable for efforts towards climate change.

Section 5: Conclusion

Zürn presents many issues for the global governance system, however, the virtue of justice, can help ease and further contribute to the common good and human flourishing in the system. Zürn discusses the problems of authority relationships in that whether they are political, reflexive, or epistemic, justice is often sacrificed in favor of self-interest, love of power, and economic competition. Political authorities frequently lean towards changing loyalties, manipulation, and enforced decisions, evading the principle of justice for one another’s good. Epistemic authorities

³²⁶ Daniel Bodansky. “The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope?” *The American Journal of International Law* 110, no. 2 (2016): 288–319. <https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintlaw.110.2.0288>. Pg. 290

³²⁷ “The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope?”, Pg. 289

³²⁸ IBID

rely more closely on moral integrity and reputation, embodying the principles of justice, particularly justice in reciprocity. However, each type of authority can lead to hierarchies, potentially leaning into the vice of injustice. Unjust hierarchies betray Aristotle's principles of proportionality and fairness, which are essential to the virtue of justice.

Numerical Equality is vital to Aristotle's notion of justice. Although his definition of personal equality may have differed from the modern version, he still believed it was crucial to justice, especially political justice. Political justice requires proportionality, equality, and reason to rule. It also states that the ruler should profit nothing by ruling, always laboring for others' benefits. In political justice, equality is concerned with proportionality as justice is distributed numerically between parties. Justice administered by proportionality allows those in authority to increase legitimation through a shared social purpose and pursuit of the common good.

Zürn also addresses the problems of sovereignty and the lack of separation of powers that come from delegitimation. States are bound by the principles of sovereignty, which is founded on authority, individual rights, and external and internal recognition. The focus of justice is individual rights, which are often bypassed when sovereignty is overreached. Concern for individual rights is critical to a shared social purpose and pursuit of the common good because individuals must have a voice in governance decisions. Zürn also focuses heavily on the problem of separation of powers in the governance system. Weak separation of powers overpowers the will of the people and creates impartiality, which is against the very nature of injustice.

Justice in distribution and justice of exchange can be seen through climate justice. Climate justice calls for the equal distribution of resources and responsibilities in an effort to reduce the consequences of climate change. Large countries often produce more of the consequences of climate justice, but smaller countries frequently bear more of the responsibilities; however, as seen

in examples such as the Kyoto Protocols and Paris Agreements, which aim to produce proportionate responsibilities. The Kyoto Protocol aims to reduce greenhouse gas emissions through larger countries giving resources to smaller ones and using other distributive methods. The Paris Agreement seeks to reduce the overall global temperature through a united force. Both the Paris Agreement and the Kyoto Protocol use distributive justice to pursue a shared social purpose and the common good, reducing delegitimation problems. Overall, the virtue of justice mitigates the issues of authority relationships, reinforces equality, decreases weak separation of powers, and helps prevent overreach of sovereignty. Justice seeks to pursue the common good, a shared social purpose, and human flourishing through proportionality, distribution, and equal exchange despite regulation issues.

Generosity

Aristotle's virtue of Generosity, otherwise known as liberality, concerns the giving and taking of wealth, particularly in the giving of wealth.³²⁹ According to Aristotle, wealth concerns anything whose worth is measured by money. Wealth can include currency, goods and services, and all resources. The generous person is praised not for actions of war, wisdom, or in the law but for their devotion to giving. The vices of generosity are wastefulness and ungenerosity. Ungenerosity, the deficiency, is those who take wealth more seriously than what is virtuous. Wastefulness consists of many applications but primarily applies to those who spend money on those who cause their own destruction and use money in intemperate ways.³³⁰ Leaders that spend money on things that lack wisdom and moderation are wasteful. Wastefulness is primarily defined by the person's desire to ruin their property by causing their own destruction.³³¹

Wealth, which is considered useful to Aristotle, is neutral but is best used by those with the corresponding virtue. Even though the world Aristotle is writing about has many differences in human rights, his opinions on the ethics of wealth and giving should still applied to the governance system. "Yet, Aristotle's mini treatise on the subject can still be studied to advantage. His account of the ethics of wealth has the advantage of integrating issues of wealth with other human concerns about ethical behavior in a way that current ethical treatments often miss."³³² Aristotle is able to integrate human problems and human flourishing with the ethics of wealth in a way that is worth applying to global governance. "This high regard for liberality depends on the way people who are

³²⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1119b25-26

³³⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a-23

³³¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1119b30-1120a

³³² Hadreas, Peter. "Aristotle on the Vices and Virtue of Wealth." *Journal of Business Ethics* 39, no. 4 (2002): 361–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25074851>. Pg. 361

liberal act, as if they have regulated the common aspiration for and the pleasure deriving from wealth.”³³³ The regulation of wealth is central to the virtue of generosity, as one must avoid loving wealth more than giving. Riches themselves are useful, but those who love riches less are connected with virtue and are generous people.³³⁴

Generosity is primarily concerned with the giving and taking of wealth and what sources that wealth should come from and be given. Regarding recourses, wealth is about possessing rather than using; hence, the generous person should know who to give and take from. Aristotle argues it is more virtuous to take from the right sources than from the wrong sources.³³⁵ It is also more virtuous to do good than to receive good, as giving implies doing good and taking the right actions. Giving is primarily the purpose of generous people as they will desire not to keep all their wealth for themselves. “Moreover, thanks go to the one who gives, not to the one who fails to take, and praise goes more (to the giver).”³³⁶ Generous people love because of their giving, perhaps more than others, than those who possess other virtues, as they primarily benefit others.

The virtue is a mean about both giving and taking in the right way and to the right people. It is more the goal to give, not just failing to take and giving rightly. Those who take rightly or only take resources are praised for justice but not for generosity. Aristotle even argues that the generous are praised more than practically any other virtuous person.³³⁷ The generous person seeks to aim to give to the right people, at the right time, in the right amounts, and with pleasure. If the generous person finds it painful to give or give to the wrong people, then they are not aiming at

³³³ Giammusso, Salvatore. “Friendship with Oneself and the Virtues of Giving in Aristotle’s Ethics.” *Archiv Für Begriffsgeschichte* 58 (2016): 7–26. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44630638>. Pg. 7

³³⁴ Nicomachean Ethics 1120a5-10

³³⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a10-11-12

³³⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a15,-17

³³⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a20-22-23

good actions; therefore, they are not generous.³³⁸ The generous person does not find giving painful but chooses the right actions over wealth. The generous person feels pain when not giving and pleasure when giving.

The generous must take wealth from the right sources, but they also must not take it from the wrong sources.³³⁹ Taking wealth from the wrong sources does not honor wealth or benefit others. The generous person does not take bribes or ask for favors, as giving is their primary goal. The generous person will neither love nor neglect their possessions but use them to benefit others.³⁴⁰ A generous person will have less for themselves and will never depend on the quantity of what is given but on the state of character of the giver. In this sense, it is not easy for a generous person to grow rich, as they honor wealth for the sake of giving, not for wealth itself. A generous person is an easy person to have common and efficient dealings with in matters of money as their spending is always just.³⁴¹ The central part of the virtue of generosity is that it “...does not depend on the quality of what is given, but on the state (of character) of the giver and the generous state gives in accord with ones means.”³⁴² It is the character of the person that encourages generosity, not the amount of possessions they possess.

The excess and deficiency are different sides of the vice of generosity, wastefulness, and ungenerosity, but both contain errors in giving and taking. The wasteful person feels neither “pleasure nor pain at the right things in the right way, in giving and taking for resources.”³⁴³ The wasteful person is this: “... the generous person is the one who spends in accord with his means,

³³⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a30-33

³³⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a30-34

³⁴⁰ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120b-5

³⁴¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a4

³⁴² Nicomachean Ethics, 1120b5,8-9

³⁴³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a-10

and for the right purposes, whereas the one who exceeds his means is wasteful.”³⁴⁴ Exceeding one's means where it affects others' resources is the primary characteristic of wastefulness. Ungenerosity is deficient in giving and excessive in taking, primarily in small matters.³⁴⁵

Wastefulness is often found in private citizens, as they lack resources.³⁴⁶ However, wastefulness can frequently be cured by habitation, poverty, or old age. The wasteful person lacks a guide and wishes to spend but lacks the resources, so it is often cured. The wasteful person is excessive in giving and not taking but deficient in taking. The Wasteful person is better than generosity as it still benefits others, while the ungenerous person benefits no one. Wasteful leaders have an urge to give, but the sources taken from do not matter to them.³⁴⁷

Generosity, however, is incurable, according to Aristotle, as it is frequently natural to humanity.³⁴⁸ Humanity loves wealth more than natural givers and tends to hold onto their wealth. Ungenerosity is a greater evil than wastefulness and is more common and, therefore, must be guarded against.³⁴⁹ The ungenerous person can separate deficiency in giving and excess in taking, which is frequently seen in the political sphere. The most common feature of ungenerosity is a shameful love of gain and taking the wrong things from the wrong sources.

Zürn's global governance system is surrounded by issues of wealth, resource deficiency, and goods and services, which lack the impact of the virtue of generosity. Instead, economic competition, self-interest, politicization, and delegitimization control the narrative in the system. Zürn points out the issues of wealth, goods and services, authority relationships, and legitimacy

³⁴⁴ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120b

³⁴⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a10-15

³⁴⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a20-21

³⁴⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121b3-4

³⁴⁸ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121b15

³⁴⁹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1122a15-16

can contribute to the problems in the global governance system. Generosity calls for wealth to be taken from the right sources, from the right people, and to be given whenever possible. Wastefulness and ungenerosity are some of the causes of the increased need for legitimacy, economic competition over the common good, and strengthened unjust hierarchies. Generosity as a virtue can reduce the problems of an increased need for legitimacy, dependence on social capital, regulating trade for goods and services, and dismantling unjust hierarchies, which, in turn, decreases human flourishing and the impact on the common good.

Section 1: Legitimacy and Generosity

Political and epistemic authorities must be legitimated to governments and non-state actors. The authorities or frequently international institutions need to be justified; otherwise, more problems will occur. International institutions often need to be justified through common goods and normative principles.³⁵⁰ Legitimization issues can lead to further problems such as institutionalized inequality, weak separations of power, a built-in tendency toward arbitrariness, and partiality in the exercise of authority.³⁵¹ Problems with legitimacy lead to reduced concern for the common good and are often caused by the love of wealth. According to Zürn, authority implies the right to justification, whether well-reasoned or manipulated. The legitimacy of public authorities can refer to the acceptance of an institution's activities.³⁵² The willingness to follow is at the core of legitimacy and authority, which stems from recognition. The desire to follow often stems from increased wealth and not the giving of resources. Wealth is also a source of legitimacy, as fairness is usually bypassed by not giving.

³⁵⁰ Zürn, global governance, pg. 62

³⁵¹ Zürn, global governance, pg. 63

³⁵² Zürn, global governance, pg. 64

Zürn argues for different narratives of legitimacy so international authorities may be recognized and continue to serve the common good.³⁵³ These sources of legitimacy are the impartial pursuit of a shared social purpose, participatory narrative, legal narrative, fairness narrative, technocratic narrative, traditional, relative gains, and manipulative narrative. Different sources of legitimacy lead to legitimacy narratives or strategies to justify a normative order.³⁵⁴ These narratives aim to increase legitimacy, reducing most of the governance system's problems. Focusing on the fairness and legal narratives as they apply to both generosity and its vices, impacting the common good and shared social purpose. The narratives do not directly affect it, but they apply to international institutions as they often bypass the rule of law to obtain wealth from the wrong sources.

The legal narrative addresses concerns with the rule of law and protection of fundamental rights.³⁵⁵ Institutions and the corresponding laws aim to prevent the disproportionate violation of individual rights. Increasing concern for individual rights is essential to both legitimacy and the common good. According to Zürn, the rule of law is one of the few universal ways to promote legitimacy, even if the definition of the rule of law is widely disagreed upon. "Therefore, people in positions of authority should exercise their power within a constraining framework of public norms that includes limitations on the abuse of public power for private gain."³⁵⁶ Leaders should use the rule of law to everyone's benefit, such as by generous measures.

Generosity aims to have citizens and states taking from the right sources, at the right time, and for good action. Individual rights are often sustained through right giving from the right

³⁵³ Zürn, global governance, pg. 66

³⁵⁴ Zürn, global governance, pg. 70

³⁵⁵ Zürn, global governance, pg. 72

³⁵⁶ Zürn, global governance, pg. 73

sources. Aristotle states, “Nor will he be ready to ask for favors; since he is the one who benefits others, receiving benefits readily is not for him.”³⁵⁷ The generous leader will only take excess benefits for themselves if the rule of law permits it. However, the leader will primarily choose to benefit individual rights over excess resources. The generous person will not circumvent the rule of law for the sake of legitimacy. Similarly, their generosity will benefit others and increase individual rights to resources, increasing authority and legitimacy in a just and legal way.

The legitimation narrative of fairness focuses more on outcomes than procedures. The goal is to justify authority by fair outcomes, as authority is responsible for a fair distribution of resources and benefits. The likelihood of legitimacy increases with the focus on fairness and equal distribution.³⁵⁸ Fairness, according to Zürn, “...can be based on needs, merits, or equal distribution.”³⁵⁹ This understanding also contributes to the discussion on distributive justice. It refers to some correction inequality, often produced by market, nature, or accident. Fairness is most often associated with opposition and legitimating international economic institutions, and it is highly linked to the distribution of wealth. Fairness connects with those who have a significant number of resources and can effectively redistribute wealth and resources.

Zürn argues that fairness legitimacy can be linked to authorities “..that have the capacity to significantly redistribute opportunities and wealth, i.e., organizations that channel a significant amount of resources available as exemplified by the welfare state.”³⁶⁰ The fairness narrative is most often seen in international economic institutions.³⁶¹ Fairness-based legitimacy is arguably one of the better ways to enhance international legitimacy than a manipulative narrative or attempt

³⁵⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a30,35-36

³⁵⁸ Zürn, global governance, pg. 73

³⁵⁹ Zürn, global governance, pg. 74

³⁶⁰ IBID

³⁶¹ IBID

to make use of all of them, leading to legitimation problems. Generosity contributes to the fairness-based legitimacy narrative through the just distribution of wealth. Since giving and taking from the right sources is the foundation of generosity and the nature of a generous person.

Generosity can correct the inequality the market produces in the fairness narrative by giving to those with fewer resources and taking from the right sources. Generosity encourages the giving of resources, but not only that, it makes it nearly impossible to become wealthy, allowing for international institutions with “...a significant amount of resources available...” to divert their resources to those experiencing inequality in the market.³⁶² Generosity is seen in both the legal and fairness legitimacy narratives in that it enforces giving and taking from the right sources and seeks to benefit all, thus contributing to the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose.

Section 2: Social Capital and its Influence on the Governance System

Authority relationships, whether reflexive or epistemic, rest on legitimacy.³⁶³ Every authority must legitimize its practice to maintain the belief in its existence. Authority relationships, such as epistemic ones, indirectly affect the behavior of consumers as they are the producers of consumer goods.³⁶⁴ These relationships significantly affect consumer choice, as ideas about good products become binding for the producer. Products, consumer choice, and the behavior of consumers are all significant components of social capital influence in the governance system. Social capital greatly contributes to the global governance system through many different avenues, taking focus away from the common good.

³⁶² IBID; Nicomachean Ethics, 1120b15-19

³⁶³ Zürn, global governance, pg. 43

³⁶⁴ Zürn, global governance, pg. 49

Modern relationships are based on social capital, as are trade relationships. Those who hold more capital or power over another will always carry more authority, unlike those who are pursuing the common good.³⁶⁵ Social capital can be the foundation of consumer choice and legitimacy concerns linked through authority relationships. “Social capital implies that people well equipped with social resources in the sense of their social network and the resources of others they can call upon better succeed in attaining their goals.”³⁶⁶ People’s social networks connect people to resources, and the consequence is that they often have fewer resources than others. Lancee considers social capital access to resources and not the actual use of resources.³⁶⁷ Resource access will depend on one's social network and can improve labor market outcomes.

Increased dependence on social capital can encourage taking from the wrong sources to improve one’s social capital to increase wealth and participation in the market and governance system. Zürn’s governance system is sustained by authority relationships that aim to increase wealth, often by whatever means necessary. In the governance system, international institutions often take from the wrong sources, such as a large corporation that gained wealth unjustly, which neglects legitimization narratives. These situations can arise in the governance system, such as objectification and institutionalization. Both objectification and institutionalization stem from sustained unjust hierarchies and social capital, which is not ideal for authority relationships that lack generosity.³⁶⁸

Objectification occurs when the dominant worldview reaches external audiences, and the authority holder becomes the objective perspective. According to Zürn, objectification can often

³⁶⁵ Zürn, global governance, pg. 43

³⁶⁶ Lancee, Bram. “Social Capital Theory.” In *Immigrant Performance in the Labour Market: Bonding and Bridging Social Capital*, 17–32. Amsterdam University Press, 2012. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt45kd4j.6>. Pg. 17

³⁶⁷ Lancee, Social Capital Theory, pg. 19

³⁶⁸ Zürn, global governance, pg. 48

become coercion, especially regarding products because of the increased dominant worldview.³⁶⁹ Coercion of resources is entirely contrary to giving because of the loving nature of giving, as Aristotle argues. Objectification is when social capital, power, and knowledge are held over those susceptible to pressure, and when combined with institutionalization. Generosity will cease to be a priority as social capital and coercion increase instead of freedom of choice in resources. Generosity strives for freedom of wealth and knowledge, not manipulation and coercion. Institutionalization is when decisions are a priori delegated, according to Zürn.³⁷⁰ In institutionalization, those in lower positions often have less decision-making power. Objectification and institutionalization lead to unjust hierarchies and lack of legitimation, reducing regulation among authority relationships. Regulation and just distribution of resources are essential for the virtue of generosity to thrive.

According to Aristotle, objectification and institutionalization are characteristics of a wasteful person. Objectification is a stronger perspective on products, often concealing the truth and using wealth to influence what products should be purchased over others. The wasteful person can benefit others, but the end goal is to benefit himself primarily, having no urge to give and always taking from the wrong sources.³⁷¹ Institutionalization connects with wastefulness by encouraging taking from the wrong sources and losing volunteers due to less decision-making power among individuals. Institutionalization involves the loss of subordinates to volunteer for anything, often due to costs.³⁷² Wealth is a significant factor in institutionalization due to a wasteful person seeking to gain wealth above all else and deficiency in giving. However, institutions

³⁶⁹ Zürn, global governance, pg. 49

³⁷⁰ Zürn, global governance, pg. 49

³⁷¹ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a25-29,30

³⁷² Zürn, global governance, pg. 49

prioritizing the voices of private citizens, if they are merely wasteful, may be able to break the vice due to habitation and lack of resources to take from, according to Aristotle.³⁷³

Section 3: Regulation of Resources and Trade

In the governance system, trade is based on Zürn's previously established authority relationships. Regulating trade is essential to the governance system, as authority and legitimacy will decrease without a well-established trade system. In Zürn's governance system, power is defined by authority and legitimacy, which are greatly influenced by resources and wealth. Proper regulation of resources and, by extension, wealth through authority relationships can determine whether relationships are legitimate. Wealth is frequently a defining factor for legitimacy, as, without significant resources, authorities often lose their purpose. Regulating resources and wealth can also control institutionalized inequality and fragmentation.

Wasteful and ungenerous leaders frequently contribute to institutionalized inequality and fragmentation. Institutionalized inequality often occurs when distributional issues become predetermined by powerful actors.³⁷⁴ Dependence on resources will favor more powerful states, ultimately shifting power dynamics. However, generosity is evident in the shift in power distribution, which needed to change in favor of weaker members instead of powerful actors because of institutionalized inequality and fragmentation.³⁷⁵ Generous leaders seek to increase the common good in trade relationships through a lack of fragmentation and the proportionate distribution of wealth.

Powerful actors such as in leading economic states and institutions can create institutionalized inequality without a strong social purpose and dependence on resources to gain

³⁷³ Nicomachean Ethics, 1121a15-30-20

³⁷⁴ Zürn, global governance, pg. 96

³⁷⁵ Zürn, global governance, pg. 96

favor with other states.³⁷⁶ These powerful actors often use abundant resources to manipulate weaker states instead of redistributing wealth proportionately. Like an ungenerous person, acquiring more resources becomes their only focus, regardless of the effect on those with less power. An ungenerous person is what Aristotle calls “...the shameful lover of gain...,” as all their ways of gaining are wrong and incurable.³⁷⁷ An ungenerous person can create inequality with their love of gain, dependence on resources above all else, and lack of care for others' resources. Ungenerous leaders will use abundant resources only for those who can, in turn, give resources back and not those who explicitly lack them, entirely dependent on their love of gain.

Zürn calls for a shift in power distribution needed to avoid fragmentation, increased institutionalized inequality, and contestation. Fragmentation or the decreasing relevance of the original incisions can often lead to a decline in global governance.³⁷⁸ The change in power distribution is produced by weaker members, often benevolently, as they demand change, frequently for voting rights, institutional rights, allocation of resources, or membership rules.³⁷⁹ Those in authority can respond to these demands by ignoring, resisting, or meeting them; either way, the rising weaker states may react against the initially more powerful states.

Ignoring conflicts in governance often creates what Zürn calls “counter-institutionalism,” which powerful states responding to the call for change must avoid.³⁸⁰ Counter-institutionalism results from an international institution's decreasing relevance due to conflicting tasks, often due to decreased resources. The purpose of generous leaders would be to give smaller states a lasting voice and reduce the status quo; however, this is difficult. The generous person would instinctively

³⁷⁶ Zürn, global governance, pg. 96

³⁷⁷ Nicomachean Ethics, 1122a10,12-13

³⁷⁸ Zürn, global governance, pg. 98

³⁷⁹ Zürn, global governance, pg. 96

³⁸⁰ Zürn, global governance, pg. 98

mitigate the status quo and provide weaker voices with decision-making power as they do not value wealth or power but giving.

Institutionalized inequality can lead to fragmentation, where the environment becomes highly competitive, and thus, the institutions have a weakened position.³⁸¹ Fragmentation introduces more competition into the system, frequently creating more value for resources and, therefore, more wasteful leaders, as more considerable wealth is a higher priority. Fragmentation occurs when the power shift has failed, and counter-institutionalization develops, putting pressure on the initial institution to adjust. As Zürn argues, when an institution encounters growing competition and a power shift, change is inevitable, and a generous person's priorities are better suited to change an institution so it may survive.³⁸² The generous leader will focus on change in the system to better distribute wealth, not keeping it all, creating an environment lacking counter-institutionalization and fragmentation.

Institutionalized inequality and fragmentation are problems of legitimation that can arise when an ungenerous person is leading the authority relationships in the governance system.³⁸³ However, due to institutionalized inequality, a generous leader must instigate change to shift the power base to the weaker states instead of those with all the resources in the system. The power redistribution and the wealth due to generous leader activities would avoid increased fragmentation. To avoid fragmentation, a generous leader would need to be motivated by right giving who does not honor wealth and would be able to make "...demands for changes in the substantial and procedural rules. These states then challenge institutionalized inequality and ask

³⁸¹ Zürn, global governance, pg. 98

³⁸² IBID

³⁸³ Zürn, global governance, pg. 96

for change.”³⁸⁴ A generous leader is not motivated by power, wealth, or property but by virtuous giving, which allows this leader to create change and empower weaker states. Avoiding counter-institutionalization, institutionalized inequality, and, by extension, fragmentation increases the impact on the common good, shared social purpose, and human flourishing through a generous leader's love of giving and redistribution of resources.

Section 4: Case Study: Amnesty International

Generosity is founded on the principles of knowing the right sources to take wealth from and how to redistribute that wealth to ensure more considerable populous benefits.³⁸⁵ The generous leader does not have a love of wealth, nor do they seek to gain it for selfish benefit. The generous leader does not need to be praised for their giving unless that praise benefits others.³⁸⁶ Mainly, a generous leader aims for correct giving and taking from virtuous sources. These central principles of generous leadership are best seen in charities and non-governmental organizations. Charities that understand what sources are not corrupt, benefit the common good, and sustain their own legitimacy are reflective of generous leadership. Larger charities that struggle to gain funds to impact the problems seen in society often struggle to take only from the right sources; however, they still embody most of the principles of generosity. The generous giver would succeed in making a more significant contribution to the common good, shared social purpose, and human flourishing and the problems in the governance system.

Zürn addresses charities, calling them “epistemic authorities” “...based on expert knowledge and moral integrity.”³⁸⁷ Moral integrity is crucial to the function of epistemic

³⁸⁴ IBID

³⁸⁵ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a30,34

³⁸⁶ Nicomachean Ethics, 1120a15,19

³⁸⁷ Zürn, global governance, pg. 52

authorities and charities. While he did not create this idea, he acknowledges the concept of an authority needed to redistribute knowledge and maintain bipartisanship. “Governance by reputation” is essential to the governance system, and Zürn argues that it characterizes itself in many different organizations.³⁸⁸ Reputation is the foundation of legitimacy, often seen in charities as they have a more trusted reputation than most governments.

According to Zurn, epistemic authorities are best seen in nongovernmental organizations or NGOs, and their authority has dramatically increased in importance since 1975. Nongovernmental organizations are best able to reflect the principles of moral integrity and a strong reputation. These organizations include Greenpeace, The Red Cross, and Amnesty International.³⁸⁹ Amnesty International, in particular, shows the necessary characteristics of how a generous authority would exercise generous giving through the right sources to decrease the problems in the governance system and increase the common good, shared social purpose, and human flourishing.

Amnesty International is a 503(C) organization that focuses on human rights, particularly those of asylum seekers, protesters, refugees, and those of high risk.³⁹⁰ Specifically, Amnesty focuses on climate justice, the death penalty, ending gun violence, Indigenous rights, gender and sexuality justice, national security, rational justice, racial and migration rights, and technology and human rights. “Amnesty International works independently and impartially to promote respect for all the human rights set out in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.”³⁹¹ Aside from

³⁸⁸ Zürn, global governance, pg. 52

³⁸⁹ IBID

³⁹⁰ "Amnesty International Donate." Amnesty International.

https://donate.amnestyusa.org/page/141452/donate/1?ea_tracking.id=W24XXADEVR0P&en_og_source=W24XXADEVR0P&supporter.appealCode=W24XXADEVR0P&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiAyc67BhDSARIsAM95QztSfzt_YsfwBdrSYY.

³⁹¹ "What is Amnesty International?." YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE. Last modified October 4, 2003.

<https://doi.org/https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/org100042003en.pdf>.

government constraint, impartial giving and support are essential to their mission. The Amnesty International annual meeting will be held in Detroit in 2025, and those who register can attend it in person or online.³⁹² This allows givers another perspective on where their money may go and the organization's purposes. There seems to be little restriction on how who can attend the meeting, further enforcing the idea of transparent giving.

As a virtuous organization, Amnesty must take from rights sources; Amnesty does this by not taking any money from governments.³⁹³ Governments often have ulterior motives in their giving, especially those that do not prioritize human rights. All money comes from private organizations and citizens. While not everyone can have a just motive, it is better to run an organization focused on asylum seekers and high-risk individuals and not take money from any government. Amnesty also maintains a relatively high policy of transparency for its giving for those who may wish to give. Once the money is donated, all statistics are available online. Everything is available to anyone, whether they want to cancel funds or see where their money went.³⁹⁴ Additionally, due to the organization's 503(C) status, they must publicize their annual report. Transparency is essential to continuing impartiality and taking and giving from virtuous sources.

Amnesty International is working on several significant campaigns that focus on generous principles. These include campaigns for at-risk people in Palestine, those at the U.S.

³⁹² "Amnesty International Annual Meeting." Amnesty International. <https://www.amnestyusa.org/agm2025/>.

³⁹³ "Amnesty International Donate." Amnesty International. https://donate.amnestyusa.org/page/141452/donate/1?ea.tracking.id=W24XXADEVR0P&en_og_source=W24XXADEVR0P&supporter.appealCode=W24XXADEVR0P&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiAyc67BhDSARIsAM95QztSfzt_YsfwBdrSYY.

³⁹⁴ "Amnesty International Donate." Amnesty International. https://donate.amnestyusa.org/page/141452/donate/1?ea.tracking.id=W24XXADEVR0P&en_og_source=W24XXADEVR0P&supporter.appealCode=W24XXADEVR0P&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCQiAyc67BhDSARIsAM95QztSfzt_YsfwBdrSYY.

border, and the incoming presidential administration.³⁹⁵ Each campaign allows givers to support a cause more focused on their passions than generally giving to the organization. Amnesty International does not restrict the “right sources,” allowing greater legitimation for the organization. They have clearly lined out what sources they will support and how that impacts the protection of human rights, clearly giving to the right sources.

A clear source of legitimation is a shared social purpose.³⁹⁶ Without a shared social purpose, most organizations will cease to operate. A shared social purpose is essential to impacting the common good and human flourishing. Amnesty uses its shared social purpose to encourage others with a shared social purpose to give to the right sources, such as specific campaigns. The shared social purpose of caring for human rights and decreasing human conflict is essential to Amnesty International's mission, which stems from its giving to virtuous sources.

Amnesty International can focus on the world's most pressing issues and increase its legitimacy due to transparent reporting of funds and generous giving.³⁹⁷ es. “As Price observes, NGOs ‘depend for their legitimacy upon reputation as providers of objective expertise,’ lending them an influential voice world affairs.”³⁹⁸ As an epistemic authority, Amnesty International depends on moral integrity and a strong reputation for legitimacy stemming from its virtuous giving and expertise. Increasing amnesty's influence and reputation is their commitment to not taking funds from any government, avoiding politicization, and taking from the wrong sources. “We regress Amnesty's cataloged background reports and press condemning abuses in 148 countries from 1986 to 2000 on a range of potential influences, including human rights conditions,

³⁹⁵ "Amnesty International Campaigns." Amnesty International. <https://www.amnestyusa.org/campaigns/>.

³⁹⁶ Zürn, global governance, pg. 67

³⁹⁷ Ron, James, Howard Ramos, and Kathleen Rodgers. “Transnational Information Politics: NGO Human Rights Reporting, 1986-2000.” *International Studies Quarterly* 49, no. 3 (2005): 557–87.

<http://www.jstor.org/stable/3693607>. Pg. 557

³⁹⁸ IBID

organizational incrementalism power, foreign aid, civil society, and media prominence.”³⁹⁹ Amnesty’s background in human rights and charitable giving is crucial to impacting the common good by retribution resources and increased legitimacy through a shared social purpose and strong reputation.

Section 5: Conclusion

Generosity seeks to reduce the problems in the governance system, such as delegitimation, politicization, regulation in trade, social capital issues, and unfair hierarchies. Generosity aims to minimize these problems by leaders seeking to give to the right sources and taking from the right sources. The vices of generosity are wastefulness and ungenerosity, which are distinguished by whether or not an organization will grow out of it and the more significant impact of the vice. Wastefulness can be fixed with habitation and age, but ungenerosity cannot. However, both vices contribute to the problems in the global governance system, such as fragmentation, counter-institutionalization, institutionalized inequality, social capital problems, and delegitimation. Ungenerosity is often characterized by the love of gain, which is central to increased fragmentation. Generous leaders can increase potential solutions to the issues in the governance system, such as legitimation, a shared social purpose, and lack of fragmentation, by primarily encouraging taking from just sources, giving to the right ones, and discouraging love of wealth. Generous leaders contribute to the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose by encouraging virtuous giving, redistribution of resources, and decreased love of wealth.

Generosity can be seen in the Non-Governmental Organization Amnesty International, which Zürn mentions as an Epistemic authority legitimized by reputation, moral integrity, and just knowledge. Amnesty International is a human rights organization that focuses on at-risk

³⁹⁹ James, *Transnational Information Politics: NGO Human Rights Reporting*, pg. 560

communities, and its defining characteristic is not accepting funds from any government. Amnesty International takes from the right sources and avoids politicization by not taking from any government. Amnesty International is also transparent in where all funds are going on its website, allowing givers to increase the organization's legitimacy. Amnesty International displays generosity by reducing the problems in the global governance system, such as delegitimation, politicization, and lack of a shared social purpose. Amnesty International contributes to the common good and human flourishing by transparent redistribution of resources and reducing human conflict, prioritizing it over wealth.

Conclusion

Zürn aims to identify the most significant problems in the global governance system, such as delegitimation, contestation, decline and deepening, politicization, and fragmentation, and provide potential ways to reduce and avoid them. Zürn attempts to minimize these problems through several solutions, but they fall short of an acceptable ethical solution. This project addressed the problems of delegitimation, politicization, fragmentation, contestation, unjust hierarchies, and unjust authority relationships by implementing the virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity, as understood by Aristotle, to reduce those problems. Friendship, justice, and generosity also aim to increase the common good, shared social purpose, and human flourishing by encouraging legitimation, collaboration, separation of powers, dependence on social capital for resources, and lack of love of power.

The virtue of friendship is based on goodwill, proportionality, love of your fellow person, and concord. Friendship seeks to pursue mutual benefits and goodwill not based on resources but directly on who a person is. Unvirtuous friendships are based on advantage and utility, not enduring through strain. Unvirtuous friendships, such as contracted, reflective, inscribed, and political authority relationships, are utility-based and have little longevity. Virtuous friendship connects to Zürn's primarily epistemic authority relationships. Epistemic relationships are based on reputation and relevant knowledge. Epistemic relationships most closely resemble virtuous friendships as they rely on moral integrity and a strong reputation.

Complete friendship, with its focus on mutually beneficial goals and proportionality, holds the potential to significantly reduce concerns about power in the global government system. By fostering goodwill and proportionality, complete friendship between authorities can effectively

minimize contestation, politicization, and legitimization problems. This potential for complete friendship to decrease power concerns is a hopeful prospect for a more equitable global governance system. Friendship can create impartiality, a shared social purpose, and mutual choice between parties, further reducing contestation and legitimization problems.

Friendship is seen in the United Nations Security Council, where the permanent council members use their positions to collaborate with other nations for the common good of the global governance system. The United Nations Security Council seeks to increase collaboration among states that do not often have the same interests but do have a shared social purpose of concern for human rights and international security, decreasing legitimization problems and contestation. Epistemic authorities and the United Nations Security Council increase the impact on the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose by having a desire for complete friendship based on mutual goodwill, which decreases legitimization problems, contestation, and partiality.

Justice, a virtue concerned with proportionality and equal concern for equal people, plays a crucial role in addressing distributional problems in the political community. Whether it's special justice, distributive justice, justice in rectification, justice by nature and by law, political justice, or justice in exchange, the aim is always the same: to increase resource equality and administer just laws. This emphasis on justice's role in addressing distributional problems should reassure the audience about the potential for a fairer distribution of resources. Justice focusing on Aristotle's ideas for justice of exchange needs to be proportionate, alleviating the issues seen when institutions in authority prioritize wealth, sovereignty, and unjust hierarchies. Political justice leads to increased legitimization because of a shared social purpose and pursuit of the common good. Justice in rectification and distributional justice each seek to decrease unequal resources between equal parties.

According to Aristotle, distributive justice and justice of exchange aim for proportionality and equal resources. Specifically, in the issues of climate justice, the distribution of resources and responsibilities is often unequal. For example, larger countries frequently create more of the consequences of climate change but usually take on less of the responsibilities. Justice is seen through the example of climate justice to impact the common good and human flourishing by using proportionality and distributional methods to reduce legitimization concerns and politicization. In needing a shared social purpose for legitimization, climate justice becomes an avenue for authorities to decrease regulation problems in the governance system. Protecting the environment is both a shared social purpose and increases the common good through concern for the environment and overall human flourishing.

Notably, The Kyoto Protocol reduces greenhouse gas emissions by distributing responsibilities to larger countries with more resources. The Kyoto Protocol uses collaboration and redistribution methods to help smaller countries take on climate change responsibilities and encourage larger countries to distribute resources equally. Similarly, the Paris Agreement aims to reduce the global temperature by uniting countries under a shared purpose and financial efficiency. The Paris Agreement uses long-term strategies and contracts to have larger countries take on their share of the consequences, a better amendment to the Kyoto Protocols. The Kyoto Protocol and the Paris Agreement use distributive justice and justice of exchange to pursue a shared social purpose and the common good, reducing legitimization problems.

Generosity, a virtue that concerns wealth and how to use it well, is a crucial element in the global governance system. It seeks to decrease the love of gain and increase giving for its own sake. Generosity is primarily concerned with giving and taking from the right sources. A generous leader must value not wealth but the well-being of the community. Gaining and protecting

resources are not the goals of generous leaders; they need to redistribute what they already possess. In the global governance system, generosity can reduce the problems of delegitimization, dependence on social capital for resources, and regulation of goods and services, primarily in trade relationships. Generosity allows leadership to have a shared social purpose in giving to the right sources and increasing the legitimacy of their organization. Proportionate redistribution of resources becomes the goal of generous leaders, especially regarding authority relationships and delegitimation. Social capital affects consumer choice, products, and consumer behavior. However, generosity allows for freedom of choice in trade and behavior and decreases dependence on resource-giving based on self-interest.

The vices of ungenerosity and wastefulness produce a love of power and wealth in leadership. Ungenerous leaders can create shifts in power due to institutionalized inequality, fragmentation, counter-institutionalization, and increased competition. Ungenerous leaders will contribute to these problems through a love of resources for their own selfish ends. Wastefulness, while it is a problem that can be fixed with age and habituation, is not as much of a problem as ungenerosity. It still contributes to the issues in the governance system as wasteful people will take from the wrong sources, such as those that are not mutually beneficial.

However, a generous leader will institute the change in power dynamics needed to avoid problems of fragmentation and further legitimization issues. Generosity is especially seen in epistemic authorities as they are founded on a just reputation, such as giving without selfish intent. Amnesty International, an epistemic authority, evidences generosity. Amnesty International is a human rights-based organization that campaigns for high-risk individuals. Their goal is to aid in human rights conflicts through giving and different campaigns across the world. Amnesty International focuses on transparency in giving and takes no donations from governments,

avoiding politicization and taking from the right sources. Governments more often have ulterior motives when giving. They are biased in human rights issues, making the private sector and individual citizens the right sources to take from and give to. It also has individualized campaigns, allowing givers to give to the right sources that align with their passions. Amnesty International creates a shared social purpose for givers, increasing legitimacy and encouraging generosity. Generosity as a virtue contributes to the common good, human flourishing, and shared social purpose by giving and taking from the sources, which decreases politicization, delegitimation, social capital dependence, and fragmentation.

Section 1: The pursuit of the Common Good and Human Flourishing, as seen by the Virtues

Aristotle's goal with each virtue is to increase human flourishing and the political community's overall common good. Virtues aim to increase flourishing in individuals who avoid both the deficiency and excess of virtue, no matter the setting. In connection to human flourishing, Zürich acknowledges the governance system is in pursuit of a common good. The common good exists in the governance system but is often overtaken by self-interest problems. The common good is frequently neglected in favor of unjust hierarchies, economic competition, politicization, love of power, love of wealth, and sovereignty. Pursuing the common good of the governance system and human flourishing alleviates the significant problems that Zürich addresses, such as delegitimation, contestation, decline and deepening, lack of separation of powers, fragmentation, and the connections between authority and legitimation.

Zürich's governance system is beset with problems, the major of which are contestation, delegitimation, and lack of separation of powers. Leadership in authority, especially those in epistemic and political authorities, should utilize virtues to increase the common good and human flourishing, decreasing the issues of legitimation and self-interest. "Politics is not only about

struggle, although it is that too- it is also about taking care of our common world.”⁴⁰⁰ The governance system, while about regulation, does have a concern for the common good, especially with the implementation of virtues. This project illustrates how the virtues of friendship, justice, and generosity aim to mitigate the problems of contestation, politicization, delegitimation, weak separation of powers, sovereignty, social capital dependence, fragmentation, and unjust hierarchies. Friendship increases the common good by complete friendships discouraging utility and politicization in the global governance system.

Generosity increases the common good by giving a shared social purpose to those in the system unaffected by wealth and social capital. Justice pursues the common good by redistributing resources and through a fair exchange to those with less, such as in climate justice. These virtues can be seen through the collaborations of the United Nations Security Council, Amnesty International, The Kyoto Protocols, and the Paris Agreement. Each virtue together pursues a greater common good, shared social purpose, and human flourishing for the political community than goals of solely economic competition, legitimation without a shared social purpose, and institutionalized inequality.

Section 2: Future directions

The goal of this project is to encourage the implementation of these virtues as an ethical guideline for leadership in authority to decrease the current issues in the governance system and to pursue the common good. A continuation of this project should explore how to implement virtuous leaders successfully. It would be helpful to explore different ways to make virtuous leaders seem valuable so they can be elected. Education, ethical codes, and specific incentives are

⁴⁰⁰ Klabbers, *Virtue in Governance*, pg. 105

some ways to ensure virtuous leaders stay in power. The implementation of ethical leaders would be the next step in this project.

Education is a critical way to ensure ethical leaders are elected. For example, encouraging high and middle school classes about virtues alongside civic education. Civic education is often one required class paired with economics, leaving little room to cover ethical guidelines. Civic education also frequently entails a history of government, personal finance, and leadership education. However, what is lacking in current civics education is a discussion of why virtuous leaders should be in civics, what types of leaders should be valued, and the connection between virtues and history. Civics education and corresponding classes should have instruction in their curricula on virtues and why they are desirable, as well as examples of virtuous leaders throughout history.

While laws that encourage virtuous behavior are critical, ethical codes tackle the problem differently. Ethical codes consist of things like ethical review boards, ethical oaths, and pledges, as well as further accountability mechanisms for unethical behavior. Ethical codes that value accountability, transparency, lack of love of power, and justice should be implemented for those in authority over governments and international institutions. These codes should be created by citizens and those who receive benefits from international institutions, not by high-ranking leaders. Further projects should illustrate the specifics of how this would be played out.

Incentives would have to be played out carefully, as the goal of virtue ethics is to have virtuous character, not to do virtuous actions for the sake of duty or prize. Incentives include potential advancement, reduced political power, and positions on boards and leadership committees. Incentives should look very different at the government level than with non-profits. Citizens and those under the authority of leaders would create incentives like ethical codes. What

types of incentives for ethical behavior should be explored in a further project. Although this project focuses on how and what virtues are relevant to global governance, further projects could focus on how to keep and implement virtuous leadership through education, ethical codes, and specific incentives.

References

1. Agnew, John. "American Hegemony and the New Geography of Power." In *Hegemony: The New Shape Of Global Power*, 37–70. Temple University Press, 2005.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt14bsxmk.7>.
2. "Amnesty International Annual Meeting." Amnesty International.
<https://www.amnestyusa.org/agm2025/>.
3. "Amnesty International Donate." Amnesty International.
https://donate.amnestyusa.org/page/141452/donate/1?ea.tracking.id=W24XXADEVR0P&en_og_source=W24XXADEVR0P&supporter.appealCode=W24XXADEVR0P&gad_source=1&gclid=Cj0KCCQiAyc67BhDSARIsAM95QztSfzt_YsfwBdrSYY.
4. Barber, Michael D. "Power, Discourse, and Ethics." *Human Studies* 41, no. 3 (2018): 485–91. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44979931>.
5. Beitz, Charles R. "Cosmopolitanism and Global Justice." *The Journal of Ethics* 9, no. 1/2 (2005): 11–27. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25115813>.
6. Bres, Helena de. "Disaggregating Global Justice." *Social Theory and Practice* 39, no. 3 (2013): 422–48. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23558604>.
7. Castells, Manuel. "Global Governance and Global Politics." *PS: Political Science and Politics* 38, no. 1 (2005): 9–16. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/30044215>.

8. Clark, Ian. "Bringing Hegemony Back in: The United States and International Order." *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs 1944-)* 85, no. 1 (2009): 23–36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27694917>.
9. Claude, Inis L. "The United Nations, the United States, and the Maintenance of Peace." *International Organization* 23, no. 3 (1969): 621–36. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2706073>.
10. Collins, Susan D. "Moral Virtue and the Limits of the Political Community in Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics.'" *American Journal of Political Science* 48, no. 1 (2004): 47–61. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1519896>.
11. Cocking, Dean. "Aristotle, Friendship and Virtue." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 68, no. 267 (1) (2014): 83–90. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24776785>
12. Cooper, John M. "Aristotle on the Forms of Friendship." *The Review of Metaphysics* 30, no. 4 (1977): 619–48. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/20126987>.
13. Daniel Bodansky. "The Paris Climate Change Agreement: A New Hope?" *The American Journal of International Law* 110, no. 2 (2016): 288–319. <https://doi.org/10.5305/amerjintelaw.110.2.0288>. Pg. 2
14. DesAutels, Peggy. "Power, Virtue, and Vice." *The Monist* 99, no. 2 (2016): 128–43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44012741>.
15. Deutsch, Karl W., and J. David Singer. "Multipolar Power Systems and International Stability." *World Politics* 16, no. 3 (1964): 390–406. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2009578>.
16. Diggs, B. J. "The Common Good as Reason for Political Action." *Ethics* 83, no. 4 (1973): 283–93. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2379966>.

17. Dingwerth, Klaus, and Philipp Pattberg. "Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics." *Global Governance* 12, no. 2 (2006): 185–203.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800609>.
18. Douglass, Bruce. "The Common Good and the Public Interest." *Political Theory* 8, no. 1 (1980): 103–17. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/190769>.
19. Duke, George. "The Distinctive Common Good." *The Review of Politics* 78, no. 2 (2016): 227–50. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24889973>.
20. Finkelstein, Lawrence S. "What Is Global Governance?" *Global Governance* 1, no. 3 (1995): 367–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800120>.
21. Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52, no. 4 (1998): 887–917.
22. Giammusso, Salvatore. "Friendship with Oneself and the Virtues of Giving in Aristotle's Ethics." *Archiv Für Begriffsgeschichte* 58 (2016): 7–26.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/44630638>.
23. Guest, James W. "Justice as Lawfulness and Equity as a Virtue in Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics.'" *The Review of Politics* 79, no. 1 (2017): 1–22.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/44653477>.
24. Hadreas, Peter. "Aristotle on the Vices and Virtue of Wealth." *Journal of Business Ethics* 39, no. 4 (2002): 361–76. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/25074851>.
25. Hariman, Robert, and Francis A. Beer. "What Would Be Prudent? Forms of Reasoning in World Politics." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 1, no. 3 (1998): 299–330.
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/41939457>.

26. Harman, Gilbert. "Human Flourishing, Ethics, and Liberty." *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 12, no. 4 (1983): 307–22. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2265376>.
27. Hamilton, Christopher. "Virtue and Human Flourishing." In *Living Philosophy: Reflections on Life, Meaning and Morality*, 25–35. Edinburgh University Press, 2001. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3366/j.ctvxcr9xw.6>.
28. Howard, Lise Morjé. "Sources of Change in United States-United Nations Relations." *Global Governance* 16, no. 4 (2010): 485–503. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29764963>.
29. HUANG, Xianzhong. "Justice as a Virtue: An Analysis of Aristotle's Virtue of Justice." *Frontiers of Philosophy in China* 2, no. 2 (2007): 265–79. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27823292>.
30. Kateb, George. "Courage as a Virtue." *Social Research* 71, no. 1 (2004): 39–72. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40971659>.
31. Kelly Rogers. "Aristotle on Loving Another for His Own Sake." *Phronesis* 39, no. 3 (1994): 291–302. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4182479>.
32. Keohane, Robert O. Review of *The United States and the Postwar Order: Empire or Hegemony?*, by Geir Lundestad. *Journal of Peace Research* 28, no. 4 (1991): 435–39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/424129>.
33. Klabbers J. *Virtue in Global Governance: Judgment and Discretion*. Cambridge University Press; 2022
34. KONSTAN, DAVID. "Love." In *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*, 169–84. University of Toronto Press, 2006. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.3138/9781442674370.12>.

35. Kraut, Richard, "Aristotle's Ethics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-ethics/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-ethics/).
36. Lee Ward, and Aristotle. "Nobility and Necessity: The Problem of Courage in Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics.'" *The American Political Science Review* 95, no. 1 (2001): 71–83. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3117629>.
37. "Marking the Kyoto Protocol's 25th anniversary." United Nations: Climate Change. Last modified December 11, 2022. <https://www.un.org/en/climatechange/marking-kyoto-protocol%E2%80%99s-25th-anniversary>.
38. Miller, Fred, "Aristotle's Political Theory", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2022 Edition), Edward N. Zalta & Uri Nodelman (eds.), URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-politics/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2022/entries/aristotle-politics/).
39. Moore, Geoff. "The Virtue of Governance, the Governance of Virtue." *Business Ethics Quarterly* 22, no. 2 (2012): 293–318. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23223727>.
40. Nicomachean Ethics." 2ndnd ed. Translated by Terence Irwin.: Hackett Publishing company
41. Pangle, Lorraine Smith. "The Anatomy of Courage in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*." *The Review of Politics* 80, no. 4 (2018): 569–90. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/26564695>.
42. Pastor, Robert A., and Jorge Castaneda. "Pastor, Robert A., and Jorge G. Castañeda," Limits to Friendship: The United States and Mexico". Toronto: Random House, 1998. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=YHCv0cbOkfIC&oi=fnd&pg=PR9&dq=friendship,+national+security+council&ots=2eOx_m1wV1&sig=p9Olba0nMunWJMe_wAkPqstd4Shw#v=onepage&q=friendship%2C%20national%20se.

43. PORTER, GARETH. "The U.S. and Vietnam: Between War and Friendship." *Southeast Asian Affairs*, 1977, 325–38. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27908325>.
44. Rosenau, James N. "Governance in the Twenty-First Century." *Global Governance* 1, no. 1 (1995): 13–43. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/27800099>.
45. Rosenblatt, Valerie. "Hierarchies, Power Inequalities, and Organizational Corruption." *Journal of Business Ethics* 111, no. 2 (2012): 237–51. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23324870>.
46. Schroeder, Donald N. "ARISTOTLE ON THE GOOD OF VIRTUE-FRIENDSHIP." *History of Political Thought* 13, no. 2 (1992): 203–18. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/26214086>.
47. Shukla, Ashish. "Pakistan-China Relations: A Case Study of All-Weather Friendship." *Himalayan and Central Asian Studies* 17, no. 3/4 (2013): 206.
48. Smith, Thomas W. "Aristotle on the Conditions for and Limits of the Common Good." *The American Political Science Review* 93, no. 3 (1999): 625–36. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2585578>.
49. Swanson, Judith A. "Aristotle on Liberality: Its Relation to Justice and Its Public and Private Practice." *Polity* 27, no. 1 (1994): 3–23. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3235084>.
50. The UN Security Council." The Council on Foreign Relationships. Last modified September 9, 2024. <https://www.cfr.org/background/un-security-council>.
51. "The Paris Agreement Related news Related Documents Related links What is the Paris Agreement?." United Nations: Climate Change. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-paris-agreement>

52. Towns, Ann E. "Norms and Social Hierarchies: Understanding International Policy Diffusion 'From Below.'" *International Organization* 66, no. 2 (2012): 179–209. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/41428953>.
53. TRACY, THEODORE. "Perfect Friendship in Aristotle's 'Nicomachean Ethics.'" *Illinois Classical Studies* 4 (1979): 65–75. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23061134>.
54. United Nations Charter, Chapter V: The Security Council." United Nations. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter/chapter-1>.
55. Unsplash, Karsten. "Kyoto Protocol - Targets for the first commitment period." United Nations: Climate Change. <https://unfccc.int/process-and-meetings/the-kyoto-protocol/what-is-the-kyoto-protocol/kyoto-protocol-targets-for-the-first-commitment-period>.
56. Vigani, Denise. "ARISTOTLE'S ACCOUNT OF COURAGE." *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 34, no. 4 (2017): 313–30. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/44983524>. Pg. 318
57. Weiss, Thomas G., and Rorden Wilkinson. "Rethinking Global Governance? Complexity, Authority, Power, Change." *International Studies Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2014): 207–15. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/24017859>.
58. "What is Amnesty International?." YOU CAN MAKE A DIFFERENCE. Last modified October 4, 2003. <https://doi.org/https://www.amnesty.org/en/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/org100042003en.pdf>.
59. "Which countries are the world's biggest carbon polluters?." Climate Change news. Last modified May 17, 2021. <https://climatetrade.com/which-countries-are-the-worlds-biggest-carbon->

