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ABSTRACT

The study sought to examine how anarchy affects the international system, particularly in the UNSC organ that depicts the realists’ model of world politics. The study relied on both scholarly literature and key UN documents, particularly the UN Charter to analyze and discuss how anarchy affects the functions and roles of the UNSC to maintain international peace and security in the world. It is an arena where states conduct their foreign policy through the national interest as well as a game of power politics, even at the heart of maintaining peace and security. The study found that even though the UN Charter gives every authority to the UNSC members to determine what threatens international peace and security with some limits, the mandate also inexplicably gives the powerful states the authority to translate or make certain decisions to their advantage, for instance, the use of the veto power. These decisions often lead to major crisis than promoting international peace, for example, the Iraqi war, the Gulf war, the Libya Crisis, which all escalated into global conflicts and are even yet to recover or achieve stability from the impact caused. The study recommended, among others, the elimination of the use of veto to make the UNSC more effective in its mandate as the organization can resort to decisions based on a simple majority or two thirds voting of all the member states.
CHAPTER ONE

RESEARCH DESIGN

1.0 Background of the Research Problem

The United Nations (UN), as an organization of independent states exists with the main aim of ensuring global peace and security. This was vividly expressed by Kofi Annan, the previous General-Secretary of the UN, in his speech declaring that:

“More than ever before in human history, we share a common destiny. We can master it only if we face it together. And that is why we have the UN”.¹

Consequently, the core obligation of the United Nations Organization (UNO) is the preservation of world peace and security which must be of a legitimate concern for the global community. In contrast to this notion, states within the international system act in pursuance of their individual interests. Thus, the driving force of states relations, irrespective of the stress on cooperation to overcome the daunting challenges confronting the international community in its entirety, is to achieve their national interest.

The UN emerged in 1945 at the height of World War II after the erstwhile League of Nations formed in 1919 failed to achieve its core mandate to prevent international conflicts, leading to the Second World War.² The UN was born out of the necessity for nations to express their opinions and endorse dialogue cum arbitration of international conflicts, providing a platform for peaceful negotiations. As Keohane and Nye articulated,

“In a world of multiple issues imperfectly linked, in which coalitions are formed transnationally and trans-governmentally, the potential role of international institutions is greatly increased”.³

In its formation as an international forum, the organization was instituted by 51 states in order to forestall international conflicts and wars, forging strategies, resolutions and accords for
conservation of world peace and security. The agreement establishing the organization formulated principles, regulations, the modus operandi and the objectives of the UN as was expressed thus:

“Save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom”.

Supplementary goals that reign supreme in the agreement is deference for codes of equivalent privileges and self-government as well as intercontinental collaboration in tackling economic, social, cultural, and humanitarian problems around the globe.

Currently, 193 states make up the UN with participation in the international organization reasonably accessible by amiable nations that consent to the requirements defined in the existing Charter, and are capable and prepared to carry out these responsibilities. Members must have attained the status of sovereignty, meaning the state must be independent in its internal and external affairs. The admittance of any state into the fold of the global organization, the UN, will be effective via a verdict of the deliberative, policymaking and representative organ, the General Assembly (GA), upon the proposal of the Security Council.

In examining the capacity of this universal organization as a forum for nation states to bring collective issues of the global system to scrutiny, certain limitations have been highlighted, making the role of the UN somewhat contentious. This is attributable to the anarchical feature of the international system, as the organization barely constrains states from being self-seeking and wielding their self-interests. Researchers, for example, Sophie Crockett and John Mearsheimer, are of the opinion that international institutions only possess inherently marginal authority,
considering the power relations existing between states, thus demonstrating power distribution in the international system.\textsuperscript{10}

Anarchy in international affairs is often characterized by the non-existence of a certain overarching authority in the global system.\textsuperscript{11} More specifically, it refers to the absence of central A political power to govern the international system, whilst creating an avenue for an actor to impose order and influence states’ actions.\textsuperscript{12} Keohane and Martin add their voices by stating that the purpose for which institutions are created is mainly to address states’ interests, and that the structural formation of such institutions dependent directly on the existing capabilities.\textsuperscript{13} Mearsheimer climaxes these assertions that, organizations simply stimulate peace by means of influencing activities of nation-states.\textsuperscript{14} In his view, organizations tend to be promoters of collaboration in a world that is basically aggressive; whereas in reality, states perpetually utilize these grounds to exploit others.\textsuperscript{15} To this end, there is a candid expression that the UN does not adjust the egocentric, disordered activities of nation-states.\textsuperscript{16}

Without a central government, the principles of independence and neutrality affirm the salient purpose of UN not to interfere in internal matters of its members. Nevertheless, it can advance negotiations and give nation-states the apparatus or means to end differences.\textsuperscript{17} Hence, international organizations often find themselves unable to use formulated laws and procedures to administer directly state and non-state actions.\textsuperscript{18} In this perspective, Powell elaborated anarchy to be a state of nonexistence of agency that superimposes individual states’ power and authority to resolve disputes and enforce laws. By that, individual states can give their commitments through treaties but no independent authority can impose any form of sanctions and compliance against deviances. The nonexistence of such a supreme authority is termed the “anarchic environment of international politics.”\textsuperscript{19} Bearing in mind the ostensibly anarchic nature of the
global system\textsuperscript{20} with self-interested states engaged in power struggle and the UN certainly not a ‘world government’, there is a vast amount of distrust in the way states deal with each other.

### 1.1 Statement of the Research Problem

In the absence of a global government, there is a continuous struggle for power, which can set any state on the verge of war with other states. Consequently, each state continuously advances its interactions to maximize relative power capabilities, ensuring its existence and survival, thus through self-help. In consonance with this is the neo-realist argument that global organizations are ‘incapable’ of controlling state actors as they cannot stop states from acting naturally in engaging in political affairs.\textsuperscript{21} Deductively, states barely trust and cooperate with one another within the international system, creating a security dilemma under the conditions of mutual insecurity. Consequently, this influences them to put in more effort to increase their security thereby making other nations less secured in gaining relative power.\textsuperscript{22}

States in the international system are sovereign and independent and not obliged to obey any form of ‘higher authority’. They often take decisions that could directly or indirectly affect other states in the international system and then possibly create chaos. The UN, for instance, has been ‘ineffective’ despite its mandate, functions and sanctions often imposed on states. Through this spectrum, the research seeks to find out how the anarchical inherent features of the international system affects the UN in the light of UNSC functions and mandates, why states behave the way they do, and examine the challenges faced by the UN in advancing its efforts to promote cooperation, regulate state behavior and govern the international system.

### 1.2 Research Questions

a) What is the effect of anarchy on the United Nations Security Council?
b) How has the anarchical nature of the international system disenabled the UNSC in achieving its mandate of maintaining international peace and security?

c) Has the UNSC been effective, considering the conflicting interests of states?

d) How viable has the UNSC been since its establishment?

1.3 Research Objectives

a) To ascertain the effects of anarchy on the UNSC.

b) To investigate the influence of the anarchical nature of the UNSC on the attainment of the organ’s mandate.

c) To assess the effectiveness of the UNSC in pursuit of conflicting states’ interest.

d) To examine if the purpose for which UNSC was formed is achieved.

1.4 Scope of the Study

The study mainly focuses on the UNSC, its composition, power and functions and how anarchy affects state actions and decisions in the international system. The study further looks at the effects of anarchy on the functioning of the UNSC in promoting global peace and security. The effectiveness of the UNSC as an organ of the UN, in the light of prevailing anarchy, is central to the discussion.

1.5 Hypothesis

International anarchy has often rendered the UNSC ineffective in executing its mandate.
1.6 Justification of Study

The discourse on international anarchy in the literature goes beyond the assumptions of realism and needed to be practically demonstrated in actual interstate organization and behavior, hence the choice of the UNSC and the need to evaluate its activities and state responses. It is the expectation that the study will shed an in-depth light on the effects of the existence of anarchy on the activities of the UNSC and the implications for the attainment of the organ’s mandate. Much more, for an effective execution of the mandate of the UNSC, it is expected that the findings of the final report shall provide valuable and applicable recommendations that will guide the future processes and actions toward resolving the challenges of the UNSC. Finally, the study will serve as a data material for reference and similar studies as well as for further investigation into the phenomenon.

1.7 Theoretical Framework

The theory that best explains this study is Realism. Some of the proponents of this theory include Kenneth Waltz, Hans Morgenthau, Joseph Grieco, Thomas Hobbes, among others. The core assumption on which this theory is built hinges on the state-centric—character of the international system where states are assumed to be rational and unitary actors. Beside, survival or maintenance of national security is a major pre-occupation of states. Indeed, realism holds the notion of states being equal and sovereign, irrespective of size and capabilities, depicting the lack of an over-arching and formidable central authority that serves as a watchdog to constrain the pursuance of state interests; hence, the anarchic nature of the international system. As established by Cudworth and Hobden and acknowledged by Kenneth Waltz, this apparent absence of a ‘global authority’ leads to an unrelenting manifestation of hostility between states.\(^{23}\) It is therefore argued that, the lack of a higher authority over nation-states leads to a self-assisting
system among states. Further, for continuous existence and survival, states are inclined to rely on their respective resources and capabilities. Lebow re-defines Mearsheimer’s description of anarchy and a self-help global system to be a ruthless platform in which states constantly seek to take advantage of another.

In view of this, realism defines five major characteristics. First it characterizes states as the main players in international or global affairs. Secondly, the global community brutally punishes nations or countries that refuse to safeguard their essential interests or pursue objectives not within their resources. As a result, states tend to be "sensitive to costs" as well as steer themselves by means of being “unitary-rational agents”. Thirdly, the lack of a supreme authority is the central force influencing state intentions and activities. Fourthly, states operating in an anarchical system are fanatical about power and self-security, inclined in the direction of war and rivalry, and frequently unable to co-operate despite shared interests. Lastly, global organizations influence the possibilities for co-operation slightly. Realists espouse that the absence of a supreme power or government (anarchy) in the international system constantly brings about rivalry and struggle among states; and thus states will only willingly cooperate with each other when their interests overlap. The pragmatist hypothesis also runs that international organizations are incapable of helping in reducing the outcomes of anarchy on inter-state collaboration because of the individual state’s interests and quest for survival.

In contrast and critical of realism is liberal-institutionalism which looks up to the Kantian description of the global system. Liberal institutionalism holds that it recognizes the various fundamental realist assumptions, together with its assertion that anarchy hinders the attainment of global collaboration. Conversely, liberals argue that realists’ understanding of world politics over-emphasize war and belittle the capacity of universal organizations to promote cooperation
in the international system.\textsuperscript{29} The UN has played crucial roles in advancing decolonization, freedoms and human rights, environmental protection and deference to international law which affirms that states actually co-operate.\textsuperscript{30} Liberal institutionalism emphasizes the significance of the United Nations’ effort, through national associations, as they grow to be imperative in the global political process, envisaging the global community will continue to steer its directives through collaborative actions with universal organizations and regional bodies.\textsuperscript{31}

Scholars of this principle assume that when collaboration among states is established, states would be unwilling to abandon it, inspired by a paranoid fear of what could happen. Liberal institutionalists sought to argue that there are also other principal actors in global politics such as specialized international agencies with technical expertise. Again, liberal institutionalists debunk the pragmatist supposition that states remain “unitary or rational agents”, since their power is now spread out within contemporary states; and thirdly, liberals argue that states are being less worried about power and security,\textsuperscript{32} because war is prohibitively costly. In addition to these views is the idea that there is an increasing interdependence of states in the world. Liberals reject realism's assumption that states will not cooperate with one another because they view each other as rivals and affirm that states are allies who are willing to procure a better relief as well as well-being toward their development. Furthermore, liberals dismiss realists’ cynicism about international institutions, for the reason that specific organizations and international organizations could advance collaboration since they execute beneficial responsibilities without frontally countering state sovereignty.\textsuperscript{33}

On further reflections, one gets the impression that there are seeming simplifications of the comparative achievements of organizations, as per the analysis of some of the important records of these organizations before advancing resounding proclamations. It is in like manner to
establish what form the attainment and failure of the UN system is, either as an international muster or a “global regulating force”, irrespective of the tactic taken, with its merits and shortcomings.\textsuperscript{34}

1.8 Literature Review

Joseph Grieco’s article “Anarchy and the Limits of Cooperation: A Realist Critique of the Newest Liberal Institutionalism” is a challenge to liberal institutionalism in which he argues that the truth must be upheld. According to him, liberal-institutionalism misinterprets realist appraisal of global anarchy and misconstrues the realist scrutiny of the dint of anarchy on the inclinations and activities of nations.\textsuperscript{35} Certainly, the new liberal institutionalism neglects in the discourse a key restriction on the readiness of states to collaborate which is shaped by global anarchy and which is exposed by realism. Thus, the neo-liberal concept's positivity about global collaboration can be shown to be incorrect.\textsuperscript{36}

Cooperation, according to the neo-liberals, is grounded on the conviction that states are atomistic players and that states strive to amass absolute gains and do not bother about the gains of other states. Cheating, according to the neoliberals, is the biggest obstacle to cooperation among rational state actors but international institutions can help facilitate cooperation among them.\textsuperscript{37} Liberal theory claims that realists view states as opportunists in nature and further argue that states are strongly focused on cheating. Those in cooperative agreements are often concerned with the possibility of partners making more benefits from cooperation than themselves. Furthermore, realism also assumes that there are at least two major hindrances of global cooperation: concerns of cheating and relative gains of individual states.\textsuperscript{38}
Comparison between realism and liberal institutionalism were enumerated by Grieco with five realist positions rebutted by liberal institutionalists. These include, to begin with, that states are the main players in world affairs and besides, that the international setting seriously punishes states that neglect to defend their fundamental interests, using their capability or ability. Thirdly, it is noted that international anarchy is the primary power that forms the reasons, ambitions and strategic activities of states. Predominantly, states in anarchy are individually enthusiastic by issues pertaining to sovereign control and safety, invariably tend towards struggle and rivalry, and regularly neglect to collaborate regardless of whether it is in their best interest. Lastly, international institutions influence the prospects for cooperation only slightly.

Rebuttal from liberal institutionalists on the realist world view targets firstly the proposition on the centrality of states. Various schools of neoliberalism enumerate key actors such as specialized international units and offices and their specialized experts, guilds, labor unions, political parties, trade unions or associations and supranational bureaucracies as well as multi-national corporations, trans-national and trans-governmental coalitions. Aside from the above, liberal institutionalists challenge the realist view that states are unitary or rational agents, by stating that power was already decentralized inside present day states and it was replicated internationally with features of multiple channels of access that loosen the grip of foreign policy progressively. Thirdly, the focus on power and security by realists, with nuclear weapons and mobilized armies, make war prohibitive, but rather, economic cooperative contacts will leave states progressively subject to each other for the achievement of full employment and economic stability. Institutionalists tend to reject the realists’ fourth recommendation that states are primarily not inclined to collaborate but rather, states progressively see each other different as accomplices to secure more noteworthy solace and prosperity for their citizens. In spite of some
evidence of crises of political and economic dimensions in the 1970s, some form of cooperation occurred among states.\textsuperscript{39}

In his publication, \textit{Anarchy Is What States Make of It: The Social Construction of Power Politics}, Alexander Wendt analyzes the discussion among realists and liberals pivoted on the degree to which state activity is impacted by system (anarchy and the dissemination of power) as against methods (communication and learning) and organizations.\textsuperscript{40} The starting point of his analysis makes considerable meaning for neo-realists, since they accept that lack of a supreme authority in social order are fundamentally create self-help systems - systems in which a dominant authority and collective security are deficient. Self-help is not viewed as organizational and as such secures an advantage which outlines opposite parts and methods which sets the standard for it and is unaffected by communication. Liberals get the logically intense confirmation that method can deliver agreeable conduct in a self-help system. Additionally, a few liberals are in agreement that anarchy does in reality influence states with self-interested characteristics.\textsuperscript{41}

Wendt's objective was to join these two traditions of realist-liberal and rationalist-reflective consideration by advancing a constructivist claim derived from structuralism and symbolic interaction for the benefit of the liberal affirmation that global organizations can alter state characters and interests. A constructivist investigation of collaboration would hinge on how desires created by actions influence characters and interests. In essence, the way toward building a new organization is the one that highlights getting a new interpretation of its self, obtaining new useful characters, and not simply on making outer limits on the actions of outside constituted players.\textsuperscript{42}
Axelrod and Keohane articulated in their article, “Achieving Cooperation in Anarchy: Strategies and Institutions”, define cooperation as when players adapt their actions to the real or expected inclination of others and anarchy as the absence of a common government in world politics which can wield order. It is these three measurements – commonality of interest, the shadow of the future and the quantity of the actors - that assistance to comprehend the acknowledgement and collapse of endeavors at collaboration in both military security and political-economic relations, as uncovered from contextual investigation. They proceed looking at the impact of the arrangement on collaboration, particularly the payoff structure of mutual and opposing preferences. Axelrod initiated a measure of irreconcilable circumstance for specific games such as the Prisoners’ Dilemma. The investigation uncovered that normally, economic issues tend to show less clashing result system than those of military security. Using the position of Lipson, Axelrod explained that Coordination among investors has been far-reaching and fruitful than most arms control arrangements. The potential of governments collaborating in a mixed-motive game is likewise faltered not just by the result of the prevailing system and the “shadow of the future” but additionally by the quantity of players in the game and the difficulties of authorization when there is default.

Axelrod and Keohane proceed to analyze the context of communication when collaboration happens without significant control. Interaction could take place in the context of shared norms and values as well as institutions. The article goes on to identify multi-level games where issues are linked to further the desires of the actors through such means as ‘blackmailing’; which entails threats and ‘back-scratching’ which entails a promise to achieve set goals or desires of states. Thus, anarchical cooperation do not particularly set out to look at that part of basic leadership yet the significance of discernment continues avowing itself. The significance of
observation, including convictions and cognizance, are obviously nothing unexpected. However, it merits calling attention to that basic leadership in equivocal settings is greatly affected by the manner in which the players consider the issue. Those performing in the interest of states regularly do not perceive how their own activities will influence players and how they will be understood by the said players. Therefore, international governments integrating the standard of mutuality render defection unlawful and, in this manner, making it more costly. By and by, these international organizations can help to foster collaboration by making it both less demanding and to secure good standing.

Cudworth and Hobden in their article, “Anarchy and Anarchism: Towards a Theory of Complex International Systems” takes anarchy, international systems and hierarchy as starting points in International Relations. They are of the view that the idea of anarchy has developed as an ongoing notion through the numerous talks in global relations. They used Waltz’s Systemic Theory in examining where anarchy happens to be the crucial or ‘prescribed norm’ in global relations. Waltz contended that every political structure involves three components: a prescribed norm, the features of the components, plus the dissemination of abilities. The prescribed norm depicted connection amid the components, possibly arranged in order of rank or with no controlling principles to give order. The prescribed norm, therefore, is the main component of Waltz’s record as it explains all that comes with anarchy and characterizes the prescribe norm of the global structure and directs the main type of state action. Thus, self-improvement is basically the precondition of activities in an anarchical system.

The conception of anarchy ignites a scrutinizing of a sharp contrast refinement among global and national policies. There might be disorder which is perceived as extreme self-governing control in the global platform; however, it does not imply there is absence of order. In like manner,
anarchy, as Waltz proposed, does not imply that the unit states remain homogenous. Agreeing to Cudworth and Hobden, all things considered, hierarchy could imply that autonomous balance is not so equivalent.\textsuperscript{54} The study of Waltz exemplified the existence of ‘systemic-level’ powers in global government, yet his method neglected to depict the self-inspired and co-transformative character of component and structure connections, and inter-system interactions.\textsuperscript{55}

The concept of complexity of the system gives a way to adjust the notion of structure which denotes the proportion of issues looked at by scholars of global affairs. Four parts of complex structures are of significance – self-organization; co-evolution; openness; and non-linearity.\textsuperscript{56}

Meanwhile, the term anarchy has always been used as characterizing components of neorealist and realist explanation of global or international affairs, political disorder as well as to draw insights of the concept of complexity which gives an extremely particular understanding of legislation and organization. This is a request where there are chains of command and, especially key performers have endeavored to force particular world perspectives and types of relations on others.

Kenneth Waltz, in his work “Theory of International Politics”, examined anarchical orders and balances of power. He laid emphasis on the contrasts amongst national and global structures,\textsuperscript{57} and considers the courses units of a system identify to build up the realization of their goals. In anarchical set ups, units do not cooperate while in hierarchic ones the units co-operate or interrelate. Despite the fact that states in the international system resemble units,\textsuperscript{58} practically, they vary in their abilities. One feature of the international political scene is such that it limits cooperation among member states, creating a self-help system. States in a self-help system are greatly concerned with protecting themselves against other states for the sake of their survival. Thus, international politics limits cooperation of states; with possible gains favoring others more
than themselves. Essentially, for states in anarchy to realize their objectives and sustain their security, they must depend on the means of generating their own security. States bear a resemblance to people, constantly uncertain on the extent or the degree of their freedoms.

Waltz’s supposition of states in balance-of-power feature states as unitary players which, at any rate, strive towards their own security and at a most extreme, push in lieu of universal pre-eminence.\(^{59}\) He again expound that a self-improve system is that of the one in which states that do not help themselves will be subjected to dangers which will make them suffer. As a result, the fear of the unknown drive states to conduct themselves in ways that give rise to balances of power. It is assumed that “balance of power” can “impose its restraints upon the power aspirations of nations” just in the event that it first “limits them by accepting the system of the balance of power as the common framework of their endeavors”. Just as states perceive “the same rules of the game” then plan “for the same limited stakes”, balance of power satisfies “its functions for international stability and national independence.”\(^{60}\)

Discussing international institutions, John Mearsheimer, in his work, “The False Promise of International Institutions” argued that institutions have least impact on state activities, and subsequently grip petite assurance for stimulating steadiness. He characterized it as an arrangement of rules that stipulate the manner by which states ought to coordinate and rival each other.\(^{61}\) Institutions stipulate bearable structures of regulating state conduct, and condemn inappropriate manners of actions. They set rules that are bargained by states, which entails the joint recognition of ethical standards, which remain "standards of behavior defined in terms of rights and obligations".\(^{62}\) In spite of the fact that these rules are typically fused into formal international organizations, it is not to coerce states to comply with the rules rather states themselves must comply with the rules they made. This hence requires the “decentralized
cooperation of individual sovereign states, without any effective mechanism of command." It is likewise imperative to take note that such institutions are not a type of world government.

The realists delineate world politics as a cruel ground where states exploit each other, especially with any little opportunity available. Hence, survival is the most paramount objective of any state. The anarchical international system is viewed as an environment where states constantly strive for power to become the most dominant player in the system. In spite of that, global relations are definitely not a steady condition of war; however, the situation always is a condition of persistent protection rivalry among states where war is always at the background. Essentially, cooperation among states cannot be guaranteed; it is limited mainly because of security competition which cannot be completely removed on account of cooperation. In view of this, realists argued that a world of genuine peace where states will not vie for control is probably not going to exist.63

Realists accordingly acknowledge the fact that states now and then work through organizations which in turn reflect state intentions of self-intrigue constructed mainly on the global diffusion of power because dominant nations in the structure design such organizations and keep up their portion of power and work toward possible increase. Pragmatists suppose that the reasons of war and peace in the global system remains an element of balance of power which organizations, to a degree, endeavor to redistribute in the structure. So, balance of power is the self-determining factor that clarifies war as organizations remain only a preponderant factor in all.64

In his articulation in "Politics among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace", Hans Morgenthau notes that political power remains a way to a country’s ends. International politics is not different to all other forms of politics, where all states or nations struggle for power. Power is
mostly the instant aim in international politics with the goals of every nations different in terms of religion, ideology, philosophy, economic, cultural or social ideal; nevertheless, states eventually pursue self-determination, safety, property or power itself.\textsuperscript{65} He further explained that the realization of goals may also be achieved through non-political means, for example, technical collaboration with other countries or through global organization and that at whatever point the objective and methods are of global politics, they do so by struggling for power.\textsuperscript{66}

Morgenthau argued conclusively that in global politics many odd activities that a state performs are of a political nature. Huge numbers of such activities are not regularly attempted without the thought of power, nor do they influence the power of the country. These forms of activities are legal, cultural, economic, humanitarian etc. which is to say that the involvement of states or nations in international politics in such activities is to participate in international politics.

Besides, not all nations are intricate in global politics at all times. The level of their participation may run the distance from the greatest to the present stature achieved by United States and the Soviet Union through minimum participation of nations such as Switzerland, Luxembourg, or Venezuela to non-inclusion of Liechtenstein and Monaco. So, the involvement of nations in international politics has a dynamic quality. Nations like United States, China and Russia are much deeply involved in international politics than they were many years ago. Thus, the inclination of such nations to be more prominent or to a lesser degree in the tussle of power incited Arnold Wolfers to state that they possess positions at opposite extremes of a range stretching from what he called the shaft of capacity to the post of lack of concern.\textsuperscript{67}

In the book, “The Anarchical Society: A study of Order in world Politics”, Helly Bull noted that sovereign states, in condition of war and disaster, may behave in a predictable and systematic
way. In other words, states in the state of dread and uncertainty portray a Hobbesian explanation of the condition of nature and may respond in conformity with some persistent designs which are untidy in social life but of chaos.

Bull explores three contending customs or schools of thought in investigating the past of contemporary state structure—the Hobbesian or traditional pragmatist, the Kantian or Universalist custom and the Grotian or Internationalist custom. All these schools of thought depict the idea of global politics and international behaviors. The Hobbesian custom exemplifies global relations as a condition of war against all—a crease of battle in which each state is organized against each other. Hence global relations denote a solid battle between states in a zero-sum game. Thus the interim between recovery from the previous war and readiness for the up and coming one is when peace relatively exist. The Hobbesian proposal for global behavior is not grounded on moral or lawful confinements; hence, states in the global circle are allowed to chase their ends relative to different states.

The Kantian or Universalist custom contests the Hobbesian perspective of the idea of global politics as a struggle among states; rather, it is the people who make up the state in the international system. Therefore, the relationship among all people in the network, when it appears, will drive the international system into limbo. Global politics under Kantian law is not seen as distributive or a zero-sum yet but rather as a co-agent or non-zero sum game, since the enthusiasm of all individuals are the same. It additionally saw morality in international relations as vital or imperative, constraining the actions of states.

Moreover, the Grotian or internationalist approach stands between the Realist tradition and the Universalist tradition, and portrays international politics as a global society where states are not
engaged in a struggle in the international system. Nonetheless, common rules and institutions restrict conflict with one another. International politics in the Grotian rule states that the game of interest is relatively distributive and partially productive. Hence, the Grotian recommendation of international behavior is that all states are bound by standards of common sense as well as by the standards or principles and rules in their dealings with each other. Bull, therefore, concluded by using the Grotian thought that international society has dependably been available in the idea of international structure, and has experienced change in the last three or four centuries.  

These contrasting views and ideas in the literature provide a splendid framework to examine the central objective of the study, thus the extent to which international anarchy constrains state behavior in the attainment of common goals within international organizations. Specifically, the United Nations depicts power aggregation on the part of the permanent members of the Security Council and the seemingly hopelessness of the organization to exert its control.

1.9 Sources of Data

The research is conducted using secondary data. This consists of books, journal articles, internet sources, and other publications and documentations such as the UN Charter.

1.10 Research Methodology

The method for conducting this research is qualitative. Qualitative analysis uses objective judgment based on quantifiable information. It applies the ideas of the existing literature that have been established in the research area and the strengths and weakness thereof. The qualitative approach permits the researcher to gain holistic and in-depth understanding to the problem stated in order to explain the complex nature and structure of the UNSCR.
Taking cognizance of the fact that the required information meets the objectives of the study using the available document of the UN and other materials.

1.11 Organization of the Study

Chapter one constitutes the introduction and consist of background study, statement of the research problem, research objectives, research questions, scope of the study, hypothesis, justification of the study, theoretical framework, literature review, source of data, research methodology, and organization of study.

Chapter two examines the concept of anarchy and its effects on the international system.

Chapter three discusses the United Nation Security Council and the problem of anarchy.

Chapter four summarizes findings of the research, draws conclusions on the basis of the findings of the study and makes recommendations.
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CHAPTER TWO

THE CONCEPT OF ANARCHY AND ITS EFFECTS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM

2.0 Introduction

This section examines the concept of anarchy and the effect on the international system. It, first and foremost, analyses the concept of international anarchy, both from the realist and liberalist point of view and how international anarchy affects state activity in the international system. It further examines the effects of anarchy on state cooperation and interaction in the international system. Based on the views provided by scholars on the subject of anarchy, the chapter finally establishes the effect on the international system.

The two major schools of thought in international relations both agree on the fact that international anarchy exists in world politics. The realist and the liberalist schools of thought accept the absence of a dominant authority or power in the global system; however, to a varying degree of disagreement, it is contended that the effect of anarchy in the international system can be minimized.¹ The global system is comprised of sovereign states which often agree to pursue a particular purpose. Often, the coming together of states within the international system is to promote their national interest hence the battle for authority. In the absence of a central authority, the interests and actions of the state is governed by the existing structure², which further results in power struggle. Understanding anarchy in the system, therefore, makes us understand how it limits corporation and interactions among the states.
2.1 The Concept of Anarchy

The word ‘anarchy’ is adopted from the Greek word ‘Archia’ meaning “absence of a leader”. In modern terms, ‘anarchy’ is not just a word but a concept often used as the central point of discussion in international relations. International Relations, to start with, developed after it first emerged during the First World War in 1919. The impact and the horror of the Great War anchor the subject on the causes of the war, how and why the war began. The attempt to answer the question led to the emergence of the concept of “International Anarchy” which has ever since been an indispensable part of international relations and international relations theory.

The concept of anarchy generally brings out the absence of global government in the world, the lack of a supreme or higher authority that can force and enforce states to resolve disputes in the international system. This is so because states in the international system have no higher authority or superior who can enforce law and order. This has widely been the preliminary argument of international relations.

A number of radical researchers utilize the expression to portray mayhem, disagreement or unrest whiles others saw it as a domain of self-governing states with no higher power above them to govern their conducts. The Hobbesian idea of anarchy still speaks of international relations in terms of the absence of an all-encompassing political power representing the universal system, despite allowing space for systems and standards of conduct for players of international politics.

International relations scholars, including realists, neo-realists, liberals and neoliberals, approve of the concept of anarchy but have different views of how the concept affects the behavior of states in the international system. A major criticism of the concept is adduced from the constructivists, exemplified by the work of Alexander Wendt in his study “Anarchy is what
States Make of It”. He argued that the concept of anarchy is not an intrinsic element of international relations as argued by realists, neo-realists and liberalists, but rather, anarchy emerges from the actions and inactions of states in the global system.⁹

2.2  Realist Conception of International Anarchy

No single theory reliably explains the international system and interactions; however, one conceptual body that has held a fundamental stance in the analysis of international relations is realism.¹⁰ Realism is a set of particular ideals held by a class of researchers in international relations that accentuate the role of states, concerning their defense capability on global issues.¹¹ Realism has ruled the academic field in international relations ever since the earliest historical writings, particularly Thucydides’ History of the Peloponnesian War, 404 – 431 BC.¹² Before then, international relations did not reflect the current ideas until the twentieth century when some writers detected many similarities in the thoughts and behavior of the ancient and modern worlds. In view of this, some writers picked out relevant ideas from his work and established what is now named realism.¹³

Realism is a way of thinking that involves a varied range of strands, the most unique of which are classical realism and neorealism.¹⁴ Writers such as Thucydides, Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes and Max Weber are among the classical authors who oftentimes draw their conclusions from the old conventional and political ideas. In the mid-20th century, there emerged the British political researcher and student of history E. H. Carr and the conceived political and historian expert Hans Morgenthau and their supporters who branded it classical because it portrayed from an extensive variety of references and offered contending ideas of the nature, the state and the society. This focused on the different obstructions to advance and
change that professedly are intrinsic in human instinct, and in the structure of the worldwide framework. Neorealism then again gives an endeavor to interpret a portion of the key goals of established authenticity into the dialectics and techniques relatable with the work of American political Scientist Kenneth Waltz.  

The earliest school of thought contended that in a universe of sovereign states and absence of a dominant authority, the main way states can accomplish their interests is through survival. By this tradition, the concept of realism is grounded on the pre-eminence principle which holds that each state must depend on its individual capability and not so much on its allies to leverage the behavior of states. In the writings of Thucydides, one finds the assumptions of realists as pointing towards power struggle, thus in the History of the Peloponnesian War. His primary contention is that the inviolable ought to take advantage of the feeble as they possess the capability to do so. He further points to an existing security dilemma, the balance of power and the place of impartiality and morals in international relations. Thus, states live under a relentless dread of hostility or betrayal by other powerful states and, as such results in security dilemma. Thucydides very much agrees that in the system where there is no overarching authority, it results in anarchy, thus the best way to retain order is through some sort of balance of power. Hobbes in his idea on “the State of Nature” absorbed the principle of the state of anarchy. He admitted that without a supreme authority, the international structure is liable to a condition of disorder and of “war as is of every man against every man.” 

Central to the realist assumption of anarchy in the international system is that human nature is such that the individual is naturally self-centered and self-interested to the degree that unkindness incapacitates moral values. The lack of a central governing authority to control the actions of sovereign states, as well as determine their actions, puts them in a self-help system to
thrive for survival. In view of this, states are the only rational players in the international system and that no supranational body can restrict their actions. Since the actions of states in the anarchical international system are unpredictable, states are to rely on their own capabilities and power, thus, struggle for survival in the international system. Additionally, realists view security as an important element in the anarchical world of states. States in such an environment continue to attain security through increasing their power and engaging in power-balancing for the aim of discouraging potential aggressors, thus giving rise to security dilemma.

Major characteristics drawn from the traditionalists and neo-realists have been centered on some major principles. The realist theory asserts that states are the dominant actors and players in international politics; that the international system is anarchical, emphasizing, the self-help principle, that they cannot rely on anyone but themselves for security; it is assumed that the basic motive of states in the international system is survival and holding on to that account forces them to increase their security leading to a decline in the safety of others. This condition forces states to constantly arm themselves whiles others are compelled to do likewise, prompting rivalry and balancing of power.

Morgenthau and Machiavelli, considered as classical realists, attributed international politics to human nature, whiles neo-realists believe that issues of global politics issues can be clarified by the arrangement of the international systemic structure in light of its fundamental element of lack of a supreme authority. Waltz’s work in “Man, the State and War”, further extended in “Theory of International Politics” asserts the lack of a supreme power over nations in the global system, depicting disorder as a condition for the possible cause of war. John Herz emphasizes that the nation’s interests and activities are foremost, given the anarchical nature of the global system, thus the lack of a supreme power; hence the significant drive for dominance.
2.3 Liberalist Conception of Anarchy

Liberalism comes from the Latin word “liber” meaning “Free”. Liberalism emerged in the 1970s as the major school of thought opposing realism which was supposedly outdated. This originated in the 17th and 18th centuries when political liberalism emerged to challenge the realist school of thought in international relations. The central propositions of liberals were centered on international cooperation and peace. Liberals likewise emphasized the global structure of the system as anarchical and, in addition, self-interest constitutes a salient point of liberalism. However, the point of separation between these two schools of thought is the liberal argument that international institutions are able to diminish the effects of anarchy in interstate relations.\(^\text{26}\)

Liberal ideals originally are developed from the works of philosophers such as Voltaire, Locke, Smith and the German philosopher Immanuel Kant. To some extent, these liberal scholars were guided by the ‘Enlightenment’. Scholars like Locke and Kant believed that war is intrinsically unwanted and that man is born with certain rights.\(^\text{27}\)

The liberalist school of thought revolves around three major principles in international relations: the rejection of power politics in the international system thus, questioning realism on the principle of security and warfare; gives more prominence to mutual benefits and cooperation; and finally it asserts that international organizations and non-governmental organizations shape state preferences and policy choices, thus depicting that states are not the only actors in the international system.\(^\text{28}\)

Kant’s original work on “Perpetual Peace and Democratic Peace” has influenced most liberals and has a large impact on their thoughts. Scholars of Neoliberalism such as Robert Keohane and Joseph Nye agreed that democracies do not fight each other.\(^\text{29}\) However, democracies resist war
because of capitalist ties, making democracies economically dependent. As such they are likely to resolve issues diplomatically. Liberals also believe that states are inter-twined through economic coalitions, thus making warfare naturally unpopular.\textsuperscript{30}

Liberalism conceives of the global structure as anarchic, but can be synchronized with various tools such as liberal democratization, liberal economic interdependence and liberal intuitionalism. Liberals state that the existence of free trade is likely to reduce conflicts as states in the international system will be hesitant to go to war because of the effects of war on trade and foreign investment. Thus, liberals argue that if states seek common interests, form alliances and institutions to regulate power, then there can be hope for world peace in an anarchical international system.\textsuperscript{31}

2.4 International Institutions

Subsequently, the ending of World War II and the role of international institutions has been central to the study of world politics. Following the effects of the war, countries across the globe deemed it necessary to establish institutions that will prevent reoccurrence of such massive destructions. This arrangement resulted in the creation of global organizations like the UN, NATO, ICC, EU, WTO, IMF, among others, with the main aim of enhancing global relations and ensuring justice to those who fault international law, thus addressing issues that can lead to another major disaster.\textsuperscript{32}

Institution is a term frequently used to refer to intergovernmental organizations, international regimes and other set of rules. Most schools of thought have defined “International Institutions as set of rules meant to govern international behaviors” such that rules “are often conceived of as statements that forbid, require, or permit particular kinds of action”.\textsuperscript{33} The formulation of
different types of international institutions, ranging from treaties, organizations, regimes, and conventions, have rapidly increase in number of importance, with regards to their growth and the efforts to describe and explain institutional phenomena in international relations have been considerable. “Institutions” are, therefore, descriptively a term used to illustrate the pattern of practices and actions, set of ideals or beliefs, and norms and rules.  

The nature of the authority that international institutions have differed, thus relating to the type and functions of the states involved. Thus, institutions will only have such an authority over states once countries admit, on code or norm, their capacity to enforce lawful, legal and mandatory resolutions on affairs concerning internal jurisdiction and territory, regardless of whether these decisions are in opposition to a nation’s own polices and inclinations. For instance, in the wake of WWII, global institutions did not expect states to surrender any power whatsoever; however, states themselves came together and vowed never again to witness another war which eventually led to the 1948 Genocide Convention that made states in charge of regulating their own regions.

Western policymakers believe that institutions are the best method of advancing world understanding; hence institutions prevent states from war and advance peace. There have been several disagreements between the realist school of thought and the institutionalist school of thought, principally whether institutions really affect the likelihood of international conflict. Realists argue that, institutions do not influence international stability and peace because they have no power over state behavior in the international system. They basically argue that institutions are just the reflections of distribution of power in the international system, that states in the international system always pursue self-interested calculations and that the institution have
no independent effects on states, thus they are not an important cause of peace in the international system.\textsuperscript{37}

On the other hand, institutionalists passionately challenge realist presuppositions of institutions, stating that because institutions are independent and have autonomous identity, they have the power and ability to move states away from war. It further establishes that even if institutions cannot change the calculated and interested decisions of states, they can always alter state preferences, therefore, change state behavior on the basis of relative power positions.\textsuperscript{38}

\section*{2.5 International Cooperation}

The absence of a central authority in the international system permits states to pursue their sovereign interests without any restrictions. Since states do not cede power to any supranational sovereign, state conduct and behaviors cannot be guaranteed in the international system. Thus the relationship that exists most times between states in the international system is highly competitive and pregnant with wars, arms race, trade wars, among others.\textsuperscript{39}

However, in most cases, the lack of a higher international power binds states in mutual benefits. Hence, states achieve collective interests through implicit collaboration, formal two-sided and multidimensional negotiations and the conception of international regimes.\textsuperscript{40} In the realist world, cooperation in the international system is basically competitive. As a result, achieving cooperation becomes difficult in most cases; however, it does happen in rear cases. Mearsherimer, in his book, “The False Promise of Institutions” explains two factors that inhibit cooperation in the international system: concerns with gains, cooperation and cheating. States in the international system, in conceding cooperation, always have two things in mind that is how profits and gains will be distributed. This consideration is further divided into two, in terms of
absolute gains and relative gains. In relations to absolute gains, states in the international system remain less interested in exactly how plentiful the other side advances or suffers in the deal. Their major worry is maximizing their own profits. Alternatively, states are more concerned about relative gains in the anarchical international system because they are worried about each side’s gains in the deal and how well it does, compared to others.\textsuperscript{41} Thus, when considering cooperation between states in the international system, states are motivated with the ideal of relative gains as states in the pragmatist domain are always anxious about equilibrium of power.

Even though each state desires to capitalize on their absolute gains, additionally, it is also necessary to improve on its performance than others in any agreement. In doing so, states are aligned to the “relative gain logic” rather than “absolute gain logic”, thus achieving cooperation in the international system becomes difficult. Alternatively, states in the global structure are also concerned with cheating, since cheating hinders cooperation, thus they are hesitant to enter into cooperation arrangements for the fear that the other side will cheat in the agreement and gain a relative advantage.

Despite these barriers, states in the realist domain cooperate. For instance, the rationale behind balance-of-power frequently makes states join unions and cooperate against mutual rivals. States now and again collaborate and join forces against a third state, as the Germans and the Soviets did against Poland in 1939.\textsuperscript{42}

Liberals argue that in an anarchical international system, collaboration can develop through the working of standards, administrations and organizations. It is also established that realist’s perception of the anarchic international system has been exaggerated on the grounds that the state ought to admit that security can be collaborative or aggregated, whereby states can build
their security without diminishing the security of others, or perceiving that the security of different states can in fact be valuable to themselves.\textsuperscript{43}

With liberals, states in the anarchic system are faced with mixed interests and situations which can be illustrated by the Prisoner’s Dilemma. Keohane and Axelrod analyzed international cooperation in the contest, where each one state prefers reciprocated cooperation to reciprocated noncooperation (CC>DD), but also positive dishonesty to reciprocated cooperation (DC>CC) and reciprocated defection to ill-treatment by another's dishonest (DD>CD); overall, then, DC>CC>DD>CD.\textsuperscript{44} In conditions of anarchy, cooperation is probable to arise in a Prisoner’s Dilemma if the contest is highly recapitulated, since states that communicate frequently in either an equally beneficial or destructive manner are probable to find that reciprocated cooperation is their lasing plan.\textsuperscript{45}

In this era of globalization and interdependency, it is increasingly becoming impossible for nations to do things on their own, based on the liberal argument that the universal situation of world politics is globalization. The interests of nations give governments a fundamental stake in the global matters that arise. Nations are constantly implanted in a national and intercontinental society which creates motivation for economic, social and cultural influences beyond boundaries. Without such fears that surpass state boundaries, states would have no reasonable motivation to participate in global politics by any means. Therefore, in other to stimulate war, collaboration, or some other expensive external policy or activity, nations must possess satisfactorily influential national interests.\textsuperscript{46}
2.5 Conclusion

This chapter discussed the concepts of international anarchy, global institutions and international cooperation. On the concept of international anarchy, both the realist and liberalist schools of thought accept the existence of anarchy in the international system. The international system lacks a higher authority that should enforce rules to control the behavior of states in the system. Both the realist and liberalist schools of thought, at a point, do not agree on how the effect of international anarchy can be managed. Realists believe that to be able to solve the anarchic nature of the international system, states resort to the principle of self-help, whiles liberals hold the view that cooperation among nations should mitigate the effects of international anarchy.

This chapter also acknowledges that institutions are created by states, but realists argue that institutions only reflect the interest of big powers in the international system and that institutions cannot influence state decisions. Liberals maintain the fact that they can influence state decisions by altering states actions, thus discouraging them from taking steps that will compromise their relative position in the international system. Furthermore, because institutions are set of norms that streamline state actions in the anarchical system, and because states can be penalized for certain actions or decisions that they choose to embark on, they are forced to reconsider their decisions.

Guided by the various views of scholars on the subject of international anarchy, it is established that both realists and liberalists recognize cooperation but dependent on the interests involved, particularly within the contemporary sphere of globalization and economic interdependence which are a proof that states do cooperate.
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CHAPTER THREE
THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL AND THE PROBLEM OF ANARCHY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter discusses the UN system and examines the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), its functions and use of the veto power and how anarchy affects the functions of the UNSC in relation to global peace and security. This helps in demonstrating the use of the veto power in pursuit of the national interest. There have been earlier references to the discourse on the concept of international anarchy and the debates on its understanding and how institutions have been used in inducing cooperation amongst states in the international system. One can characterize the concept of anarchy as the “lack of any supreme authority”; hence, making states in the international system act the way they do. Therefore, one can attest that the presence of anarchy in the international system gives room for states to pursue their national interests, thus, determining the level of cooperation in the system.

3.1 The United Nations System

3.1.0 Formation of the UN

Before the formation of the UN, various global arrangements were proffered to mitigate clashes between countries. The Paris Peace Declaration of 1919 finally laid the foundation for the League of Nations on January 10, 1920 after the horrifying ending of World War One in 1918. The League of Nations required the representation of half of the US, USSR, Germany and Japan. However, the catastrophe of the League not to act against the 1931 Japanese attack of
Manchuria, the second Italy-Ethiopian War in 1935, the Japanese control of China and the Nazi development under Adolf Hitler altogether swelled into World War II.¹

The unsatisfactory performance of the League of Nations led to the built up of the UN. The UN was established with the point of keeping another overwhelming war with its significant spotlight on keeping universal peace and security. The name UN started from the events encompassing the Washington Declaration of 1 January, 1942 amid the Second World War. This was first declared by the United States President Franklin D. Roosevelt. Around the same time, President Roosevelt, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill, Maxim Litvinov of USSR and T.V. Soong of China drafted and marked a short archive which later originated the UN Declaration, promising the signatory governments to bound them toward making peace distinct.²

Below is the consented declaration:

“A Joint Declaration By The United States Of America, The United Kingdom Of Great Britain And Northern Ireland, The Union Of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, South Africa, and Yugoslavia.

The Governments signatory hereto,

Having subscribed to a common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Joint Declaration of the President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister of Great Britain dated August 14, 1941, known as the Atlantic Charter. Being convinced that complete victory over their enemies is essential to defend life, liberty, independence and religious freedom, and to preserve human rights and justice in their own lands as well as in other lands, and that they are now engaged in a common struggle against savage and brutal forces seeking to subjugate the world,
DECLARE:

1. Each Government pledges itself to employ its full resources, military or economic, against those members of the Tripartite Pact and its adherents with which such government is at war.

2. Each Government pledges itself to cooperate with the Governments signatory hereto and not to make a separate armistice or peace with the enemies.

The foregoing declaration may be adhered to by other nations which are, or which may be, rendering material assistance and contributions in the struggle for victory over Hitlerism.³

The pictorial evidence of the signatories with reference to the above stated declaration is presented in Figure 1.

---

Figure 1: Original UN Declaration Signatories

Source: UN Historical Photo of the 1942: Declaration of The UN, pledging "to employ its full resources, military or economic."³⁴

This Declaration united twenty-six Allied nations, who utilized their assets and battle against the Rome – Berlin – Tokyo Axis (Assertion said in Article 3 and 106 of the UN Charter).
3.1.2 Functions and Mandate of the UN

The UN Charter is the basis for carrying out all the functions relating to achieving its objective towards “saving succeeding generations from the scourge of war.” One of its principal intentions is “to maintain international peace and security.” This was finally approved by fifty states in June 1945 during a meeting in San Francisco, which finally gave birth to the UN on 24th October, 1945, thus enforcing the Charter to begin active operations. Since its formation, membership of the UN has steadily increased due to the successive wave of decolonization and disintegration of states and today, there are 193 independent member states of the UN, making the UN the only organization with such a large membership.\(^5\) It has been the predominant institution in controlling and managing the conduct of international relations. The UN comprises of independent states and most states in the world are members of the organization and pledge to a single set of values of the UN Charter. The UN is historically unique and has been in position of authority to take major decisions, especially in the sphere of security that affects global peace.

For an organization like the UN to function effectively, it is frequently backed by mandates. The UN mandates prescribe decisions that give the body authority to carry out its functions. These mandates are used in different ways to achieve specific results. These sets of mandates can be found in various documents such as resolutions or pronouncements of the principal organs and additionally the given accounts of the Secretary-General and subsidiary organs. The UN mandates typically involve peacekeeping operations usually ratified via the UN General Assembly or the UNSC in particular.\(^6\)
3.1.3 UN Organizational Structure

In the creation of this Organization, the UN system is composed of six major structures: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Secretariat, the International Court of Justice (ICJ), the Trusteeship Council, and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC).
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**The General Assembly** is the largest deliberative organ of the UN, whose function is to deliberate on global issues in the Assembly. It constitutes representatives of 193 independent states in the world. Irrespective of the size or influence of the component states, each member state has one vote per delegation and thus 2/3 votes of members are needed to pass resolutions and mandates. Its primary role is to discuss matters emerging and underpinning the UN Charter and to make proposals; it has no power to compel state actions. The Assembly is also responsible for the election of members of other organs, admitting new members, as well as suspending or revoking membership of states who do not follow the principles and directions of the institution. The Assembly approves the financial budget and spending of the entire organization with the
UN’s budget unquestionable by two-thirds or 66% consent of members, while additional issues are unquestionable by a simple consent. The Assembly is credited with successfully playing major roles in the erstwhile decolonization of the global system and has over the years engaged in constitutional rights and electoral observation of sovereign states. It also brings issues mostly overlooked or avoided by other organs of the UN to general attention giving impetus to several resolutions passed and adopted without opposition. Yet, there are times when there has been divergence among members on numerous matters in connection with the Cold War, the Arab-Israeli conflict and constitutional rights. Such issues have constantly drawn public attention and have led states to join global arrangements like treaties, conventions, protocols, and so forth, but eventually have an affirmative effect in the world.\textsuperscript{8}

**The Security Council** is solely responsible under the UN Charter in maintaining global peace and security. Unlike the General Assembly, members of the SC convene any time the need arises, most especially, in situations where global peace and security is threatened. The Council is always notified once there is a threat to peace: official mandates legally binding are formalized to carry out their obligations. The council is supposed to use peaceful means to reach agreement between parties. However, when conflicts break out, the Council endeavors to anchor truce via negotiations, creating sanctions or by approving the use of force, voted upon by willing member States. The Council may similarly resolve to set up peacekeeping tasks to advance lasting peace.\textsuperscript{9}

**The Secretariat** is another organ of the UN and its role has evolved significantly since 1945. It is made up of different offices with an aggregate staff of 16,000 employed from most member states with its Headquarters in New York, in addition to UN offices in Geneva, Vienna, Nairobi and other places. The Secretariat is the executive branch which oversees the daily activities of the Organization. The Secretariat’s responsibility differs, depending on the issues to be
administered - be it peacekeeping tasks, mediation processes, communal and monetary patterns, arranging the foundation for global settlements to consolidating global sessions. In addition, it is obligated to provide assistance to other organs that are overseeing or implementing programs and strategies for execution. The Secretariat is the supervisory organ of the Secretary-General, nominated via the Security Council then elected by the General Assembly on approval of the Security Council intended for a 5-year term. It is an independent body and places the concerns of the Organization above its own. The Secretary-General may convey to the consideration of the Security Council any issue which, as he would see it, might undermine global peace and security and can use his “good offices” to avoid clashes or advance diplomatic negotiations between nations. The Secretary-General may likewise follow up on humanitarian activities or issues of great concern.10

**The Economic and Social Council** (ECOSOC) is designed to be the overwhelming organ, accountable for the economic and social coordination of the UN. 54 members constitute the organ and representation from by different geographical location and allowed to on 3years tenure. Elections are carried out in the Council by a simple majority votes besides every one member is allow to a vote.

The main function of the organ is devoted towards advancing higher standards of living, creating employment opportunity, and improving conditions of economic and social development of members states, thus making the organ the most department that implement over 70 per cent of the work of the UN.

**The International Court of Justice** (ICJ) is that judiciary organ of the UN, situated in The Hague, Netherlands besides it replaced the former Permanent Court of International Justice
created in 1992. The Statues of the ICJ’s was approved the same year the UN Charter was approved and begun operations in 1946. It is the duty of the organ to resolve disputes between nations legitimately in accord with reference to international law. As soon as a nation acknowledges the Court purview, it must comply with its rules and regulations. From the time of formation, the ICJ has deliberated on more than a hundred and fifty cases, as well as passed several rulings relating to global conflicts reported by states that needed to be addressed; these includes issues on economic and human rights abuse, environmental protection, the non-use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of states, diplomatic relations, hostage-taking, the right of asylum and nationality and so many more. It also serves as a consultative body to answer series of issue raised under the UN. Ruling approve by the ICJ are ultimate and without petition. In all, 15 judges are elected by both the General Assembly and the Security Council for a period of nine years.

Despite the uniqueness of the UN, the global society is still characterized by the anarchical nature of the structure. Even though there is some sort of order with wide range of international institutions to regulate states actions and conducts in the international system, it is still viewed as anarchical in nature.11 Regardless of the anarchical nature of the international system, the UN since its establishment has made extensive contribution and played vital roles in maintaining world peace and security, promoting cooperation among sovereign states as well as international development. Yet still, the organization is faced with numerous problems as states still remain the principal actors; since it has no power to control states’ behavior, states ultimate goals in pursuing their national interests within the international system. Despite the fact that there are shared norms and values which the UN both reflects and projects in building blocks of international society, not all states work well together.
3.2 The United Nations Security Council

As determined prior to this discourse, the UNSC is a fundamental vital organ with the highest authority to implement decision on behalf of the UN. The organ was created alongside the UN in 1945, and was enforced in 1946. However, in the events of the Cold War between the two-super powers, the Soviet Union and the United States in addition to their allies at the time – incapacitated the Council thus making the institution ineffectual to carry out its function. In spite of their difficulties, the Security Council figured out how to manage and authorize intervention in the Korean War in 1950, the Congo Crisis in 1965 and peacekeeping in the Suez Crisis, Cyprus and West New Guinea.\(^{12}\)

Around the late 1980s and the mid-21st century, the Security Council (SC) regained its power particularly with its role in international peace and security. Subsequently, with the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the number of peacekeeping tasks and major military exercises authorized by the SC between these years expanded, including those of the Balkans, Angola, Haiti, Liberia, Sierra Leone and Somalia and others. This drastically expanded the UN peacekeeping effort, thus keeping up world peace. Notwithstanding, some of its operations in Rwanda and Bosnia fizzled leading to thousands of deaths and giving rise to question the effectiveness of the UN as peacekeepers and the SC as a deliberate body.\(^{13}\)

3.2.1 Functions and Powers of the Security Council

The SC is charged with the fundamental responsibility for maintenance of international peace and security as per the standards and motives behind the creation of the UN. Therefore, its primary concern is keeping up global peace and security at whatever point peace is undermined. The purposes and powers of the UNSC are plainly characterized and completely expressed
separately in Article 24-26 of the UN Charter: “responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, Agreement to accept and carry out the decision of the Security Council, and Regulations of armaments.”

The functions and roles of the SC in the above Article can further be simplified to investigating any dispute or situation which might prompt international friction; recommending methods or actions in addressing to such disputes or terms of settlement before escalating; formulating a plan for the establishment of a system to regulate armaments. The Council is additionally empowered to determine the presence of danger to peace or acts of aggression and to recommend what action ought to be made; urge members to apply economic sanctions and different measures not involving the use of force to prevent or stop animosity; take military actions against an aggressor when necessary; commend the affirmation of new members; practice the trusteeship tasks of the UN in “key areas”; and to recommend to the General Assembly the appointment of the Secretary-General and together with the assembly, to choose the Judges of the ICJ through Security Council resolution on behalf of the UN that ties member states.

3.2.2 Membership of the Security Council

The Security Council is perceived as one of the principal organs of the UN confer on with the legitimate capability to endorse policies it deems necessary to keep up international peace and security. Accordingly, it has the legitimate consent to punish states within the international system through using economic sanctions and diplomatic relations between countries, levy blockades, and approve the use of armed force.

The membership of the SC in 1945 when the organization was shaped was made up of 11 members. It highlighted on Five Permanent members - the Republic of China (Taiwan), France,
the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States and Six Non-permanent members elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms. Not until 1964, (19 years after its establishment) the UN Charter was altered to expanding Council membership to fifteen, maintaining the permanent membership but increasing the non-permanent membership from six to ten.\textsuperscript{17}

### 3.2.3 Permanent Members

The seats of the permanent members have remained constant since the making of the Council with the defeaters of World War II: The United Kingdom, the Russian Federation (formerly the USSR), France, the People’s Republic of China (formerly occupied by the ROC government) and the United States FORM the permanent memberships of the SC. These members are conceded veto control which enables any one of them to declare any substantive Security Council resolution ultra vires, as well as to vote against it.\textsuperscript{18}

Since the making of the Council, there have been two noteworthy seat changes made on the council by the Republic of China and the Soviet Union respectively. In 1971, the Chinese seat formerly occupied by Taiwan government (ROC) was replaced by the Mongolia government (PRC). China was some time ago a founding member of the UN Charter in 1945, thus making it a member of the UN and legitimate member of the P5 in the Security Council. After Mongolia’s triumph in the Chinese Civil War in 1961, the Taiwan government ceased to be perceived as a legitimate government in the UN. In consonance with Resolution 1668 of the General Assembly (that required any adjustment in China’s representation in the UN to be determined by the two-thirds or 66% vote, with reference to Article 18 of the UN charter) the resolution passed conceded the PRC the legitimate government of the Chinese people at the UN.\textsuperscript{19}
The Russian Federation succeeded the Soviet Union after its breakdown in 1991. The Alma Ata Protocol on 21 December 1991 declared that the Soviet Union ceased to exist and that Russia would proceed with the Soviet Union's membership in the UN and maintain the full responsibility regarding every one of the rights and commitments of the Soviet Union under the UN Charter. This document circulated among the UN, recognized and perceived the Russian federation as a member to the Security Council without any objections.  

3.2.4 Non-Permanent Membership

Article 23 of the UN Charter (which was amended on 17 December 1963 and enforced in 1965) expanded the number of the non-permanent members of the Security Council from six to ten, hence the expansion of the number of seats of the non-permanent members. As per Rule 142 of the Rules of Procedure, the General Assembly is again empowered yearly to elect five permanent members to serve in the Council. Election is made on a regional basis to serve two-year terms.

The decision procedure of the non-permanent members (NPMs) is distinctive from that of the permanent members (PMs). Nominations of the non-permanent members take after certain rules and agreements in the decision procedure. Seats assigned to the 10 permanent members are divided among five regional bodies: one country representing Eastern Europe, two from Western Europe and Other groups, two from Latin America and the Caribbean group and five countries representing Africa and Asia. Thus, for a country to be eligible for elections in this category it has to belong to any of the five regional groupings identified above. Staggered elections can likewise be conducted by the UNGA for five seats every autumn, with terms beginning the following January. Also, under the Article 23(2) of UN Charter, “Non-Permanent members in their final year of their term are not qualified to stand for immediate re-election.” For a country
to be declared a winner, it must at least receive two-thirds or 66% of the votes in the UNGA expressed in Article 18 (2) of the UN Charter. Each member of the non-permanent council is granted a vote but does not have the power to veto resolution unlike the permanent members.

### 3.2.5 Veto Power

The UN Charter, with reference to Article 27, stipulates that every member of the Security Council is entitled to vote on procedural matters; that decisions shall be confirmatory based on the votes from nine members, including the concurring votes of the permanent five members. However, in Chapter VI, paragraph 3 of Article 52, it states that any member may at any point choose to abstain from voting even though each member of the Security Council is entitled to one vote.

However, since 1945, each of the five permanent members of the SC possesses unconditional veto power, which the UN Charter does not explicitly mention. Instead it stipulates that for a resolution to be passed, it must receive nine confirmatory votes of the 15-member states from the Council, including the concurring votes of the 5 Permanent Members. Hence, a negative vote cast by one or more of the permanent members is, in essence, a veto.

### 3.2.6 The Use of Veto

The concept of states possessing a veto to implement certain activities of the global institution did not come as a surprise in 1945. It has thrived since the establishment of the League of Nation-states during 1920s, where every single member in the Council, regardless of permanent or non-permanent exercised veto in relations to matters of concerns. However, in the making of the UN, the veto was restricted to the victors of WWII. As such, the usage of veto was exercised extensively amid the Cold War era especially between the two noteworthy powers of the US and
Russia in their quest of national interest instead of aggregated interest. Statistics show that the five permanent members of the SC have cast their veto power at uncountable times either to simply retaliate or block other countries’ application to be members of the UN.  

The Cold War era, demonstrated that the USSR was responsible for nearly 50% of all the veto votes cast. Over 79 votes were cast within the initial 10 years. For instance, the USSR rejected bid for new membership simply because the United States refuse to concede majority of the Soviet States. Following a disintegration of the USSR, Russia cast its veto power infrequently. It used it to obstructed Japan’s confirmation as another member to the UN in 1952, because it was considered as a subject that could be easily influenced by the US. The Soviet Union obstructed determinations in “assistance” to Hungary as a result of 1956 revolt, the 1968 Czechoslovakia invasion as well as the Afghanistan invasion in 1989. Its use of veto power likewise heightened towards the end of 2000s also at the 2010s owing to aggregated determinations on wars it was taking part in militarily, together with Ukraine, Georgia, and Syria.

The US is the second country that cast its veto power as much as Russia. In the year 1975, US first utilized its veto in connection to the Rhodesia disaster, and later vetoed hindering the resolution denouncing Israel to wage war against Lebanon and Syria. Ever since then, US turn into a frequent incessant abuser of veto, on mostly determinations reprimanding, as well as convicting Israel, in addition it virtually at all times unilaterally go to war and human rights defilements. Besides Negroponte Doctrine asserts that the US will oppose SC resolutions against Israel that will condemn Israeli-Palestinian conflict without convicting terrorist groups this has from time in memorial been connected to block all resolutions identified with Israel-Palestinian war. Indeed, it relentlessly caused the strife among member states of the SC. However, on February 18, 2011, Obama’s administration banned a determination convicting Israeli agreement
and later on the 23 December, 2016 it permitted a determination requiring a conclusion to Israeli settlements to pass.³⁰

Moving away from the US and Russia who virtually veto resolution due to national interests, Britain has on 32 occasions exercised its veto power.³¹ The first time it ever used its veto was in 1956 with France vetoing a letter from the US to the President of SC concerning Palestine. The most recent France and Britain vetoes were in 1989 when the UK and France vetoed against a draft determination convicting the US incursion in Panama. UK additionally used its veto on Southern Africa generally with issues on racial discrimination in addition to the situation of the Southern Rhodesia (now Zimbabwe) respectively. It further vetoed between the periods of 1963 - 1973 seven occasions in connection with Rhodesia matters, with five cases being one-sided. This was the main time which the UK has utilized its veto power singularly.³²

France, one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, hardly uses its veto power. However, it first unilaterally used its veto power in 1976 to hinder a resolution that will allow Comorians freedom, in other to possess the Mayotte Island to be a part of the community. In 1956, France alongside UK vetoed a determination of immediate cessation of armed activities carried out by Israeli armed forces hostility towards Egypt in the Suez Crisis. In December 1989, France vetoed a resolution regarding the unstable state of affairs in Panama, thus making it the last time it utilized its veto power.³³ Not until, 2003 when France joined Russia to veto against any draft resolution proposed by the US and the UK on the impending invasion of Iraq that could possibly lead to war.

For the duration of 1946 and 1971, the Republic of China (ROC) was in possession of the Chinese seat in the SC. Between this period, the ROC cast its veto just once in the year 1955, to
hinder the admission of the People Republic of China (PRC), on grounds that they viewed the nation as a part of existing government, thus delaying the confirmation of PRC. However, not until Soviet Union protested in 1961 to block all affirmation of newly independent African states, that the admission of the PRC was granted. After the admission of Mongolia’s government in the UN in 1971, the newly admitted Chinese government vetoed affirmation of Bangladesh to become a member of the UN in 1972, in the light of the fact indicated by the delegate of China to the UN that USSR and India are building an aggressive military alliance in South Asia thus making China vulnerable. However, by February 2017, the Chinese government has cast its veto on eleven resolutions, just to resolutions that are of interest to them; if not, they prefer to abstain.

One can argue that the usage of veto by the great powers during then and after Cold War was in quest of varying national interests which often affect the UNSC’s functions, especially when a major decision is to be taken. The use of the veto among the 5-P invariably causes tensions since they cannot come to an agreement.

3.2.7 Criticism of the Veto Power

As established before in an earlier discourse, the veto power makes the Security Council the most ground-breaking organ of the UN with regards to decision making. The post-Cold War era has experienced extraordinary transformation in international relations which has furnished the world with new opportunities to develop certain objective criteria on the basis of which some powers can be affirmed into the permanent Council. The ongoing deliberations on the restructuring of the UNSC is becoming alarming after the end of the Cold War, and this has certainly renewed interest in democratic governance all over the world.
During the Cold War era, it could be argued that the formation and structure of the UNSC was based on power military and economic - backed by the status of permanent members, and thus giving them the capacity to make major decisions in the world and influence the decisions of the UNSC. For the UNSC to attain its objectives such as peace-keeping, peace-enforcement and peace-building, then it has to be economically and militarily robust.\textsuperscript{37}

Military wise, the US was the first to ever develop nuclear weapons and construct an Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), long-extended aircrafts and submarines that could possibly be used to engage in instantly offensive destruction globally. In the 1990s, particularly in the Gulf War and in 2001, the US increased its offensive capability massively and has additionally been victorious in every one of the wars it engaged in the twentieth century; hence, earning it unconquerable power and other recognitions. Despite the fact that, the US still keep up the leadership position in the global world (which initially justifies its privileges to the UNSC) its economic power has significantly decline overtime. Thus, it relatively lacks the resources to exclusively carry the burden of world policing alone. This is quite evident from the Persian Gulf Crisis I.\textsuperscript{38}

The power position of Russia, UK and France has also declined substantially. Succeeding the breakdown of Soviet Union then an end to the Warsaw Pact in 1991, Russian military, economic and demographic capabilities have shrunk considerably. However, Russia is as yet regarded as a noteworthy power as it retains the military capabilities to deny security to others. It likewise holds the assets to cause instability to neighboring regional states as well as European countries, even with the decline in its conventional capabilities. The power positions of France and the UK has weakened significantly in both military and economic terms, yet they remain members of the UNSC.\textsuperscript{39}
China did not possess many of the ingredients necessary for it to become a noteworthy power then. However, its major role played in the victorious alliance and with a solid support by US positioned it as a member of the Security Council. China’s role in Vietnam, by supporting armed struggle worldwide, and as a supplier of military and economic aid to such movements had fortified its position. In view of this, as far as hard power assets is concerned, China has the largest standing armed forces, a constrained atomic deterrent and the world’s quickest developing economy. This presents China with the most robust opportunities to emerge as a super power today.  

The above points establish the declining economies and military powers of the so-called great powers within the SC, thus, questioning their capacities to still retain the status of the P5 members. It additionally questions why certain decisions are still approved by these permanent members particularly when other countries have equally solid or better economies and military capacities in contributing towards the maintenance of international peace. For instance, it merits recognizing that Japan and Germany loom some portion of the largest economies in the world, surpassing the economies of France, UK, and Russia and furthermore contributing a substantial aggregate towards the UN’ budget, therefore, making them viable to the Security Council position.  

Another critique has been with the under-representation of Third World countries on the SC. It is argued that the SC still operates under the Cold War era, and as such, it does not reflect the current global politics. Greater parts of the ongoing conflicts occurring are located in the Africa, Asia and Middle East continents and as such, the continents have been classified as the most conflict-ridden regions in the world. In addition the increasing number of states that have joined the UN ever since the end of the Cold War, have not reflected in the SC especially with regards
to the continent, thus the claim that the Third World is under-represented in the Security Council and the UN has not dealt with the primary security problems of the Third World. Therefore, “in other to maintain parity of status in the council, veto powers should be given to the countries representing the Third World to better address security matters.”

3.2.8 Security Council Reform

Over the years, the structure of the Security Council has remained highly controversial as well as questioning its continuing legitimacy particularly ever since the end of the Cold War. Members of the UN have argued that the five-permanent membership of the SC still reflects old system of power structure created at the end of World War II; Member states are also concerned with transparency, accountability and participation and how the Council actually reaches decisions, thus, the agitations by members for the restructuring of the Council to depict current world situation of democratic governance. Proposals have been put forward for the Council’s reforms to make it more representatives, yet these have not led to any definite results.

The unconditional, over-riding powers possessed by the five-permanent members of the Security Council since 1945 have been criticized as the most undemocratic stakes, together with the featured unequal representation of members states in the Council. During the 1979, General Assembly gathering, India and other 35 Non-Aligned states, proposed a provisional agenda of equal representation and an expansion in participation of the Security Council. Several resolutions have as well been petitioned and items have been officially placed on the General Assembly agenda where no changes have been effected. The resolutions call aimed at membership to submit a reform proposition in 1993 to the Secretariat on ways to reform the Security Council. Numerous propositions put together by members uncovered that large number
upheld the extension of the SC yet no agreed number of seats were mention and which countries needed to be added.\textsuperscript{44}

The call for reform in the five-permanent membership of the SC started earlier when both Germany and Japan started advocating for their own perpetual seats on grounds that they played a profound role in the Gulf Wars, in addition their economic and military contribution to the institution have increased considerably over the years, making them the second and third largest donors to the UN per the 1992 records. Later, India and Brazil and their supporters joined Germany and Japan (The Group of Four) in the argument for the creation of new permanent seats. India grounded its assertion on being the world’s following largest populated nation, with one of the massive economies and the third biggest provider of soldiers for UN peace-keeping operations; whilst Brazil argued for membership stemming from being the biggest state with reference to territory size, population size and largest economy in South America.\textsuperscript{45}

African Union, the representative of the African body at the UN similarly proposed in lieu of two perpetual places for Africa in addition to right to veto. Africa’s argument was based on the way the primary piece of the Council’s work is focused on the African continent, and therefore is appropriate for the continent to be represented on the Council. This assertion is currently centered on the Ezulwini-Consensus, a collective stance agreed on in 2005 by all members of the AU.\textsuperscript{46}

3.3 The Pursuit of National Interest

The concept of national interest assumes a vital part of international relations. The quest for national interest is constantly the foundations for realism. Niccolò Machiavelli is widely considered as the first thinker for the primacy of the national interest.\textsuperscript{47} Ever since the concept
gained prominence in politics, states tend to use their national interests as a defense for most of their actions.\textsuperscript{48}

The pursuit of national interest shapes and influences the foreign policy of every nation. It is most of the time perceived as the goals and aspirations, be it economic, military or cultural. The national interest of states is mostly considered to be multi-faceted with the states’ survival and security very paramount in the international system. According to Hans Morgenthau, power is the most important element that informs the relationship between states.\textsuperscript{49}

In view of this, the main forces that worked in creating the Charter of the UN and the structure of the inner circle of the United Nation Security Council are moved by vested interests. America, Britain, China, USSR and France were made permanent members based on idiosyncratic representation, and not objectivity. The US made China a permanent member to contain Japan and the UK was of the view that making France one of the permanent members will assist Britain maintains its own kingdom and further addresses difficulties that may emerge from decolonization. Hence, supporting France to a veto power in the UN system was a great interest to Churchill at the time.\textsuperscript{50}

The conduct of the powers under Chapter VII of the UNSC is constantly addressed with regards to decision made by the Security Council. Unilateralism shakes the foundation of the UN aggregated security structure and the purpose of its Security Council executive in international community. Another challenge faced by the Security Council is the demand for post war/post-conflict justices caused by the occurrence in multilateral peace rebuilding since the 1990s. Thus, the aim of the UN to uphold and restore peace and security poses questions around the way the Security Council handles its execution of powers in the context-like international territorial
administration. Among the various instances that raised concerns about the scope of the UNSC powers are the two contemporary events in Kosovo and the recent US - Iraqi War.\textsuperscript{51}

In a situation like this where the use of sanctions prompts a particular state to recommend an action to be taken indicates the very state’s intention to act on the Security Council authorization. This gives rise to the issue of self-interest. In the case of Iraq, when the Security Council adopted the Iraq resolution, Iraq asserted that the United States put forward the resolution as a cover for its hostile and imperialist policies in the region. The charge at the time was more compelling because of the United States' dominance as the only remaining global influence. To further question the resolution and the motives for its adoption, Iraq believed: The United States totally dominates the Security Council and its arbitrary and biased procedures. This was made clear soon after the vote on the Iraq resolution, with the United States cutting economic aid to Council member Yemen, as a form of revenge for Yemen's negative vote on the resolution. By so doing, the action proved the impression that the United States was acting out of self-interest.\textsuperscript{52}

The Rwanda incident also demonstrated a typical example of states interest. France, during the Rwanda civil war was alleged to have favored the Hutus because their second spoken language was French while the Tutsis spoke English. It supported the Hutus by supplying weapons to the Rwandan government in its civil war against the Tutsi-led Rwanda Patriotic Front. Upon passing and adopting the Rwanda resolution, the Tutsi rebel force pronounced its objection to France's entry into Rwanda and vowed to attack French forces. The intention of France in Rwanda was obvious as it was the only country willing to act.

Consequently, the effort to attaining victory with military interventions has fatefuly served to confirm doubts about self-interest on the part of intervening states. Among the major powers, the
perceived failure of the Security Council’s authorized interventions reinforced the belief that a state should become involved militarily only if it has a direct interest in the state in question.⁵³

### 3.4 Collective Security

Collective Security is the most promising approach to international peace in recent years. It is a gadget for emergency administration which proposes a dedication with respect to all countries to collectively meet an animosity of the threat of war or hostility in any part of the international system. According to George Schwarzenberger, collective security is a machinery for joint activity with a specific goal ends in other to anticipate or counter any attack against the built up global order. ⁵⁴ To Palmer and Perkins, collective security clearly implies collective measures for dealing with threats to peace. ⁵⁵ David Schleicher further characterized Collective Security in his work as a game plan among states in which all guarantee to arise towards the relief of any member of the system in the happening or hostilities or when any member engages in certain illegal actions of war or violence against another member. ⁵⁶

The idea that states should come together to create an international organization with the authority to maintain peace called for the creation of the League of Nations in 1919, which was the first effort to put the idea of the concept of collective security into practice. However, the League failed in view of its powerless system for basic leadership and for aggregate action. A reasonable case of failure of the League of Nation’s aggregate action was the Manchurian Crisis in which Japan attacked some portion of China. Given that each country of the League at that point had veto power, Japan vetoed the resolution passed requesting its withdrawal or face extreme punishment. This extremely restricted the League capacity to react. In addition, the inaction of the League amid 1935 Italy intrusions in Ethiopia (then Abyssinia) confirmed it was frail and was concerned more with European issues. ⁵⁷
The failure of the League set up the UN with a more grounded arrangement for basic leadership and aggregated military activity that those of the League of Nation’s Covenants, that did not speak to the aggregate security then. The UN’s principle of aggregated security define in the UN Charter approves the Security Council towards examining any condition impeding global peace; endorse measures for nonviolent resolution of differences; and applies its resolutions in a military way, or through every means obligatory.\textsuperscript{58}

3.5 Effects of Anarchy on the Functions of the UNSC

The UNSC is that establishment of the world organization that typically demonstrates pragmatist or realist model of global politics.\textsuperscript{59} It is the organ of the UN with “the essential obligation concern to support of universal peace and security,” indicated in Article twenty-four of UN Charter. Part conditions of the UN unequivocally perceive their commitment to execute SC resolutions, as expressed in Article twenty-five: "The Members of the UN consent to acknowledge and do the choices of the Security Council as per the present Charter."\textsuperscript{60}

The UNSC has been noted as the most intense international organization since its formation. The members of the P-5 alone account for more than 60\% of overall military expenditure and their partisan influences are likewise overarching. Furthermore, the UN Charter enhances its capacity by entrusting the Council superior lawful authority above global security issues.\textsuperscript{61} In addition, the Charter requires the military and political resources of the Council adherent be made available for ‘executing the determination of the Council’ with concession to ‘the support of universal peace and security.’\textsuperscript{62} Besides the military capacity, the Council has permission to take measures for the benefit of the 193 independent affiliates of the Organization, most of who have not served any tenure in the Council.\textsuperscript{63}
The existence of the SC is by virtue of the UN Charter which establishes and outlines the degree and restrictions of its authority. The Articles in the Charter also accord the Council legal right to decided what constitutes global “threat to peace, breach of peace, and act of aggression” and react to such threats. In such cases, the existence of threat is considered opinionated instead of constitutional decree; thus, decisions are made base on Council’s inclination and act to correct the situation. Article 41 and 42; describe corrective measures, and grants the Council the power to effect decisions including non-military actions, for example, economic sanctions and military actions necessary to reinstate global peace and security.\textsuperscript{64}

Despite the fact that the Charter gives certain degrees of authority to the Council in determining what constitutes threat and what should be done to restore international peace and security.\textsuperscript{65} The Charter further explicitly creates legitimate restrictions preceding the authority of the Council. These are expressed in Article 2(7), generally limiting the activities of the UN and the Council to respect the internal jurisdiction of member states - thus, protecting the domestic affairs of independent states from the interference of both the UN and the SC. Essentially, this must be in concurrence with Article 39 which authorizes the Council to determine when a state of affair is classified as hostile to global peace and security. Under the UN law, “a threat to international peace” cannot be classified as ‘an affair within the national constitution of the government’; in circumstances where Council agrees that a noted status quo is not domestic and considers it as a menace to global peace, then restrictions in Article 2(7) will be irrelevant in this state of affairs.\textsuperscript{66}

Another major limitation to the functions of the Council is in relation to the voting power rule. For an important decision to be made by the Council, it needs the backing of nine out of fifteen adherents, in addition to the referendum of the five memberships.\textsuperscript{67} The veto in this case, in Article 27(3), lays down the legitimate framework for the Council’s pronouncements and this is
strictly decided by the five perpetual adherents. Hence, for the Council to implement any significant action, it has to be backed by the legal and procedural prerequisite of the Commission.

The Council, originally designed by the Great Powers of 1945, still reflects the political realities of the time when the Charter was written. The veto at that time makes certain not to execute resolutions restricted to any of the permanent membership. This obviously resulted in the incapacity of the perpetual members failing to correspond with each other, and was clearly manifested all through the Cold War and in recent times, with the Iraq attack in 2003 and the 2011 Syrian war. The allies of World War II placed themselves at the center of collective security system to prevent another war, they granted more privileges to the P-5 through the veto power than other member states. Thus, the organization abandons a permanent member free to wage war on any country without being punished because it has a veto power. A permanent member can veto against any resolution that does not affect its self-interests and has nothing to do with its national interest.

Between 1990 till date, the US became the most frequent user of the veto power - using it 16 times - and out of those times, using it 14 times to influence the Israel/Palestine situation. The Russian Federation comes next with 11 vetoes: 6 of which has been used alongside China obstructing a Security Council determination convicting radical suppression in Myanmar, just because they felt the SC was violating its global peace and security decree by unduly meddling in the internal matters of Myanmar. Similarly, this same reason was used in the Zimbabwe situation in 2008 to block such resolution.
Nevertheless, one can say that the number of vetoes utilized by the 5-permanent members has reduced drastically since the end of the Cold War and the disintegration of the Soviet Union. On the other hand, the use of resolutions has increased rapidly particularly for unanimous resolutions. Up until now, the veto still raises concerns as to when and how the veto power is being utilized in executing the functions of the Council.\textsuperscript{72}

Bearing in mind the state of affair in global politics and the significance of the UN, the international organization is unlikely to result in sudden disintegration. Be that as it may, the arrangement of the establishment, as well, has turned out to be awkwardly behind time: Britain and France feature in medium-ranking world powers by any calculation, yet they both have dominance of Security Council vetoes. Interestingly, countries like Germany, Japan, India, Brazil, and other countless countries having huge geopolitical attributes for all intents and purposes hold no veto. By means of universal fundamental precedents, according to which member states is acknowledges and governed by, stipulates that every member in the international organization are equal and as such the UN Charter must maintain the principle independent impartiality, which states that members have equal right and no discrimination, yet the UNSC violates the principle.\textsuperscript{73} The presence of veto right contradicts the rule, to a large extent with modern nations dominating and developing nations which are yet to be represented. The criteria for veto power is unfairly prejudiced and definitely not for universal peace. It additionally creates further disagreements between countries over the world; bringing about formation of additional groupings.

On countless occasions, member states have demanded for the reform and restructuring of the UNSC to reflect the existing global realities of global politics and democracy, but this has not been granted. The organ has been labeled extremely autocratic, because it agrees to a rule that
singly permits a state to a point of view disagreeing with the rest of the world.\textsuperscript{74} Notwithstanding in cases a veto vote is not casted, it fundamentally control all intents and purpose of the perpetual five members. This is so, due to the fact that, it is constantly important to get each and every one of them on board. A P-5 country will normally veto a determination in the UN since they or their partners have a solid national interest to achieve. These interests over and over again suddenly contradict with the interests of other nation state. Besides, given the fact that, the veto can singularly be used to prevent hostile occurrence, it can likewise convey complexities to surface in an unpleasant, infuriating, and provoking manner. Hence, it draws an immediate association amongst opposition and the contrast among nation state, leading to an unhealthy relationship in the global structure.\textsuperscript{75}

In establishing the UN, the veto system was also established alongside to guarantee that the institution fit inside the extensive geopolitical game. However, it makes an indefinite continuous disastrous geopolitics of egocentric countries instead of accepting a basic, nondiscriminatory role of universal governance with the goal of securing anchoring global interests. For instance, the SC neglected to act in the course of the Rwandan massacre in 1994 because of the concealed votes of France and the US. The Americans were keen on sparing cash while the French were concerned with protecting their associates, the destructive government, which led to the loss of at least 800,000 people, if not more. In recent times, the activities of the Council can also be illustrated in the Arab-Israeli war, where a great number of determinations were approved by the General Assembly convicting Israeli course of action simply to be invalidated by a US veto.\textsuperscript{76}

There are some instances one can illustrate that the use of vetoes has been utilized for different purposes to promote ideological desire and pursuing national interests. China for instance obstructed peacekeeping operations proceeding in Guatemala and Macedonia because of the
commitment of those nations with Taiwan. Thus, depicting that veto power is no longer connected to the purpose of aggregated security for which it was recognized. An evaluation with regards to the use of veto power would point to the fact that, it is being utilized in advancing political and national interests, rather than defending matters and principal objectives, in light of legitimate concern of the global community. The impression of a veto has intensified the domineering role of the perpetual members of the Security Council, making them an exclusive group and lessening the role of non-permanent members. The threat of a veto in recent circumstances has been utilized to frustrate valuable initiatives and decision of other members of the Security Council.

Israel's aggression against the Palestinians and its violations of international law against Hezbollah in Lebanon and many excessively countless occurrences, demonstrates Israeli misuses and abuses of international law clearly, however United States has shielded Israel from international conviction in the UNSC several times. US defending Israel in these instances, accordingly constitutes an unmannerly and immoral action to defend an ally. This exposes how the UNSC veto opens the door to exploitation of international activities and due to several reasons the implementation of the functions of the UNSC is often considered in-effective. In spite of the functions of the Security Council, the lack of a higher authority in the organ most often inhibits its effectiveness, especially where the notions of nation-states and national interest are paramount.

By way of creating the UN, victors of the World War II imposed on themselves the duty of policing and ensuring worldwide tranquility and safe future, thus occupying perpetual membership of the Security Council of the UN and granting themselves the power to veto all decisions.
3.6 Conclusion

The chapter discusses the formation, functions, organs and organizational structure of the UN. It targeted the UNSC, the most powerful organ in the international system, with its main mandate and functions in promoting and maintaining global peace and security. It further discusses how the Victors of the World War II imposed on themselves the duty of policing and ensuring worldwide peace and security, thus occupying the seats of the P-5 and granting themselves the power to veto any resolutions.

It also establishes the composition and electoral procedures in the non-permanent membership of the Council. Furthermore, it demonstrates how the veto has been used in the past; the criticism of the veto power; and the agitation for reform by members in the UN, for better democratic representation of the current global politics. Finally, it addresses the effects of anarchy on the obligations and mandates of the Security Council and how their action and inactions affected the advancement of global peace and security.
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CHAPTER FOUR

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

4.0 Introduction

This chapter sums up the findings of the research conducted to evaluate the effects of anarchy in the international organization, using the UNSC as the case study. The chapter also provides conclusions and recommendations for further research.

4.1 Summary of Findings

4.1.1 Effect of Anarchy on UNSC

Per the objectives, the study first assessed the effects of anarchy in the international system, using the UNSC as the scope of the study. In defining anarchy, the two noteworthy schools of thought- Realism and Liberalism help in making its inference on the presence of anarchy in the global arena. It stated that the absence of a preeminent power to manage worldwide affairs is referred to as anarchy in international relations. Also, in the light of the inherent features of the international system which is anarchical, the ultimate concerns of states is survival and in that capacity, states in this condition will do everything to increase their ability in protecting themselves from other states as a result, this has led to security dilemma in the global arena. In this perspective, states are constantly supporting themselves with self-justifying weapons.

The research demonstrates that despite the actions in the international arena, realist asserts five attributes why states in the framework would not trust and collaborate with each other; however some of the realists’ claims were rebutted by liberalists on the basis that institutions are the best avenue to mitigate such actions, hence, fostering states collaborate in the global arena. Such
institutions can keep an eye on states practices and activities through formation of codes and norms. States are not to be subjected to any type of incomparable power in the international system, the mere facts that states are a member of international institutions, and as such institutions find ways to check their actions by standard principles, thus regulating some states actions. However, it is not always so in the case of the UNSC, the highest decision-making organ and without any higher authority, to sanction their (i.e. five permanent members) behavior; they always get scot free of their actions.

4.1.2 Influence of anarchical nature of the UNSC on the attainment of the organ’s mandate

The study furthermore uncovers that the UNSC organ within the UN often mirror the concept of anarchy. As the most powerful organ, comprising of the most powerful countries with the main mandate of the objective of the UN, and it is often characterized by power reflection; states are always in constant rivalry for power. Thus, decisions making in this condition becomes very difficult to achieve among its members, thus making the organ ineffective in its functions.

Upon the above findings that the study accepted the underlying hypothesis of the study that anarchy in the international system has often rendered the UNSC ineffective in executing its mandate.

4.1.3 The effectiveness of the UNSC in pursuit of conflicting states’ interest

The research observed that the quest for national interest is the order of the day in the UNSC. Members of the P5 are constantly using the arena to further implement their foreign policies. For instance, the use of the veto power between members clearly showed that members are always indifference in carrying out missions that are not of global interest rather their national interest.
As per the findings of this research, members of the General Assembly are constantly agitating for restructuring of the Security Council on the grounds that; membership of UN has extensively increased since its inception, the percentage contributed by some members towards UN Operations and budgets, and unequal representation of member’s base on geopolitical locations in the UNSC. Moreover, ever since the collapse of the League of Nations in 1945, the permanent Council has not undergone any major changes that ought to mirror the contemporary global politics, thus, the demand for expansion of the P-5. Findings demonstrated that despite the fact that there has been expansion in the number of the NPM, it does not reflect equal representation considering the number of states within the UN.

4.1.4 Examination of the purpose for which UNSC was formed

The central role of UNSC aims at the advancement of global peace and security. The finding demonstrates that to some degree UNSC has been pronounced ineffective in its dealings. Stemming from the fact that, while the organ has been effective with specific tasks in reinstating worldwide peace, it has likewise failed in some cases. In the failure of some of its mission, the Security Council has been criticized for the quest of national interest rather than collective security for which it was formed.

4.2 Conclusions

The underlying hypothesis of the study as outlined in chapter one was that anarchy in the international system has often rendered the UNSC ineffective in executing its mandate. This hypothesis is affirmed because; the absence of a supreme authority allows states in the international system to pursue their national interest to the disadvantage of other states. This is not different with the case of the members within the Security Council. Anarchy also allows
states that do not conform to rules and regulations to go unpunished because of the principle of sovereignty, thus states continue to pursue their national interest without limitations. However, states in the international system cannot live in seclusion or function without another; along these lines, states will undoubtedly weigh the degree of their actions before certainly implementing its decisions.

It is prove of this research that the UNSC possesses the legitimate mandate and as clearly stated in the UN Charter, which grants the UNSC members to exert some form of authority to decide what threaten global peace and security, in addition executing decisions to keep up the global peace and security on behalf of the UN. This was affirmed from the literature of scholars used in the research topic. The study analyzed the effects of anarchy on the functions and role of the UNSC and how their actions and inactions as exhibited in world politics.

In the course of the study, the goals of the research have been appropriately addressed. It can therefore be inferred that ‘Anarchy’- which is the lack of supreme power in the global structure, plays a significant role in deciding the actions and inactions of states in world politics illustrated in the case of the UNSC of the permanent 5 members. This again can be exemplified by the quest for national interest in the global arena. States display little interest in issues that are of no relevance to achieving their national interest, thus, in this manner achieving cooperation among states becomes difficult, especially when resolutions are passed to determine necessary action in the international system.

The research further established that due to lack of central authority or governing body to oversee as well as caution the activities of the UNSC, particularly with the P5 members in the Security Council, decisions made to uphold global peace and security is often base on members
interest, and as a result it renders the activities of the Council ineffective with regards to the required mandate of preserving global peace and security.

4.3 Recommendations

In view of the analysis and discussion in the preceding sections of this research, the ensuing proposals are offered as recommendations to address and mitigate the degree of anarchy within the UNSC of the UN.

- **Elimination/Abolishment of the Veto**
  
  The veto power is assumed to be the rationale behind the ineffectiveness of the Security Council. Permanent members use their veto to control the Council’s agenda and prevent the Council from taking up certain issues, thus some suggested resolutions cannot get passed in the SC as a result of the veto powers; the abolishment of the veto power will essentially imply that more resolutions can be passed with no blockage from any nation. By eliminating the veto power, the productivity and the efficiency of the UNSC will be enormously enhanced as voting will begin to have effect on the members.

- **Expansion of UNSC Membership**
  
  The Security Council is not equally represented by all members of the UN; apart from the five permanent members only ten additional states from 193 member states are on the Council. The structure of the Council has barely changed since the inception of the UN. Consequently, for the organ to mirror the current worldwide circumstance, it must be genuinely be design to reflect the expansion in the number of member states particularly with less developed nations. There should be an expansion within the PM and the NPM membership to reflect the current political circumstance and adequately portray developing nations in the P5 Council and addresses the legitimacy of the UNSC.
- **Political Neutrality of the UNSC**

  As far back as the UN’s origin, commitment to the principle of impartiality and fairness without doubt was going to be extremely difficult basically because of the intrinsic attitude of states. However, for the UNSC to function effectively and efficiently, states should avoid being biased with the pursuit of the national interest in determining acceptable form of punishments when international peace has been threatened. This will help to ensure states objectivity and neutrality in performing its mandates towards advancing universal peace and security, as well as keeping up with the activities of the Council.
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