

Progress and Challenges to the Global Peace: An Evaluation of the United Nations Security Council

Dr Shahzad Akhtar²⁰

Abstract

In 1945, the international community, led by powerful nations at that time, committed to creating a world organization known as the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The primary goal was to prevent another world war and safeguard humanity from catastrophic destruction. However, the Council has not fully met expectations in maintaining world peace and resolving international disputes. This dismal performance is largely due to limitations in the Council's composition including lacking diverse international representation and granting veto power exclusively to the most powerful states which have been driven largely by their self-interests. Reforming the UNSC is crucial for achieving the vision of international peace by enhancing its democratic nature and eliminating these shortcomings.

Keywords: UNSC, World Peace, Cold War, International Dispute, Legitimacy

Introduction

The victors of the Second World War instituted the United Nations in 1945 with the objective of safeguarding future generations from the scourge of war. This commitment entails employing all possible means to avert the reoccurrence of a Third World War (Cousens, 2004, 102). Efforts by diverse statesmen and philosophers to institute a global organization, initiated during the Middle Ages and persisting until the early 19th century, culminated into the establishment of a global entity known as the United Nations (UN) (Ross, 1966, 4). The UN Charter Preamble has clearly stated its aim to prevent the recurrence of another world war in future to safeguard the larger humanity (UN Charter). Other commitments including promotion of human rights, economic betterment, and arms control are considered indispensable to promote and safeguard international peace. In addition, to reinforce commitments regarding global peace, the Charter laid out rules and mechanisms to preserve and further the objectives of global peace that included forbidding states from resorting to force, encouraging the nations to respect and follow international law and bringing innovation to the peaceful resolution of inter-state disputes.

The United Nations Charter delegated the responsibility of addressing international peace challenges to the Security Council, comprised of the five permanent members—formerly recognized as great powers, namely the United States (US), the Soviet Union (USSR), Britain, France, and China—and ten elected members (UN Charter). These members convene regularly to assess threats to international security, including domestic conflicts, natural disasters, arms proliferation, and matters pertaining to terrorism.

The concept of collective security provided rationale for the working of the Security

²⁰ Assistant Professor at School of Social Science, the University of Lahore.
Email: shahzad.akhtar@siss.uol.edu.pk

Council as the five founding members of the Security Council acted as the guardian of international peace. While overseeing international politics, these members possessed the authority to determine events with the potential to disrupt international peace and to undertake requisite measures, including the imposition of sanctions or employing other appropriate means commensurate with the nature and severity of the threat, as delineated in the United Nations Charter.

The initiation of the Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union after the establishment of the United Nations posed a substantial hindrance to the Security Council's ability to actively address challenges in maintaining global peace. The frequent utilization of the veto power by both superpowers against each other's interests rendered the Security Council practically ineffectual. In 1982, the fifth UN Secretary-General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, presented a bleak assessment of the Security Council's performance in fostering international peace. He expressed that the Council appeared disinclined or unable to make any headway toward the peaceful resolution of outstanding disputes. Perez de Cuellar attributed the Council's lackluster performance to the schisms within the international community, which effectively precluded the Council from assuming a decisive role in global peace establishment (Sutterlin, 1995, 5).

End of the Cold War with the fall of the USSR supposedly equipped the Security Council with the necessary political will and other necessary means to play a more proactive role in dealing with the challenges of international peace and security (Khan, 1994). The first test for the Security Council's role in the new World Order settings appeared with the Iraq invasion of Kuwait in 1990 (Boon, 1992). The Council responded swiftly by characterizing the invasion as a threat to international peace and security and vowed to take stern action (Alnasrawi, 2003). Subsequently, the Council authorized the use of force against the aggressor and gave a clear message that any threat to World peace would be dealt with iron-hand. Similarly, the Security Council's authorization of humanitarian intervention in Somalia earned an international appreciation. Later, the Security Council helped some countries in Central America and Southern Africa in terminating ongoing wars between them.

However, the Security Council's proactive role did not last for long. The Security Council exhibited a conspicuous lack of involvement in addressing persistent and volatile regional conflicts, notably the disputes in Palestine and Kashmir. Instances of ethnic cleansing and genocide in Rwanda and Bosnia similarly went unaddressed by the Security Council. The initial enthusiasm surrounding the Council's proactive stance during the early post-Cold War years proved ephemeral, casting uncertainty over its prospective role. The US invasion of Iraq in 2003 without the approval of the Security Council further ruined the credibility of the Council (Simuziya, 2023). Likewise, in recent international conflicts such as the Russian invasion of Ukraine and Israel naked aggression Palestinians, the Council proved to be a silent spectator.

The preceding discussion shows that it is plausible to assert that the Security Council has fallen short of meeting the expectations envisioned by its founders. This article aims to examine the inherent structural deficiencies inherited by the Council at its

establishment and those subsequently acquired over time, impeding its intended role in sustaining international peace and security durably. Furthermore, this research endeavors to present practical yet modest recommendations that could enhance the Council's participatory nature and diligence in implementing measures to establish enduring peace at both regional and global levels. The article will conclude with a summarizing assessment.

This research employs a qualitative methodology, drawing upon both secondary and primary sources to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the Security Council's contribution to global peace maintenance, especially during the post-Cold War period. Extensive literature review, encompassing books, journal articles, and relevant reports, has been conducted to collect primary data, supplemented by scrutiny of news reports. Specialized journals focusing on peace and conflict were systematically examined to gather insights into the Security Council's role in actualizing international peace within the context of its structural limitations. The information derived from these sources serves as the foundation for analysing the Council's role in international peace.

The Veto Power, Great Powers Politics, and Role of the Security Council

Chapter V of the UN Charter delineates the organizational framework of the Security Council, encompassing aspects such as the number of its members, their specific roles, and the procedural mechanisms involved. The architects of the post-World War II political landscape, notably the United States, the Soviet Union, and the United Kingdom, shaped the Council's composition. The Security Council's five permanent members—China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United States, collectively referred to as the P5—possess the authority to exercise a veto over resolutions, a privilege not extended to the Council's elected members.

Granting veto power to the then-five great powers was considered essential to sustain their commitment to establishing an entity devoted to advancing global peace. Scholars argue that the disinterest of significant powers such as Germany, Italy, the USSR, the US, and Japan in the League of Nations was a major contributing factor to the organization's failure, leading to the collapse of the Wilsonian order established in 1919 (Kennedy, 2006, 13). Nevertheless, the distinctive status accorded to the great powers has significantly compromised the original objectives for which the Council was established.

The introduction of veto power within the Security Council was primarily intended to safeguard the interests of the great powers. It was implicitly agreed that the Council would refrain from intervention if the interests of any great power were implicated. Consequently, the structural inclusion of the veto power served as a limiting factor, effectively restricting the Council's engagement when threats to global peace emanated from the great powers. Therefore, the establishment of the Security Council aimed to furnish a mechanism for collective security that could selectively address aggression threats, while concurrently maintaining a delicate balance of power among its five permanent members (Smith, 2001, 45).

Consequently, the nascent collective security system exhibited a tendency to respond selectively to acts of international aggression. The five permanent members held the privilege to determine whether a particular act of aggression posed a threat to international peace. The Council was more likely to respond if a smaller power committed aggression and the permanent members collectively deemed it as such. However, the Council faced limitations in responding to acts of aggression involving either a permanent member or its client state, primarily due to the veto power wielded by a select few states. Among the P5, the Soviet Union extensively utilized veto power, having vetoed more than one hundred resolutions since the Council's inception. The United States demonstrated a comparable frequency in exercising its veto power, while China increased its use in recent years. In contrast, other major powers such as France and the United Kingdom refrained from using their veto power since 1989, setting a discouraging precedent for others who have done so more frequently (Council on Foreign Relations, 2021).

Foremost among the impediments to the Security Council's effective functioning was the power dynamic between the United States and the Soviet Union during the Cold War era. The conflicting interests of the permanent members, particularly the U.S. and the Soviet Union, both superpowers at the time, resulted in the sporadic utilization of veto power or its mere threat, rendering the Council largely inert (White, 1994, 14). Evan Lurad, a scholar specializing in UN affairs, nuances the dynamics of veto power usage by noting that the initial intent of the great powers was to employ this special authority solely in safeguarding their vital national interests, predominantly confined to Europe due to limited interest in other parts of the world. Lurad further observes that the globalization of the Cold War extended the essential interests of the great powers, thus broadening the scope of these vital interests (D. O'Sullivan, 2005, 16).

Even the mere threat of using veto power by permanent members restrained the Security Council from responding to threats to international peace. For instance, the prospect of China exercising its veto power in the Darfur case deterred Council involvement in the issue. Similarly, the potential Russian veto power in the Kosovo case hindered the Council from making any substantive progress in resolving the question of the territory's political and legal status. Russia's intervention in Ukraine in 2014 raised doubts about the Council's ability to mitigate crises. Likewise, efforts to address human rights violations by the Assad regime and hold it accountable faced considerable challenges due to Russia's consistent use of the veto power. Consequently, the utilization of veto power, driven by the great powers' pursuit of safeguarding their strategic interests, resulted in the inaction of the Security Council, carrying serious repercussions for global peace.

In recent times, several international conflicts have arisen, posing significant threats to international peace and stability while causing extensive human suffering. Nevertheless, the Security Council finds itself constrained from intervention due to the vested interests of its member states wielding veto powers. In February 2022, Russia initiated a military offensive in Ukraine, constituting a blatant infringement upon the territorial integrity and sovereignty of Ukraine. Notably reminiscent of Cold War politics, the role of the Security Council was hampered by Russia's exercise of

veto powers to impede the passage of a resolution calling for the prompt withdrawal of Russian troops (The Indian express, 2022). Likewise, concerning the Israeli transgressions against innocent Palestinians, the Security Council displayed ineffectiveness when a UN resolution, urging an immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza, was vetoed by the United States in December 2023. Since October 7, 2023, the conflict has resulted in over 17,400 Palestinian casualties, while Israel has suffered 1,100 losses in the hostilities (Nichols, 2023).

Weak Performance of the Security Council in the Pacific Settlement of Disputes

One of the articulated objectives of the Security Council is to facilitate the resolution of inter-state disputes, thereby mitigating the risk of armed conflicts and establishing enduring foundations for global peace. Chapter VI of the UN Charter delineates an array of political and diplomatic tools at the disposal of the Security Council for the "peaceful settlement of disputes" (UN Charter). In pursuit of its stated goals related to the peaceful resolution of international disputes, the Security Council provides contending parties with opportunities to seek resolution through negotiation, arbitration, or other peaceful means. Importantly, the Council's authority extends beyond diplomatic measures, encompassing coercive tools such as the imposition of sanctions or the authorization of the use of force to address challenges pertaining to international peace and security.

The Security Council possesses the authority to bring to attention any dispute or issue that has the potential to lead to war between states, thereby posing a threat to world peace. Consequently, the Council is empowered to take initiative either independently or upon request by a member state to intervene and mitigate crisis situations that could escalate into conflicts jeopardizing global peace. Deliberations among the permanent members serve as a forum for assessing the severity of threats in crisis situations involving states engaged in territorial or other disputes. However, the Security Council has fallen short of the expectations outlined in the Charter, as evidenced by a discernible lack of effectiveness in efforts to resolve inter-state disputes. Former UN Secretary-General U Thant attributes this deficiency to a combination of factors, including the reluctance of states involved in disputes to take initiative and the enduring nature of conflicts. Thant noted that states embroiled in disputes often find themselves unable to devise pragmatic solutions, leading them to refer these complex issues to the United Nations. He further emphasized that disputes brought before the UNSC are frequently characterized by a high level of complexity, rendering a solution seemingly unattainable (Thant, 1978, 32).

An alternative explanation in this context attributes the lack of confidence in the Council, particularly during the Cold War years, to the reluctance of the great powers. Instead of relying on the Council, these powers sought alternative channels to address disputes involving threats to international peace (Touval, 1994, 47). The great powers found that their self-interests could be better served by directly engaging in mediation between conflicting parties, bypassing the Council. The United States, for instance, played a mediating role between disputing NATO allies like Greece and Turkey, as well as between its allies and anti-colonial forces in conflicts such as the Anglo-

Iranian and Anglo-Egyptian disputes. Driven by its interest in enhancing international stature, the U.S. strategically denied the Soviet Union any role, practicing its containment strategy, and offered mediation in conflicts involving newly independent states, such as Indonesia and Malaysia, as well as Egypt and Israel. Similar self-serving motivations were observed in the actions of other great powers, such as the Soviet Union's mediation between India and Pakistan at Tashkent and France's mediation between Mali and Senegal (Touval, 1994, 47). This unintentional outcome contributed to the diminishing role of the Security Council in settling inter-state disputes, thereby depriving the Council of legitimacy and credibility in the eyes of the international community.

A significant hindrance to the international role of the Security Council lies in its incapacity to operate independently, lacking inherent military power or economic resources (Touval, 1994, 52). The Council is entirely reliant on member states, particularly the great powers, to furnish the necessary military and financial resources for the resolution of inter-state disputes. While ostensibly member states, particularly those with considerable strength, may contribute resources to enhance the credibility and effectiveness of the Council, such cooperation proves challenging to attain, particularly when states are driven by self-interest and are disinclined to act unless their interests are directly impacted.

Owing to these structural constraints, the Security Council faces limitations in fostering a cohesive, adaptable, and dynamic negotiation process that could adequately address the aspirations of all involved parties. Furthermore, the dominance of the five permanent members in Council affairs not only diminishes its dynamism and flexibility but also hampers its role as a mediating body facilitating negotiations between adversaries. Recent instances, including the Syrian civil war, Russian occupation of Crimea, and the Covid-19 pandemic, underscore how conflicting member state interests have recurrently obstructed the Council's ability to address interstate conflicts or natural disasters.

The Insufficient Enforcement Authority of the Council

The Security Council is endowed, as articulated by Hans Kelsen, 'to maintain international peace and security by enforcement actions' (Kelsen, 1950, 283). Empowered to preserve international peace and security, the Council is authorized to identify significant threats to peace or impending aggression from any disputing parties and undertake measures to alleviate crisis situations that have the potential to escalate into a military conflict, thus disrupting international peace and security (UN Charter). The Council has at its disposal a range of options, including the imposition of sanctions, deployment of peacekeeping troops, and assuming a mediating role. However, the Council has been notably ineffective in conflict prevention, a shortcoming attributed to several contributing factors.

The efficacy of the Security Council in conflict prevention is notably contingent upon the determination of the great powers to assume leadership roles, driven primarily by their respective national interests. The pursuit of self-serving policies by the great powers constrains the Security Council's ability to intervene in conflicts where the

strategic interests of major powers are at stake (Cousens, 2004, 13). Illustrative examples supporting this contention include the Council's limited interest in addressing the conflict in Chechnya and its reluctance to respond to human rights violations in Uyghur-dominated areas of Western China.

The Security Council confronts a significant deficit in the necessary powers to enforce its decisions aimed at maintaining global peace (Laurenti, 2005). A portion of this challenge can be attributed to states' unwillingness to contribute troops when their vital interests are not perceived to be in jeopardy (Laurenti, 2005). For instance, the United States has asserted that its involvement in peacekeeping or peace-enforcement activities would be contingent upon the alignment with American national interests (Sutterlin, 1995, 8).

A resolute commitment from the great powers is imperative for the Security Council to assume a meaningful role in the resolution of ongoing international disputes. Consequently, the Council's involvement in the absence of such commitment from the great powers offers little prospect for meaningful progress in dispute resolution. The enduring Israeli-Palestinian conflict, which the Security Council has engaged in resolving for decades, exemplifies the lack of progress due to the absence of interest or conflicting interests among major powers (Cousens, 2004, 113). Absent a robust political will and commitment from the great powers, the Security Council remains a predominantly non-functional body in the prevention of both domestic and international conflicts, thus posing an enduring challenge to international peace.

Breach of the UN Charter by the Security Council's Members

The UN Charter explicitly prohibits the use of force by a state against another state or any act of aggression within the international system. The charter articulates principles that allow the use of force in specific situations, such as self-defense or when authorized by the Security Council. Despite the Security Council being entrusted with the primary responsibility for preserving international peace and security, it is bound by the Charter and international law in carrying out this mandate (Ellen O'Connell, 2019). Notwithstanding these principles, since the establishment of the UN in 1945, numerous states have engaged in acts of aggression against others while attempting to resolve disputes. Permanent members of the Security Council have, at times, circumvented these rules when their national interests have sanctioned the use of force in an unlawful manner.

Universal principles and moral considerations have demonstrated limited relevance in the realm of state interactions, as state actions are predominantly influenced by perceived national interests, characterized by a continual competition for power among states and the fluid nature of these interests. During the Cold War era, superpowers frequently resorted to military power, exemplified by the U.S. intervention in Nicaragua and the Soviet Union's involvement in Afghanistan in 1979 (Lupu, 2006, 884).

Similarly, in March 1999, NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) forces initiated a military campaign against Serbian forces in Yugoslavia without seeking approval

from the Security Council. The campaign aimed at protecting the Albanian population in Yugoslavia's southern province of Kosovo. Tensions escalated between Kosovo rebels and the Serb-controlled government in 1998, raising concerns of a potential mass murder akin to the events in Bosnia several years prior. Anticipating the likelihood of a Russian veto, the U.S. and European powers opted to circumvent the Security Council and relied on NATO troops to advance their interests (Lupu, 2006, 890). The NATO military campaign, lacking authorization from the Security Council, further tarnished the image of the Council in the international community, reinforcing the perception that the Council is functionally impaired in the establishment and maintenance of international peace (Perle, 2003).

The American invasion of Iraq in 2003, undertaken without the approval of the Security Council, serves as a paradigmatic illustration of the Council's perceived ineffectiveness in establishing conditions conducive to international peace. Preceding this military intervention, the Security Council had passed 'Resolution 1441' in 2002, calling for decisive action against Iraq should it fail to comply with international inspection protocols for its atomic establishments. While the international community favored diplomatic initiatives and non-coercive measures to encourage Iraq's compliance with UNSC resolutions, the United States insisted on employing force as a means of coercion. Despite international disapproval, the Bush administration proceeded with the invasion, contending that UNSC resolutions, including Resolution 1441, provided authorization for the use of force (Taft IV & Buchwald, 2003). This position was met with opposition from Kofi Annan, who asserted that 'from our point of view and the U.N. charter point of view, [the invasion] was illegal' (Lupu, 2006, 886).

Furthermore, the international community widely perceives the US invasion of Iraq as unjustified, constituting a violation of the UN Charter and marginalizing the Security Council (Murphy, 2004, 253). The persistent contravention of the Charter, particularly by great powers, has significantly eroded the credibility and effectiveness of the Security Council.

The Non-Democratic Character, Illegitimacy, and Inefficiency of the Security Council

Since the establishment of the UN and its various organs in 1945, the permanent members of the Security Council have consistently exerted dominance over the agenda and activities of the Council, raising concerns about the organization's legitimacy. Notably, developing countries have expressed apprehensions that the Council's current structure does not align with evolving geopolitical realities. The only amendment made in 1965 pertaining to the membership of the Security Council expanded the number of non-permanent members from six to ten. However, this limited alteration has resulted in the Council's failure to adapt to the shifting contours of global geopolitics.

The global landscape has undergone significant quantitative and qualitative transformations, necessitating corresponding adjustments in the composition and powers of the Security Council. First, the expansion of UN membership resulted from

the decolonization process, the dissolution of the former Soviet Union, and the fragmentation of the former Yugoslavia, leading to the accession of numerous states to the organization. Second, this quantitative shift laid the groundwork for a more crucial qualitative change, as some permanent members of the Council experienced a gradual decline in their military and economic influence. For instance, France and the UK, despite retaining their status as nuclear powers, witnessed a diminishing international standing compared to their position post-World War II. Similarly, the former Soviet Union relinquished its superpower status, and several states seceded from the Soviet federation to establish themselves as sovereign entities, exemplified by the Central Asian Republics (CARs) (Berdal, 2003, 11-13)

The Security Council's failure to adapt to shifts in regional and global strategic configurations has prompted inquiries into the legitimacy of the organization, with potential repercussions for its effectiveness. A report by the United Nations highlighted that, despite changes in the power configuration among member states since 1945, the Security Council has been resistant to responding to these transformations (UN Report, 2004). Expressing similar concerns, an editorial in the *New York Times* observed that the Security Council remains entrenched in the power structure of 1945, failing to mirror the contemporary power dynamics among states (New York Times, 2004). In early 2021, UN General Assembly President Volkan Bozkir underscored the imperative of restructuring the Security Council, suggesting that enhancing the Council's legitimacy and its authority to enforce decisions could be achieved by ensuring greater representation of the international community, along with increased accountability and transparency (UN News, 2021).

Diverse proposals have been put forth to reform the Security Council, encompassing suggestions such as expanding its membership and amending the rules pertaining to the veto right. The consensus is that broader representation and participation would contribute to addressing challenges to international peace (Ellen O'Connell, 2019, 11). In this context, regional powers like Brazil, Germany, India, Japan, Nigeria, and South Africa have advocated for Council expansion and campaigned for securing permanent seats. Conversely, objections have been raised against France retaining its permanent seat and not ceding it to the European Union post-Brexit. Furthermore, in 2021, Britain expressed support for Germany's bid for a permanent seat on the Council. Nevertheless, these endeavors have largely proven inconclusive. Additionally, an agreement among the P5 is deemed essential for any amendment to the Council's membership structure. Any attempt to modify the Council's membership can be thwarted through the use of the veto power wielded by any of the permanent members. It is anticipated that the great powers would be reluctant to relinquish these special powers and are likely to obstruct any proposals concerning the restructuring of the Council (Ellen O'Connell, 2019, 141).

Moreover, a discernible decline in the relative strength of the permanent members of the Security Council has resulted in a gradual waning of the great powers' engagement with this global institution. This has profound implications for their efficacy in upholding international peace and security. A report from a high-level panel highlighted the considerable failure of the Council's five permanent members to

provide financial and military resources to the international body commensurate with their designated status and influence within the organization. Conversely, the Council's non-permanent members often exhibited limited interest in supporting the organization materially (UN Secretary-General Report, 2003). A Security Council characterized by enhanced international representation that aligns with the contemporary geopolitical realities of the world is likely to operate with greater authority and decisiveness in addressing challenges to global peace and security (Frechette, 2005, 13).

Suggestions for Enhancing the Efficacy of the Security Council

The preceding discussion in this article underscores significant issues related to the weaknesses of the UN Security Council, particularly concerning its composition characterized by a lack of broad international representation and the exclusive reservation of the veto power for the most powerful states, collectively known as the P5. Notably, the actual use or the threat of using the veto power by any permanent member of the Security Council has proven detrimental to the effective functioning of the Council. Addressing this impediment has the potential to significantly enhance the legitimacy and efficacy of the Security Council. However, there is currently no concrete proposal in motion to restrict or eliminate the veto power. This can be attributed in part to the reluctance of the P5 members to relinquish their power, given its perceived utility in safeguarding their states' interests and international prestige. Additionally, the UN Charter does not impose any mandate that could compel them to withdraw from this privileged position (Weiss, 2003, 149).

The international community acknowledges the imperative for a substantial revision of the existing composition of the Security Council to align with evolving regional and global strategic realities, essential for effective action in the establishment of international peace and security. The High-Level Panel on the UN asserted that the outdated structure of membership lacks legitimacy and garnering support for Council decisions is increasingly challenging (UN Secretary-General Report, 2003, 79). Emphasizing the need for Security Council reforms based on equitable international representation and credibility, the report underscores these as critical issues requiring earnest attention (UN Secretary-General Report, 2003, 79). Overcoming challenges to the organization's legitimacy necessitates a significant overhaul and change in the membership structure of the Security Council (Hurd, 2008, 201). The panel report proposes expanding the council's membership and establishing criteria wherein participation in the decision-making process should be proportionate to the material contributions made to the international body (UN Secretary-General Report, 2003, 7). However, the international community faces substantial disagreement over the expansion of the Council's membership (Weiss, 2003, 149).

Crucially, the substitution of power politics among great powers with cooperation has the potential to facilitate a smoother functioning of the Security Council, thereby significantly contributing to the fulfillment of the objectives envisioned by its founders. Mats Berdal illuminates the disruptive impact of power politics within the Council, identifying factors such as the power dynamics involving both permanent

and non-permanent members, as well as the diverse and frequently conflicting interests of the member states. These dynamics, as highlighted by Berdal, contribute to rendering the international body impotent and largely ineffective in playing a substantial role in the realization of international peace (Berdal, 2003, 9).

Conclusion

Despite notable limitations hindering the Security Council's ability to establish lasting peace through the resolution of international disputes among states, it would be erroneous to assert that the Council has lost all justification for its existence. The Security Council not only monitors regional and international issues that have the potential to destabilize global peace but also seeks to proactively contribute to the resolution of international disputes. Its mere existence sustains hope for the establishment of enduring peace and international security. Some critics even attribute the prevention of another world war to the organization, despite the persistence of several disputes among states.

It is not unfounded to contend that the Security Council has fallen short of the expectations set by its founders, although they may not have foreseen the challenges the organization would encounter in the post-establishment years. The entrenched power dynamics within the international system, particularly evident during the Cold War era, coupled with the frequent use of veto power by its permanent members, impeded the Council's effective handling of threats and obstacles to achieving durable international peace and security. Reluctance on the part of the great powers and the Council's inability to adapt to changing regional and international geostrategic environments have raised concerns about the organization's legitimacy, further eroding its international standing.

The possession of nuclear weapons by states embroiled in longstanding territorial disputes, such as the Kashmir issue and the Palestinian question, poses a serious threat to world peace. Tensions between Pakistan and India over Kashmir have brought the two states to the brink of war on multiple occasions, prompting alarm within the international community. Timely interventions by great powers in crisis situations between these states have effectively averted the escalation of conflicts that could have resulted in unprecedented catastrophes.

Addressing global challenges such as climate change, pandemics that transcend borders, and the rise of international terrorism necessitates a collective responsibility from the entire international community, particularly the great powers. To invigorate the organization, it is imperative for these powers to transcend narrow parochial interests and take effective steps to enhance the Security Council's legitimacy, thereby enabling it to address problems related to international disputes on a durable basis. However, reconciling the national interests of states focused on individual gains with the collective security interests of the entire international community poses a formidable challenge.

References

“A U.N. for the 21st Century.” *New York Times*. December 7, 2004.

Berdal, Mats. (2003). "The UN Security Council: Ineffective but Indispensable." *Survival*. 45 (2).

Charter of the United Nations. Available at <http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/chapter5.shtml>

Cousens, Elizabeth M. (2004). "Conflict Prevention", in *The UN Security Council: From the Cold War to the 21st Century*, edited by David M. Malone (USA, Lynne Rienner).

Cuellar, Javire Perez de. (1991). *Anarchy or Order*. New York: United Nations.

Frechette, Louise. "The United Nations: Adapting to the Twenty-First Century", in *Irrelevant or Indispensable: The United Nations in the 21st Century*. edited by Paul Heinbecker & Patricia Goff. Canada: Wilfrid Laurier University Press.

Hurd, Ian. (2008). "Myths of Membership: The Politics of Legitimation in UN Security Council Reform." *Global Governance*. 14 (4).

Jeffery Laurenti, "What 'reinforcement 'for the Security Council?." www.iss.europa.edu/chailot/chai78.pdf

Kelsen, Hans. (1950). *The Law of the United Nations: A Critical Analysis of its Fundamental Problems*. New York: FA Praeger.

Kennedy, Paul. (2006). *The Parliament of Men: The United Nations and the Quest for World Government*. London: Penguin.

Lupu, Yonatan. (2006) "Rules, Gaps and Power: Assessing Reform of the U.N. Charter." *Berkeley Journal of International Law* 24 (3).

Lynch. Colum. (2004). "U.S. Allies Dispute Annan on Iraq War." Washington Post.

Murphy, Sean D. (2004) "Assessing the Legality of Invading Iraq." *Georgetown Law Journal*. 99 (2).

O'Connell, Mary Ellen. (2019). "The UN Security Council for Maintaining the Peace," in *The Art of Law in International Community*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

O'Sullivan, Christopher D. (2005). *The United Nations: A Concise History*. Florida (USA): Krieger.

Perle, Richard. (2003). "Thank God for the Death of the UN." *Guardian*. March 21, available at <http://www.guardian.co.uk/Iraq/Story/0.2763,918812,00.html>

Report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. (2004). "A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility." Available at <http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf>

Ross, Alf. (1966) *The United Nations: Peace and Progress* (Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press).

Smith, Edwin M. (2001). "Collective Security: Changing Conceptions and

Institutional Adaptation”, in *Adapting the United Nations to a Post-Modern Era: Lessons Learned*, edited by W. Andy Knight. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Sutterlin, James S. (1995). *The United Nations and the Maintenance of International Security: A Challenge to be Met*. U.S.A.: Praeger.

Taft IV, William H. & Todd F. Buchwald. (2003). “Preemption. Iraq, and International Law”, *The American journal of International Law*. 97 (3).

Thant, U. (1978) *View from the UN* (New York: Doubleday& Co.

The Council on Foreign Relations. “The UN Security Council.” August 12, 2021. <https://www.cfr.org/background/un-security-council>

Touval, Saadia. (1994). “Why UN Fails” *Foreign Affairs* 73 (5).

Weiss, Thomas G. (2003). “The Illusion of UN Security Council Reform”, *The Washington Quarterly* 26 (4).

White, N.D. (1994). *Keeping the Peace: The United Nations and the Maintenance of International Peace and Security*. UK: Manchester University Press.