

Good example of  
research paper on  
does the united  
nations benefit the  
entire glob...

[Engineering](#), [Aviation](#)



With the end of the Second World War in 1945, the international community had desired to create an international organization that would ensure that wars would be prevented and entice global development and partnership between nations. There had been earlier attempts prior to the end of the war to create such “ united organization”, but the growing aggression that led to the Second World War and the national interests of each nation restricted these attempts. With the aftermath of the war revealing the ailing economies of the war-torn nations and the trauma on wars, the necessity to maintain the attained peace became imminent. The establishment of the United Nations in October 24, 1945 had been a huge step towards the goal on global development and prevention of wars. However, it is observed that the UN only benefits a few nations as the organization’s decision-making and intervention/peacemaking capabilities are handled by the “ great powers” and the overall capability of the UN is restricted under its Charter, especially in the issue on intervention/peacekeeping.

The United Nations, according to Taylor and Curtis (2011) has six major organs to handle its many roles and oversee its programs: the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic and Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the Secretariat and the International Court of Justice. Out of these six agencies, it is the Security Council that is the “ main executive body within the United Nations with the primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security”. The SC is comprised of five permanent members, or the “ great powers” and 10 members who are voted by their regional blocs to the position. Its decisions are binding to all its member countries and reflects the collective will of the UN. Experts argue

that for an organization such as the United Nations to have members have an upper hand in its main governing body contradicts its creed of equal rights and responsibilities for all member countries. The SC's permanent members - the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China and France - have the capacity to veto power, or the capability to decline or approve the adoption of any Council resolution even if the other member countries of the UN support the draft. While the veto does not work on the procedural meetings, the SC's permanent members utilize these veto power to vote against "procedural" draft resolutions without having to block it through the council. Coordination is also prevented by the SC permanent members as they may opt not to support resolutions, which also have an impact to the overall UN action.

This difference in power is alarming as stated by Joyner (1997) as "the SC's permanent members can utilize their unique capability to determine what the UN can do and intervene into", preventing initial deployment of UN forces in issues supported by the other member countries. Since these permanent members determine the process and activities the UN enters into, "members are mandated to agree to the decision and follow SC ruling under Article 25 of the Charter". Members must also provide their services and support to any SC initiative even if they are against such policy under Article 49 of the UN Charter. These members are often unrepresented in the UN SC due to the still traditional system of the SC despite the calls for reforming the entire SC, especially the seat of the permanent members. Aside from giving the permanent members powers to control the UN's decision-making capabilities, the UN also benefits only a few people as seen

in its intervention/peacemaking capabilities. Intervention by the United Nations is mostly restricted under the UN Charter. Under Article 2 (7) of the Charter, "sovereignty is regarded as the right of all states and no authority, even the UN, cannot intervene in its jurisdiction." However, when the call for revisions to UN's capabilities to intervene were raised, the supporters of the idea stated that the UN's Charter outlines the standards that proves its capacity to intervene. Although these actions are indeed able to provide some results, it is observed by experts that the action of the UN remains limited due to its incomplete power and the fact they cannot contradict its member's intentions. The Kosovo Conflict in 1999 reflects the UN's limited capability as they are unable to argue against the NATO action even if they did not get the proper permit from the SC to attack Yugoslavia. The 2003 Iraqi War also reflects the UN's weak intervention capability because UN action had only been possible because of the US, who called for an invasion to Iraq because of their possession of weapons of mass destruction. The UN SC was unable to stop the will of the permanent members when they push for an intervention operation, preventing legitimization of the actions as seen in the UN Charter .

Peacekeeping is also less to be desired as it is unable to aid the countries under war, especially the civilians caught in the crossfire. Zakaria (2004) cited that cases such as the Rwandan Genocide in 1994 left the Rwandan public at the mercy of the warring Tutsi and Hutu tribes. The conflict, which have been triggered by the assassination of the leaders Juvenal Habyarimana and Cyprien Ntaryamira, had successfully killed 1 million Tutsis and despite the fact there were UN peacekeepers already deployed in the

region, they mostly played as spectators to the carnage due to their lack of influential power in Rwanda. According to Zakaria, “ Rwanda was just one of the issues the UN had failed to intervene into since 1945”. Heywood (2007) also cited the 1995 Somalian crisis as another event the UN showed incapacity in aiding the citizens. Although the UN had seen the dangers of the conflicts, the organization was not able to save the people or provided active aid in the region . Grieg and Diehl (2005) also cited in their own assessment that the UN intervention capability is faulty, preventing it to stopping conflicts in behalf of the people. Studies even show that the UN’s presence in the conflict only causes difficulties in arranging a negotiation process between states. The presence of the UN in conflicts also present possible spillovers to the public, causing either the continuation of the conflict or the continuous suffering of the public and the neighboring territories. .

Finally, Heywood (2007) emphasizes that with the UN’s role as an advisory or recommendatory body to its members and responsibilities and roles it gives to its members, it is still unable to act on its own. Heywood stated that “ Despite the UN’s image as a world government, the fact that its members dictate the UN’s action prevents it from moving on its own accord”. With the lack of independent power, the UN is restricted to “ the decisions of its members (mostly by the SC) and only concentrate on its role in being a third actor to the resolution of international conflicts”. The UN is also restricted when it comes to superpower-related issues as seen in the Cold War. With the US and the former Soviet Union in the opposite political spheres throughout the conflict, it had disabled the SC from acting against the

aggression of both countries. The UN had also found itself unable to act upon the invasions triggered by the Cold War, leaving the people vulnerable and unaided as the conflicts progress .

Despite the intentions of the United Nations in becoming the actor to ensure peace and development for all, it is visible that it is still a system unable to reach out completely to its member countries and provide its blessings. Currently, the SC's membership structure shows that the UN's action is determined mostly by 5 permanent members and these five have the capacity to stop any action. The UN also only benefit a few countries in terms of its intervention/peace making capabilities given the fact that its Charter limits its overall capability and a few nations could utilize the UN for their own intentions. Finally, the UN's limited power prevents it from reaching out to the entire international community because it is only a recommendatory/ advisory body. It is crucial for the world leaders to revise the overall UN structure in order to activate the organization's role as an international organization that would cater to all its members. If the UN retains this same system that benefits only a few, it is possible that it may end up like other organizations that are unable to present results to the members who had hoped for its positive intervention.

## **Works Cited**

- Grieg, J. Michael and Paul Diehl. " The Peacekeeping-Peacemaking Dilemma." International Studies Quarterly 49. 4 (2005): 621-645.
- Heywood, Andrew. Politics. New York: Palgrave Macmillian, 2007.
- Joyner, Christopher. The United Nations and International Law. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. Print.

<https://assignbuster.com/good-example-of-research-paper-on-does-the-united-nations-benefit-the-entire-globe-or-just-a-few-nations/>

Taylor, Paul and Devon Curtis. " The United Nations." Baylis, John, Steve Smith and Patricia Owens. The Globalization of World Politics: An introduction to international relations. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. 310-325. Print.

Zakaria, Fareed. " When the UN Fails, We All Do." 13 December 2004. Global Policy Forum. .