

UNITED NATIONS

Exam Strategies: Give **differentiated answers and examples**, e.g. about the two identities of the UN, agencies, or about its different purposes. Do not talk about the UN in abstract. Look at the different norms of human security and ways in which the UN has helped changed the terms of international discourse. Use **broad range of empirical examples!** However, do not recycle too much material. To make a more nuanced argument, use different levels of analysis (international, regional, domestic, sub-state...) and different time frames/episodes. Arrive at a **conclusion!**

My own position: *Institutions matter even if they are politicized. Who else, if not the UN can bring Great Power together to a table? Although far from perfect, the UN is one of the best organizations we have for creating a more peaceful and secure international order. Its key assets are: facilitating conflict prevention, norm- and standard setter (e.g. move to human security, R2P), can employ different identities (neutral and consensual for peacekeeping, judgemental and partial for power politics, providing expertise through NGOs). Thus, the UN excels at providing different platforms for multilateral dialogue and setting norms and standards. But it is fundamentally constrained by power politics (like anything in the international sphere) and collective action problems. It is often difficult to get all P5 members aligned. The UN today however is not the UN that the founders imagined to be – it has become a defender of human security more so than state security.*

DEFINITIONS AND CLARIFICATIONS

- > What is the UN?
 - > The United Nations (UN) is an **intergovernmental organization** made up of 193 sovereign member states: it acts as instructed by its member states.
 - > It was established after WWII with the **aim of preventing future wars**, succeeding the ineffective League of Nations. 51 original member states signed the formal UN Charter und the leadership of the UK and the US.
 - > Its principal organs are: The Security Council (SC), the General Assembly (GA), the Secretariat (SG) and the International Court of Justice (ICJ). It also comprises numerous other bodies and **agencies** such as UNICEF, WHO, UNDP, World Bank, IMF etc.

- > What are the **purposes of the UN?** ([Art. 1 UN Charter](#))
 - > Maintaining international peace and security
 - > Developing friendly relations among nations
 - > Achieving international cooperation, especially in matters of human rights and fundamental freedoms
 - > Harmonizing the actions of nations, bringing them closer together

- > What is the UN constrained by? ([Art. 2 UN Charter](#))
 - > By the **principle of sovereign equality** of all its members and the **principle of non-intervention**.
 - “Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the UN to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.” ([Art. 2,7](#))

- > How is the UN seen through different IR lenses?
 - > **Realism:** States remain to be the dominant actors and the logic of maximizing power and security also applies to their approach to the UN: It is merely advantageous so long as they get benefits through them – and they defect as soon as it endangers is. There is no stable basis for continuous cooperation.
 - “parlement” (talkshop) instead of parliament
 - **Neorealism** does a good job in explaining why bonds fail or change, but it cannot explain why institutions continue to persist even if their fundamental purpose has disappeared (e.g. NATO after end of Cold War)

- > **Liberalism:** Existence of UN affects state preferences and provides a legal framework for interaction. It becomes an arena for cooperation in which weaker and stronger states oblige to the same norms and laws.
 - States need multilateral institutions because they need to share the material and political burdens of security management and to gain authority and legitimacy. This is something that the possession of crude power can never secure on its own. (Hurrell 2007)
- > **Constructivism:** Like liberalism, constructivism argues that the UN affects states' preferences, but goes beyond that by arguing that it also **shapes the identities of states** and gradually constructs new state identities, which imply a different (changed) behaviour.
- > How can we assess/evaluate institutions?
 - > By their **particular objectives**, e.g. binding the powerful, sharing burdens, fostering trust, impartiality and access. In the UN's case, we can evaluate it by its own standards, as written out in the Charter.
 - > By **systemic purposes**: mitigating war, limiting weapons
- > What is the post Cold War international order?
 - > Rise of smaller states
 - > Unipolar moment of US power
 - > Era of globalization and complex interdependence.

UN IN ITS HISTORICAL CONTEXT

- > UN was born plural and decentralized, out of pragmatism and pressing need to change the way states conducted their international affairs. It was **never intended to approximate a formal world government** (Weiss et al. 2018)
 - > Dag Hammarskjöld (2nd UN SG) *'The UN wasn't set up to bring mankind to heaven but to save it from hell.'*
 - Comment by Mishana: But normative developments have shown that people are not all evil. Hammarskjöld is speaking as a politician to get some buy-in for the UN as an institution.
- > Looking at the UN Charter one can see that there was a desire for implementation (of peace), but that the constraints of the international order were still recognized
 - > It **highlights human rights in an unprecedented fashion**, both in the Preamble and in the main body of the Charter – but immediately following in Art. 2 we have the **stringent domestic jurisdiction clause**.
 - > *"promoting and encouraging respect for human rights"* is not clearly defined, no means of implementation and enforcement, it remains empty phrases
- > Mazower (2004): It is a puzzle: *"Given that the protection of human rights implies a curtailing of the state's power over its citizens or subjects, how do we explain why the states grouped together in the United Nations Organization came to commit themselves to the defence of human rights?"*
 - > This cannot be explained solely by the triumph of civilization over realpolitik, but it was also a **triumph for state interest**, too.
 - > The rights regime that the UN represented was weaker compared to that of the interwar League of Nations. Perhaps this was the reason why Great Powers like the US and the Soviet Union joined – it is ultimately the "price" of getting everyone on board.
- > After WWI, the Great Powers made international recognition of Eastern European States (Poland, Czechoslovakia...) conditional upon their guaranteeing their minorities certain collective rights
 - > It was **unprecedented** that the monitoring of these provisions was entrusted to the League of Nations, rather than to the Great Power themselves. The turn to human rights after 1945 needs to be understood in the context of this historical experience.
- > After WWII, for many involved human rights were an attractive and plausible alternative to minority rights (Mazower 2004)

THE UN CHARTER - [LINK](#)

- › "The UN Charter, concluded at San Francisco in June 1945, is a remarkable amalgam of realism and idealism" (Lowe et al. 2008)
 "The UN Charter is a bridge between the older Westphalian norms of sovereignty and non-intervention with relatively newer norms, such as the pacific settlement of disputes and the prohibition of the threat and use of force in international relation" (Weiss et al. 2018).
- › What does the Charter say about the **use of force**? (Art. 2,4)
 - › "All members shall refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state, or in any other manner inconsistent with the Purposes of the United Nations."
 - This is a fundamental principle, and even though it has been violated, it is still a benchmark principle of IR. It wasn't that long ago that the use of force wasn't considered illegal, but rather considered acceptable practice.
 - › Which two legitimate uses of force are there?
 - **Self-Defence (Art. 51):** "Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defence if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the UN, until the SC has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security." Once the SC has taken up the matter, states may take no unilateral action to defend themselves anymore.
 - Example: 2001 Afghanistan self-defence against the Taliban
 - **Authorized force by the SC (Art. 39):** "The SC shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Art. 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."
 - Example: Resolution 678 on Iraqi invasion in Kuwait 1990
- › The domestic jurisdiction clause states a **principle of non-intervention**, but also leaves the door open for enforcement measures.
 - › *Nothing contained in the present Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state or shall require the Members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter; but this principle shall not prejudice the application of enforcement measures under Chapter VII. (Art. 2, 7)*
- › **Chapter VI is about pacific settlement of disputes**
 - › Parties to any dispute shall first seek solution by: negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements (Art. 33)
 - › Security Council can call upon parties to settle their disputes by such means
 - Example: Austrian and Italian long-standing dispute over South Tyrole – it was only after the UN attempted multiple settlements in the 1960s that they got to an agreement
- › **Chapter VII is about more 'robust' measures**
 - › **Art. 42:** "Should the SC consider that measures provided for in Art. 41 (which is about measures not involving the use of armed force) would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security..."
 - › **Art. 43** requires each member state to make available to the SC their armed forces, assistance and facilities. – but in reality this hasn't really happened before.

However, the **Charter is not very explicit in defining what a “threat of peace” consists in**, and deliberately leaves it to the discretion of the Security Council. It used to be **acts of aggression**, but nowadays they not only extend to inter-state wars, but also to civil wars, humanitarian crises, refugee flows, even absence of democracy!

Example Haiti 1994: Overthrow of Aristide in 1991, the first democratically elected President of Haiti, coupled with reports of persecution of his supporters led to pressure on SC to take action. In 1993 the SC unanimously instated a worldwide fuel and arms embargo on Haiti. In 1994, SC authorized the use of a US-led multinational force to “*facilitate the departure from Haiti of the military leadership, (...) the prompt return of the legitimately elected President and the restoration of the legitimate authorities of the Government of Haiti.*”

IDENTITIES OF THE UN (CLAUDE 1996)

The UN is many things. The **different identities of the UN need to be distinguished**. Why? Because it allows us to soberly consider which tasks regarding peace, stability and order the UN can reasonably fulfil. (Berdal 2003)

- › **First UN (“it”):** consists of the **bureaucracy of the UN** in its headquarters, most notably the General Secretariat and its staff – behaves like a separate corporate entity or actor which gets sponsored from its members. Led by the Secretary-General, it exhibits non-state agency.

UN bureaucracy provides **expertise, knowledge and independent diplomatic skills**, which allows member states reduce the transaction and information costs associated with multilateral action (Weiss et al. 2018)

 - > Activities are **non-coercive, consensual and neutral**
 - > **Example:** Peacekeeping missions which are negotiated between the UN and have the consent of the state in which they are operating (such as in Rwanda, 1993/4). The characteristics of the peacekeeping missions are henceforth impartial, defensive and consented (Hurd 2014)

- › **Second UN (“we”):** consists of the **collective of the member-states**, who employ the first UN and discuss in the various UN organs – behaves like an arena or stage, where members can discuss amongst each other, but are still **dominated by the major powers of the system**.

Thus, this UN is primarily an intergovernmental organization in which members may pursue or channel their foreign policies diplomatically and multilaterally (Weiss et al. 2018). Organs, which are populated by representatives of member states are: SC, GA, ECOSOC, HRC...

 - > Activities are **judgemental, partisan and coercive**
 - > **Example:** Peace-enforcement operations which are coercive invasions of countries by a UN-authorized force with the intent on eliminating or mitigating a threat to international peace and security, such as in Iraq 1991, following their occupation of Kuwait.

Looking at the different meanings of the UN leads us to better recognize its strengths and weaknesses and what we can reasonably expect it to do (Berdal 2003)

- › **Claude (1996)** argues that an attempt to transform the UN into a partial, military power (like the United States) would be unreasonable, because this would undermine its capacity to carry out pacific settlement and peacekeeping missions. Instead, the UN should be conceived as an **instrument of the multistate system** to make it workable, because the UN’s task is to make the world safe for pluralism, not abandon it.

- › **Third UN:** As a **collective of expertise:** Weiss 2012 argues that in addition to the distinction made by Claude, a third UN developed which consists in the **network of NGOs**, experts, corporate executives, media representatives and academics. This complements the first and second UN and is employed around the world. This presents a key strength of the UN: **Bringing information from different networks together**.
 - > Though it is independent from the two other UNs, **it provides essential input**.
 - > Almost 4000 NGOs have some form of consultative or observer status within the UN, this allows them to participate in international conferences. They fulfil a **lobbying function and subcontracting role in delivering humanitarian and development aid**.
 - **Example:** IPCC – Panel of experts on climate change

- > **Activist networks are motivated by values** rather than by material concerns or professional norms – they are most prevalent in issue areas characterized by high value content and informational uncertainty. The core of the relationship is information exchange (Keck and Sikkink 1999)
 - > UN arguable **gives those smaller entities within civil society a voice**
 - > Arg.: The UN is evolving with the international system into a solidarist vision. However, there is also some backlash.
- > How do the **different UN identities interact with each other**? Answer: **Interactively and Dynamically!**
- > First UN cannot function well if its actions go against the preferences of powerful member states (Second UN, especially the P5)
 - But even if first UN cannot instruct members how to act, it can push member states and remind them of their obligations under the Charter and international law.
 - > Second UN – via the Security Council – may decide to create a peacekeeping force but then leaves specifics and mechanics to the SG, i.e. the First UN.
 - > First and second UN turn to third UN (NGOs) to provide assistance and expertise during routine field operations, fostering development and monitoring (Weiss et al. 2018)

THE UN'S ROLE IN MAINTAINING PEACE AND SECURITY

- > What are the range of activities undertaken by the UN to maintain international peace and security?
- > **Conflict Prevention and Mediation:** diplomatic measures to keep intra-state or inter-state tensions and disputes from escalating into violent conflict. Difficult endeavour since the crisis is a possible or potential one and hence almost invisible. Justification of intervention on grounds of a potential conflict may be difficult.
 - Examples.: early warning, information gathering and a careful analysis of the factors driving the conflict
 - Arg.: Even if the UN is “just” a talking shop, then this is still something good!
 - > **Peacemaking:** measures to address conflicts in progress and usually involves diplomatic action to bring hostile parties to a negotiated agreement
 - > Peacekeeping: “**Traditional peacekeeping**” may be defined as using international personnel, civilian and/or military under UN command (the UN does not have an army itself) to help control or resolve an actual or potential international conflict. It is about “lowering the temperature” and allowing the parties to settle the issue. Meant to **create a space for diplomacy to work** (Caplan 2020)
 - Guided by three basic principles:
 - consent of the parties,
 - impartiality,
 - non-use of force except in self-defence and defence of the mandate
 - > **Peace enforcement:** application of a range of coercive measures, including the use of military force. It requires the explicit authorization of the Security Council.
 - > **(Post-conflict) Peacebuilding** aims to reduce the risk of lapsing or relapsing into conflict by strengthening national capacities at all levels for conflict management, very long-term and complex process. This is important however, because a very large number of conflicts re-start within the decade that they have been ‘settled’.

The lines between these measures are quite blurred: **Peace operations are rarely limited to one type of activity.**

- > What happened after the end of the Cold War regarding peacekeeping missions?
- > There was a **surge in the number of peacekeeping operations**: From 1948 – 1988, there were in total 14 peacekeeping missions. Since 1988, there were 51 UN peacekeeping missions. In 2020 alone there are 14 active peacekeeping operations, as many as through the entire Cold War period!

- The total cost of those is estimated at 6 billion US Dollar. For comparison, the US spent the same amount in one month on Iraq in 2007. So one could say that the UN is conducting several missions around the globe without that much money.
- > The **nature of peacekeeping operations changed**: It was no longer just about keeping peace, but also about ensuring the delivery of humanitarian aid, for disarmament, training police, for verifying human rights agreements, UN even served as judiciary on some regional levels → “*Complex peacekeeping*”

SUCSESSES AND FAILURES

The answer to the question whether the UN has been successful or not will depend on whether one believes that the world would have been better off without the UN. Important to recognize the compromises which were necessary to bring into being. KEY: The UN or the Soviet Union did not “need” a world organization, and they would not have joined if the UN had possessed the authority to intervene in their internal affairs. (Mazower 2004)

- > What are (arguably) **successes of the UN**?
 - > There has been **no direct war between the world’s great powers since its foundation**.
 - Claim: Giving major players veto powers in the UNSC institutionalized the UNSC as a place for political compromise in which competing interests of great powers can be managed diplomatically, without escalating into direct violent conflict.
 - Obj.: There have been proxy wars of course.
 - Additionally, even if there have been fewer interstate wars in the world, the number of intrastate conflicts has increased.
 - It has also provided some “escape routes” for Great Powers, to save face in the international system
 - **Example 1956 Suez Crisis**: UN provided an escape route for Britain and France, which had taken up an untenable position by invading Egypt and following Israel. Accepting the replacement by international forces which the UN provided (in its first peace-keeping mission) was much more politically tolerable than admitting that they made a mistake.
 - > UN is an **idea-manager, a purveyor of ideas and a norm- and standard-setter** (Weiss 2015)
 - Promotion of universal human rights for all, setting global goals (Millennium Development goals, SDGs), bringing the issues of environment and development to global attention
 - Sufficient ambiguity was built into the UN’s approach to allow a new emphasis on human rights to emerge during the Cold War (Mazower 2004)
 - **Example: Norm-shift in the areas of security** (from state to human security) as well as state sovereignty (from territorial right and right to non-intervention to Sovereignty as Responsibility)
 - Moving toward a more solidarist ideal – the UN takes part in that.
 - > It has virtually **brought in every country in the world**, created a common platform
 - Obj.: But the UN is little more than a talkshop
 - Reply: Talking is good, facilitates diplomacy 😊.
 - > The UN has crucially contributed to the **prevention of conflict** (Mingst and Karns 2018):
 - Promoted a culture of legality and rule of law
 - Raised awareness of plight of the world’s poor and boosted development by providing technical assistance
 - Promoted concern for human rights, including status of women, children’s rights and rights of indigenous people
 - **Example 1979 Vietnamese boat people**: Geneva conference was called to address the humanitarian tragedy that threatened to develop. Arrangements to grant refugees

temporary asylum were quickly worked out, relieving the worst of the distress and reducing tension in the South-Asia region.

- Contributed to making multilateral diplomacy primary way in which international norms are established
 - **Example: 2007 Kenya Presidential Election:** using diplomatic instead of military means, this is cited as a showcase example of R2P implementation. *See sovereignty as responsibility concept in Humanitarian Intervention cheat sheet.*

These are all “softer” forms of power, but just because they cannot be measured quantitatively, that doesn’t mean that there isn’t a significant qualitative impact!

> **UN can use preventive measures successfully**

- **Example: Guinea 2008-2009:** Following a volatile coup in 2008, resulting in massacre of protestors in 2009, international actors applied a range of measures in order to stabilize the region and prevent it from escalating into broader ethnic conflict. These included preventive diplomacy, arms embargoes, travel bans and threats of prosecution from the ICC
- Goes to show that a sustained, concerted and coordinated effort by actors on all levels (regional, domestic and international) can avert atrocity crimes in the lead up to Guinea’s presidential election in 2010. (Kikoler 2015)

> What are (arguably) **failures of the UN?**

> **Deadlock of the UNSC, paralysis of the UN** – The rules upon which the UN is built are too weak to deal with geopolitical factors, because it is still the sovereignty of states that animates the UN structure, and which prevents it from effectively addressing crises (Glennon 2003).

- Arg.: The rules upon which the UN is built are too weak to deal with geopolitical factors, because it is still the sovereignty of states that animates the UN structure. Rules should come from the way states *do* behave, not how they *ought* to behave, since they will continue to seek power and disagree upon where force should be used. As the Westphalian system is very much present, we should thus move away from unrealistic principles (Glennon 2003).
- **Example 2003 Iraq intervention:** UNSC fatally deadlocked when the US threatened to act alone if the UN did not cooperate: France, Russia and China were against a resolution that authorized force against the Saddam regime, while UK tried to agree on some compromise (Glennon 2003)
- Reply: Norms are not emerging descriptively, but because they have normative force. Though it is true that the UN, like any other international institution, is subject to power politics, this does not mean that it is useless. The UN, in form of its first and third identity, and by giving members a platform for discussion has importantly contributed to peace in the international order.
- Berdal 2003: We shouldn’t assess the effectiveness of the SC in relation to some unattainable ideal because this lets us forget about the **evident utility of the SC to states**
 - UK and France: veto power gives them privilege and influence, have vested interest in keeping SC at centre of peace and security considerations, Russia similar
 - China: uses SC membership to make it clear what it is against
 - US: ambiguous relationship – US doesn’t seem to “need” the UN, but on the other hand the legitimacy it confers on its actions is very costly to ignore

> UN is reliant on Great Powers’ forces, on its own it is inefficient

- **Example. UN Intervention in Somalia 1992** Somali dictator Barre was overthrown in a military coup staged by a coalition of opposition warlords (Muhammad and Aydid), between whom soon a power fight emerged. UN intervened, and later gave power to US, ending in Battle of Mogadishu.

- Largely perceived as a failure, UN had to outsource control to the US (could not rely on its own forces)
- > UN authorizes politically motivated interventions
 - **Example 2011 Libyan intervention:** UN SC passed resolution to militarily intervene in the Libyan Civil War, demanding "immediate ceasefire" and authorizing a no-fly zone, in order to protect civilians. This was adopted under Chapter VII of the UN Charter. This then led to NATO intervention in March 2011, where combined air strike forces launched several attacks against Libyan Army tanks and vehicles.
 - Critique: Instead of protecting its people, NATO became an "army force of the rebels"
 - Reply: It is a problem of implementation of R2P, not necessarily of the theory behind it, which the UN helped to shape. Principles and norms in the international sphere are always subject to power politics.
- > UN is ineffective and limited in its ability to act
 - **Example Rwandan Genocide:** The UN Assistance Mission for Rwanda was established by the UNSC in 1993 in order to assist and aid in the peace process between the Hutu-dominated Rwandese government and the Tutsi-dominated rebels. But this has failed and did not prevent the Rwandan genocide and the outbreak of fighting.
 - **Analysis:** Collective Action Problems? States still need to have vested interests.

COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND MOVE TO HUMAN SECURITY

- > What is the idea of **collective security**?
 - > *"a system, regional or global, in which each state in the system accepts that the security of one is the concern of all, and agrees to join in a collective response to threats to, and breaches of, the peace"* (Wight 1977, adapted)
 - Assumption here is that threats to be addressed may arise from one or more states *within the system* – this makes it distinct from systems of alliance security or collective defence which are against external threats (Lowe et al. 2008)
 - > Sitting at the heart of the UN peace and security missions, collective security indicates the **idea that all states join forces to protect any one of its members from the unlawful force of another state**. This requires cooperation of all member states.
 - > But collective security measures aren't automatic – the UN SC has to decide on them.
 - Critique: UNSC does not reflect the collective interests of all UN member states, but **those of P5 states and their allies**. The UN Charter cannot provide the basis for a general system of pure collective security (in the classical sense), because the veto power of the P5 means that action can never be mandated by the UNSC to use against them. (Lowe et al 2008)
- > How has the **meaning of security changed**?
 - > The meaning of "threat to peace" has changed profoundly in the history of the UN. Why? Because patterns of war and peace have altered since the founding of the UN – wars between states have become rarer.
 - Instead, we observe a whole **new set of security challenges**, including civil wars, ethnic strife, refugee crises, humanitarian disasters, nuclear proliferation (Hurrell 2007). What is different about those is that they derive from state weakness and absence of political legitimacy.
 - We are **increasingly concerned with the level below the states, such as ethnic minorities and individuals**.
 - > This leads us to talk about **human security**, putting emphasis on the security of the individual, rather than that of nation-states. Note that this is **very different to what the founders of the UN had in mind!**
 - The UN Preamble reads: *"We the Peoples..."*

- › What is the rationale for this reconceptualization?
 - > The focus on security of states was justified by appealing to a special protective role of the state for its citizens – **human security now introduces a qualification on sovereignty**: The rights of sovereign states are conditional upon those states’ compliance with international expectations regarding the protection of human beings
 - This is meant to **overcome a tension between sovereignty and human rights**, two core principles of the UN system
 - Sovereignty suggests that states should possess exclusive jurisdiction within a territory, free from outside interference; human rights capture the idea that individual rights are inalienable and transcend state borders (Weiss 2012)
 - **Kofi Annan 1999**: “*State sovereignty, in its most basic sense, is being redefined – not least by the forces of globalization and international cooperation. States are now widely understood to be instruments at the service of their peoples, and not vice versa*”
 - Gives rise to the **R2P doctrine** (see separate sheet)
- › How is the move to human security criticized?
 - > It seems to **render the notion of “security” too broad and therefore meaningless**: If aspects beyond violence are included in the notion of security, then security issues can no longer be distinguished from “normal” political issues (which may very well lie within the jurisdiction of each state). Security should remain by definition a highly important issue, which one must do something about.

ISSUES AND CONTROVERSIES

- › **Use of force for humanitarian purposes** → see separate “humanitarian intervention” sheet.
 - > After the end of the Cold War, the SC has become more confident in its expanded definition of threats to international peace and security
 - **Example Northern Iraq 1991**: Resolution designed to address Saddam Hussein’s repression of the Kurdish population in Northern Iraq which led to the flight of up to a million civilians into neighbouring countries such as Turkey. US, together with UK and France then sent troops into northern Iraq to provide for the safety of Kurdish Refugees and facilitate delivery of humanitarian assistance.
 - Often cited as precedent for humanitarian intervention, but it might have been less revolutionary than it first appeared (Welsh 2008): the relevant threat to peace and security was considered to be the “transboundary effects” of the conflict, rather than the actual suppression of the Kurds within the borders of Iraq – this **allowed the supporters of the resolution to avoid the contradiction between principle of non-intervention and promotion of human rights**.
- › **Who should sit on the Security Council?**
 - > Decisions on the SC have to be made by an affirmative vote of nine members, which include the P5. But it is important to note here that **non-permanent members have in effect a “sixth” veto** and can block resolutions. The P5 members are the WWII victors and China, which is **not representative of today’s distribution of power**. Other rising powers such as Japan, Germany, BRICS countries have some claim to a permanent seat.
 - > There has also been the call for an abolition of the veto or a voluntary suspension
- › **Mingst and Karns (2018)** identify multiple challenges/dilemmas for the UN about to come:
 - > Expanding needs for governance vs. the UN’s limited capacity
 - > Sovereignty vs. challenges to sovereignty

- > The **need for leadership**: Whilst multilateral institutions such as the UN create opportunities for small and middle powers (NGOs, groups of states...), it is still the case that states, and **leadership from major power with resources and influence matters**.
- > The need for inclusiveness: UN must address inequality and the marginalized more directly
 - Renewed focus not only on advocating for excluded groups but also in including them

MAIN AUTHORS

CLAUDE, PEACE AND SECURITY: PROSPECTIVE ROLES FOR THE TWO UNITED NATIONS (1996)

GLENNON, WHY THE SECURITY COUNCIL FAILED (2003)

BERDAL, THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL: INEFFECTIVE BUT INDISPENSABLE (2003)

[LOWE, ROBERTS, WELSH, ZAUM, THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL AND WAR \(2008\)](#)

MINGST, KARNS, THE UN IN THE 21ST CENTURY (2018) - [LINK](#)

WEISS, WHAT'S WRONG WITH THE UN AND HOW TO FIX IT (2012)

WEISS, FURSYTHE, COATE, PEASE, THE UNITED NATIONS AND CHANGING WORLD POLITICS (2018) - [LINK](#)

HURRELL, ON GLOBAL ORDER (2007)

HURD (2014?)