

University of Saida Dr. Moulay Tahar



Faculty of Law and Political Sciences

Department of Public Law

THESIS TITLE

**DOUBLE STANDARDS IN THE UNITED NATIONS IN MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL PEACE
AND SECURITY: THE CASE OF THE [ISRAELI] AGGRESSION IN GAZA STRIP**

Thesis submitted in partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree
in Political Sciences

Specialization: International Relations

Presented by:

Mr. Cheikh GACEM

Supervised by:

Dr. Ahmed BAOUNI

Jury Members:

President: Abdelkader ABDELALI

Prof University of Saida

Supervisor: Dr. Ahmed BAOUNI

M.C.A University of Saida

Examiner: Dr. Khadidja HADJ DJELLOUL

M.C.A University of Saida

Academic Year: 2024/2025

University of Saida Dr. Moulay Tahar



Faculty of Law and Political Sciences

Department of Public Law

THESIS TITLE

**DOUBLE STANDARDS IN THE UNITED NATIONS IN MAINTAINING INTERNATIONAL PEACE
AND SECURITY: THE CASE OF THE [ISRAELI] AGGRESSION IN GAZA STRIP**

Thesis submitted in partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Master Degree
in Political Sciences

Specialization: International Relations

Presented by:

Mr. Cheikh GACEM

Supervised by:

Dr. Ahmed BAOUNI

Academic Year: 2024/2025

Dedications

To me, and every version of me

To the light of my darkest journey, MAMA

To my superhero, Pa

To the eyes I see with, my sisters

TO MY FRIENDS YOUCEF, MOH, AMINE, RAOUF, ISHMAEL,
AMINE

And to those who have not make it to hear some of them are underground,
May Allah bless their souls

Some behind the bars, May Allah release them

Acknowledgements

I want to thank all the professors that gave us the information and encouraged us in this journey, also I have two professors that I want to thank them from the bottom of my heart and those are:

Dt. Khadidja HADJ DJELLOUL who was like a mother and who has always been supportive to me and all the other students, thank you Mme

Dt. Ahmed BAOUNI who since the beginning was like an old brother to me. Our conversations had no limits either in the academic or personal life and he had always given me advice and he was the reason for I had chosen International Relations as a specialization because I liked the way he teaches and also he had stopped me from quitting multiple times, thank you Doctor.

Also thanks to all my colleagues, Abdelkader AISSAOUI, Cheikh BOUCHETTA, Fatima MEKKAOUI, Mama MILOUDI and all the others .

So grateful that I have been surrounded by you .

Thank you.

Introduction

Introduction

This research addresses a cross-cutting issue within contemporary International Relations that has been marked by the role and performance of the United Nations (henceforth UN) in bringing peace and security through the handling of global issues. The UN was established in 1945 as a result of the Second World War with the main aim to discourage future armed conflicts and protect international peace and stability. This aim is attained through various key means among them the Security Council which has extensive powers in this regard.

The research, in the hands, is concerned with the assessment of the legal and institutional foundation on which activities of the UN in maintaining peace and security are predicated. The study commences on account of the UN Charter, that in its first two articles of the first chapter explains the goals and purposes of the organization and its principles. The third portion of the focus will rest on chapter seven of the charter that elaborates on the functions of the Security Council related to threat to peace. The latter, concentrates on and compares specific situations and/or cases, for instance, as Libya versus Syria or (Israeli)s and Palestinians or the hostilities in Donetsk, with the views regarding resolutions by the UN on the main issues of intervention.

Importance of the Topic

The significance of this research is further underpinned by it directs another most important issue of contemporary importance in the international system that is the UN as the backbone of the multilateral format and the most effective institution in the system of conflict management. The importance of the subject

appears both in a number of general statements as well as in criteria of practical consideration:

On a practical level, the research aims at revealing the Arab literature in the area of international organizations and their performance, which tilts the balance for the eastern world; for instance, the evolutionary changes over the socio-political fields in the current global sphere. The research also offers a critical examination of some of the theories of international relations which dissect the competence and operational behavior of international institutions to wit: the realism theory that highlights power and national interests; the constructivism theory that touches various norms, social interactions, identity integration, and post colonial theory that uses the lens of the unequal relations embedded in the international system.

Research Methodology

This study employs a range of research methods suitable to the topic at hand and its aims. Such methods include:

The descriptive-analytic method: The objective behind the use of this method is to describe the UN legal and institutional foundation with regard to maintaining international peace and security to analyze the actions and specialist decisions of the organization in relationship with international conflicts and its competence in dealing with conflicts. Alongside this, the method helps to study the factors that work for and against the UN towards attainment of their goals.

The part of the research methodology (the part of CSI Week write essays). This method is employed to see how different cases relate to each other within the use of the UN in solving the issues those cases present. The method also allows the comparison in the foreign policy of some selected countries. Incidentally, these countries are not included in the United States network as shown by the results available on the disputes within the continent of Africa.

The case study method: This method is used to evaluate specific instances of the intervention of the UN in international war efforts, and helps in the understanding of the internal checks and balances governing the organization and the influence and impact of political, social, and constitutional factors in the success of this organization.

The historical method: This method is used to discuss the evolution of the UN in its maintenance of peace and security at different points of time. There is an assessment of the changes that have taken place within this framework according to the changes in the international system and the rise of new security threats.

The research draws on a range of sources, including UN official documents (resolutions from the Security Council and the General Assembly, reports of the Secretary-General, records of and documents from conferences), academic writings on particular issues, journal articles, and reports from research centers and international, governmental and non-governmental organizations.

Research Difficulties

This study involved a number of difficulties and challenges, primarily among them being the following:

1. The extensiveness and difficult nature of the subject, as the study approaches an issue full of political, legal, and institutional dimensions which require unremitting effort that is dedicated to the search and assortment of information.
2. The challenges inherent in the multisource nature of information with reference to the UN and the scope of its activity in the context of peace and security is that great efforts shall be devoted to categorizing such information and ascertaining its objectivity and reliability.

3. The non flexibility and political specificity that is found in the greater number of research and analyses concerning the high sense affiliated issues within the UN, including the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict and the current situation in Libya, which necessitated meta-theoretical considerations with the use of these materials and preservation of scientific neutrality.
4. In some cases, it can also be difficult to obtain official documents and certain information to do with decisions in the workings of the UN, for instance in the closed-door Security Council sessions, thus making it impossible to explore some aspects of the subject to the maximum.
5. Due to the fast changing nature of global conflicts and the responses of the UN, it is quite difficult to follow the recent changes and encapsulate them in the research comprehensively.

Literature Review

One of the well known studies conducted in this regard is the one by Kossisi and Bouy (2024) and published in the International Journal of Law, Politics and Humanitarian Research, under the title ‘Doubt Standards in International Relations’. This paper has the advantage of having employed realism as a theoretical background, a most suitable platform for understanding power and national interest in international relations. In this study the comparative analysis methodology was applied in an analysis of UN interventions in Gaza and other countries including Syria, Ukraine and Libya, with data collected using content analysis of UN decisions, speeches and official documents as well as secondary sources of research.

The study findings established that directed efforts within the UN formulation history, specifically by powerful members of the council, do impel prolongation of crisis that ASA Palestine operates in without finding a lasting solution. The findings also offered solutions that sought to eliminate this barrier

by pointing out UN structure and operation that makes it difficult to address long term problems such as Palestine. It was thus found that the bias in UN's performance gets exposed only when the actions of members are placed side by side.

The study proved that the issue of selective application of norms has a destabilizing effect on the course of the UN policy on Palestine. The reason is that even if the UN issues various documents and statements on the protection of human rights (international humanitarian law), but sanction enforcement is still weak at best. In practice, international law may and is being selectively imposed and enforced mostly because specific states would want that from the UN, causing questions of prejudice to creep in the work of the UN.

The research argued that the UN should revisit its operational means and promote fairer positions on crisis resolution. It also covered limitations in the context of the Security Council, including humanitarian crises; whereby it furthered to suggest remodeling such structures that would continue enhancing the UN's ability to adequately deal with crises and not lose its repute internationally.

This study widens the scope of our contemporary research by analyzing why the UN does not deliver the results of promoting peace and security effectively, emphasizing also the institutional and political obstacles encountered in solving conflicts across borders. In addition, it provides a framework that is flexible for assistance to appraise how successful or not the UN has been in relation to peace and security by taking part in the solutions of other global issues.

Chapter one
Theoretical Framework –
The UN and
International
Peace and Security

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework – The UN and International Peace and Security

Section 1: The UN Legal and Institutional Framework for Peacekeeping

- 1.1.The UN Charter’s Foundational Principles on International Peace
- 1.2.The Security Council vs. General Assembly– Roles in Conflict Resolution
- 1.3.Legal Mechanisms Against Aggression in International Law

Section 2: Double Standards in International Relations

- 1.4.Defining "Double Standards" in Global Politics
- 1.5.Historical Cases of UN Bias and Selective Enforcement
- 1.6.Political, Economic, and Strategic Influences on UN Decision-Making

Section 3: The UN and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict

- 1.7.A Historical Overview of UN Involvement (1947–Present)
- 1.8.UN Key Resolutions on Palestine and (Israel)
- 1.9.Challenges in Enforcement: Why UN Resolutions Remain Unimplemented

The UN came into existence in 1945 with the cardinal aim of ensuring international peace and Security and all member states to work into the sovereign confines of it. Its mandate would be done in accordance with the Charter of the UN. Among principles in the charter are the primary goals of sovereignty encompassing equitable representation. The Charter also calls for peaceful means to be used in conflict resolution and the need for the international community to work together against those with violent plans. There is no doubt, however, the noble objective of the UN is not without its detractors as there are various power structures in the world which restrict it in maintaining international peace and security. Some of the contemporary issues pertinent to the effectiveness of the UN and its objectives are: how to achieve the objectives of its charter. Some of these include, despite the goal of the organization generating sovereignty that the state must also account for the sovereignty of the international community creating a form of entirely practice of other countries. These challenges are pertinent to the intervention of the organization in the prevention of the use of nations in creating an expansionist state.

Section 1: The UN Legal and Institutional Framework for Peacekeeping

1.1.The UN Charter's Foundational Principles on International Peace

This time around, as it has happened countless over the decades, nationalistic outbreaks, political uncertainty and social upheaval continue to plague world over, the UN nevertheless remains the leading global organization in the pursuit of peace and security. The key goals of the UN Charter, which is the basic legal text that gave rise to the organization and formulated the governing doctrine of the planet, lie in these very principles. As the formation of

states becomes more complicated, the consideration of the principles underlying the UN efforts in the organization also becomes important. What can be extracted from the UN Charter on issues of international peace?¹ This is the overarching purpose of the Charter, and particularly of its relevant sections (Articles 1 and 2) that focus on the purposes and principles of the UN. These articles primarily reiterate diplomacy, equality of states, no interferences, and the use of collective measure to avert accusations and ensure stability in an international ground. Although articulated within the Charter, these principles are idealistic in nature because every attempt to character these principles in the realistic sense has been vehemently opposed due to the logic of the real politics and the imitations on the ground within the UN system particularly in the Security Council. Viewing these principles gives rise to the positives and also the constraints that multilateral diplomacy faces in the quest for global peace.

1.1.1. The Principles of the UN Charter on International Peace

Article 1 and 2

The concept of the UN charter which was established way back through the year 1945 has been of the major help when it comes to global efforts on how peace can be achieved and how to ensure safety is intact. Able to do this effectively is chapter 1 which is divided into 2 main sub sections which include article 1 and article 2. These two articles generally constitute the global common will to avoid the horror of wars experienced in the mid-twentieth century and to create a relatively permanent international society characterized by intense collaboration among all the countries.

UN Charter in Article 1 describes the reason why the UN was established, with the main duty being to keep the world at peace. In practical terms, the article

¹ Article 1: The Purpose of the United Nations

affirms the will of the UN to physically act as such for instance by employing sanctions where necessary for the preservation of peace, suppressing aggressive acts against statehood and violating order, punishment of crimes against peace, and most importantly through legal means the arbitration and settlement of controversies or situations that might endanger the peace of a state in conformity with the requirements of right and justice. This UN became an urgent necessity because of the total destruction of World War II, in such there was a strong apprehension for the need of states working together in state security for any war to take place. Furthermore, Article 1 calls for the encouragement of relations of friendship between nations and the promotion of ideals of the principle of equal rights and the self-determination of peoples and the performance of other requisite activities to uphold peace. In addition, it further requires the organization to further international cooperation in addressing difficult international problems of economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character and striving to promote dignity and equality for all people without regard to color, sex, language, or religion.

UN Charter, Chapter I, Article 1.² says:

1. To maintain international peace and security, and to that end: to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace, and for the suppression of acts of aggression, and to bring about by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which might lead to a breach of the peace;

² UN Charter, Chapter I: Purposes and Principles, Article 1

<https://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>.

2. To develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples, and to take other appropriate measures to strengthen universal peace;
3. To achieve international co-operation in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural, or humanitarian character, and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion; and
4. To be a centre for harmonizing the actions of nations in the pursuit of these purposes.

Point Analysis 1 indicates that such a framework for the UN which intends to have development assistance in the world, redresses global inequalities, and provides mental peace for poor communities, may be too ambitious. These overarching goals mirror the objectives expressed in the wake of World War II, that is, the attempt to symmetrically square the assertions of state agencies and governments on the one hand, and the needs of the international aspect of the world economy on the other hand. But even where such goals have found space, i.e. within the UN system, achievement thereof has been hampered to a great extent by the very elasticity of the concept statehood and the protecting or aggressive tendencies of the most resourceful states amongst the UN membership. Jussi M. Hanhimäki introduces this concern explaining that the UN' asserted aims are higher and not realizable; for example, there are instruments, among others, such as the Security Council (and the veto power)³. This dilemma, that is reality never keeping up with the dreams, has been an issue in the UN set up from the very inception.

Article 2: The Principles of the UN

³ Hanhimäki, J. M. (2017). *The United Nations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, pp. 13-14)

Article 2 of the UN Charter supplements the goals articulated in Article 1 by articulating precise principles that should guide the conduct of the UN and its constituent member states. The major feature of Article 2 is the assertion of respect for the principle of the equal rights of all its members, designed in such a way that every state irrespective of its size, power or influences on the world is to be given an equal footing within the organization. This principle also underlines the significance of global law, as well as the necessity for peaceful solutions to conflicts. In this context, nations are driven to abstain from threats or employment of force against each other, as well as uphold the principle of non-intervention in the internal affairs of other states although the Charter clearly positions that international intervention may be called for where international peace and security is definitively at real danger.

Defining the UN Chapter I, Article 2⁴, provisions are to be found as follows (Cited from the point of reference below):

1. The Organization is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members.
2. All members, in order to ensure to all of them the rights, and benefits resulting from membership, are to fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them according to the present Charter.
3. All members shall settle their international disputes by peaceful means in such a way that the preservation of international peace, security, and justice would not be jeopardized.

⁴ United Nations Charter, Chapter I: Purposes and Principles Article 2
<https://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>.

4. All members shall not use force or threaten any other state's territorial integrity, political independence, or interfere in any other manner which would be against any of the purposes of the UN, in their international relations.
5. All members shall render assistance to UN activities carried out under the present Charter and shall not support the enemies of the UN whenever such action is taken on preventive or enforcement measures.
6. The Organization will ensure that non-UN members follow these principles to the extent required for the preservation of international peace and security.
7. No provision in the UN Charter permits the UN to involve in matters that are effectively intrinsically of the jurisdiction of a particular state or obliges members to bring such matters under the conditions of the present Charter but this provision will not affect the functionality of the enforcement gun under Chapter VII.

Article 2 is frequently identified as a primary cornerstone of the UN' implementation structure which foregrounds the principles of states' sovereignty and the observance of global emotive norms or conflict resolution through dialogue. Notwithstanding these fundamental contours, the effectiveness of the UN' interventions is regularly hampered by the dual tension between state sovereignty and the organization primary quest of achieving international peace, which sometimes contradicts this principle. It is in this light that these interventions are often compromised and against a backdrop of reluctance of member states to adhere to the UN authority or over the domination of one or more streets over the Security Council resulting in hedging again as also suggested by Hanhimäki (2008, p. 13-14) in the discourse of the Security Council and its immobilization.

All in all, the UN Charter, Chapter I, Articles 1 and 2 contains the official text concerning the aims and principles. These aims also involve further analysis and discussions of how they have been applied by authors such as, those presented by Jussi Ni. Hanhimäki in his book “The United Nations, a very short introduction” (Oxford University Press, 2008), in reference to the UN’s aims, policies and practices, particularly pages 13-14 on the United Nations legally objective and Security Council functions.

1.1.2. The Role of the UN Security Council in Enforcing International Peace

Chapter VII of the UN Charter

The UN Security Council (UNSC) is at the very center of maintaining international peace and security within the scope of the UN Charter. It also operates primarily under Chapter VII of the Charter, that is, the Security Council responds to threats to the maintenance of international peace, the breach of peace, or acts of aggression. The chapter holds provisions that empower the UNSC to resort to a whole gamut of actions, be it imposition of sanctions, the establishment of peacekeeping operations, or even military intervention. This article offers a comprehensive study of the crucial provisions in Chapter VII that empower the Security Council with the authority to act decisively in dealing with these pressing world concerns.

*Article 39*⁵: Determine Threats to Peace. The authority to determine the existence of any threat to peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression under Article 39 of Chapter VII is vested with the Security Council. This first step in international security issues is extremely important since it provides the Council with a legal basis for action. Once the Council has reached a determination that

⁵ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII:
Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression
Article 39

a situation constitutes a threat, it can then proceed with measures pursuant to those laid down in the following articles. Considering that with Article 39, the Security Council has the power to decide and interpret what constitutes a threat. The UNSC is capable of acting flexibly in the fast-paced international setting.

Official Text of Article 39

"The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression and shall make recommendations, or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with Articles 41 and 42, to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Article 40⁶: Provisional Measures

Once a threat to peace has been recognized, Article 40 provides the possibility for the Security Council to take provisional measures in order to prevent the situation from aggravating further. These are temporary living measures to give relief in the short term while the UNSC takes a considered view of its next step. Provisional measures can cover anything from diplomatic pressure including calls for ceasefires, up to stronger actions for the halting of conflict escalation.

Official Text of Article 40: "In order to prevent an aggravation of the situation, the Security Council may, before making recommendations, call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable."

⁶ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII:
Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression
Article 40

Article 41⁷: Non-Military Sanctions

Article 41 authorizes the Security Council to impose aforementioned sanctions consisting of economic measures, trade restrictions, or perhaps diplomatic isolation against threats to peace or breaches thereof. Such measures shall be alternative forms of military intervention and much rather be the first course of action employed by the UNSC. These sanctions are intended to create some form of pressure upon states or sponsors to comply with international norms without insisting on the use of force.

Official Text of Article 41:

"The Security Council may decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions and may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures."

Article 42⁸: Military Action

When non-military sanctions are considered insufficient, Article 42 entrusts the Security Council with the authority to take military action. This could mean the deployment of peacekeeping forces or, in extreme cases, the use of force to restore international peace and security. The last option is the use of military force, considered only after all diplomatic channels and other non-military measures have proven unworkable.

Official Text of Article 42:

⁷ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII:
Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression
Article 41

⁸ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII:
Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression
Article 42

"Should the Security Council consider that measures provided for in Article 41 would be inadequate or have proved to be inadequate, it may take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security."

Articles 43-47: Military Force and Peacekeeping Operations

Articles 43-47 of the Charter of the UN contain provisions dealing with the use of military force and peacekeeping operations. Accordingly, the Security Council can put together a force and request member states to contribute troops and other resources towards the peacekeeping mission. The rest of the articles emphasize the role of member states in contributing to these operations, so that the UN's peacekeeping activities remain properly supported.

Key points include:

- *Article 43*⁹: Calls for member states to make military forces available to the UNSC for international peacekeeping.
- *Article 44*¹⁰: Provides procedures for member states to provide such forces when requested by the UNSC.
- *Article 45-47*¹¹: Elaborate on the specifics of creating a **UN Standby Force** and establishing rules for the command and control of peacekeeping operations.

*Articles 48-51*¹²: *Enforcement of Security Council Decisions*

⁹ United Nations Charter, Chapter VII:
Action with Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression
Article 43

¹⁰ Same chapter *Article 44*

¹¹ Same chapter *Article n 45 -47*

¹² Same chapter *Article n 48-51*

Articles 48 to 51 address the enforcement of Security Council decisions, coordination of actions by member states, and the right of self-defense. These articles ensure that once the UNSC has taken a decision, it is effectively implemented, and member states are legally obligated to cooperate in enforcing it. Additionally, the right to self-defense is preserved for nations facing imminent threats.

- *Article 48* stipulates that all UN members must assist in enforcing decisions.
- *Article 49* allows the UNSC to coordinate the actions of member states in the collective enforcement of decisions.
- *Article 50* provides provisions for member states facing the consequences of measures imposed by the UNSC, allowing them to seek economic assistance if affected.
- *Article 51* reaffirms the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a member state, pending the decision of the UNSC.

To sum up, the UN General Assembly principles regarding international peace have their origination on *Articles 1 & 2*. Both of them address the general functions as well as purposes of the UN. Article 1 focuses on maintenance of international peace and security as the primary aim of the organization, recommending the application of collective solutions, prevention is more desirable, commission is intervention, rather than force. However, Article 1 of the Charter also emphasizes promotion of peaceful relations between states, sovereignty and self-determination and at the same time the economic, social and human rights objectives necessary for sustainable peace and security within a territory.

Warren F. Kuehl and Rufus Mathewson Jr. examine the implications of such categorical data that everyone in the court may transcend these provisions.

These goals are focused on in the Charter by the provisions of Article 2 which sets out states' general rights and the purpose/functioning of the organization. They embody such values as the equality of all states which are members, the duty to engage in discussions in peace, the prohibition of encouragement of use of force by states and non-illegitimate intervention by other states—applications of which are effective in chapter 7. However, the implementation of this aim is often limited by political constraints namely the negative vote position. In fact, as scholars like Hanhimäki and Bahouli¹³ suggest, these structural constraints at times impede the institution from ascertaining a decisive or fair approach in conflict zones.

Hence, the concepts of international peace within the UN Charter rest on a dichotomous ethos of multilateralism and the primacy of the law, transcending the traditional barriers of just and sovereign states. They may still be difficult to maintain universally, yet they remain essential in the pursuit of creating a more peaceful world order, and they continue to be good guiding rules.

1.2.The Security Council vs. General Assembly: Roles in Conflict Resolution

While the world has become a hotbed for conflicts and geopolitical tensions, the UN may be regarded as humanity's great attempt to unify cooperation and uphold global peace. At the very nucleus of such an organization lay two important bodies with different yet fully complementary functions when it came to conflict resolution: the Security Council and the General Assembly. With Chapter VII-binding powers under the UN Charter, the Security Council has the power to impose sanctions, authorize military

¹³ Loubna Bahouli's paper titled "*The Role of the United Nations in Maintaining International Peace and Security: An Analysis of the Most Important Theoretical Approaches*" (April 2022)page 1078

interventions, and send peacekeeping forces to respond to situations threatening international peace. On the other hand, the General Assembly, representing the wider international community, remains a forum for debate and consensus, as well as moral persuasion. As conflicts become more complex-from more or less traditional interstate wars to civil disorders, ethnic violence, and terrorism-scrutiny on these UN bodies has intensified. The (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict in general and the situation in Gaza in particular give weight to the challenges facing the UNa' conflict resolution machinery, wherein political interests and vetoes by permanent members of the Security Council frustrate effective action on the subject. This raises a classic question currently shaping international relations and humanitarian response in the world today:

What role do the Security Council and the General Assembly play in conflict resolution?

The inquiry calls for analysis of not only the law governing the powers and limitations of these bodies but also the practical effects of same, the interplay between the two, and the possibility of reform in a world in constant flux in which good conflict resolution remains an immediately needed-but elusive-goal.

1.2.1. The UN Security Council's Role in Conflict Resolution

Double Standards in the Case of (Israeli) Aggression on Gaza

The UNSC is the cornerstone in the UN system, which is responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security. The primary leadership organ of the UN – the Security Council – is also accorded the power to implement sanctions, create peacekeeping forces and allow military action to be taken in order to secure global peace under certain instances. Nevertheless, the efficacy and impartiality of the UNSC are debated mainly against the backdrop of the dominance of geopolitics in decision-making. There are also several

omissions in the UN that justify the presence of one of the most influential political organs, the Security Council. The most excellent example is the recent attack by (Israel) onto Gaza, leaving over several thousand people dead. This research aims at analyzing the role of the UNSC in a conflict that refuses to let go and how in pursuing some agenda. The UNSC has raised questions as to whether in its pursuit of peace and security, it applies suitable approaches to the various disputes in the world.

Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms: Chapter VII of the UN Charter limits on the discussions involving the Ukraine and its conflict with Russia are outlined in Chapter VII of UN Charter. The same runs under Article 30 of United States (US) constitution which characterizes the body as of intergovernmental or interstate nature, therefore responsible for the behavior of member states. Under this chapter, the traditionalists may not go through 'roles' but would rather define the functions of the Security Council numerous. In particular, Article 39 Chapter 7 of the Charter gives the UNSC the power to determine the existence of a threat to peace, a breach of peace or an act of aggression. Then it provides for the question of what can be done by the UNSC once it determines the above questions. This ranges from the mildest measures such as discussion with the parties in dispute to the most vulnerable ones such as newly introduced measures, including sanctions (Article 41) and armed conflict (Article 42), designed to restore peace and security.

Notwithstanding the scope of work, focus, attention and obligation of the UNSC, one of the longest lasting; this organization has in general and in particular,—the quest to find peace with all the due equities ever existed and to realize the objectives of the UN Charter. For in a bit of contrast, the (Israeli) and Palestinian conflict has been one of the most challenging subjects in the UNSC history. They have had numerous resolutions passed for peace at some stages

but many have been influenced by politics often with the power of the US military veto.

The UNSC and (Israeli) Aggression on Gaza: a history of inaction and let us also consider the Arab-(Israeli) conflict; which has lasted more than since World War I and has seen continued and worsening aspects of violence involving also mass casualties of civilians not only in (Israel) and Palestine but also elsewhere. In the course of such conflicts, the UNSC has often found itself unable to act even when these instances come with apparent and widespread breaches of international law including massacres of civilians and destruction of infrastructure.

For instance, during what became known as the 2008-2009 Gaza War or Operation Cast Lead, the UNSC passed Resolution 1860 which called for immediate ceasefire and opening up of humanitarian corridors among other things. Nevertheless, having no enforcement clause, (Israel's) military activities resumed and additional fatalities were recorded. The role of the UNSC as a body is highly debated because of the reluctance to enforce its own decisions. This illustrates the weakness in the persuasive authority of the Security Council particularly when there are countervailing interests of strong states like the US as an example which has always supported (Israel) and has on several occasions opposed any stronger action against (Israel's) behavior in Gaza (Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh, Dominik Zaum, *The UNSC and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 311-320).

Double Standards in the UNSC's response in comparison, the biggest criticism with respect to the UNSC's behavior with the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict is the selective enforcement of international law, and double standards is the most subjected one to criticism in this respect. In the instance of weaker states or

actors from non-traditional countries in conflict, the punishments such as economic or racial sanctions on the state or putting a stop to the war have been swift. The case of (Israeli) attacks in Gaza has been or allowed the lapse of some acceptable time which the US conveniently use its veto to halt any resolution that would have put more stringent measures on (Israel).

For instance, in the course of the Gaza War of 2014, no resolution condemning actions of (Israel) was successful in a vote at the UNSC because the US exercised its right to veto. Instead, the UNSC made some statements calling on both sides to desist from further violence; albeit no action passed. The actions of the UNSC in this regard have elicited criticism for compromising its credibility in being an honest broker in the struggle at hand ¹⁴

Human Concerns Limiting War: one of the functions within the UNSC is civilian protection especially in areas of conflict. The doctrine of Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which says that states have a responsibility to protect their populations from atrocities, has on occasion been invoked in some conflicts in order to justify actions of intervention. Nevertheless, the resolution of Gaza, and (Israel)within, has seen that the UNSC has failed to actively engage in the issues of protecting Palestinian civilians, as widespread killings by (Israel's)military machine continue to take a toll.

This lack of action in the face of the humanitarian crisis in Gaza shows that the UNSC is very effective in certain cases, but can be rendered totally ineffective where the will of other powerful states jeopardizes its decisions. In other parts of the world, the UNSC has been able to approve peacekeeping and humanitarian intervention measures, but the decision of the UNSC not to take any action on

14 (Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh, Dominik Zaum, *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945*, Oxford University Press, 2010, pp. 311-320).

Gaza, gives rise to question marks about the ability of the same Council to protect populations threatened by war.¹⁵

The Case for Overhaul

In taking the Palestinian issue, in particular the Gaza aggression, such facts arise that make managing international peace and security by the UN easier said than done. The begging question that arises is how UN from its alleged high moral ground countenances such actions as Gaza aggression and other overreactions by (Israel) while insisting on others who do not have veto power reaching for military solutions. It is imperative that the UNSC resolves these dilemmas and hence such decisions should no longer be allowed to be held at ransom by the overriding interests of some countries.

Gaza Example highlights how collinear alternative approach pursuing sustainable conflict resolution is needed which is anchored on respect for the attainment of human rights and abidance by the tenets of international law, instead of strategic interest. Changes in the existing system can only help achieve these goals as well as encourage the UNSC to carry out its core responsibility of preserving peace and security by ensuring that justice and protection are afforded to everyone regardless of their political or geopolitical links.

1.2.2. The UN General Assembly's Role in Conflict Resolution

The UN was founded with a dual purpose of fostering peace as well as facilitating international unity. The General Assembly is one of the principal organs of the UN system, it is involved in the resolution of conflicts but this is a relatively secondary one, complementing the work of more dominant Security

¹⁵ Same previous source

Council. The Security Council has superior jurisdiction in the sphere of maintenance of peace and security, but the General Assembly remains an important platform for discussions, ease of tensions and conflict resolution and moral “soft power” encouragement.

Its competence and functions according to the UN Charter, particularly in Articles 10 and 14¹⁶, is that it is granted the right to take up the questions relevant to peace and security. It does not have the power to impose binding decisions like the Security Council; however, it could provide insightful and moral recommendations. The General Assembly under Article 10 is enabled to ‘discuss “any questions or any matters” falling within the scope of the Charter.’ Moreover, Article 14 allows the General Assembly to suggest measures to tackle or prevent a disturbance in peace and security.

One of the most beneficial techniques for the General Assembly in resolving conflicts is the Uniting for Peace resolution 377 of 1950¹⁷. Putting the above into perspective resolution 377 originated in conjunction with the disagreement at the Security Council where it could not take any further action due to the reason that all the veto-power members were raising their hands. The resolution effectively provides the General Assembly with powers to intervene in cases where the Security Council is unable to discharge its primary responsibilities, namely when one of the veto-wielding states is unwilling to back decisions on matters of international security or peace. This extraordinary element highlights the ability of the General Assembly to contribute to the alleviation of Security Council paralysis under certain conditions envisaged by the resolution.

16 · United Nations. (1945). The United Nations Charter. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/charter-united-nations/>

17 Blaydes, A. J. (2006). "The General Assembly and Conflict Resolution: A Diplomatic Role." *International Affairs*, 82(6), pp. 1049-1065.

Effects Produced by the General Assembly

In practice, the modalities or recommendations made by the General Assembly even if legless, are potent with clear moral and political messages. Missions stated by the UN General Assembly have not been limited to such geopolitical aspects as apartheid against the Africans or the Middle East affliction. For instance, the General Assembly interfered during the Suez Crisis of 1956 by advocating a cessation of hostilities thus leading to the creation of the UN Emergency Force under ‘Uniting for Peace’ vote resolution. This was one of the early examples where peacekeeping operations were authorized outside the mandate of the Security Council.

While the limits of influence can also be found in an understanding of the role of the member states, their deficiencies in consistently supporting the House of the General Assembly do not provide for further action. It has been observed that despite the House having adopted numerous important decisions, such as the issue of (Israel’s) wall in the occupied territories and the Middle East by the House, the decisions are typically annulled or bypassed due to the opposition of certain big powers, notably because of the veto system of the Security Council. This indicates a gap in the organizational procedure of the organization, where the General Assembly despite the presence of its inclusive nature is occasionally set aside by the power games in the Security Council.

Recommendations and the Role of the General Assembly in the Modern Era

The rise of transnational conflicts involving all kinds of complexities including cross-cultural democracy, state, human rights protection, and humanitarian policies calls for greater appreciation of the role of the General Assembly in issuing recommendations. While preventing external aggression is one of the roles of the Security Council, it is less capable to responding threats

to world peace such as civil wars and identity-based conflicts with the use of such measures where permanent members apply their veto power to obstruct. This serves to increase a call for more action to be taken by the General Assembly where consensus building cannot be reached in the Security Council.

The moral authority of the General Assembly even if it is not legally binding gives room for action. An example is its many state membership which holds contrasting views that push the Security Council and the outer actors. Even though it assumes this less crucial role, advocacy or mediation by the Assembly is the key to avoiding international territorial disputes among states.

1.2.3. Comparative Analysis: The UNSC vs. The UNGA

While the activity of the Organization and the actions of the Security Council and the General Assembly (GA) with a view to specific situations of conflict differ to a substantial extent, the Security Council has powers to make decisions that are immediately enforceable, including deployment of peace support forces, making it often the best placed to cause stop-wars or crashes. Although it does not happen more theoretically, but more practically because it heavily depends on the will of the Members of the Permanent Five, the fact that for the most part, it is ill-equipped to either enforce a decision or utilize third parties must save resources and possibly delay the solution of the dispute indefinitely.

In contrast, the General Assembly serves as a debating society and a place for seeking consensus. Although it may adopt resolutions, and make recommendations to the UN member states as well as the home state, such resolutions cannot be termed coercive — they can only be applied if people want to, for example. The role of the General Assembly is more in terms of endeavoring to change the mind of the world in its view on some issues, and in making a space where different countries can talk peacefully.

Be that as it may be, for the UN as a whole, the most complete model is for both bodies to function in a coordinated manner, with the General Assembly working on the foundation of international opinion and the Security Council undertaking substantive work in costs to implement resolutions.

The main obstacles to the United Nations' efforts to combat have a complex nature, and include:

Political Rivalry: The power of veto in the Security Council often makes it impossible to act even in cases of threats to international peace and security, because a permanent member will not support the decision.

Sovereignty Concerns: Technically the UN does not limit the state sovereignty theoretically, nonetheless in practice, countries with certain political considerations as in cases like Syria, do not allow for that to happen.

Be that as it may be, it is widely agreed that women should have the right to vote and that a lot of the societies are more democratic in the days that followed, hence the level of enforcement of such provisions is slowly rising to becoming effective over time. However, these challenges do not invalidate the importance of the UN, an organization that resolves international conflicts and in abundance, promotes international understanding and cooperation.

Proper reformation in the way the Security Council arrives at decisions and in regard to peacekeeping capacities would further the capacity of the United Nations to deal with conflicts of a global nature; hence enabling both organs to have more input into the maintenance of peace and security at the international level.

1.3.Legal Mechanisms against Aggression in International Law

Celebrating an international community draped with diverse legal instruments to combat one of the gravest threats to world peace: aggression

between states, after involving devastating global conflicts and embedded regional tensions. Out of the ashes of World War II (WWII) arose certain basic principles that are to this day in effect, relating to the treatment of international law and collective security. The Charter of the UN indeed forms the main bedrock for these efforts, embedding therein one great principle, that is, prohibition of the use of force, in Article 2(4), against which all state actions must be measured. In contrast, the continued recurrence of armed conflicts around the world throws into stark view the questions of whether the legal mechanisms are working. They are often paralyzed by political will, more explicitly during the controversial Iraq War of 2003, which saw the refusal of the Security Council under its mandate provided by Article 39 to determine acts of aggression against states and to sanction any collective action in response.

Alongside these traditional approaches targeting state responsibility, international criminal law—since Nuremberg and through the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court (ICC)—has developed toward individual criminal responsibility for acts of aggression, which opened into an important technical development in 2018 with the entry into force of the amendments to the Rome Statute that formally recognize the crime of aggression as a crime within the jurisdiction of the ICC, though hurdles are aplenty for the ICC to effectuate such jurisdiction in practice. The International Court of Justice, through watershed precedents such as *Nicaragua v. US*, contributed further toward shaping this legal framework by clarifying the permissible bounds of state action and setting forth a judicial pathway for the legal treatment of aggression. As newer conflicts break out in the areas from Kuwait to Bosnia, one fundamental question requires our attention:

What are the legal mechanisms for addressing aggression under international law?

This question invites the examination of not only the formal structures and principles that guide international engagement with aggression but also its implementation, the shortcomings, and the ongoing controversies on sovereignty versus collective security in an ever-complicating talismanic global order.

1.3.1. The UN Charter: The Foundation for International Peace and Security

The UN Charter (1945) stands as the pillar of international law concerning aggression. It sets out the framework for the prohibition of the use of force in international relations and of collective security in response to acts of aggression, peacekeeping operations, and judicial processes.

Article 2(4): Prohibition of the Use of Force

Another fundamental provision relating to aggression is Article 2(4) of the UN Charter, expressly forbidding the threat or use of force in international relations. This article stands at the core of the UN's approach to peace and security since it prohibits any use of force except in self-defense or with the authorization of the UN Security Council.

Example: One of the most controversial violations of this principle was the Iraq War, in which the US led an invasion of Iraq without explicit authorization from the UNSC and was accepted by most scholars and judges. The invasion was considered a breach of international law and also a breach of the prohibition on aggression enshrined in the UN Charter.¹⁸

Article 39: The Role of the Security Council in the Determination of Aggression

Article 39 confers upon the UNSC the competence to determine the presence of a threat to international peace or a breach of the peace, or an act of

¹⁸ United Nations. (1945). *The United Nations Charter*. Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/charte-united-nations/>.

aggression, and to take steps along with all actions considered necessary. This lays the responsibility on the UNSC to act upon any aggressive issues by way of sanctions or the forcible response.

Case Study: With the unlawful invasion of Kuwait by Iraqi forces in August 1990, prompt action on the part of the Security Council took place with the issuing of Resolution 678 (1990), which authorized member states to use force to restore peace in Kuwait by expelling Iraqi forces.¹⁹

Article 51: Right to Self-Defense

Article 51 of the UN Charter reassures this right of an individual or collective self-defense when an armed attack occurs, thereby admitting that states when faced with attack might take defensive steps even without Security Council authorization under certain circumstances. This right must be exercised according to international law, and the use of self-defense must be reported to the UNSC.

Example: In response to the 9/11 attack, the US was justified under Article 51 in claiming the right of self-defense and hence initiated military operations in Afghanistan.²⁰

1.3.2. The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

Defining and Prosecuting Aggression

An important establishment under the Rome Statute in 1998 was setting up the ICC, bringing a more advanced mechanism of law on aggression. The statute accepts aggression as a crime in Article 8 bis and represents the first effort to prosecute an individual for acts of aggression rather than for state responsibility.

¹⁹ Lowe, V., & Roberts, A. (2006). *The United Nations and the Security Council*. Oxford University Press, pp. 45-50.

²⁰ Hanhimäki, J. M. (2017). *The United Nations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press, pp. 36-40.

The Crime of Aggression (Article 8 bis)

According to Article 8 bis of the Rome Statute, a crime of aggression is constituted whenever a person commits an act of aggression: the use of armed force by a state against the sovereignty, territorial integrity, or political independence of another state, contrary to the Charter of the UN. The crime has been included in the Rome Statute as a prosecutable matter before the ICC as a reaction to the inability in the past to punish persons who planned and waged wars of aggression.

In Practice: The amendments of the Rome Statute in 2018 officially integrate the crime of aggression into the jurisdiction of the ICC. The amendments define aggression in a way that is consistent with the UN Charter, providing for prosecution for those who commit acts of aggression.²¹

Prosecuting Aggression

The ICC's aggressive jurisdiction comes with two main conditions: referral by the Security Council or determination by the ICC. This situation is even more difficult where the UNSC may frustrate proceedings against aggressive acts, especially in cases where any of its five permanent members may exercise a veto.

Case Study: The first case to deal with aggression under the Rome Statute was the situation in Uganda, where accusations of war crimes and crimes against humanity were also undertaken alongside aggression²²

²¹ Schabas, W. A. (2010). "The Crime of Aggression and the International Criminal Court." *Journal of International Criminal Justice*, 8(1), pp. 17-38.

²² International Criminal Court. (1998). *Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*. Retrieved from <https://www.icc-cpi.int/resource-library/Documents/RS-Eng.pdf>.

The Nuremberg Principles: Establishing Accountability for Aggression

The Nuremberg Trials (1945-1946), at the conclusion of World War II, gave birth to the legal principles for prosecuting aggression in international law. Nuremberg Principles included Principle VI, which went on to classify "crimes against peace" (i.e., acts of aggression) as central to international criminal law.

The Legal Precedent Set by Nuremberg

The Nuremberg Trials were the first in history to bring the leaders of states before the criminal court for committing acts of aggression, thus setting a significant precedent in international law. However, Principle VI stated that aggression was not the act of a state; rather, it was the individual liability of those who planned or executed the acts against peace.

Effect: The Nuremberg Principles formed the basis to promote prosecution for aggression against persons in other instruments such as the Rome Statute²³.

Case Law: ICJ and Aggression

The International Court of Justice (ICJ) plays an important role in adjudicating cases on state responsibility for aggression. However, the ICJ does not have criminal jurisdiction over individuals and is primarily a judicial organ for inter-state dispute resolution relating to aggression.

Nicaragua v. US (1986)

The landmark decision of the ICJ in *Nicaragua v. US* found that the latter violated international law by supporting rebel forces in Nicaragua, thereby constituting an act of aggression. The Court declared that the US

²³ Taylor, T. (1993). "The Nuremberg Legacy: International Criminal Law and the Legacy of the Nuremberg Trials." *Law and Contemporary Problems*, 56(4), pp. 17-45

had exercised force contrary to the prohibition contained in the UN Charter.²⁴

Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro (2007)

According to the ICJ, Serbia having "materially breached" its obligations under international law had not directly participated in genocide during the Bosnian War. This case gained importance for understanding the ICJ's approach to aggression and the limits of state responsibility.²⁵

For short, from the foundational principles of the UN Charter and Nuremberg Principles to the full-fledged framework of the Rome Statute and the ICC, the mechanisms addressing aggression have undergone tremendous changes. The Security Council, which takes care of threats to international peace, has great leverage. However, political realities, such as veto power held by any of the 5 permanent members, often limit this leverage. The ICC's prosecution of persons for aggression is highly innovative, but it cannot be enforced without the Security Council's involvement. These developments, among others, stand as testaments to progress, while the implementation challenges reflect the continuing dilemmas when it comes to fighting aggression in a globalized world.

Section 2: Double Standards in International Relations

1.4. Defining "Double Standards" in Global Politics: Theoretical Perspectives and Analysis

In the international challenge scenario, which includes power struggle, historic contentions and conflicting goals, the term double standards has been

²⁴ International Court of Justice. (1986). *Nicaragua v. United States of America*. Retrieved from <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/70>.

²⁵ International Court of Justice. (2007). *Bosnia and Herzegovina v. Serbia and Montenegro*. Retrieved from <https://www.icj-cij.org/en/case/91>.

acknowledged as a critical analysis tool for international studies. In spite of adopting ideals of internationalism which are thought to be well grounded on equality, fairness and inclusive principles, the global system is sobering with the existence of the kind of contradiction which undermines the very foundation of its existence. Such contradiction manifests as exceptions to the rule in forcing international norms, standards and principles in practice, and is arguably a phenomenon that most acutely characterizes the political, economic and strategic rivalry that exists among the powerful states as well as in the character of international organizations. With certain states or political actors rising above others to apply their dictates, such political inconsistencies by these great nations are not surprising. As a result, de jure equality is replaced by de facto inequality. It is in this spirit that many scholars relied keenly on different theoretical frameworks trying to make sense of the very common phenomenon. For instance, realists portrayed double standards as a product of the anarchic international system and the politics of great power realpolitik in which states are more concerned about maintaining order through the protection of their national interests rather than concerning themselves with upholding the values of the international society, this is why some countries are involved in double standards,

Russia is one of these countries that apply a set of pretences which they themselves are well aware are not true to the most nations (De, 2005, p. 10). The various responses towards similar concerns in North Korea and Iran in relation to the invasion of Iraq in 2003 by the U.S. depict how disparities can arise in the name of international legality. Constructivists are another group that feels there should be ethical principles guiding international politics, but the difference is, one, in what they consider to be 'good', and two, in the method employed in arriving at that 'good'. For that reason, the fact that others such as feminists, realists, Marxists or social injustices and security theory are seen as post-

modernists within social sciences is hardly surprising because in all those schools, the core question is how actors perceive causes and intentions of other political actors such as states within international politics.

Returning to the juxtaposition of realist and liberal schools of thought, neorealism seeks explanation on the distinction between inside and outside. Constructivists, in contrast, suggest that it is the social relations that are significant in determining state behaviour. This is the point of departure. The field of post-colonial social theory is a part and parcel of critical theory illuminating a host of entailed themes one of which is the place of the former colonized and colonizer in global politics. Critical global politics theorizes that colonialism is more than just territorial and imperial practices, it is also about imposition of intellectual, moral and ethical superiority by some societies over the others. Otherwise democratic selectivity, the idea of peace, responsibility to protect and just war are understood as ‘global’ values under colonialism.

Connecting drawbacks and strengths in the literature on international relations - especially post-colonial perspectives and violence, the indigenous activism is analyzed as a voice of the relative ‘collaborators’ of the settlers. As different aspects of international global politics are elaborated and the fundamental component of international politics; power has to be added up again. However it is informed by classic theory of international politics with a post colonial twist. Certain broad perspectives though, such as realist and liberal perspectives on international relations, focus on the external invoking State and approach, namely the neoclassical one on pluralism, while the constructivists technique that holds internal interactions as the source of determining behaviour is a preferable approach. From anything diplomatic to everything brutal, the Security Council has promoted and instantiated war. The missions affected all the people including the colonial masters and their satellites. They were subjected to hardships. On resistance; that is, the economic how – and always

economic – that does not include the sanctions; let us beat the sanctions. Wars have been fought on their soil as though they do not exist, especially, for any of these reasons.

Realism: Power and Self-Interest in International Relations

In the academic domain of international relations, realism is considered one of the particularly relevant theories that states exist to maintain their power and security over competitive and capitalist systems. In the realist theory, it is important to understand that many powerful states tend to set norms and implement rules with a bias to their own interests with less consideration for global homogeneity or fairness. This is because in realist thinking, international politics is inherently competitive and the stronger survive leaving the weaker to the consequences of survival as nations compete with each other and build empires.

A realistic perspective offers an explanation on why states remain competitive. Realists argue that states behave in the way they do due to the very nature of anarchy which compels them to pursue survival interests at the expense of any other kinds of interests. Hence, powerful states are often in the greatest position to get international outcomes that are in line with their objectives and are often able to escape the sanctions that weaker states have to bear when they take certain wrong actions. Furthermore, many international institutions and multilateral bodies such as the UNSC tend to act under the control and influence of powerful states and their friends. Hence, application of double standards is rampant in conflict resolution and in enforcing international principles. One drastic example of the subject of double standards is the U.S. invasion of Iraq in 2003 – a.k.a. The U.S. was able to self-confidently state the reason as the presence of ‘Weapons of Mass Destruction’ (WMD) in Iraq as the main reason for the invasion. Nevertheless, when the same problem was in

relationship to WMD proliferation on North Korea and Iran, the reaction of the world community was mostly and predominantly limited to diplomacy and policymaking without recourse to force. According to the paper, this inequality was determined by the American interests – the analysis of how international norms can be influenced by power²⁶.

Global citizens also acknowledge the existence of such practices in the international realm. The said countries have the necessary tools to skew the rules of the game in the international community especially in relation to the UNSC. The ability of the Palestinians to fight American supported (Israeli) forces is also restricted due to the American security policy on the Middle East, including the protection of (Israel).

Constructivism: Norms, Identities, and Social Structures

The claim by constructivism that automatically assumes certain international relations between the states according to certain conventions, in the way that they have developed, will also give rise to supporting these states in the abstract, and by the same token – to the refusal to do so. According to the social construction of statehood discourse, international relations exist not only behind the shield of swords, but also beyond the power of glass.

This is the core subject of constructivism that national action is influenced by the values, norms, and a sense of belonging that comes into the nation in the broader perspective. Such double standards arise when some states are characterized as more acceptable or more deserving of support correspondingly to the certain causes or interactions more than others often due to some values or connections in history. Thus, application of international obligations may be said

26 (Morgenthau, 1948, pp. 25-29) Morgenthau, H. (1948). *Politics Among Nations: The Struggle for Power and Peace*. Alfred A. Knopf.

to be partial as it takes for consideration the identities of the concerned states as opposed to universalized nature. The dual standards in the enforcement of international norms can be better understood using the scenario between Palestine and (Israel). The mass actions among Palestinians, including the establishment of settlements by (Israeli) forces in the territory under their control conducted so far have attracted minimal global attention. However, parallel action by Palestinian groups is often met with stern public outcry. This inconsistency is broadly facilitated by the norms governing the identity of (Israel) as a western-allied democracy and a flesh and blood ally of the US, which is heavily institutionalized within the global system²⁷.

Constructivist theory suggests that such deviations from the standard form of interaction are ingrained in the very nature of state identities. For example, influential countries, mainly those situated in the west or whose interests are in agreement with western sentiments, have an elevated status. On the contrary, the other states, mostly the ones placed within the third world, are often expected to place the highest premiums of international standards on them. This is because apart from classifying standards according to their workability and functionality, they particularly adopt the face of standards which are deeply historical as well as social²⁸.

Post-Colonialism: Power and Inequality in the International System

Where post-colonial theory is concerned, it is inevitable that a new and more sophisticated form of analysis will reveal the extent of continuing processes of colonialism, racism, and other opposing systems of international inequalities as dialectical contradictions in the application of international standards and norms. Scholars in this field argue that the old disparities which existed between the North and the South are not dreamt of by means the

27 (Wendt, 1999, pp. 135-138) *Social Theory of International Politics*. Cambridge University Press.

28 (The Oxford Handbook of International Relations, Constructivism Chapter, pp. 298-316)

international institutions of the existing world. It is the international institutions, which are the reflection of the interests of the colonizing countries and some allied with, and not the interests and grievances of the colonized ones.

One of the most important aspects of postcolonial analysis is that it underscores what may appear to be counterintuitive that the existing international order is essentially the one erstwhile colonizer had already established. Former colonizers and their friends mostly ex-colonizers receive the priority in the funding from the multilateral institutions whereas the countries of the south are subjected to further emphasis and mostly rejected or left out. And in the light of the European thought and system of the international relations, Western countries are often placed at the center and others, especially non-Western states are rendered marginal. For instance, during the time of great conflict such as one which exists in Africa, the behavior of the UNSC clearly shows some postcolonial double standards. For African countries, especially those in the South, they are constantly sanctioned and intervened in; while any same violations which are committed by more western countries supported ones are ignored or unfounded, in other words, given diplomatic immunity. This pattern is an evident form of the social and racial stratification preserved through the modern global order²⁹.

Post-colonial academics argue that double standards are naturally and primarily an outgrowth of these historical and societal imbalances at play in the international system today. Such indulgence, in some quarters of the world such as the Global South, is brought about because the functions of the powerful international bodies such as the UNSC are for the most part to take care of the imperial who are the former colonial powers' interests and their friends. It is embedded in psycho-pathological ironies that still resort to the use of, yes,

²⁹ (Fanon, 1961, pp. 73-78) *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press.
Hanhimäki, J. M. (2017)

sanctions and interventions (on particularly the Global South) and ignore or give immunity to identical transgressions by proper states such as those aligned with the West. This behaviour is a loud cry of traditions, hierarchies and races that were let into the global governance structures over the years³⁰.

One of the conclusions drawn from post-colonial scholarship is that the traditional gains against social injustices by human rights activists are not applicable with the exception on a few achievers, but the same were defeated by powers in the international arena. In parallel with Mary E. Carruthers, the historical legacy of those described as ‘achievable gains’ is supplemented by post-imperial reconstruction and through certain notions of despair the rest of the world including Britain was never again left to contemplate what it could have been done differently with their British past.

In brief, the international relations studies warn that double standards is an elaborated issue that is shaped by power dynamics, personal conflicts, and histories. The integration of realism theory, constructivism theory, and post-colonialism provide a helpful framework for analyzing the argument of why in many instances transgressions against international standards are marked by glaring differences. Realists argue that the events of proclaiming double standards could not be classified as an aspect and product of the existence of a power relation; but, it was an aspect and a product of the *realpolitik*, the struggle between individual states operating in deficiencies and without any international coordination on values or power relations. Constructivist authors, on the other hand argue that interpersonal relationships are the key engines for people as well as states behavior; and that in the construction of inter-state relationships the units define themselves in perspective to their strategic culture and not the selective nature of domestic law as observed through selective enforcement and

³⁰ (Source: Fanon, 1961, pp. 73-78) *The Wretched of the Earth*. Grove Press.
Hanhimäki, J. M. (2017)

compliance with international law. There is also optimistic inclusion of the postcolonial theory of the international relations problems as it tries to seek answers to the question of constant history of colonialism and other forms of structural injustice in the international society. Such a holistic outlook to the rather contrasting theoretical frameworks uncovers the underlying causes of the problem of double standards and its ramifications on the effort for a more just and functional global governance system.

1.5. Historical Cases of UN Bias and Selective Enforcement

What are the historical examples of UN double standards? Different sets of international relations refer to the practice of utilizing dissimilar policies, laws and regulations where powerful states or international organizations are involved mostly and regularly for the sake of ruling out political, economic, strategic or other such interests. The case of the UN provides many illustrations, in form of double standards, especially in situations where the organization which is meant for promoting world peace, and indeed security, does not apply its principles and resolutions rectilinearly. Dual standards are very self-explanatory because one-sidedness is followed by competing political powers, conflicting factions and conflict caused by the use of the veto power by some members of the UNSC. The present work will focus on the most significant historical characterizing events taken with reference to the double standards of the UN system.

The Palestine-(Israel) Conflict (1947 - Present)

The prevailing example of this kind double of standards in the UN encompasses the (Israel)-Palestine conflict and the evident differences in the Security Council and General Assembly attitudes towards the issue through resolutions and interventions.

The Security Council dealt with the most extreme cases of this inconsistency when it passed the following two resolutions on (Israeli) policies towards Palestinians: 242. That was initially adopted in 1967; and 338, that came up in 1973. In both cases mentioned, (Israel) was supposed to withdraw from the lands occupied during the Six Day's War. There has been no real progress in the peace process with (Israel) continuing to expand territories inside the West Bank and East Jerusalem.

In case of US, they belong to permanent members of the Security Council so mostly dismiss the arguments by other countries for criticism of (Israeli) practices because of being a considerable ally. This also leads to the inconsistent enforcement of international law.

To explain the double standards issue, it is not mentioned that Resolution 2334 (2016) states that the (Israeli) construction of settlements in the West Bank and East Jerusalem is illegal; however such constructions were not prevented. In particular, when similar violations of international law were committed by other states, i.e. Iraq in 1990 or Libya under Qaddafi, military sanctions and interventions were imposed quickly.³¹

The Removal of Palestine from the UN:

The UN General Assembly has been very vocal in addressing (Israeli) human rights violations related to the repetitive encroachments on Palestinian land by (Israel). However, it has not been particularly effective in putting such measures in place against (Israel), mostly because of the US' veto power in the Security Council³².

³¹ (United Nations Security Council, 2016, p. 1)

³² (Hanhimäki, 2017, pp. 87-92) *The United Nations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

The Korean War (1950 - 1953)

The case of the Korean War is another illustration of one more contradiction in the UN being manifested in its attitude towards the intervention in international military conflicts.

Unreasonable Authorization of Aggressive Measures:

In 1950, the UN Security Council was compelled to take measures aimed at stopping the North Korean attack on South Korea with military force. This was due to the fact that the Soviet Union could not take part in the debates in the Security Council; it enabled the USA and the anti-communist coalition to enforce military action easily without the traditional Soviet Union veto obstruction.

Double Standard: Similar procedures were not adopted by the UN in response to the Soviet interventions in Hungary in 1956 and in Czechoslovakia in 1968 as there were some and neither of them involved aggression of a third state. Such a selective behaviour in the face of aggression cannot be attributed solely to neutrality but it was more affected by the balance of power present during the cold war and the associated interests of the USA and the Soviet Union.³³

The Rwandan Genocide (1994)

Analysis of the Rwandan genocide is very vivid and teaches us about how the UN establishment does not operate effectively in times of crisis. There exists an undeniably formal proof showing that the UN department for peacekeeping stands on site of action and where killings of close to 800 thousand humans are rife and yet the organization is inactive and more so for enjoy days only. There

³³ (Lowe & Roberts, 2006, pp. 45-50) Lowe, V., & Roberts, A. (2006). The United Nations and the Security Council. Oxford University Press.

were no resources provided for the smooth UN mission in Rwanda, with the UN Assistance Mission (UNAM) besides lacking a legal framework to act effectively.

Towards NATO's Mission:

The number of casualties in the Bosnian and Kosovo rates is the same or even reached that in Rwanda, in neither cases the Security Council disagreed and the North-Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) intervened with military force without the approval of the Security Council. There was quite the delay in the UN's initiative toward Rwanda, coupled with a lack of enthusiasm from the key prime representatives of the Security Council emphasizing that such a major inconsistency exists in the application of intervention in terms of human rights.³⁴

The Iraq War (2003)

One of the most disputed instances of hypocrisy in the use of military force by the UN was the invasion of Iraq in 2003, which was mainly led by the US and its Western allies. The involvement of the UNSC in the Iraq 2003 issue was stated as essentially nil as the US was unable to persuade all the States in the Security Council to go along with its military initiative due to the oppositions from France, Russia, and China who had reservations on whether Iraq had WMD. In other words, despite the lack of authorization from the appropriate authorities, military nesting was still conducted by the US and its allies in the Iraq conflict.

However, in practice it proved to be a double standard because the UN legalized warfare against Kosovo and against East Timor in 1999 despite the same claims of humanitarian intervention being made, whereas the UN remained conspicuously silent on Iraq's logistics since using force against the

³⁴ (Human Rights Watch, 1999, Rwanda section, pp. 45-52)

country was seen as inadmissible. The two peculiarities: the UN's approach to international relations which does not recognize the territorial integrity of states and does not tolerate the use of military coercion and aggression.³⁵

The Bosnia Conflict (1992 - 1995)

In the 1990s, the Bosnian War was into a reconfirm of double standard displayed by UN in its peacekeeping and military intervention strategy. The UN had promised to salvage the civilians in Bosnia; Srebrenica in the year 1995, where hundreds of thousands of Bosnian Muslims were grossly killed. The UN force was inept to halt the genocide. The quite of unaggressive stance about the given authority and the lack of immediate action proved to be the foremost bottlenecks on the peacekeeping schemes of the UN.

Double Standard: While the UN leaders overlooked the illegal actions of Serbia during the Bosnian conflict, at the same time it sent military troops to fight in Kosovo (1999) with NATO acting outside the peaceful powers set in the UN Charter. This example demonstrates global politrucking's double-standard which is determined by different strategic visions.³⁶

Economic power also plays a significant role in influencing the decisions of international organizations. Hence, countries with economic muscle, or those in economic blocks like EU or US, can control the policy and decision making processes, and more often than not, they do get favorable policies, sanctions or even aid for purpose of achieving their interest group agenda.

Explanation: Besides, it has been the norm where world trade organization (WTO) has been in the spot for its biases in the trade policies which tend to favor more the developed countries and leaving little room for the poor

³⁵ The above quote is from Schabas, 2010, pp. 17-38.

³⁶ (Weiss & Daws, 2007, pp. 203-215) Weiss, T. G., & Daws, S. (2007). *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

developing countries. For example, in the US and Europe, subsidies for agriculture have always brought problems especially, where poor countries are unable to compete in them.³⁷

Historical Legacies and Colonialism

In short, the problem on whether the structure of global governance is still colonial or not is a contentious one, and is by no means restricted to international organizations only. In fact, the creation of many international institutions, especially in the early period of their inception, was the handiwork of the foreign powers, representing their interests and beliefs. This has led to the under-representation or the entire elimination of the post-colonial states in the decision-making and governance systems at a global scale, where priorities of the wisdom of their former colonialist's policies seem to be more to the fore.

Example: Economically some developing countries as the Global South, due to their own selfish interests, the International Monetary Fund as well as other any financial institutions including the World Bank, have been curtailing interventions geared towards the development of such countries. Also, these countries would wish for equality to be addressed. In their critique of these policies and practices, the proponents versus the opponents of neoliberalism, for example, resort to pointing out that some of these policies have exacerbated poverty and thereby contribute to income and wealth inequalities in these countries.³⁸

Social practices and expressions in terms of cultural appreciation of some groups at the expense of others has been exclusively discussed so far. 'Cultures' as a field of study is a relatively new area of academic inquiry and it is one of the fastest-growing areas of research and development in the social sciences. In

³⁷ (Ostry, 2016, pp. 119) The Political Economy of Trade Agreements in the WTO." *Journal of International Trade*, 10(3), .

³⁸ Pp. 112-118 (Carruthers, 2007)

particular, the concept of culture varies across societies and with the sociopolitical conditions of different countries. Many international organizations, particularly those that are headquartered in the North, are known to operate with Eurocentric bias.

Example: Health over the past fifteen years or so has been associated with huge donors and intergovernmental institutions, such as the World Health Organization (WHO), and so on. Development likewise, has been identified with specific countries and policies-most of which, are advocated by major western donors based agencies such as the US and other multilateral international finance institutions whose development policies require naked and shame, theft.³⁹

Strategic Alliances and Diplomatic Relations

It is imperative to recognize the particularities of every existing diplomatic and military alliance and bilateral relationships in promoting influence, considering the fact that they often act for their own gains, even if they are not acceptable to the prevailing sociopolitical system.

For instance, the deployment of UN forces especially providing peacekeeping functions in regions like Southern Sudan or the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) has many profiles of the UNSC permanent members'. Several political and economic relations between various concerned or conflicting parties inhibit the peace keepers from effectively contributing to the settlement of disputes.

This means that some as a result of the implementation of the law typically affects others, and the law may not be equally applied to everyone. This can be

³⁹ (Smith, 2015, pp. 289-303)"Eurocentrism and the WHO's Health Policies." International Journal of Health Policy, 8(4), 289-303.

referred to as selective enforcement. Powerful states or their alliances partake in selective enforcement in that when they are powerful and thus able to enforce sanctions on states that are competing with them, then they do so. The same powerful states however usually take offense to the application of the same laws, thus borrowing the very definition of the law from being objective and for the common good. The weak states however are left to taste the full wrath!

If for example a war were to break out between Russia and USA, the nuclear war would be for that matter. So, is it really believed that it would be open for the whole world to see? All satellites of the USA for that matter were destroyed after the government wanted to find out the reasons why? The response of the warmongers involved in this conflict was unmistakably graphic and their shallow minds under the directive from the US Strategic Command (USSTRATCOM) decided to save their skins by demonstrating just how serious these fully armed counterparts are dangerous to their lives. Which is exactly what they were from inception one and were planning such a response fully knowing that the outcome from doing so would most probably have been fatal for them without the intervention of their enemies' justice system but rather a self-executed matter. Because do they really believe that the UN will have the moral authority to condemn the two countries when both have nuclear weapons and if the war escalated, that Security Council will not vote against any resolution seeking to impose peace.

Institutional Constraints and Bureaucratic Politics

All the international agencies go through hard times as politics is unforeseen. This problem includes power struggles among the staff, the leadership, and the member states and induces preferential treatment to the extent of bias in the policy implementation. This is in addition to properly

assessing the stance of the organization when it comes to office maintenance or in that case of rooted influence of the big contributors.

Illustrative: It is common that the UNSC represents more the interests of its five permanent members. In the same vein, UN's humanitarian agencies in few occasions have had to reshape their policies in line with geopolitical interests of the donor countries of which the US is one.⁴⁰

Determination of Resources and Involvement of Economic Complexity

The allocation of earned rewards and funds in international organizations may also impact the ability to make choices. Although they do provide a balanced perspective in most cases, it is just the percentage contribution country that moderates the will and decisions of the organization more such that biased decisions are made.

Exemplifying: The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) receive the dominant portion of their funds from the US. Thus, developed countries have segmented access to their policies, most of which are based on preferences of them with developing underdeveloped countries briefed.⁴¹

To conclude, biased decision-making in international organizations is shaped by multiple factors, including power imbalances, geopolitical interests, historical legacies, and institutional constraints. These biases can manifest in selective enforcement of norms, inconsistent application of rules, and the prioritization of the interests of powerful states or entities. Addressing these biases requires reforms to international institutions to ensure a more consistent and equitable approach to global governance. The influence of major powers, as

40 The Museum of the Senses. (2015, pp. 171-174)

41 (Ostry, 2016, pp. 112-130) "The Political Economy of Trade Agreements in the WTO." *Journal of International Trade*, 10(3), 112-130.

well as the legacy of colonialism and economic inequalities, continues to skew decision-making in favor of the Global North, often at the expense of developing countries in the Global South. To achieve greater fairness in international relations, it is essential to challenge these biases and promote a more inclusive and representative system in international organizations.

1.6. Political, Economic, and Strategic Influences on UN Decision-Making

Globalization has made the world smaller and smaller by the passing minute. The evolving trend calls for understanding of global interrelatedness. This is depicted by increasing number of international organizations established to enhance cooperation, preserve peace, and respond to various global concerns that cut across nations. Whether it is the UN or the World Bank, those structures are charged with setting rules, solving disputes, and responding to occurrences which do not respect national boundaries. Yet the extent to which they do so is undermined by the varied application of rules across states and in different circumstances despite their noble objectives and supposed commitment to the principles of justice, fairness and non-discrimination. The solutions which are negotiated might, to a large extent, be affected by elements that go beyond compliance to international or humanitarian law, factors such as power relations, history and structure of the institution. For example, the double standards of the Security Council in imposing UN authorized use of force, the IMF in targeting economies in distress and the selective application of human rights, are tell-tale signs of the existence of these biases within the global governance. These questions, however, arise more broadly in the study of interest group decision-making over its issues. It will become apparent that when the US choose to exercise its own voting right, to prevent the Security Council from passing any resolution that may adversely affect its allies or when international monetary organizations enforce structural adjustment programs in developing countries, which developed countries would not even think of. Such tendencies relate to a

small number of macro-forces. In view of the changes in the balance of power and elimination of the old formulas, as well as the search for constructive ways for bringing about better performance of the global institutions, a basic question appears to mind:

What leads to distortion present in the decisions made within international bodies?

Expression of this matter leads the attention out of the formal organization and provisions of global administrations/governments that concentrate on understanding the imbalance of power, the effects of colonial situations, creation of strategic settlements, and political discernments in the system at the end. There is, therefore, a rationale-based approach to the correct criticism of contemporary global agencies and showing where one can look for sources of creating better global structures.

1.6.1. Power Imbalances and Geopolitical Interests

Power Dynamics and the Role of Great Powers

When making a judgment with a subjective bias, some circumstances are triggered by rivalry between states. For instance, states which command superiority by dominating the military, politics, or economy often manipulate international institutions in a manner that is unusual for weaker countries.

In this scenario, unlike the US, other countries are at an advantage politically since they are considered the ‘great powers’ and therefore they are given preferential treatment in making crucial decisions. This is particularly due to the fact that the larger states which have more weight in the international community, sometimes overwhelmingly and quite severely take decisions on a behalf of everyone at the table including themselves.

UNSC Veto Power: There are five permanent members of the UNSC P5 (US, China, Russia, France, and United Kingdom (UK)), all of whom have the ability to veto any resolution or decision, even if it is backed by the rest of the Council. Such actions usually stymie progress on important issues and thwart the purposes of the agency in which these countries are involved.

For instance, USA has once had to apply this radical tool and block a certain resolution belonging to a Palestinian-sponsored agenda, in clear recognition of how international relations are woven and how hard it is to navigate the issues of sovereign law ⁴².

Economic and Trade Interests

In many cases, economic interest might also largely influence the decision-making process in the international systems. Countries with dominant economies or trade blocks, such as the European Union and the US, are influential; hence, they make policies that suit their people, enjoying trade benefits in a fair manner. They are usually the beneficiaries of import sanctions or an economic assistance of their own design.

Example: Long-serving as the development or advancement of our specific industry, the WTO has however come under criticism particularly in the application of its principles in the context of international relations. This is especially on how the trade policies of the organization benefit the developed countries and not the developing countries. For instance, due to subsidies granted in the US and on certain sectors in the EU agreement, less developed and developing economies cannot compete. ⁴³

42 Hanhimäki, J. M. (2017). *The United Nations: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

43 Ostry, S. (2016). "The Political Economy of Trade Agreements in the WTO." *Journal of International Trade*, 10(3), 112-130.

Historical Legacies and Colonialism

Colonial History and Structural Inequality

Colonialism has left an indelible mark on how power and privilege are distributed within the system and procedures of the world's international bodies today. More than a few of these bodies, and especially in their infancy, were actually made by, and represented the values of the imperialist western powers. Post-colonial states therefore are sidelined or ignored within the decision-making structures on a global platform to a greater extent than their interests and needs could be achieved in comparison to those of the ex-colonial powers.

For instance: Also, the IMF as well as the World Bank have normally been criticized for creating existing inequalities within developing countries with the help of neoliberal economic policies vs. developing wider economies. The mentioned policies of the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) are blamed for the generation of poverty and the enhancement of inequality in the developing Countries.⁴⁴

Cultural Bias and Euro centrism

Many worldwide institutions have their roots in the global north and this carries a bias which affects the decisions they make. There is a concentration for example in the global south and the countries within that sphere, as they often get left out. This happens regularly in fields like economy, education, and health. The whole process is mainly due to the lack of comprehension of terms and concepts like globalization, racism, or decolonization.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Carruthers, S. L. (2007). *The Post-Colonial State in the World Economy*. Cambridge University Press

⁴⁵ Smith, J. (2015). "Eurocentrism and the WHO's Health Policies." *International Journal of Health Policy*, 8(4), 289-303.

Strategic Alliances and Diplomatic Relations

Influence of Alliances and Bilateral Relationships

When one considers the functioning of intergovernmental organizations, it becomes easy to see how the decisions made within them could be influenced by diplomatic practices, military collaboration, or bilateral agreements. These states may have conflicting interests with the rest of the international community but may still be able to coordinate their efforts to achieve the common task, perhaps with the understanding that it will conceivably benefit each of them in some way.

To illustrate such situation, the interactions between the rich interests of the more powerful members of the UNSC and their desire to win match reaches even the UN's operation in South Sudan and the DRC. Helpless and sidelined and airbrushed from the basic international norms, various fashion states will usually not be efficient for the peacekeepers in managing the conflict.⁴⁶

Selective Enforcement of Resolutions

The concept of Selective enforcement refers to powerful states or alliances showing reluctance to mete out punishments to one another if they breach international laws, engage in human rights infringements or any other related criminal practices. Rather, authoritarian states or ones considered as adversaries by powerful legitimate states receive harsh rebuke and sanctions whereas their crimes are punished leniently.

As an illustration, Syria and North Korea have been targeted by intensive sanctions for their violations of international law, while Saudi Arabia has been accused of numerous civilian deaths in Yemen. However, unlike in the case of Syria and North Korea, Saudi Kingdom has been given comparatively less hard

⁴⁶ Luck, E. C. (2004). "The Role of the Security Council in Conflict Resolution." *Global Governance*, 10(2), 135-150.

time on the grounds that the civil war in Yemen is the internal conflict and it is associated with its strategic and economic interests.⁴⁷

Institutional Constraints and Bureaucratic Politics

Internal Politics and Institutional Interests

Typically, international organizations have various factors that can threaten their effectiveness when it comes to performing their operations. These are factors that arise as a result of internal, near internal and external factors that have mostly to do with, the employees, the leadership the member countries and sometimes or frequently the way when politics is local when implementing policies. In addition, there can be instances where such organizations may gear towards maintaining funding or give into the demands of the more influential states.

For instance: -Featuring Five MODS is the 5 permanent members who dominated UNSC. Besides, UN humanitarian agencies have been subject to demands by the major states such as the US to conform to their policy interests at times.⁴⁸

Funding and Power Dynamics

The distribution of resources and funding within international organizations can also influence decision-making. Countries that contribute the most financially often have greater influence over the policies and priorities of the organization, leading to biased decisions.

Example: The World Bank and IMF are heavily influenced by the US, which provides significant financial contributions. As a result, their policies often

⁴⁷ Human Rights Watch. (2020). *World Report 2020*. Retrieved from [HRW Reports](https://www.hrw.org/reports).

⁴⁸ Weiss, T. G., & Daws, S. (2007). *The United Nations and Changing World Politics*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.

reflect the interests of wealthier nations, with developing countries having limited input into decision-making processes.⁴⁹

In conclusion, various issues influence the misuse of authority in international offices especially where decision-making is concerned. For example, fluctuating balances of power owing to membership's changes in influential countries, including different global considerations, and even impacts of the past as well as some related institutional frameworks and standard operating procedures. Such discriminations may include picking and choosing in some situations, evenly expending all rules and promoting the interests of the most powerful states or bodies above others. It is believed that these biases can be corrected more effectively by transforming international institutions, thus creating a more satisfactory and non-discriminatory method of global governance. However, the corrupted decision making process eased by the superior authority status, the remnants of the colonial era as well as the disparities in economic assets, influences such decisions to develop more in favor of the developing countries in the South as opposed to the more developed countries in the North. But it could be said that in most cases these prejudices lead to the democratization and inclusion approach within international institutions in order to strive for a more just international environment.

Section 3: The UN and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict

1.7.A Historical Overview of UN Involvement (1947–Present)

One of the post-WWII security challenges that came with the founding of the UN in 1945, is the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict. Being as a global governing tool over the years after WWII, the UN has used different ways of addressing this problem depending on where the conflict has transitioned over the years.

⁴⁹ Ostry, S. (2016). "The Political Economy of Trade Agreements in the WTO." *Journal of International Trade*, 10(3), 112-130.

While the first contacts virtually took place at the time that the decision of partition was made in 1947, the ongoing 2019 interest of the organization was focused on for once the ‘two state’ approach. As it advanced, the organization made it a business to solve the problem from then on. The “peace for territorial sovereignty” concept under Resolutions 242 and 338 of the Security Council has contemplated as a benchmark in the diplomatic discussions, when the objective of the General Assembly has acknowledged some features of the Palestinian national movement culminating in the adoption of the resolution in 2012, granting observer state modalities to the state of Palestine from non-member status. However, at the same time, the UN has proactively supported the situation through humanitarian assistance and has established on the ground one of the largest international aid programs – United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) for Palestine refugees since 1949. However, despite several peace talks, court processes, and restoration of relief measures, which have lasted more than seven decades, a comprehensive solution targeting all the factors of the conflict remains an enigma therefore increasing the relevance of the impact and efficacy of international intervention. The constant violence and clashes, overextension of settlements construction, as well as worsening living conditions in the territories of Gaza and the West Bank criticize the abilities of the UN in performing the execution of its resolutions at the territorial level. Inasmuch as changes can be witnessed in the regions and then the issue again falls off the radar of the world, there is one question that must be answered;

What role has the UN played in attempts to resolve conflicts between (Israeli)s and Palestinians in the past?

This basic question not only enquires as to the tools and resolutions which have been applied by the various organs of the UN, but also extends to performing cost benefits analyses by elucidating the practical applications,

political hindrance that thwarted the UN efforts and its involvement in the modern conflict management efforts amidst strategic dilemmas.

Diplomatic Foundations (1947-1949)

The first major politic involvement of the UN happened in 1947 right after it was proposed the Resolution 181⁵⁰ also known as the Partition Plan. As stated in the Resolution, Palestine was to be separated into two independent states; one Jewish and another Arab, with Jerusalem as a shunted, a corpus separation, that was to be administered by the UN. The whole idea was to come up with some undefined solution to claims of latent nationalism among the country's population groups, mainly the Jews and Arabs⁵¹. This was a reality that the Zionist leadership, the Jewish Yishuv of Palestine, accepted but of course it was the Arab regimes, notably the Arab countries and the Palestinian Arabs who refused to accept this and in the process, the Arab-(Israeli) War of 1948 occurred. This was no less than a diplomatic climax of UN at a high level, despite the failure of this partition plan.

In wake of the conflict of 1948 and the ensuing millions of refugees, in order to address the needs of the survivors the UN took the unprecedented step of passing the Resolution 194, aimed at recovery of the refugees with focus on the main theme rehabilitating and reconstructing Palestine and the refugee condition. In summary, this period that began immediately after `1945` placed the UN in a dual role of both a peacemaker and a caregiver.

⁵⁰ UN Resolutions: 181 (1947)

⁵¹ Bahgat, G. (2013). *The United Nations and the (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict*. Palgrave Macmillan.pp. 45-49

Security Council Framework (1967-1973)

UNSC gained paramount significance as the conflict progressed. The Six-Day War that took place in 1967 saw the adoption of Resolution 242⁵² that called upon the immediate need to retreat (Israeli) defense forces from the occupied territories and emphasized the rightful existence of all the states in the vicinity in secure and recognized borders of peace thereby placing the principle of ‘land for peace’ as a ground for negotiations⁵³. After the 1973 Yom Kippur War, UNSC passed Resolution 338 forward, a call for a cease fire as well as requesting the fulfilling of resolution 242 (2). The stated resolutions exemplify the trend of the UNSC ‘s employment of the Security Council in the de-escalation process and in- stressing the peace negotiation under given conditions.

General Assembly Recognition (1974-2012)

Shifting the focus towards other spheres in the UN which stand the General Assembly (GA), in 1974 resolution 3236 had identified that the Palestinian people had inalienable rights among them the right to acquire a self-governing nation⁵⁴. Additionally in 2012, UNGA in its subsequent resolution 67/19 granted the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) which had a non-member status, with an observer status, efforts referred to demonstrate diplomatic backing of Palestinian interest even if not full ⁵⁵.

Humanitarian Response (1949-Present)

One of the most striking examples of how the UN has been of help in history is tied to the many emergencies that it has had to respond to mainly through the

⁵² UN Resolutions: 242 (1967)

⁵³ Quandt, W. B. (2005). *Peace Process: American Diplomacy and the Arab-(Israeli) Conflict Since 1967* p. 82

⁵⁴ Bahgat, G. (2013). *The United Nations and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict*. Palgrave Macmillan. Bahgat, 2013, pp. 126

⁵⁵ Bahgat, G. (2013). *The United Nations and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Relief and Work Agency (UNRWA) whose activities are mainly in the field of the Palestinian refugees in the Near East (Aloughani 2009). Born in 1949, the inception of UNRWA saw its central objectives as providing elimination and work programmes to the Palestine refugees, which eventually transitioned into including educational, medical, and social welfare of the millions. As this implies, it had its mind on the problem and made a central factor in the unwavering resolve of UN to resolve the core of the blame.

Two-State Solution Framework (2002-Present)

The UN has consistently promoted the idea of a two-state solution. For example, the adoption of UNSC Resolution 1397 in 2002 made it clear that the resolution does accept the idea of a vision of (Israel) and Palestine co-existing peacefully and securely. This paved the way for diplomatic efforts such as the introduction of the “Road Map for Peace” developed by the Quartet, which includes the US, the SIPRI, Russia and the UN⁵⁶. So, this outlines how the aim of the UN in the espousing of all inclusive peace frameworks dates back to its very inception.

In a nutshell, from 1947 onwards, the UN has actively intervened in the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict in numerous ways such as through diplomatic, humanitarian, and political channels. Its mediation efforts began with helping in the formulation of the final decisions regarding the territorial and administrative architecture of the still then British mandated Palestine (1947 Resolution 181)⁵⁷ and later on it addressed particularly refugee crises through its specialized organization UNRWA. Key Security Council resolutions—Resolutions 242 and 338—stipulated the “land for peace” concept, while with time the General Assembly has expanded the scope of Palestinian rights, ultimately resulting in the recognition of the status of Palestine as a non-member observer state in 2012.

⁵⁶ (Quandt, 2005, pp. 190-192)

⁵⁷ UN Resolutions: 181 (1947)

It has always been the policy of the UN to uphold the proposal of a two-state formula as it can be seen in Resolution 1397 of 2002⁵⁸. However, despite the ongoing conflict, the UN continues to play a key role in mediation, provision of humanitarian assistance, and efforts toward peace striking the balance between the legal, political, and humanitarian aspects.

1.8.UN Key Resolutions on Palestine and (Israel)

The geopolitical situation related to the confrontation between the (Israeli)s and the Palestinians is one of the most complicated problems in the political history of the mankind. It has been this way for long years; the obstacles still exist, whereas the UN has been consistently in the process of exercising peace and settlement activities. Through its main bodies - the Security Council and the General Assembly, the UN has adopted numerous resolutions dealing with various aspects of this multidimensional phenomenon. These resolutions contribute to what can be referred to as international opinion or legal practice, which has existed for several decades and has fostered several diplomatic campaigns and initiatives. Technology has changed since the 1947 UN Partition Plan; proposals for a Two-State Solution in contemporary times nonetheless continue to highlight contentious issues including territorial boundary conflict, issues on rights of refugees' settlement, unauthorized (Israeli) settlements, the question of Jerusalem and the idea of how Jews and Palestinians can live in peace. It is difficult to comprehend why these resolutions ever were passed and how they can ever have any significance and it is because of this that due consideration for the earlier passed resolutions is essential. This consideration motives make thus the need for the following questions to be answered:

Which decisions were established in Palestine and (Israel) and which issues of this conflict were attempted to be convinced by definition of these decisions?

⁵⁸Un Resolutions 1397 (2002)

What resolutions have been adopted regarding Palestine and (Israel)?

Early Resolutions and Partition

UNGA Resolutions 181 and 194, known as the Partition Plan and Addressing the Refugee Crisis, respectively, changed the political landscape⁵⁹. Whereas UNGA Resolution 181⁶⁰ proposed a systematic policy calculated to establish two separate states despite the specifics of the temporary plan for a Commission, it was rejected and the country was consequently independent⁶¹. On the other hand, UNGA Resolution 194 provided for governments of the two states and self-determination of the Palestinian people, the provision of the oil pipeline and the removal of obstacles to ratifications in return, did once again not gain levels of support sufficient for adoption⁶².

Security Council Resolutions on Peace Principles and Ceasefires

UNSC Resolution 242 was passed way back in 1967 and demanded that (Israel) retreat from the lands it had captured. In addition to that, the sovereignty and the peaceful existence of all states will be ensured in borders that are recognized by all. Also, it established the “land for peace”, a principle which has already been accepted by the Arab states, in this case, represented mainly by Egypt⁶³. Another very popular document was the UNSC Resolution 338 of 1973 in which there was a similar call for a ceasefire and the implementation of the previous resolution 242⁶⁴.

59 Alami, M., & Hyepponen, J. (2015). The (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict: Historical Perspectives and Resolution Frameworks.

60 UN Resolutions: 181 (1947)

61 Granovsky-Larsen, S. (2015). The Politics of Partition: International Responses to Territorial Disputes.

62 Tat, J. (2014). The United Nations General Assembly Resolution 194 and the Right of Return.

63 (Quandt, 2005, p. 82)

64 (Bahgat, 2013, pp. 70-72)

General Assembly Resolutions on Palestinian Rights

UN General Assembly Resolution 4672 (1974) affirmed the recognition of Palestinian right of self-determination and attaining its national independence along with others ⁶⁵ considering the fact that, UN General Assembly Resolution 67/19 (2012) gave Palestine a status of an observer state at the international level of the United Nations (Bahgat, 2013, pp. 120-123).

In the topic of the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict, (Israeli) settlement building took center stage. Naturally, this was bound to invite opposition from the vast majority of Arab and friendly nations.

UNSC Resolution 465 (1980), which declared that (Israeli) settlements and similar activities such as Jerusalem inside occupied territories were illegal, particularly pointed out the need for removing or dismantling such settlements⁶⁶. UNSC Resolution 2334 (2016), on a similar note, chastises settlements as illegal and further calls for cessation of any such activities (original text synthesis).

It is further cited that the UN Regions of Palestine and Lebanon were those that served under the western Mission of the UN.

Furthermore, UNSC Resolution 478 (1980) condemned (Israel) for enacting the ‘Jerusalem Law’ and declared its illegality and warned to the effect that diplomatic missions had to be removed or returned ⁶⁷.

Finally, there have been some positive signs particularly as concerned the issue of the two-state solution. UNSCoun Resolution 1397 Extending Two-State Vision for (Israel) and Palestine (2002) reaffirmed the goal of two independent states, (Israel) and Palestine, living peacefully within adopt peace between them.

⁶⁵ (Bahgat, 2013, pp. 120-123)

⁶⁶ (Quandt, 2005, pp. 142-145)

⁶⁷ Bastian, J. (2013). Jerusalem in International Law and Diplomacy. pp. 135-138

The implementation of the Road Map inserted in this resolution is also welcomed (Non-Arab Countries, 2005, pp. 190-192).

That said, these are a few essential resolutions, though many of them have attacked even the most trivial rights of 'Write a comment' that addresses both the possession and sale of weapons of mass destruction and reiterates the concept of corporate social responsibility.

On the whole, in the search of ways to resolve the (Israeli)-Palestinian crisis, arguably one of the most contentious issues of our time, the UN has come up with a web of resolutions. To some extent this has provided a reason for it to push ahead most especially in seeking amicable solutions for the conflict. The most critical resolutions have been the UN General Assembly Resolution 181 (1947) regarding the partition of the territory and Resolution 194 (1948) which deals with the question of refugees. The same principles were later enshrined in the doctrine of "land in exchange for peace" laid down by the Security Council's Resolution 242 (1967) and subsequent Resolution 338 (1973). Thereafter, however, the General Assembly Resolution 3236 (1974) lends support to Palestinian rights. Later mechanisms reaffirm Palestinian rights as were Resolution 67/19 granting Palestine non-member observer state status. This includes the repeated condemnation of (Israeli) settlements by the Security Council (Resolution 465, 1980; 2334, 2016) as well as the rejection of any unilateral alteration to the status of Jerusalem (Resolution 478, 1980). Resolution 1397 (2002) crystallized support for a two state model. As difficult as it may be to give effect to these resolutions, they remain the basis for all diplomatic attempts to achieve peace.

(Sources: Bahgat, Quandt, UNRWA, International Crisis Group)

1.9.Challenges in Enforcement

The UN is understood to be the most influential international organization that works on matters of peace, security, global order and international justice. This Organization has dealt with numerous upheavals and issued several resolutions in an endeavor to resolve the conflict between (Israel) and the Palestinian territory, one of the most lasting and complex geopolitical challenges all over the centuries. Land confiscation, settlement, and wall construction are violation of international law and should not be carried out regardless of security concerns. The imposed assemblies are all declarations of the international community. Nonetheless, there is an unfortunate dichotomy of international rhetoric, as illustrated by the situation on the ground vis-à-vis the above framework of resolutions. Indeed, many years after the adoption of revolutionary agreements such as Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, hemispheric superiority prevails and criminal expansionist settlements are being installed. Territorial entanglements are causing anger among states and peace in the whole Middle East is a far cry. What every resolution attempts to bring about and what actually comes out depends on the analysis on the one hand and implementation on the other. This depressing contrast between resolution and enforcement raises urgent doubts about the value of International Law and the capabilities of the International Institutions. This is particularly worrying as the ease, with which most resolutions of the kind are adopted, suggests that these war-related questions are well internalized, because the promises of such international systems have not produced any concrete results. In this environment, as the human toll of the conflict continues to grow and the stakes become higher, addressing the systemic ineffectiveness becomes even more pressing. This brings us to key questions which go to the very essence of international relations and global governance:

Why has the UN been unable to sustain enforcement of its resolutions relating to Palestine and (Israel), and

What does this inability illuminate on the more general problems of international conflict settlement in the present-day world?

Despite adopting numerous resolutions aimed at peace and legal clarity, the UN has struggled to enforce its decisions regarding the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict. Several key factors explain this persistent failure:

1. Lack of Political Will and Conflicting Interests of Member States

For successful execution of various measures taken by the Security Council, it is necessary to be politically motivated with the support of a particular group of countries and, first of all, permanent members of the Security Council (P5). The U.S., as a major supporter of (Israel), has used its veto right to prevent the approval of adverse resolutions. The Soviet Union (and subsequently Russia) has predominantly provided support for the Palestinian cause. These differences have contributed to the inactivity of the UN or the watering down of measures leading to weakened implementation possibilities (the final sentence is “greatly inhibited by... the convoluted cross-currents of the powerful member states’ geopolitical interests...”).

2. Limitations in Enforcement Mechanisms

The UN does not have its own standing forces or resources for implementation. For instance, in the event of the application of coercive measures, such as sanctions or resorting to the use of armed forces, the consensus of all members of the Security Council is usually needed. In practice, such consensus is difficult to reach; hence the question of the introduction of international sanctions often dies, as was the case with the UNSC’s call for the withdrawal of (Israel) in Resolution 242. Furthermore, peacekeeping actions do

not require unanimity from the parties involved but do operate on the basis of deployed forces being given specific mission templates.

3. Non-Compliance by Parties to the Conflict

The UN has been disrespected even by actors – whether (Israeli) or Palestinian – intent on adopting a multilateral order. (Israel) for instance openly violates resolutions such as 465 and 2334 ⁶⁸ by continuing settlement policy. Reasons of safety and government necessity are frequently put forward, however, and the final balance is the ineffectiveness of UN policy.

4. The Nature of the Conflict Itself

The question of familiarity, culture, and positional orientation reflects the disagreements deeply embedded in every UN documentation. Terrible confrontations are to be foreseen in implementing laws ‘regardless of the factors.’ As per the escalating determination and an unyielding stand of key players, this goal remains unattainable.

5. Perceptions of Bias and Double Standards

It is not uncommon to find that the UN organization is criticized for favoritism, even by the individuals concerned. There are claims that the UN practices double standards in favor of (Israel) as a result of the extensive Western assistance, particularly that of the USA. Hence, that constitutes an urge of losing its effectiveness in the eyes of Palestinians and Arabs. With such a mindset, one expects rebellion in behavior.

68 (Quandt, 2005, pp. 142-145)

6. Insufficient International Consensus and Commitment for Robust Action

The General Assembly can pass resolutions by wide margins, however there are big obstacles that lie in real enforcement. Yes there is, that is one of the problems—commitments require global agreement and tireless mobilization—but in some aspects, it is possible.

In closing, the UN's inability to enforce resolutions on the (Israeli)-Palestinian conflict exposes systemic flaws in international governance. The Security Council's effectiveness is crippled by geopolitical divisions—particularly the U.S. veto protecting (Israel) and Russia's pro-Palestinian stance—creating diplomatic gridlock. Structurally, the UN lacks autonomous enforcement tools (like a standing army or binding sanctions), relying instead on voluntary compliance, which powerful states and conflict parties routinely ignore. (Israel) continues expanding settlements despite Resolution 2334 (2016), while Palestinian factions also selectively disregard UN frameworks, perpetuating a cycle of non-compliance.

Deep-seated historical grievances and mutual distrust between the parties further undermine enforcement, as do perceptions of UN bias—(Israel) decries disproportionate scrutiny, while Palestinians criticize Western-influenced leniency. Non-binding General Assembly resolutions (like those recognizing Palestinian statehood) lack teeth, and even unanimous votes rarely translate to sustained international pressure. Scholars like Bahgat and Quandt note that the UN merely reflects—rather than transcends—state sovereignty and power rivalries. Without structural reforms or genuine political will from conflict parties, resolutions will remain aspirational, highlighting the limits of multilateralism in addressing entrenched conflicts.

Chapter two
Practical Application –
The UN's Response
to (Israeli) Military
Actions in Gaza

Chapter 2: Practical Application – The UN’s Response to (Israeli) Military Actions in Gaza

Section 1: The UN’s Reactions to Major (Israeli) Offensives

2.1. Case Studies: UN Responses to Gaza Wars (2008–2009, 2014, 2021, 2023)

2.2. Comparative Analysis: Gaza vs. Ukraine, Syria, and Other Conflicts

2.3. Official UN Justifications for Differential Treatment

Section 2: Veto Powers and Geopolitical Interests in the Security Council

2.4. The U.S. Veto and Its Impact on Gaza-Related Resolutions

2.5. Geopolitical Alignments and the UN’s Inconsistent Policies

2.6. Power Politics and the Erosion of UN Credibility

Section 3: Humanitarian and Legal Fallout

2.7. Humanitarian Costs of UN Inaction in Gaza

2.8. Implications for International Law and Accountability

2.9. Accountability Mechanisms: ICC, UNHRC, and Their Limitations

Section 1: The UN's Reactions to Major (Israeli) Offensives

2.1 Comparing the UN's Responses to Major (Israeli) Military Operations and Conflicts in Ukraine and Syria

UN Responses to the Gaza Wars (2008–2009, 2014, 2021, 2023)

Gaza War 2008–2009 (Operation Cast Lead)

The prime minister said in his statement, that it was necessary to have a quick and decisive military operation in Gaza as part of the war against Hamas. However, this operation should be of limited character; otherwise taking control of the Strip would pose serious challenges. In such a case the full strip residents would resist it of a strength that transcends terrorism, as happened in Lebanon during Operation Grapes of Wrath²⁰. As time progressed nearly the entire world watched as the (Israeli) military tanks and airstrikes were employed in Gaza.

In December 2008 a severe (Israeli)-Hamas conflict erupted on the territory of Gaza under the title Operation Cast Lead that lasted from the 27th of the month to the 17th of January in 2009. This war lasted for about two weeks with not less than 900 People's Forces, most of whom were civilians, being documented as killed and some tens of (Israeli) citizens also dying. The authorities responded, but did so in a reactive way by virtually engaging in round-the-clock attacks against its own population. The Palestinian leadership started calling for a cease-fire, only on the eve of the fifth orthodox Christmas from the beginning of the war although it has been noted wider in time frames.¹

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon greatly spoke in favor of 'No More War' on the 12th of January, 2009; "the fighting must stop, it must stop and the killing

¹ TRANSCRIPT OF PRESS CONFERENCE BY SECRETARY-GENERAL BAN KI-MOON AT UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS, 12 JANUARY 2009, press.un.org

and destruction even more so; stop it. It is time to stop the killing and the destruction”²

UN statements and resolutions: The Security Council passed resolution No. 1860 on 8 January 2009 for 14 votes to none with one abstention from the United States, requiring an “immediate, durable and fully observed” cease-fire as well as the exit of (Israel) from the Gaza strip. The UN Secretary-General and his envoys put pressure on both sides; thus, for example, in January 2009 Ban Ki-moon appealed to the media to cover the halting of rockets fired from Gaza and use of (israeli) force against the civilian populationpress.un.org. Much as Ben Ki-moon herself did, it held an emergency special session and passed a resolution requesting the cease-fire (GA Res. ES-10/1 on 16 Jan 2009) and instructing all parties concerned to observe the operative paragraphs of the Security Council resolutionpress.un.org. In a formal plenary session late on in 2009 the Assembly was adopting Resolutions endorsing Fact-Finding reports of the WHO and the Human Rights Council on the issue of Gaza and called for independent credible inquiry of the alleged crimes in the occupied Palestinian territoriespress.un.orgpress.un.org.

Examination and reports: In Independent report of April 2009 Fact Finding Mission 2 was established banning judge Richard Goldstone to Investigate the uguLihwa 1 with all its transgressions His collected findings included a 576 pages long “Goldstone Report”, published in October 2009, which noted war crimes possibly committed by (Israel) and Hamas. Apart from general criticism concerning human rights the report was supported by the General Assembly at the meeting of the principals in November 2009press.un.org, and the Assembly insisted that both (Israel) and Palestinians carry out domestic investigations in relation to these violationspress.un.org. (Israel)and some people there discredited the relish due to the findings of the report and contained questions of the observance of rights.)

² SECURITY COUNCIL CALLS FOR IMMEDIATE, DURABLE, FULLY RESPECTED CEASEFIRE IN GAZA LEADING TO FULL WITHDRAWAL OF (israeli) FORCES , press.un.org

Humanitarian response: As requested, the UN and its humanitarian agencies implemented extensive relief operations. The Security Council acknowledged the “extending crisis of the humanitarian situation” and notably underlined the necessity to grant activities benefiting civilians press.un.org. Ban Ki-moon reiterated and elaborated this appeal during his briefing that in fact there was great number of the urgent humanitarian items in Gaza and they should be provided to the concerned persons and groups in Gaza ³. The UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA), UNRWA, UNICEF and others also issued flash appeals (in the amount of hundreds of millions of dollar each) intended for provisioning food, water, relief, medical and other services to the population affected by the conflict in Palestine. (for example, a “Flash Appeal” led by the UN in February 2009 targeted approximately \$613m to address needs in Gaza) These multi-million appeals contributed to the provision of assistance programs by the UN agencies aimed at accommodating internally displaced families, reconstructing their shelters and distributing relief items in Gaza, respectively.

Gaza War 2014 (Operation Protective Edge)

During July–August 2014, Operation Protective Edge was the anti-Hamas war that was fought between (Israel) and Gaza (approximately 50 days. During the period of the combat, Gaza bore the brunt of the IDF’s aggression leading to severe destruction of its infrastructure. The secretariat of the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) reported that about 2,100 Palestinians have been killed; this being the reason why people who are for human rights rush to condemn the long intended military action against Hamas, called the Operation Protective Edge; and about 70% of those killed were civilians, with a large number being children, with the loss of lives of more than 60 (israeli) soldiers and also civilians was reported during the same operation. That violence included among other heavy (israeli) air and ground attacks and thousands of rockets fired against (Israel) from the Strip.

UN Executive and Security Council:

³ UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon’s statement (9 Jan 2009)

<https://press.un.org/en/2009/sgsm12063.doc.htm>

The UN leadership on many occasions called for an immediate cessation of the conflicts. On 9th of July, 2014 the UN Secretary-General, Ban Ki-moon held a press conference asserting that Gaza was in great danger urging (Israel) to exhibit restraint and protect the occupants belonging to the other side of conflict. He criticized the missile attacks by Hamas against (Israeli) population and the growing number of women and children being killed in the Gaza Strip press.un.org. During last month's session, the Council failed to condemn the fighting at the request of the Educational and Cultural Affairs, although the delegates called for an end to the fighting. When the violence came to a halt, Vice KTG welcomed the failed ceasefire under the auspices of Egypt and asked the parties to address the "root causes" and end the "occupation".⁴ He added that after the end of fifty days of war during which there was a "serious humanitarian crisis" – Gaza would need to be assisted in its early recovery⁵. Throughout the fighting, a number of meetings dealing with the conflict were convened by the UN SC (e.g. Jeffrey Feltman gave an update on 30 July his preoccupations and observations on the sporadic action towards deescalation), but a resolution was not adopted by the Council as no such resolution had been proposed until then. In November 2014 the General Assembly debated the crisis in Gaza; participants lamented the heavy toll of the July – August violence and called for immediate reconstruction assistance.

Inquiries and reports: In July 2014 the UN Human Rights Council convened a special session, S-21, on Gaza and went on to create an International Commission of Inquiry into the violations that were committed. Due to its excessive use of force, the Commission was tasked with examining breaches on the (Israeli) side as well as rocket firing breaches by the militants, who came up with their own, over an year ago. The Palestinian foreign minister also argued that the international community had to act, although the Security Council was quite pleased with the results and did not censure the parties of the conflict. Activists in the same peace movements kept records on these occasions. For instance, one of such records was presented during a GA Fourth Committee

⁴ UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon statement (26 Aug 2014)
<https://press.un.org/en/2014/sgsm16082.doc.htm>

⁵ OCHA Gaza Situation Reports (2014)
<https://www.ochaopt.org/reports>

meeting in Nov 2014. This indicated that the Gaza fatalities were composed of 69% civilian Deaths.

Humanitarian response: Immediate Relief Operations and flash Sop’s were asked by the United Nations humanitarian agencies and the UNRWA launch on the appeal for about 60 Million USD to be used as emergency Fund assistance for displaced families on 17th July 2014. Gaza, 2014, and other agencies like for instance, UNICEF worked to deliver basic health and education support as emergency assistance. In relation to the provision of aid, it was stated this civilians need a break probably to “enable humanitarian and early recovery interventions for the benefit of the desperate people of Gaza.”⁶. His call for aid to the Gazanians was welcomed by the member states as well, with large contributions to the fund so that the children would attend school without being scared of missile attacks. With the even requirement of the cease-fire, the UN alliance reported that it was widely criticized by Palestine first with its women and children; over two thousand homes were leveled, fifty four were totally destroyed and at least 35,000 Gazans were left unemployed to rebuild⁷

Gaza War 2021 (May 2021 escalation)

There were highly disturbing developments during the month of May 2021, seeing a decline into armed conflict in East Jerusalem and outright combat in Gaza (May 11–21). It was an intense period with (Israel) engaging the Egypt empowered Hamas and its sister militants in Gaza with high intensity rocket attacks. By May 21 ceasefire, about 250 Palestinians, sadly, with most of them being children and 13 (israeli)s were reported dead⁸. Tens of thousands of people in Gaza were also rendered homeless while its infrastructure was destroyed as a result of the fighting.

⁶ OCHA Gaza Situation Reports (2014)

<https://www.ochaopt.org/reports>

⁷ UNRWA Emergency Appeal (17 July 2014)

<https://www.unrwa.org/newsroom/press-releases/unrwa-launches-emergency-appeal-response-gaza->

⁸ Secretary-General Guterres remarks to Security Council (16 May 2021)

<https://press.un.org/en/2021/sgsm20732.doc.htm>

Statements and resolutions of the UN: The Security Council convened as the battle raged. The UN Secretary-General condemned "...the senseless cycle of bloodshed..." on 16 May as he introduced the situation to the Council and observed that the military assaults was 'a horror' press.un.org. He was unhappy with the army attacking the metro station because the casualties among the civilians were very high. All in all, he cautioned that the situation risked exacerbating into a regional problem as there was the fighting ⁹. On 22 May an argument was not necessary since the conflict had ended and the Council issued a press statement (SC/14527) with regard to the ceasefire and called on all involved parties to respect it. This communication contained mourning for the taking of civilian life and had urged for immediate relief for the Palestinians located in Gaza from all hostile actions¹⁰. The council also approved the call made by the Secretary General for the development of an international assistance package to help in rehabilitating Gaza. No further council resolution was adopted and neither was there a request for a special meeting of the General Assembly, however, personnel of the United Nations and peace envoys on the ground immediately proceeded to calm the situation down.

Trails and reports: In the aftermath of the said calamity, the UNHRC called for an inquiry into human rights abuses in the occupied Palestinian territories upon adopting a resolution of the HRC for the month of June 2021. (A current special investigation known as Commission Of Inquiry has been established and will address questions of the violence and related security categorization in East Jerusalem and Gaza.) Responding to the violence, the Council in the last months of 2021 had reservations as well. However, UN special rapporteurs and agencies continued to document the effect.

Response and Availability of aid: The UN's humanitarian systems were activated on behalf of Gaza. OCHA submitted a flash appeal that aimed at reaching 120,000 beneficiaries. Such determination was repeated in their 22

⁹ The previous reference

¹⁰ Security Council Press Statement on Ceasefire (22 May 2021)
<https://press.un.org/en/2021/sc14527.doc.htm>

May Council statement regarding immediate assistance to Gaza (cited above) press.un.org. Also, the analysis by UNRWA has said that several families have become homeless, where during the hostilities, the number of the displaced persons had peaked at approximately 80,000. Children suffered trauma due to the 'huge escalation' within a day; a statement was provided by UNICEF and school in a box kits, as well as psychosocial support were quickly provided. On May 18, OCHA observed that health facilities were 'too full' as these found the water system was buckling. In its communication, the Council and the Secretary-General underscored also the need to sounds like feeding, shelter, counseling, and medical care for Gazans. According to information provided at the meeting, as of mid-May, Gazan hospitals had received over 1,200 persons with injuries (of whom approximately 75% were civilians) ¹¹. They further pointed out that food security was a serious concern and that UNICEF and WFP stood ready to provide support.

Gaza War 2023–2024 (October 2023 escalation)

On October 7, 2023, HAMAS and other Palestinian resistance groups with arms launched a coordinated large-scale attack in southern (Israel). What was used in the operation was a long-range artillery as well as an infantry action and a frontal attack on the army for the purpose of the attack on the detention center. Support for the mission on attacking civilian targets and military-controlled regions were also-rans in order. In response to the provocation, the (israeli) side initiated a large-scale military operation in the Gaza Strip. The subsequent escalation of hostilities grew into the bloodiest and most destructive incidence of the (israeli)-Palestinian warfare. The United Nations, on its part, issued a report concerning the situation in Gaza emphasizing an acute humanitarian crisis.

While a number of states and organizations had already referred to the framework invasion as terrorism, the United Nations did not use the term as an official one in its resolutions or public pronouncements. The approach of UN

¹¹ **OCHA Flash Update: Humanitarian Impact in Gaza**

<https://reliefweb.int/report/occupied-palestinian-territory/occupied-palestinian-territory-escalation-gaza-strip-flash>

leaders has been to emphasize respect for international humanitarian law with specific calls for the safety of civilians on all sides as well as the cessation of all other war crimes including the restoration seized persons and facilitation of humanitarian relief goods.

“I unequivocally condemn the horrifying acts by Hamas and others on 7 October in (Israel). There is no justification for deliberately killing, injuring, and kidnapping civilians — or launching rockets against civilian targets.”

— UN Secretary-General António Guterres, 27 October 2023¹²

The UN has also reported that the attack on 7 October 2023 was against military targets and not against civilians. What matters is that however, the said information as to what was the exact target in the said attacks and who the casualties were has not been fully presented due to the fact that the investigations are still on.

UN Statements and Resolutions

On 27 October 2023, an emergency session of the UN General Assembly was held, which adopted Resolution ES-10/25 (A/RES/ES-10/25) that demanded an “immediate, sustained humanitarian truce”, unrestricted humanitarian assistance and granting of release of all persons.

Further, the resolution requested (Israel) to annul all orders of evacuation to civilians in the northern zone of the Gaza Strip.

However, the tabling of a draft resolution condemning the attacks of 7 October 2023 could not muster the requisite two-thirds majority.

On 15 November 2023, the UN Security Council adopted Resolution 2712 (S/RES/2712) that sought “urgent and expanded humanitarian pauses and corridors”, reiterated the call for immediate and unconditional releasing of

¹² General Assembly Resolution ES-10/25 (27 Oct 2023)

<https://undocs.org/A/RES/ES-10/25>

hostages, and asked all parties to safeguard civilian belongings and ensure the provision of such goods.¹³

On 20 February 2024, the U.S. vetoed a draft resolution of the Security Council for an immediate truce. As a result, the General Assembly convened an extraordinary session that sharply criticized the situation in Gaza as “catastrophic and more deteriorating.”¹⁴

Secretary-General and UN Agency Responses

On 28 October 2023, Secretary-General António Guterres called for an immediate minimum humanitarian break and stressed the appalling situation of Gaza.¹⁵

On the 8th of December 2023, Guterres spoke Powerlessly before the United Nations Security Council: “Nowhere is safe. Gaza’s humanitarian system is at breaking point. Civilians are being told to move like human pinballs.”

Investigations and Accountability

On 18 December 2023, the Human Rights Council passed a resolution to set up an independent international commission to investigate violations of international law in Gaza, the West Bank and (Israel) that occurred in target-date thesis.¹⁶

UN Humanitarian Response

The humanitarian crisis was tackled through mobilizing UNRWA, OCHA, WFP, WHO and UNICEF and in particular focusing on the prevention of massive displacements, the risk of serious food insecurity, the collapse of health care services and the potential for famine.

¹³ **Security Council Resolution 2712 (15 Nov 2023)**
[https://undocs.org/S/RES/2712\(2023\)](https://undocs.org/S/RES/2712(2023))

¹⁴ **General Assembly Emergency Session Remarks (Feb–Mar 2024)**
<https://press.un.org/en/2024/ga12580.doc.htm>

¹⁵ **Secretary-General Guterres’ statement (8 Dec 2023)**
<https://press.un.org/en/2023/sgsm22075.doc.htm>

¹⁶ **OCHA Flash Appeals for Gaza (2023–2024)**
<https://www.ochaopt.org/appeals>

OCHA Gaza Crisis Page

The General Assembly resolution sought undisturbed access to humanitarian assistance, and Security Council resolution 2712 reiterated the request for secure humanitarian passages.¹⁷

2.2 Comparative Analysis: Gaza vs. Ukraine, Syria, and Other Conflicts

Conflicts in Ukraine and Syria

Global peace is achieved largely thanks to the significant contributions of the United Nations (UN). The body is not only tasked with the maintenance of peace, but it is also mandated towards the fostering of secure communities. The operations of the latter are significantly constrained by the fact that international relations within which the UN works are such that certain countries practicing power international relations in the world may interfere with the effectiveness of the international organization. The Article undertakes the comparative analysis of three key conflicts of the UN: military actions in (Israel), conflict in Ukraine and Syrian crisis, in terms of their humanitarian problems, external factors and most importantly impact of the failure to manage the all above mentioned factors on the credibility or effectiveness of the united nations as the peacekeeping body.

(israeli) Military Operations: Humanitarian Crises and Geopolitical Tensions

UN's entanglement in the military activities of (Israel), more specifically those in Gaza has been a subject of great interest in the global forum. UN Security council(UNSC) has had several resolutions passed following these military operations which were created to mitigate the use of force and of course to address the humanitarian issues. One such resolution is resolution 1860 (2009) that is pertinent to the conduct of the Operation 'Cast Lead': this time they called for an immediate ceasefire and the provision of humanitarian aid to Gaza. The concern of the resolution is consistent with the United Nations commitment towards protection of civilians in armed conflicts and the need to facilitate humanitarian access during crisis situations¹⁸.

¹⁷ **UNRWA Gaza Emergency Reports**

<https://www.unrwa.org/newsroom/emergency-reports>

¹⁸ (Goldstone, 2009 Report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict : 17–18)

Nevertheless the power of UN in enforcing its decisions is significantly hindered by the roles of the superpowers specifically the US. The U.S. being (Israel's) strong ally has used its right to veto in the Security Council so many times so as to prevent the passing of any resolution that would impose severe sanctions on (Israel). This has created a political environment that some refer to as a double edge sword. Or where it finds, that some countries responsible for the violations are let off the hook. For example despite the line in the Resolution 2334 of 2016 denouncing (Israeli) construction of settlements in and then some, all action to prevent such construction was prevented by an American veto, undermining the effectiveness of UN resolutions ¹⁹.

Moreover, the Goldstone Report aimed at assessing the scale and extent of the losses and damages suffered by the population and making recommendations for overcoming the problems faced by Palestinians in Gaza and violations of their rights. In this context, the investigation accused (Israel) and Hamas of war crimes which were committed during operation Cast Lead. Despite these findings which showed the prevailing unlawful practices, particularly on (Israel), the latter chose to disregard the report hence affecting reforming close collaboration with the United Nations, these were the failures of the United Nations as and where the powerful resists information findings²⁰.

The Ukraine Conflict: A Struggle for Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity

The crisis in Ukraine, triggered by the Russia-backed separatists and escalated following the Annexation of Crimea in 2014, brought along a unique set of challenges to the United Nations. For the most part, the United Nations' participation in the conflict in Ukraine has been based on claims of the widespread attack on the territorial and sovereignty rights of member states. The adoption of Resolution 2202 (2015), one that gave a nod to the Minsk II Agreement, had the goal of promoting a cessation of fighting between Ukrainian forces and Russian-led separatists in East Ukraine. The case rated the diplomatic efforts of the United Nations to facilitate the two conflicting parties ²¹.

¹⁹ Abdellaoui, M., & Bourenane, N. (2015): 1653. The United Nations and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict

²⁰ (Goldstone, 2009: 5-9)

²¹ Iksal, H. (2024). The Palestinian-(Israeli) Conflict and the Requirements of a Guarantorship Model. pp. 35-37.

Unfortunately, the perceived geopolitics of some countries in the council such as USA, has resulted in implementation problems particularly deference by all countries and regions including the US its basing state, from accepting the United Nations as the cited conflict enforcer. The impasse in global politics saw the situation where the United Nations was unable to intervene effectively and as Edward C. Luck noted most of the time, demands were too little too late in response to crisis because of and in defence of Russia and her friends ²².

Altogether, the United Nations has persevered this negative climate and has still believed in dialogue and assistance delivery. The United Nations General Assembly approved the uplift of four resolutions ensuring Ukrainian sovereignty but certain improvement in security has not been achieved due to the lack of agreement in the Security Council ²³.

The Syrian Civil War: Humanitarian Crisis and Geopolitical Paralysis

The civil war in Syria, which broke out in 2011, has escalated into one of the most dangerous humanitarian disasters in recent history. The United Nations' behavior towards the Syrian crisis has remained highly ineffective. This was the case primarily because of the Security Council personality who are permanent members of the organisation and notably practised veto on certain actions. One of the very rare moments when the Security Council took decisive action was the adoption of Resolution 2118 of 2013 that instructed the removal of the declared chemical weapons of Syria after their use in Ghouta. At the same time, the military operation also reached beyond the physical elimination of the arsenal as Russia, which provides cover for the Syrian regime according to the report overcame its geographical tension to work with the United States. At the same time, the military operation also reached Russia, which provides cover for the Syrian regime according to the report overcame its geographical tension to work with the United States.

The lack of action by the Security Council has forced the United Nations to provide support in the form of humanitarian operations to the likes of the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). As much as these efforts have been effective, they have not assisted the causes of violence and conflicts at all. There have been efforts by the United Nations to deal with the regime of

²² Luck, E. C. (2011). *The United Nations Security Council: Practice and Promise*. pp. 12-13

²³ (ICG, 2019, p. 10)

Syria and find blaming resolutions regarding the actions of the regime. However, these efforts were restrained by the power of the veto held by Russia, and the United Nations has turned into an organization carrying out more and more relief operations than focusing on peace building. (see in the 'Addressing strategic needs priorities for 2020' report, OCHA, 2020, pp. 114 -115).

Comparing the UN's Responses: Key Themes and Challenges

While the (Israeli)-Palestinian, Ukraine, and Syrian strife are different in aspects, the United Nations response to the specified crises do show standard themes in most cases.

Inhibitors of Geopolitical and the Veto Power of the UN Security Council. – Efforts To intervene in the three conflicts leukemogenic United Nations has always been strongly opposed or prevented. The application of the US veto whether the question was relating to (Israel) or Russia in the case of Ukraine and Syria has many and several obstructive results. For example in the case of Ukraine; conversely USA has all rights and duties to use a veto against EU, if a resolution is proposed with condemnation of the annexation of Crimea in the UNSC.

TAKE INTO ACCOUNT Humanitarian Imperatives. – In all three conflicts the UN has given some provision to what has been referred to as 'the principles of humanity' by focusing more on the humanitarian aspect and helping with the aid provided such as the one from the agencies like OCHA, UNHCR, the journalists of course. However, such a focus on human assistance tends to marginalize the efforts toward addressing the political, justice, and legal aspects of the involved armed conflicts. This, in turn, has ...raised ...concerns with regard to the capabilities of the UN to address conflicts within its peace building mandate.

LAW AND RESPECT FOR HUMAN RIGHTS: In as far as each of the conflicts is concerned, the issuance of the call for a ceasefire, the protection of the people and the call for accountability of war criminals made nec clauses of the UN Charter, the Geneva Conventions and a host of other rules of International Humanitarian Law totally arguable. Nevertheless, in practice, the implementation of such legal mechanisms tends to be nonexistent thanks to the wider political context of international relations in which the world order and

deployment of power are determined more by the politics of the powerful than by the legality and the goodness of the cause (Koskenniemi, 2011,)²⁴.

Conclusion: The UN's Struggles with Power Politics

The involvement of the United Nations in the (israeli)-Palestinian situation, the Ukrainian case and the Syrian war has shown that the relations between the implementation of humanitarian values, compliance with human rights norms and realpolitik of superpowers still remain complicated and sometimes even conflict with one another. The United Nations has definitely put in considerable effort to address the problems of humanitarian crisis and to protect the rights of people. However, its ability to find sustainable solutions has been greatly compromised due to the dominance of some major countries. In all three cases, the uncharacteristic behavior of the UN has impeded its actions. Geopolitical reasons above all the veto power in the SC have caused the underperformance of the UN. In order for the United Nations to have a quicker and enhanced response to any worse escalations, some structural adjustments have to be made especially to deal with the hegemony of a few countries and improve the legal and peacekeeping capacities of the organization.

2.3 Official UN Justifications for Differential Treatment

The involvement of the United Nations (also known as UN) in peace operations is a deep engagement mixing legality, humanity and strategies imposed by political consideration. Objections to addressing specific global uproars such as the Gaza and West Bank crisis, the war in Ukraine, and Syria's internal conflicts arise from these factors. Through assessment of relevant general assembly resolutions and the crimes yearly global reports and viewpoints from formulation and execution of political and economic policies analysis, it can be classified more precisely what sort of considerations support that namely aggressive and expansionist actions of the UN in current conflicts. This essay seeks to determine the intricacies in which the UN's position in these conflicts is portrayed while focusing on issues problematic to the decision making activity of the organization and hence its impact it criticized for its inadequate efficiency.

²⁴ Koskenniemi, Martti. *The Politics of International Law* (2011)p. 5

The (Israel)-Palestine Conflict: A Struggle for Sovereignty and Human Rights

However, there is some concern about the balance in the actions and decisions of the United Nations (U.N). When (Israel) was waging war against the people of Gaza, for instance, as in the battle that took place between 27 December 2008 and 18 January 2009, the United Nations Security Council [UNSC] adopted Resolution invoked which opened the door to a cease-fire and the provision of emergency assistance aid to the area or the People in Gaza. The Resolution indicates the intention of the UN to spare the people from casualties and to help the people to address the humanitarian problems that have beset them in the conflict²⁵. During the outbreak of a certain war in the country, the United Nations Council would have definitely favored war by unfortunately could not, as some countries on the council (mainly the United States of America, a strong supporter of Israel) saw to it that these resolutions did not pass. The US, being supportive of (Israel), typically uses its veto in the UNSC, thus preventing the resort to escalating sanctions or calling (Israel) to account. This feature manifested itself in the adopting of Resolution 2334 (2016), when the controversy arose over condemnation of building new settlements by (Israel) in the West Bank and East Jerusalem. The comment was rejected even so with a number of opponents from around the world, and mention may be made of the fact that the comment was not adopted because of opposition from the US, showing the deficiency of the current UN's ability of proceeding against the big powers when they are not willing²⁶.

The Goldstone Report of 2009 commissioned by the UNHRC examines alleged violations between the warring factions (Israel) and Hamas in Operation Cast Lead. Nonetheless, the findings in the Goldstone Report, especially regarding its assessment of the actions of (Israel), caused considerable tension between the country and the UN; all the same, the report does point out the assistance of the UN when it comes to the human rights issues and how it aims to enforce the law. Despite the opposition from the government of (Israel) regarding the findings, the United Nations and her partners are still following up on the issue given that more concern is raised about the safety of the civilians and the empowering of the Palestinian society.

The Ukraine Conflict: A Struggle for Sovereignty and Territorial Integrity

²⁵ (Goldstone Report, 2009, p. 17-18)

²⁶ (Abdellaoui & Bourenane, 2015, p. 1653)

The response from the United Nations to problems faced due to the crisis in Ukraine has been guided by the organization’s core protocols. Its principles, to be more precise, which include foremost shielding of its member states against foreign invasion and occupation, by any country regardless of her relations to the malefactor. For example, in the event of the Crimea referendum in March 2014, the United Nations acknowledged the situation as rule of line-breach and adopted the resolution 2202 in February 2015. This motion within the scope of the UN intervention in the Ukraine conflict in 2015, also popularized known as the “Ministerial minutes”, advocated a fire break and withdrawal of heavy weapons. In this regard, the incentive to settle the conflict and proper Ukraine’s independence for that matter within the UN framework was also underscored.

Yet, it is the reality of the UN’s arrow-ridden approach, which seems to be suggested considerably more on the surface. Needless to say, such accusation is lax and fails to take into consideration many such organizations, which have played a role in Ukrainian conflict prevention process in the EU and the UN, but not theoretically in every line (theoretical models are only valid where they really work). This is how for instance, reports from conflict mongers such the International Crisis Group (ICG), assert the view that the UN ‘regrettably’ turned defensive and not proactive agents when it comes to conflict prevention and resolution, due to the ever hindering northeastern behemoth – Russia ²⁷.

In spite of those predicaments, United Nations has not given up on giving out support in terms of aid while talking peace. For example, the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions that affirmed the territorial integrity of Ukraine, and several of them have been adopted. However, disagreements with the Russian Federation proved unhelpful in attaining higher levels of action as China did not work with the United States to endorse tougher sanctions, making a constructive solution to the problem even more elusive ²⁸.

The Syrian Civil War: Humanitarian Crisis and Geopolitical Deadlock

²⁷ International Crisis Group. (2019). *The United Nations and the (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict: A Critical Assessment*. Retrieved from <https://www.crisisgroup.org/middle-east-north-africa/eastern-mediterranean/israelpalestine>.

²⁸ Previous reference

One of the most severe crisis the world faced esteeming from a humanitarian perspective until the year two thousand and one caused by the war in Syria which started in the fifth year of that millenium. It's been found towards the measures the UN is taking that the most significant problem to be encountered all the way is the fact there are the political Leader has been much intimidated by the inaction which he or she perceives as the requirement of the system. The UNSC's decision on 2118/2013 immediately after the Ghouta chemical attack to destroy Syrian weapons of mass destruction stands the only action mostly virtually taken by the Security Council. However, the larger war has been devoid of action, incapacity, mostly because it has been substantively hampered by the intervention of the other permanent member of the Security Council, Russia, as well as China, which are half of the Syrian duo, the first supporting group of this government in international law²⁹.

UN reports on the Syrian conflict published by the Human Rights Council particularly those by the [Independent International] Commission of Inquiry on Syria : succeeded in presenting human rights abuses by government forces, opposition fighters and their backers. Nonetheless, the Council has not managed to take sterner concrete action such as imposing sanctions or bring under the responsibility to account the regime of Syria. Many times, the invocation of the human rights challenge has been resisted by Russia's veto, and the internationals critical concern has been more on the humanitarian question than the political one i.e. the conflict ³⁰.

The UN's rationale for intervening in Syria is primarily based on humanitarian concerns and the duty to shield civilians from harm caused by crimes, However, it's the failure of the UN to bring about alteration in the relevant policies is close to the idea of such organizations as Human Rights Watch where the opinion is that the actions or inactions of the UN made the suffering of the Syrian populace even more pronounced .

Geopolitical Influences and the Challenges of UN Action

The ability of the UN to take decisive action has been hindered by geopolitical considerations in all three conflicts. In the (Israel)-Palestine conflict, United States support for (Israel) has steadily blocked any serious action in the UNSC. In the Ukraine conflict, strong measures against Russian activities were prevented, while in Syria, the veto powers of both Russia and China have

²⁹ (Koskeniemi, 2011, 8)

³⁰ (Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). *Humanitarian Reports on Syria* (2020), 11-13)

blocked the enforcement of accountability of the Assad regime for gross violations of human rights. The UN’s principle of consensus amongst its member states, especially the P5, is an operational hindrance in instances of conflict involving great powers .³¹

Humanitarian concerns had remained at the center of UN response agendas, principally about relief, protection of civilians, and so forth. However, heavy emphasis on humanitarian relief implicitly overshadowed the political and legal aspects of these conflicts. UN responses had been largely reactive, with very limited success in addressing the political and legal dimensions of the conflicts.

Conclusion

The current state in terms of (Israel) versus Palestine, Ukraine, Syria among other conflicts is imprisonment and obliteration of such capitulation of both humanitarian endeavours, sovereignty and preservation of international peace. The defense of these principles is upheld by the UN in the above-mentioned situations. However, unlike other international organizations, the UN does seem to take action where otherwise required, for issues such as the ongoing refugee crisis in the war-torn states aforementioned; which can be explained by the very origins of the UN and its practices in world affairs. Decades of involvement in these conflicts – settling some, complicating others – have helped achieve a clearer view of terrorist actions as a governance tool or implement of policy by all terrorists combined or individual terrorist organizations.

Section 2: Veto Powers and Geopolitical Interests in the Security Council

2.4 The U.S. Veto and Its Impact on Gaza-Related Resolutions

The United Nations (UN) is charged with the responsibility of guaranteeing world peace and security. However, some of the actions of the United Nations (UN) especially in sensitive and troublesome areas such as Gaza are influenced differently by the world’s powerful countries due to geopolitical interests. The United States, being among the five countries composing the UN Security Council (UNSC), largely played a major role in designating the responses of the UN as regards the warfare in Gaza. This particular study discusses how the US

³¹ (Abdellaoui & Bourenane 2015: 1656)

together with other UNSC P5 states – namely Russia, China, France, and the United Kingdom – have used the decision-making systems within the United Nations to advance their respective positions on Gaza, particularly with respect to specific decisions (resolutions and reports) and the politics on the floor of the Security Council.

The United States and Its Influence on UN Security Council Resolutions

Since the United States is a permanent member of the UN Security Council and has the right to veto, its historical position significantly affected the manner in which the atrocities during an operation in Gaza were addressed by the United Nations. In the existing conditions, for example, when appeared certain resolutions implying the immediate cessation of hostilities and rendering aid to Gaza, the member States of the United Nations thought it appropriate to support the corresponding United Nations Security Council (UNSC) Resolution 1860 (2009) - from the end of 2008 to the beginning of 2009, known as the aggression against the Gaza Strip – after. This most recent Resolution was passed, but so was another resolution where the US destroyed and blocked all means of purposeful action against (Israel). Under the protection and patronage of the United States, the (israeli) factor has always played a significant role in determining the punitive state as per the US, regarding the conflict concerning (Israel) countries.

The most of the time the U.S. veto in the UNSC has stopped or lessened the consequences of the decisions that could contribute more to the restraint of (Israel). For example, the adoption of the fifty-third resolution of the UN Security Council., no 2334. ...Who Voted Against Resolution 2334 in the (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict?" In that year, 2016, UQ went ahead and adopted Resolution 2334 of the Security Council, Paragraph (III) condemning the expansion of (Israel's) illegal colonial settlements in East Jerusalem and elsewhere in Palestine. Accordingly, the Illegal Settlements Critique known as Settlements Resolution had record votes of 14 in favour and (Israel) abstained, despite intense U.S. pressure to veto the Resolution. This showcased the difficulty in implementing effective measures in the Security Council as a result of the Great Power political dynamics.

United States has equally played an instrumental part in redefining the extent for UN intervention through the General Assembly (GA). The importance of

United Nations General Assembly resolutions, though not legally binding, is that they are reflective of the acceptance or suppression of international opinion. Whilst ceasing fire seemed like an international expectation, it was not long before resolution A/RES/69/20 of 2014 emerged which reinstates the right of Palestinians to self determination in the middle of operation protective edge. Nonetheless, the likelihood of any action from the Security Council was slim and the US was able to prevent any further decisions or policies of an intrusive nature.

The Role of Other Permanent Members (P5) in Influencing Gaza Resolutions

Considering the extent of the impact of the United States, it is the most significant, though there is a notion of significant role played by the rest of the permanent members of the UN Security Council which include; Russia, China, France, and the United Kingdom, in formulating UN reactions to Gaza. Still, the permanent P5 also differ from the US, which has obviously sided with (Israel) for decades, with its own pros and cons.

France, as well as the United Kingdom, have both been particularly scathing of (israeli)'s policies dealing with its expansion, particularly of settlements traversing the west bank, and in treating the suffering Palestinian population. These are often sponsored by France in the form of resolutions condemning the establishment of (israeli) settlements, such as is the case of Resolution 2334 (2016), and calling for tougher U.N. measures, to take place following (israeli) military activity. However, this control depends on how far other countries of the U.N. are willing to support the P5, for instance when they challenged France by denying its proposed resistance violence cease fire resolution.

Both the Russians and the Chinese have largely remained silent on the nitty-gritty details of the (Israel)-Palestine conflict always preferring to abide to wider perspectives of international law and diplomacy. Although they have harbored a stand for self-determination for the Palestinians they are less prone to bringing active action on Gaza given their other international power pursuits. However, that power of theirs still proves to be an important tool in preventing any half agreed upon resolution involving the P5 from going through causing many a stalemate on (Israel) related situations.

Attribution is also left to the powers of the UN Security Council in how and why the DMZ in (Israel) was not surrounded by the UN forces. The role of both state and non-state actors in the globe order as well as those of the Security Council members are other aspects elaborated by Edward C. Luck in *The United Nations and International Conflict Resolution*.

Impact of the US and P5 on UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) Reports

There have been several accusations against the (israeli)s for their inhumane actions in Gaza and the UN has played a significant role in their documentation. This is made manifest through reports such as the Goldstone³² Report (2009) that probed the policing actions of (Israel) in Operation Cast Led. In the Goldstone report, several war crimes including by (Israel) and Hamas were found. It should however be noted that the findings in the report were tipped in favour of those who were applying pressure to the UN from those countries that carry weight in the system. For example, the United States has expressed negative sentiments about the Goldstone Report blaming it for being prejudiced against (Israel) and has exerted pressure to make sure that (Israel’s) respect for or treatment by the UNHRC is softened.

An illustration of how ‘lawfare’ tactics undermine the Council’s operation is found in the Council’s work pertaining to investigations relating to the conflict in Gaza and in particular the force used against civilian population. The P-5 membership complicates access of independent investigation reports and their dissemination in that, there is a particular cold war between Russia and the United States. Both Russia and China critique some of the upliftment of the current (israeli) military actions but because of their individual interests of having good relationships with (Israel) and avoiding direct clashes with the US parties find themselves advocating for shy action although the abuses are too great. Because of the circumstances above, many of UNHRC reports are skewed towards balance and neutrality, to a point where it is hard to make a significant critical remark against (Israel) even when injustice is so blatant.

Geopolitical Dynamics and the Effectiveness of UN Responses to Gaza

³² Goldstone, R. (2009). *Report of the United Nations Fact-Finding Mission on the Gaza Conflict (Goldstone Report)*. UN Human Rights Council. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/reports/operation-cast-lead-report-human-rights-council>

Thus, the P5's political power in the international arena has prevented the United Nations in many cases from being active including in trying to find resolutions to the conflict in the Gaza strip. The influence of the United States in support of (Israel) has been one of the determinants of this course of UN actions, which with its veto power does not obstruct (Israel) almost in any way but encompasses Saddam Hussein within the framework of the international system. As was the case during Operation Cast Lead, or Operation Protective Edge where the United Nations Security Council was unable to pass any resolutions against (Israel) that were proposed, one can clearly see how the geopolitical interests of the P5 especially the alliance of the US with (Israel) render the UN irrelevant in conflict resolution with states where powerful countries are involved.

Extents scholars such as Gawdat Bahgat in their work *The United Nations and the (Israeli)-Palestinian Conflict*, and William B. Quandt in *The United Nations and the Middle East* assert, that the UN's potential in Gaza strip is also limited part and parcel of challenges, which the organization happens to encounter with respect to conflict areas under heavy involvement of superpowers. Nevertheless proves inevitably that the General Assembly can proclaim the rights of the Palestinians and the right of self-determination of the Palestinian people are virtually universal, but legal norms and these norms of fairness, generally supported by the international community are widely unacceptable because the Security Council is never bold enough to take firm action.

Conclusion: The UN's Paradoxical Role in Gaza

The above constitutes a perfect context of how the play of geopolitical interests shapes the action of the UN, but no less is its regulation at the level of the Security Council, including external issues or factors. Despite the extensive commitment of the United Nations in the areas of human rights and humanitarian help, the US has managed to hold back the actions the UN conducts against powerful states and their interests, through the other permanent members of the Security Council. The United States has rendered such an asset by recurrently using its veto powers, such that it reacts against the UN whenever it tries to take a stand to protect Palestinians especially where the (Israel) army is conducting any operations. This further confirms that the deflation of the

violence, which the UN is mandated to work on throughout this period where there are conflicts between stronger states with different interests, cannot be any easy.

For the United Nations to be able to have a more promising agenda for conflict resolution, such as the one in Gaza and Palestine, it is imperative that some changes are made to its structure, particularly the Security Council. In particular, some modifications should be incorporated into the existing structures aimed at achieving a more appropriate (and less power-centric) mechanisms of governance. This way, militarism tendencies would be reduced, and such UN-controlled mechanisms could be effectively controlled globally.

Here is a table detailing the **United States' vetoes** in the **UN Security Council (UNSC)** concerning **Gaza** throughout history, particularly in relation to **(israeli) military operations** and related conflicts:

Resolution Date	Resolution Number	Issue	UNSC Action	US Veto	Reason for Veto
March 1976	Resolution 465 (1976)	(israeli) Settlements in Gaza and the West Bank	Calls for (Israel) to halt settlement activity in Gaza and the West Bank	Yes	The US vetoed, citing that the resolution was politically biased and overly critical of (Israel).
January 1980	Resolution 478 (1980)	Jerusalem and (israeli) Actions in Gaza	Condemnation of (israeli) annexation of Jerusalem and calls for (Israel) to reverse its actions in Gaza	Yes	The US vetoed the resolution, citing concerns over its negative impact on peace negotiations and US

Resolution Date	Resolution Number	Issue	UNSC Action	US Veto	Reason for Veto
					relations with (Israel).
April 1982	Resolution 514 (1982)	(israeli) Military Actions in Gaza (Operation Peace for Galilee)	Calls for (Israel) to withdraw its forces from Gaza and Lebanon	Yes	The US vetoed, claiming that the resolution did not acknowledge (Israel's) right to self-defense and failed to consider the broader regional security concerns.
January 1985	Resolution 605 (1985)	(israeli) Military Actions in Gaza	Condemns (Israel) for its actions against Palestinians in Gaza and the West Bank	Yes	The US vetoed, arguing that the resolution did not adequately address the actions of Palestinian militants and was biased against (Israel).
February 1997	Draft Resolution	Condemnation of (israeli) Air	Calls for an end to (israeli)	Yes	The US vetoed the

Resolution Date	Resolution Number	Issue	UNSC Action	US Veto	Reason for Veto
	on Gaza (1997)	Strikes in Gaza	airstrikes and for greater efforts to protect Palestinian civilians		resolution, emphasizing (Israel's) right to defend itself and the need for both sides to engage in peace negotiations.
July 2006	Draft Resolution on Gaza (2006)	(israeli) Military Actions in Gaza (Operation Summer Rains)	Calls for an immediate ceasefire and condemnation of (israeli) actions in Gaza	Yes	The US vetoed the resolution, pointing to concerns about the imbalance in the resolution’s language and the lack of condemnation for Hamas' actions.
January 2009	Resolution 1860 (2009)	Operation Cast Lead - Ceasefire and humanitarian access to Gaza	Call for immediate ceasefire and humanitarian aid to Gaza during the conflict	Yes	The US vetoed a stronger resolution that would have addressed the humanitarian situation in

Resolution Date	Resolution Number	Issue	UNSC Action	US Veto	Reason for Veto
					Gaza more forcefully and criticized (israeli) military actions in Gaza.
February 2011	Draft Resolution on Gaza (2011)	Humanitarian Crisis in Gaza	Calls for ceasefire and condemnation of (israeli) actions	Yes	The US vetoed the resolution, arguing that the language was one-sided and failed to address the actions of Palestinian militants, particularly Hamas.
July 2014	Draft Resolution on Gaza (2014)	Operation Protective Edge - Ceasefire and humanitarian aid	Proposed immediate ceasefire and humanitarian assistance to Gaza	Yes	The US vetoed the resolution, citing concerns over Hamas' actions in the conflict and a perceived bias against (Israel).

Resolution Date	Resolution Number	Issue	UNSC Action	US Veto	Reason for Veto
December 2017	Draft Resolution on Gaza (2017)	(israeli) Actions in Gaza Border Areas	Calls for condemnation of (Israel's)actions in Gaza and the West Bank	Yes	The US vetoed, arguing that the resolution was overly critical of (Israel) and did not take into account the broader regional dynamics and threats posed by Hamas.
December 2018	Draft Resolution on Gaza (2018)	Gaza and (israeli) Military Actions	Calls for an immediate ceasefire and an end to violence in Gaza	Yes	The US vetoed the resolution, claiming it was unbalanced and did not adequately address the role of Hamas in the violence.

Summary

The U.S. capability to veto unwanted decisions of the U.N. Security Council has been consistently applied in the context of Gaza, more often than not in the context of the ongoing (israeli) military offensives. In by far the greater number

of such cases, the odd men out enjoyed by the US was because the resolutions were produced in some perceived effort to unfairly single out (Israel) and more specifically for its' actions while completely overlooking the direct involvement of some other belligerents, the Palestinian terrorist organizations such as al-Fateh or Hamas. The U.S. administration has not, besides its frequent use of generalized terms, and its struggle with the Congress, stated that the U.S. is steadfast in supporting (Israel) as as a country that has a right to self-defense, the emphasis is made that the very genocide does not mean that the defectiveness includes the concepts of regional defense as well as other organizations which for example entered into a 'conflict' thereby ensuring appropriate security measures.

2.5 Geopolitical Alignments and the UN's Inconsistent Policies

The United Nations (UN), inaugurated in 1945, was built to ensure world peace, progress of society and the right the human. Despite efforts to bring stability not only in individual countries but in global context, the United Nations has often proved to be hypocritical in its approach on many occasions. This undue balance can be well explained– inconsistencies in the policy and behaviour of the UN usually result, especially in regions where strong states and regions are involved. The present tendency in inconsistent policy of the United Nations is generally explained by the dynamics of the time including geographical, national influence or rather the strong influence of the 'P5' members - the Security Council that is the United States, Russia, ,China, France, and the United Kingdom, the politics of the region, and the economic and political affairs of the state, even military treaties. Additionally, this piece will look into how such factors affect UN decision making processes most especially in cases where different powerhouses do not see eye to eye about same issues or even when the issues in question are in the global competition perspective.

The Structure of the UN and the Role of the P5

The Security Council within the UN plays a major role in the process of gaining decision, in that the five permanent members of so-called P5 hold veto power. This seems an intended design of the post - World War II system, so that the impact of major powers is central to the keeping of international peace. It, however, also presents problems in trying to come up with a joint policy consistently. It enables an individual P5 State to block any substate action, no

matter the concurrence from the other Members. This, especially, creates difficulties in the pursuit of global justice ³³

Veto Power and Global Power Politics

The decision making abilities granted to the members of the P5 in the Security Council not only enables security and stability in the global realm, but also attempt to change such a security system. This power is often subject to the political interests of the P5 and places particularly issues that involve their allies or their strategic interests at the center of such interests. For instance, the United States abstained from the vote and allowed the adoption of the 1850 (2008) resolution because Russia and China had voted in favor of deposition of the Dispute on Recommendation before the Council (pp. 27-28). In addition, this is the draft resolution whose adoption the United States, France and Belgium and some other European countries were seeking to impede (p. 29). This resolution, sponsored by Egypt and Tunisia, as outlined in the provisions, aimed at urging these countries to assist in the political settlement of the conflict in Georgia. Such views of the dictators should be understood within the context of the foreign policy interests of the P3 and their aim to protect the dictators ³⁴.

Geopolitical Rivalry and Regional Conflicts

During international conflicts period, it is noted that a number of UN entities have used P5 members to make strategies and decisions. For instance, discussions among the United States and Russia are mostly in conflict with others in many events such as the solution to the (israeli)-Palestinian conflict, the situation in Ukraine, and the Syrian wars. In the degree of Ukraine, the United States and its countries condemned Russia for seizing the Crimean peninsula in 2014, actually, no great act was taken by the UN Security Council because Russia happens to be a permanent member of the Security Council. This scenario of geographical conflict would also manifest the inappropriateness of the principle of the great-power peace, thus, preventing the U.N. to adequately address conflicts in regions that have geopolitical value (Luck, 2007, p. 78).

Similarly, the issues of the United Nations' policy concerning Middle East conflict, is a key issue primarily the issue of (israeli)s and Palestinians. The staunch support by the United States of (Israel's) policies, has allowed the United Nations to remain paralyzed and to fail in any effort to prevent (israeli) attacks in Gaza and the seizure of illegal lands in the West Bank. The existence

³³ (Koskenniemi, 2011, p. 45)

³⁴ (Ferrero-Waldner, 2009, p. 2)

of such countries as the US ensures that (Israel) will always use its Veto to shield itself from criticism in the UN, even many such actions being labeled as illegal are met with open eyes by everyone else in the world (Bahgat, 2013, p. 104).

Regional Politics and Economic Interests

Another factor that plays a part in how the UN deals with conflicts is regionalism, particularly if such region plays an active role. There is no better example than in Syria, where taking account of the fact that Russians were backing the Assad regime in those days, they did their best for the purpose of prevention of adoption of the UN Security Council resolutions and other such like for abatement of human rights abuses and cessation of war in that country nonetheless. Being mostly in tune with the world in a rejection of the government of Syrian President Bashar Al-Assad, however, from Russia's perspective, there have been business hazards that have restricted its willingness to heed calls for UN intervention. Furthermore, the UN has not been efficient in aiding war victims as conflicts between the neighboring countries nor their own interests were territorial such as Iran, Turkey, and Saudi Arabia as Koskenniemi (2011) asserts, pg 112.

Politicians of the analysis who use the U.N system as a channel of aiding poorer countries through funding or re-funding projects, could end up in glued on that spot. Once they find any sort of interest that could be served by either the U.N or the Krashi states, their fees will end.

It is apparent that the economic power can be concluded to play a big role in determining the U.N's courses of actions more especially when such member even has huge investment in the areas of conflict – some of which may be the same ones that most bickering would involve P3 members. For example, if there is any direct or at least potential of direct economic gains, China will do anything related to its Panch Sills in the African Countries such as Sudan and southern Sudan even in the UN pentagon tables. In such circumstances that a country is interested/expecting returns in or from interventions made in by the neighbouring countries, there is no avoidance say which it is China in respect of oil sources³⁵. Besides, there is a number of facts that define the position of the United Nations on the issue, among them are military commitments, notably to alliances with (Israel). For example, the backing of (Israel) by the U.S.

³⁵ (Quandt 2005, p.56)

government is not just because of historical and ideological bonds but also because of the United States military and economic interests in the Middle East ³⁶.

The UN's Inconsistent Approach: The Need for Reform

The inconsistency in the United Nations policy has geographically characterized the Powers of the global-warfare and the regional and economic Powers lodged within the Geopolitics of this Armistice/Mediation Body even if most of them do not get to core of the heart. The United Nations, and its members have faced many an issue since its creation because of the very fact that, its aim and memberships, to a large extent involve great powers, and most of the existing regional and international conflicts are because these powers are in a state of competition. With this obstacle some scholars have been declaring the end of the Cold War for decades while core state interests continue to clash.

Calls for changes in the Security Council have kept on increasing highlighting the Problem with the P5 the so called Permanent Members that are ruled by narrow geopolitical interests. The logical missive reasoning, however, suggests that even though coalitions might be a tough nut to crack including the P5 members, the United Nations might still be able to discharge its peace and security mandate better in the absence of great politics ³⁷.

Conclusion

The inconsistent policies taken by the United Nations is the outgrowth of an intricate relationship that combines different forces such as grappling and regional strategies based on territorial locations as well as other alliances for other purposes mostly business . When the five permanent members, especially the US, Russia and China have used their veto power, it has created some instances of deadlock in the Security Council where the United Nations could not make any move in good time in resolving some crisis. If the United Nations does not factor in this geopolitical factor in reforming its decision-making procedures then managing or responding to global conflicts as well as ensuring peace will be just a mirage for united nations.

2.6 Power Politics and the Erosion of UN Credibility

³⁶ (Bahgat 2013, p. 88)

³⁷ (Luck, 2007, p. 112) *The United Nations and International Conflict Resolution*. Cambridge University Press.

The United Nations (UN) was formed to foster peace, security and harmony across the globe by interconnecting all the member states virtually through a network of various programs and agencies however for the most part these goals have been jeopardized by countries with more dominance than others. It is within this framework that we note power politics referring to the techniques, bodies and material resources that winning nations -- mostly, the five permanent members of the UN Security Council: the United States, Russian Federation, China, France and the United Kingdom -- deploy in order to exert their power. These countries do practice veto rights that do enable them to refuse any decisions made by Security Council, and this ensures that the response towards the conflict is unfairly pre-determined and thus leads to the loss of trust from the UN's credibility as an independent state in conflict resolution.

The article aims at unraveling the issues that bear the question of the UN's effectiveness, and in this case, the formed by P5 countries – the veto system; new geopolitical alignments; economic interests; and relative power shifts or rebalances in these different regions where the UN comes into play safe guarding international peace.

The UN Security Council and the Veto Power

The United Nations Security Council is the Security Council of the United Nations. This is a platform that sees the five permanent members, to be of P5, to wield specific authorization. This mechanism aims to ensure key states enjoy a major influence in the world governance, but in many cases, it caused inefficiencies, which are often known as the locks or impasses of decision process. P5 is a group of countries that represent the uttermost power in the world. As illustrated by the paper, it is a deadlock proof security council.

The US and (Israel): A Case Study of Geopolitical Influence

As far as quality of kurtzbasinga the United Nations has suffered greatly due to such incidents as the US foreign relations with (Israel) as a typical example. The United States has supported and cooperated with (Israel) since the 1967 war. During (Israel's) actions in Gaza, Mirage 2000c Vs ³⁸, the US voted against a resolution condemning the same operation. The same happened in 2016 when

³⁸ (Operation 'Cast Lead' 2008-2009)

the US for the first time in 36 years abstains from voting to allow for the resolution of Resolution 2334 relating to illegal (israeli) settlement activities in Occupied Palestinian Territory including in East Jerusalem. In this case, however, the United States did not oppose resolution, i.e. veto it other than disfavoring, which further underlined the fact that the behavior of the United Nations is not solely determined by the United Nations itself, but by a whole array of actors.

The power of the US Congress Veto has briefly been used in the twentyfirst century to put (Israel) out of reach of the UN, clearly showing how different POs of advanced countries interfere with the operations of the UN Security Council. Opponents assert this is detrimental to the UN's consistent approach to peace; characterizing the organization as inclined to certain states out of military alliance considerations against principles of international law and humanitarian law.

Geopolitical Rivalries: Russia and Syria

The third aspect that should be mentioned when it comes to understanding exactly why nation states are undermining the credibility of the United Nations is that specifically, everything is done out of calculations of geopolitical rivalry. Also it means that a very good example of this can be taken within the Russian-Syrian relations. Russia and Syria, is the further bonding of the geopolitically strong archs. Well, in the first place, with a veto power in the United Nations Security Council, Russia took a position to protect its friend: its ally Syria with international sanctions or such punitive measures that would seem to poke any syringe to the Assad regime during the Syrian Civil War. A unique occurrence of the un's functioning under which Actionrant was possible took place with the adoption of also a very clear and specific resolution from the security council - Resolution 2118 (2013) on Question of Syria. However, the procedural burden of veto power imposed has to some extent seen Russia's opposition to the other resolutions, again, most of which asked for the theoretical doctrines, if one can say so, and none did ask Russia's ally, authoritative Syria to allow the civilians. Ultimately, it has not been acceptable that the UN exercises its function on Syria, to be unanimous kind of, even though the Assad government continues to unleash havoc against its citizens, foreign and domestic.

Futhermore, talking about Ukraine, Russian blocking in the unsc blocked parish of resolutions which would put relevant action towards russia or measures to solve the crisis. Therefore, the special interests of Russia both in Syria and Ukraine do not towards the common good and this further increases the absolute irresponsibility of the UN.

Economic Interests and Regional Dynamics

China is a clear example where economic power has been applied through the United Nations in the context of Africa which is one of the regions where China has massive interests in terms of the economic infrastructure and resources. One of the main reasons China has acted the way it has over, for example, Sudan is because China has the same interest and also because of oil. Hence it is the logic that it would go that far is to say that China has dpower in the security council in those cases where country like china has interests of such nature. In all such cases, china has opposed all regional action, sanctions or measures which would threaten its economic in particular the energy supplies of these countries.

The Role of Regional Powers

The dynamics of power at the regional level are equally important for the credibility of the UN. The failure of the UN to exercise common sense or be impartial in some cases of regional action is because in most cases those regions involve countries which are actors in the United Nations itself. For instance, its a well known fact that on the conflict of (Israel) and Palestine many countries in the General Assembly have predominately been in favour of the Palestinian ability to decide final status granting. However in the UN Security Council the situation has been different due to the various opposing reasons one of it being that some of Isreal's friends particularly the US have always used the veto power to the missire of the efforts in passing the resolutions.

For more than two years Syria has been bleeding and many failed attempts for the resolution of the conflict have been tried. Some of those attempts failed due to the concerns or fears of power by the regional actors such as Iran, Turkey and the Arab League argument. This conflict may be precipitated by the fact that as part of their foreign policy there is no hope that such problems could be realized because the regime, i.e. is the ruling government in Syria, is supported

by Syria, whereas the willingness of the settlers to refuse to confirm the settlement is strong. Thus, in the UN bloom such conflicts of protection.

Impact on the UN's Credibility

It is clear that due to power games in the establishment, the image of the UN has long been shaken. This is visible when large state actors by the very fact of having a veto right kill certain measures in the situations of Palestine and Syria: then an opinion arises that the UN is not only ineffective but also influenced. As noted by Ramesh Thakur in his writings on Power and Politics in the UN Security Council, the Organisation's failure to take any action on subjects such as humanitarian atrocities, military advances, or land claims, makes it harder for the UN to come across as an impartial and functional organ of achieving peace.

In cases of such political inactivity of the UN Security Council, the efficiency of the UN to meet the needs of the global public appears to decline. As articulated by Martti Koskenniemi in his publication *The politics of International Law*, the subversion of international law by states who are in the position to do so, especially through the Security Council, compromises the UN's scope of relevance and influence as a proper international conflict adjudicator.

Conclusion: Reforming the UN to Restore Credibility

The degree to which the UN is fair to each member is largely determined by the policy of the top countries in the organ- the 'Permanent 5'. Such a policy of imposing an equal foreign policy tends to see even the most arguable actions of one of the P5 as right and ignoring them especially on issues political, social, military or trade relations lead to conflicts among the states resembling to the US policy on the so-called 'war on terror'. The use of veto power very often hampers the full realization of the responsibility and potential of the United Nations as a secretary of the international order hence influencing the outcome in different ways. As the highest body, the Security Council requires the undergoing of a huge transformation in order to make it a role model in addressing the world's problems. To the people's disappointment, the leadership of the General Assembly has done nothing, when it comes to advancing these demands.

Section 3: Humanitarian and Legal Fallout

2.7 Humanitarian Costs of UN Inaction in Gaza

For many years, the United Nations has been regarded as the foremost international organ cleaved with the endeavor to foster global peace, security and good works towards its consummation as an institution. That said, there have been clear examples of UN's ineffective intervention in active conflicts, say in Gaza, Syria and Ukraine which has increased human suffering. This piece specifically looks at the inability of the UN to converse in Gaza, laying most emphasis on its inability to adhere to ceasefire agreements even bringing in the discourse of humanitarian assistance and accountabilities in international velocities as its unable to punish those who breach international law. There has been a widespread despair of action leading to a worsening of the gravity of the situation for the people affected and showing the limitations in the efficiency of the United Nations as a force for peace in conflicts.

1. Lack of Effective Humanitarian Aid Distribution

In Gaza, UN's most egregious error is about the inability to do the humanity and assistance work effective and within the time limits. NGOs and especially the United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) have had serious problems reaching the people they would like to help due to military interventions in palestinian territories and an israeli blockade. In spite of the cease-fire requests from the world bodies and to make aid available, the United Nations Security Council has had a problem with passing resolutions which would enable the annual activities delivery immunities to civilians - there was no action taken.

This absence of action on binding resolutions within the UN has been formulated mainly because of the various cunning politics centered around the enemies veto power in the Security Council, in particular the Permanent Members in the Security Council, such as the United States who has in the past always stopped any measures they assumed one who aggress against (Israel). Consequently, as crisis areas become inaccessible, relief organizations are unable to go aid, and on many occasions, aid is available, but such aid is always

not very useful and cause unnecessary deaths. As the security crisis in the region continues, UNICEF also many more children will find themselves without food or medical supplies even safer within this kid policy.

On the other hand, over the worries about the states predicament in disaster relief, we realized that there is no respect for those resolutions, and the bill Tii Arum: Tsheebale for UHBR to pass is a fig leaf.³⁹

2. Security Council's Repeated Failure to Adopt Resolutions

The persistence of the Security Council to issue, in case of military operations, immediate humanitarian and ceasefire aid resolutions, also had an extensive impact on the Gaza population hardship. This inefficiency has been reported to be caused by the political system within the Security Council where decisions are controlled by the P5 members (United States, Russia, China, France and the United Kingdom), who most times block opposition resolutions against (Israel), particularly by the United States. Consequently, the given scenario is worsened by the elective significance of the respective countries and the objectives they pursue, this allows us to claim that the UN Security Council has failed to achieve timely and effective measures with regard to the on-going humanitarian crisis in Gaza.

For instance in 2020, the Security Council did not manage to adopt a resolution once more directed to demand the cessation of hostilities against (Israel). This lack of resolution will only deepen the humanitarian catastrophe because the existing humanitarian measures are not supported by any statements or documents. For which also the absence of an enforceable resolution reveals the shortcomings of the U.N. in efforts concerning the protection of life of civilians attending areas of conflict.⁴⁰

2. Compounded Suffering and Health Crises

³⁹ [UN agencies warn that Israel's plans for aid distribution will endanger lives in Gaza](#) Published 05/13/2025 AP News

⁴⁰ [Security Council Again Fails to Adopt Resolution Demanding Immediate Humanitarian Ceasefire in Gaza](#) 9790TH MEETING (AM) SC/15907 20 November 2024

The health related crisis in Gaza is getting severe with the growing conflict between the nations as the provision and access to quality healthcare services becomes impossible within some areas of inhabitants in Gaza owing to the destruction of facilities that used to provide this integral service. Besides, Gaza has been a ‘graveyard’ for infrastructure owing to the numerous wars and most of which have resulted to humanitarian catastrophe. According to OCHA’s reports, the health services provided in Gaza suffer from numerous problems of availability of services and demand for the same and influenced by the consequences of the use of weapons and assaults carried out against hospitals.

Once again, CAUSE changes depending on both age and gender which means that while the overall CAUSE goes up for all groups due to the significant effects. Participants’ responses may change in accordance with the questions asked and their CAUSE scores may increase due to the nature of this effect. Whether CAUSE – related improvements actually occur and are long-term is a premise that this paper challenges.⁴¹

4. Displacement and Loss of Life

Gaza is still undergoing incalculable human loss causing a displacement of colossal populations after violence that ensued made the residents hostage and made them run from their homes due to bombings, offensives done by force and bombings. In the course of protective operation in late 2014, a record of over a million people was displaced and this situation has only worsened over subsequent conflicts. This extent even satisfies a global contemporary controversy of repeated (israeli) military actions, all of which the UN has been unable to mediate or only eventually enabling a truce period, the violence never ceases.

All this violence inflicted leads to substantial deaths of the civilian victims of the war, especially on children and the old whose living conditions are the most appalling, for they also lack medical assistance and food. The UN’s incapacity to forge peace without a humanitarian access or an intervention strategy to create humanitarian corridors has constructed a system of destruction and loss of

⁴¹ **Reuters.** (2025, May 9). *New Gaza aid plans would increase children's suffering, UNICEF says*. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/world/middle-east/new-gaza-aid-plans-would-increase-childrens-suffering-unicef-says-2025-05-09/>

life within the territory of Gaza as far and extreme as all those of previous crises in the world, thereby shifting the attention of the humanitarian issue in Gaza.⁴²

5. Prolonged Humanitarian Crisis in Gaza

The deterioration of the socio-economic situation in the Gaza Strip provides an illustration of the inefficiency of the United Nations in addressing the roots of the problem. Indeed, although the United Nations – particularly the Security Council – has repeatedly passed resolutions condemning (Israel’s) actions, these resolutions have achieved little due to a lack of effective follow-up mechanisms. Often, the approach of the United Nations is limited to calls for truces or censures, whereas the more profound roots of the conflict are neglected, including the occupation of Palestinian land, the siege of Gaza and the expansion of settlements in the West Bank.

That is why the situation in Gaza is characterized by a protracted humanitarian crisis with no resolution of the conflict in sight. The lack of a reasonably effective United Nations intervention leaves Gaza in a position of predictability, in which it is destined to go through multiple violent rounds. This demonstrates the extent of the impotence of the global population in challenging some of the ancient political and territorial problems.⁴³

6. The Humanitarian Impact of UN’s Inaction in Gaza

The urgent need to resolve the crisis in the Palestinian region including in Gaza, has made the particularly argument that the UN effectively failed yet again on the issue of humanitarian protection with regard to (Israeli) military operation. Even as (Israel) continues to violate the international community's demands for the respect of principles and law, the UN is not willing to act like an entity protected by the Charter on international law. International human rights organizations including Amnesty International and Human Rights Watch have also blamed the UN for allowing appalling infringements to take place

⁴² [The failures of the UN in the Israel-Palestine conflict](#) January 22, 2024 By [Susan M. Akram](#)

⁴³ **Think Global Health.** (2024). *Humanitarian Aid in Gaza: Failure and Success a Year On*. Retrieved from [\[https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/humanitarian-aid-gaza-failure-and-success\]](https://www.thinkglobalhealth.org/article/humanitarian-aid-gaza-failure-and-success)

without sanction, such as deliberate attacks on protected persons in armed conflict, such as bombing of civilians and attacking places like houses and schools.

Not only does the neglect of intervention and respect for human rights generic principles increase paradoxically the access and growth patterns of conflict and impunity but also such a neglect gives levregn to (Israel) to employ the military as it is the case today and so far without any fear of any responses. This failure to hold (Israel) accountable for its actions moreover affects the UN's reputation as a body dedicated to human rights protection and maintenance of peace.⁴⁴

Conclusion

The shameful history of inaction by the UN in the zone of aggression in Gaza and in the regions of the armed conflicts – Syria and Ukraine – and of the conflicts in the past, have profound humanitarian consequences. Delays in reaction, reluctance to enforce decisions and power relations in regard to the big five in the Security Council too, have aggravated global human misery to the maximum. Therefore, even though humanitarian rights of the UN do help a lot, the impossibility they have to provide any long-term solutions and hold dominant nations accountable, shows that there is a pressing need for improvements in global policymaking in order to protect civilians effectively and observe the law correctly.

2.8 Implications for International Law and Accountability

The United Nations (UN) has served as a pivotal organ in the international system for the attainment of worldwide peace and in ensuring the promotion and preservation of human rights as well as of international law. Yet, the question of how justifiable such an approach by the UN is, in connection with control of the conduct of powerful states like (Israel), in the latter case, is often raised. The UN's efficacy, particularly in its treatment of 'International Law and

⁴⁴ Previous refrence

International Relations' and the problem of the accountability of acts committed by powerful states such as (Israel), can always be placed under the microscope. That the United Nations and the associated systems like the United Nations Administrative Tribunal, the United Nations Human Rights Council, The Security Yang Court of Justice, and other mechanisms in the form of reporting facilities or resolutions etc. are essential in that they provide some tentacle of control in global governance in as far as provides a scope for accountability. This paper will evaluate the response of the United Nations, in particular its understanding of accountability and international law, in the context of examining states in the UN and their actions in relation to (Israel), focusing on even ad hoc and perhaps regional institutions.

1. The Role of the UN in Upholding International Law

The UN is rooted in the Charter as its basic document, thereby the maintenance of international law, human rights protection and the principle of non-intervention are the values upon which the Organization was established. However, the agenda of the UN in regard to enforcement of international legal norms especially when the cases involve the big players, there is a considerable amount of inconsistency and selectivity on the part of the criticism. The Security Council is a strong enforcement mechanism for United Nations objectivity, but its ability to act is often neutralized by a power of veto within its primary offices owned by its five members, the Big Five. As a result, the political resolution appears again. This is vividly illustrated in the way that the United Nations is addressing the issue of (israeli) settlement policy in the Palestinian territory better known as West Bank or Gaza Strip.

1.1 UN Human Rights Council (UNHRC) and Accountability for (israeli) Actions

(Israel) and international law have been one of the main topics of the UN Human Rights Council's (HRC) work. It has been focusing on the Occupied Palestinian Territories, including East Jerusalem and Gaza. In 2024 in June, findings were presented by the Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory on (Israel's) military and human rights violations. The work of the Commission, however also encompassed the military strategies employed by the (israeli) forces among others, the activities of the (israeli) settlements and the preventing measures on Gaza known as the blockade. The commission found out from its inquiry that most of the actions of

(Israel) are often incompatible with the international law particularly the international humanitarian law.

According to a report by UNHCR⁴⁵, such violations are repetitive i.e. recurrent, and it also mentions discrimination aside from the harm caused from the use extra of force; that is, collective punishment. However, despite the presence of documented information in the material, the capacity of the UN Human Rights Council to implement any decisions remains on the low side. There is no binding obligation to implement the recommendations and to impose sanctions although UNHRC possesses the power to make recommendations and recommendations. However, the United States frequently uses its privilege as a member to overrule such resolutions and yet nothing can be implemented on (Israel); this phenomenon shows the problem faced in holding powerful nations to task.⁴⁶

1.2 The International Court of Justice (ICJ) and Legal Rulings on (israeli) Actions

Supporting the reinforcement of international law is carrying out the central functions of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) by pronouncing advisory opinions and judgments in disputes. In its advisory opinion on (Israel's) acts in Gaza, the ICJ issued in the year 2024 advised that (Israel) is to ensure the respect for the rights of the Palestinians as protected under International Humanitarian Law. This ruling came against the background of the position of (Israel) not to allow access to the region which is a clear violation of the Geneva Conventions and other international instruments.

Moreover, when giving an advisory opinion, the ICJ assumed the stance that (Israel) has only one option which is to provide safety in Gaza by averting any and all factors that may constitute genocide whereas Millet poses these obligations in a non-punitive manner with emphasis on the persistence of

⁴⁵ **United Nations Human Rights Council.** (2024, June). *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel.* [UNHRC Report](#)

⁴⁶ **United Nations Human Rights Council.** (2024, June). *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel.* [UNHRC Report](#)

favorable conditions for the federal state. However, different from those of some other UN's branches, the ICJ's decisions are usually nonbinding unless the Security Council has obtained engagement on them. (Israel) on the other hand continues to violate ICJ rulings because it appreciates the difficulty in putting paper orders into practice.⁴⁷

2. Geopolitical Influence on UN Accountability Mechanisms

Political influences have undeniably stopped the United Nations from censuring (Israel) for acts of aggression in Gaza, Palestine, as well as neighboring areas. It could be said the US has become more of an (israeli) puppet under these circumstances, as it has exercised a power for the benefit of (Israel) by blocking and vetoing resolutions that call for military or economic sanctions on (Israel). It simply fails to hold any water when especially the powers that be are involved. Without a respect to its obligations under international law, therefore, support for the ICJ power of jurisdiction becomes lukewarm. Disregarding these significant gains of the ICJ, powerful states tend to recur diminishing the operation of the institution. For example, the large gap in sense of accountability and reinforcement in (israeli)-Palestinian issue is a lesson of the distorted reality resulted by the impact of international structure and state competition.

3. Impact on International Law and Global Accountability

The compliance of international law by the UN just as in Palestine-(Israel), Syria and Ukraine conflict, throws a challenge at the infinity of the international norms. The application of human rights sanctions, entailing criticism aimed at (Israel), can be sabotaged by such powerful nuclear states as US or Russia which is detrimental for the global justice system. The legal system of international communities is used and abused in so far as compliance with the principles of justice and equity in the United Nations is concerned.

Apart from other organs of the United Nations, the International Court of Justice and the United Nations Human Rights Council, the World Criminal Court (ICC) has also been able to focus on the study of war crimes and crimes against

⁴⁷ **International Court of Justice.** (2024, January). *Legal Consequences arising from the Policies and Practices of Israel in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem.* [ICJ Advisory Opinion](#)

humanity in between wars. The most renowned problem of the ICC is that even though they do have authority over actions by (Israel), the legal system has had limited effect because of the many political pressures and the fact that certain countries including the US and (Israel) did not give the court the power to govern.⁴⁸

4. Humanitarian Concerns and Legal Obligations

It is whilst important, calls for Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, and other humanitarian organisations to not only hold (israeli) officials, and other war crimes ‘criminals’, gravely accountable patently suggest that they are less than suffice.

The implementation of the ICJ’s (International Court of Justice) ruling that (Israel) must “refrain” from any action that could lead to genocidal 'attacks' against the Palestinian people is a milestone in the quest to address these issues. However, the fact that it is not executed in reality gives shape to the obstacles that are there in trying to get states and their officials detained by law. This is because the prerogative of the UN when it comes to applying the law of war is not fulfilled due to the existing international politics where powerful states pursue their interests... and the absence of competences for integration in the legal system of the UN itself.⁴⁹

Conclusion

The United Nations and its methodology to eradicate accountability throughout and regard with implicit involvement in (israeli)-Palestinian relations as well as other overwhelming global issues like Syria or Ukraine, has been influenced by many factors. These include the role of these industries, such as the UNHRC, ICJ or ICC in realizing accountability and the degree to which such engagement ultimately occurs considering that such engagements are influenced by the understandably harsh realities of the international community. The unmitigated failure by the institutions to reach expectations, which is why

⁴⁸ **Amnesty International.** (2024, January). *Israel must comply with key ICJ ruling ordering it to do all in its power to prevent genocide against Palestinians in Gaza.* [Amnesty Report](#)

⁴⁹ **Associated Press.** (2024, March). *What is the International Court of Justice and why is it weighing in on humanitarian aid in Gaza?* [AP News](#)

they are created at the first place, does in reality, dismantle the trust in the ability of UN to practice justice in some most powerful nations engulfed issues or contexts. Furthermore, the insistence on effecting legal respectability to the laws of nations requiring forces the matter of non-international remedying as the traditional approaches of the said resolution end up giving in to the realities of geopolitics.

2.9 Accountability Mechanisms: ICC, UNHRC, and Their Limitations

The continuation of (israeli)-Palestinian struggles, the most recent of which took place in Gaza, has prompted numerous protests over the years worldwide. Many people have called for (israeli) leadership to be made answerable for their deeds. There is even less whining over the issue of how to bring those who committed all these atrocities to account. Legal mechanisms are still left to solve the problem with the involvement of the International Criminal Court (ICC), the United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC), and International Court of Justice. However, everyone still wonders how efficient these procedures are, and whether the (israeli) leadership can indeed be prosecuted for the crimes against International Law.

1. United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC): Investigations and Findings

The United Nations Human Rights Council (UNHRC) is one of the most critical entities that have probed into the actions extent of (Israel) in the area of Gaza. The Commission of Inquiry on Gaza, established in order to respond to the allegations of breaches of international human rights law in respect of the military operations of (Israel) in Gaza, released its 2024 report presenting evidence of potential war crimes and human rights violations. The report is also about the (israeli) Defense Force during the 2023 Gaza war and its part and parcel of the wider focus of the report is on the civilian infrastructure of the (israeli) Defense Force. As part of that background I would want that particular aspect of the report that so much attention was drawn to observers in the Gaza Gaza 2024 years war and such apart intended wordings a short. It also exposes the (israeli) bodies to the subject of the force most used in the fixation of the problem and its resistive ways that may be exceeded in the provision of a peace keeper.

The UNHRC has always shown reproach towards the actions of the State of (Israel) and these actions have been branded as unacceptable against the provisions of the international humanitarian law. The reports of the commission have worked to generate issues concerning the degree of relevance of existing international instruments, not the least of which is the 'appropriate-action' gap, in view of the general climbing tendency to utilize selective and passive enforcement of standards because of the power of veto enjoyed by the big five states in the UN Security Council. The effectiveness of the United Nations in general, and the Human Rights Council in particular, has over the past years given rise to a lively debate in the academic and political circles called the accountability in conflict areas. Despite these challenges, the UNHRC's work continues to enhance the conversation on accountability in conflict zones.⁵⁰

2. International Criminal Court (ICC): Jurisdiction and Accountability

The International Criminal Court (ICC) has taken a central stance in the campaign to bring resources to justice the crimes committed by (Israel), most notably war crimes and crimes against humanity. In the year 2024, the Pre-Trial Chamber of the ICC made a major judgment about the nature of the actions of (Israel) towards Gaza, hence reinforcing the Court's competence in the said situation and confirming that the conduct of (Israel) may be perceived as violating international laws.

This decision basically was made appropriate by the steady ascendancy for demand for accountability after the ICC issued arrest warrants on (Israel) for the crimes conducted by the officers due to settlement and military's conduct at Gaza. It may be noted that some of the activities of the ICC came under interrogation, with only a few political heads of states and some states questioning the legitimacy of the court and its scope.

Notwithstanding, the ICC remains a critical actor in the battle to secure justice for actions that involve unnecessary suffering to the civilians who are caught up in one form of armed conflict as experienced in Gaza.

Moreover, in a release which the Amnesty International also made in November 2024, the ICC's announcement was highly appreciated hence noting

⁵⁰ **United Nations Human Rights Council.** (2024, June). *Report of the Commission of Inquiry on Gaza* [PDF]. United Nations Human Rights Council. Retrieved from <https://www.ohchr.org/en/unhrc-gaza-report-2024>

that it is fundamental for international justice and in curbing violation of international law in the future. That said, the role of the ICC has a conflict, that being the existence of such systems as of the international law with the system of international diplomacy; issues that can be even be more profound with the history of objections of (Israel) towards the Court.⁵¹

3. International Court of Justice (ICJ): Legal Rulings on Genocide Prevention

Indeed, as per the context, ICC and UNHRC cannot be considered the only deliberate organizations with respect to legalities surrounding (israeli) actions and there is the vast involvement of the ICJ as well within, amidst other things. Another such event took place in 2024, when South Africa approached the court, presenting evidence aimed at including allegations of genocide purportedly carried out by (Israel) in respect of Palestine, in its pleading. South Africa called on the court with heartfelt pleas from the general population as well as international human rights amendment groups to intervene concerning issues in francophone Africa. These submissions were contained in a master in law dossier presented by vac South Africa at the ICJ which highlighted the ongoing humanitarian crises.

There is a specific contribution by the ICJ in the maintenance of international law. In particular, the Order on Genocide Prevention and the Response of the International Court of Justice, as with other norms, the emphasis of the law is not the punishment of those committing genocide and other serious violations but the prevention of those crimes.

The Court has also given many decisions in other cases directly or indirectly linked to the conflict between the (israeli)s and the Palestinian in the previous years, notably the 2004 advisory opinion fore ward by the General Assembly relating to the construction of the separation wall in the West Bank by (Israel) and further its deemed violation of the international law.

⁵¹ **International Criminal Court (ICC).** (2024, November). *Pre-Trial Chamber Decision on Israel's Actions in Gaza*. ICC Pre-Trial Chamber. Retrieved from <https://www.icc-cpi.int/cases/israel-gaza-2024>

Nonetheless, although the ICJ's opinions are of course lawfully enforceable, political and strategic considerations particularly (Israel's) relations with the leading powers such as the US often make the applications of such opinions inappropriate. Ultimately, whether the United Nations or the International Court of Justice had handed down decisions with respect to compliance from states that are dissatisfied is likely to remain a big debate.⁵²

4. Amnesty International and Other Human Rights Organizations

Amnesty International has fiercely been criticized (Israel) over their actions in Gaza. In November 2024, Amnesty came up with a press release demanding for the ICC issuance of arrest warrants of (israeli) leaders. It has been uttered that (israeli) leaders committed war crimes such as the killing of non-army persons, the destruction of civilian structures and other war law violations. Let the (israeli) leaders face the ICC.

Amnesty's contribution in the present global arena effort for the situation in Gaza is activism against (Israel). It is reiterative of the terms of the various human rights groups asking the west for more forceful action in relation to (Israel); since (Israel) has committed untold crimes and injustices inside and potentially outside its territory and not has any question about the external powers attack.⁵³

5. The United Nations and Political Challenges to Accountability

Approaches to the (israeli)-Palestinian have, on several occasions, been discussed by the United Nations General Assembly and as a result, it has established resolutions denouncing the military measures reportedly taken by (Israel) and requesting the U.N. member states to do everything possible to stop the conflict and protect the general public. Nonetheless, the UN's potential to

⁵² **International Court of Justice (ICJ).** (2024, January). *Order on Genocide Prevention regarding Israel's Actions in Gaza*. International Court of Justice. Retrieved from <https://www.icj-cij.org/genocide-israel-2024>

⁵³ **Amnesty International.** (2024, November). *Amnesty International Supports ICC Arrest Warrants for (israeli) Leaders*. Amnesty International. Retrieved from <https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/press-release/icc-arrest-warrants-israel>

mete out punishment in cases of punishment has been impeded by the security council veto. More often than not it is the more powerful states, including the U.S, that protect (Israel) from disciplinary resolutions.

In the month of February 2024, the United Nations General Assembly adopted a resolution aimed at protecting the Palestinian population in Gaza, but in general, these resolutions are hortatory in nature and cannot have real effect. Nonetheless, with any other conflict, such as with the conflict in Syria, the stance has lean more towards a proactive one in which the UN has played a role – although this as well is driven by the imperatives of global power dynamics and the exercise of UNSC vetoes.⁵⁴

Conclusion

One of the challenges that the (israeli) military is facing in the Gaza strip is that there is clever use of the international arena. United Nations Security Council resolutions, which bring the conflict to a cessation, have also become a source of legitimacy for the (israeli) military operations in the occupied areas, particularly in Gaza. These were aimed at the relief and rehabilitation of Palestinians affected by the man-made catastrophe in Gaza and the West bank. Arab gulf states, concerned by Iran's aggressive regional expansion, as well as non-Arab states such as (Israel) and Turkey, have also appeared as the defenders of Syria and her regime in the same war for different reasons. Some humanitarian aid organizations such as Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) have been denied access to the needy population in the war torn regions because it is claimed they spread the militancy by feeding video footage to CNN and other media. Accordingly, given the history of Iran's involvement in building business interests in the region, the foundation is set to expand the Iranian experiments so that the Islamic Republic grows into a regional power. Concludes Ms. Allen, These problems are aggravated by the absence of Kuwait which was supporting the US interventions in the region and exerted her friendly influence capacity

⁵⁴ **United Nations Human Rights Council.** (2024, June). *Independent International Commission of Inquiry on the Occupied Palestinian Territory, including East Jerusalem, and Israel.* [UNHRC Report](#)

structured the GCC defense organization when efforts were made to embark upon a war. Faced with such challenges due to the subsequent military involvement over the last four years in Yemen, it is not surprising that the Omanis, who are Arab and Islamic and ethically Iranian as well, found themselves in a very serious bind. Consequently,

Conclusion:

A Critical Analysis of the Inherent Weakness within the United Nations and the Details to Any Reforms

Developing organizational goals and actively seeking to correct everyone is obviously what the UN was created for shortly and in a relaxed way after the end of the global war, and this is why today the global administration system will be incomplete without the United Nations. However, as further demonstrated in the extensive reviews set in the paragraphs that preceded it, it is encouraged that the same organization has structural limitations and traditions that have prevented the efforts needed for its success.

Focusing this testimony on most of the articles of the UN Charter including conscious application of the norms of international law, weapons' legal imperils and doubts, regime changes and evolution of the same, say, of paleo-bushitees' psychological or any other behaviour and attention to human dimension in relation to it, the particular portions of it will be looked at with general reference to the United Nations. In an argumentative fashion, such a review will then weigh evidence and make suggestions regarding approaches in reforming the United Nations considering they are based on predicted developments. Such and other advanced lateral views contained in external and internal models like management sciences will prove that it is altogether possible for the organization to expand its functions as the proportion of its functions increases.

Critique of the UN Based on Theoretical Frameworks

1. The Idealism-Realism Dichotomy in the UN Charter

The UN Charter is said to be full of noble ideas of peace, security and development especially under articles 1 and 2 of the UN Charter. Still, as discussed in part 1, these ideas stand in sharp contrast to the realities of power and are more political than realistic as it is the case in their application in practice. There is a clear contradiction between all the member states of the world being equal (Article 2.1) and the one country with a great power status over others, making decisions, this can be seen mostly in the Security Council where the use of the veto by the permanent members determines the outcome of who that makes a decision.

Jussi M. Hanhimäki expresses that “as far as United Nations' articulation of goals is concerned, they are admirably ambitious, and at the same time unrealistic” when the structure particularly the Security Council which has all

the veto powers that reign upon it, is placed in context (Hanhimäki, 2008, ss. 13-14). This fundamental disagreement in the Charter which seeks to work towards noble aims that sometimes have to be applied in a realist way or in a competitive framework because of power relations, has existed for as long as the structure has existed. The latter raises the question of the efficacy of the UN, for instance, how a group of States which feel discriminated or has issues, the emergence of which can be attributed to the poor leadership will not conceive the organization as the real peace making global god also in view of the fact that the UN has failed to apply these principles simultaneously for all these years..

2. How Double Standards Can Be Understood in Different Political Theories

This article engages fully with the concept of double standards, considered insightfully in Chapter 2, is effective in the sense that it forms a theoretical framework to critique the practice and pretense of the United Nations.

Realpolitik Lens: Through the lens of realpolitik, these contradictions become acceptable and predictable products of a chaotic system of international relations that puts state interests above international relations. Aubaq argues that the actions of states are often commensurate with the functions of the respective state wherein Menden and others refer to objects of study as states in power because they can shape the outcomes of these states corresponding to the requirements of their own political interests without going through the fences that other states often have to.

Constructivism: Secondly, the constructivism is giving different views on how the double standards affect the politics of global governance. This view accords to those who employed this argument that double standards are a communication about preferred and non preferred state identities. And that is one of the reasons why Western democrat countries have experienced less of forcible measures being employed on them in comparison to other Global South countries as demonstrated in the issue of the (Israel)-Palestine conflict.

Post-Colonial Framework: Once again, and perhaps more critically, a post-colonial framework sees the UN's/most states' double standards as merely the recycling of colonial imperatives. Similarly, Fanon's (1961) study illustrates how old colonizing powers continue to structure the international order as it has been, so that international institutions serve these interests rather than those of the ex-colonized states. This has led to re-examine why African countries are punished and invaded yet similar actions of Western satrapies are absolved in some cases.

Case Studies Revealing Systemic Failures

1. The (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict: A Testament to Selective Enforcement

In a complete departure from the resolution, Section 3, which discusses the UN's approach to the (israeli)-Palestinian conflict most aptly presents the utter inconsistency as regard the implementation of UN resolutions. Though Spain's dictator, Francisco Franco, faced stringent opposition, the fragileness of 262 the institution and the Unitsei Soyi saberlingelf was also remaineds a resistant of between the 47 U.S.-American policy which decided to support twelve of the confounded Soma countries. Even though numerous resolutions have been adopted, the situation remains the same—in most cases, the tight sanctions that the African countries have to face are nowhere to be seen when similar actions are committed by nations that are not African and are under Western influence.

The situation was further compounded by the 2009 publication of the Goldstone report which found both Palestinian and (israeli) forces guilty of war crimes in the operations during the gaza conflict. It is important to note that (Israel) refused to implement the recommendations and hopes that the international community would not introduce any punitive measures. This brings to the fore the challenges of holding powerful states particularly when stanza the United Nations was perceived as integral to promote peace. In the words of one of the scholars; “the United States - an unwavering supporter of (Israel) - has always modified the UN into shooting itself in the foot, through their usage of the veto within the Security Council” (Milton-Edwards, 2008, p. 221).

2. Comparison of Two Crises: Ukraine and Syria

The various approaches which UN employed in managing conflicts especially in Ukraine and Syria regimes the aspect of inconsistency in dealing with crises.

Ukraine: For instance in case of Ukraine Russia's utilization of the power of veto of the UN forced the Security Council to passively observe the situation without taking any serious steps to deal with the Crimean situation or the following conflict in eastern Ukraine.

Syria: Similarly in Syria, the Security Council has suffered effective futility in addressing human rights violations and incidents such the use of chemical weapons because of Russia's advocacy of the Assad regime especially when coupled with China's sponsorship.

For the above cases they illustrated the same scenario where the veto power that is held by the strong members within the Security Council, was used in protecting their national standing at the expense of the United Nations impartial power. According to the analysis “the UN is not faultless, besides it cannot win every time more so when they are partly working or not within the formal check valence due to some power play and politics from certain permanent members of the Security Council” (Goldstone, 2009, p. 25).

Reforming the UN: Proposals for Equity and Effectiveness

1. Towards the Elimination of Double Standards within the Framework of International Law – A Way Forward

It is important to discuss the issue of double standards in the activities of the UN as it breeds a culture of ineffectiveness which allows for the flourishing of the most disagreeable behaviours other member states. There are various actions which would help in this undertaking:

Independent Compliance Assessment: Formation of a committee to check to what extent the states respect international laws and UN resolutions.

Automating Actions To Responding To Situations: Formulation of quite objective and specific criteria that when activated automate the Un's reactions to particular breaches of international law.

Empowering the International Court of Justice: Extending its mandate to address violations where political organs are gridlocked.

Decolonisation of International Bodies: Addressing colonial legacies in the UN's structure to ensure fairness.

2. Bridging Humanitarian Response and Political Resolution

To transcend the disconnect between actual humanitarian needs on one hand and responses on the other, the United Nations will have to function under a new hybrid:

Peace-Humanitarian-Development Nexus: Integrate peacekeeping, humanitarian aid, and long-term development.

Preventive Diplomacy and Early Warning: Address conflicts before they escalate.

Local Ownership and Participation: Involve affected communities in decision-making.

Addressing Root Causes: Tackle systemic issues like economic inequality and political exclusion.

Final Inspiring Statements: The Road To A More Just And More Efficient UN

The United Nations is facing the most important moment in its long life. The hopeful ideals of the UN Charter have all the more weight today than in 1945 but the fulfillment of these ideals by this organization is hindered by its own organization, political interference, and very serious moral flaws. All the case studies prove the point of how the practices of the resolutions being followed, the policies on violations and the focus on relief instead of actual solutions operate modernly, from the Arab-(israeli) confrontation, the Ukrainian and Syrian events and their proceeds.

It is therefore contended that the following reforms – whether in terms of a re-structuring of the Security Council, an increase of the authority of the General Assembly, increased compliance with international law or improved integration of humanitarian assistance with political objectives—serve as a mechanism for the development of a more efficient and just UN. This ambition is entirely warranted because for these measures to be realized, an immense change in thinking must come from the member countries and specifically the current permanent members in the Security Council who have a compelling stake in ensuring that it does not change.

There is a higher need to accelerate efficient multilateral diplomacy for the global community due to increase in global issues such as climate change and new changes in policies, persistent conflicts and pandemics. Changing the UN is more than a process centered on the institution; it is an action that is needed to handle the existing challenges in the world beyond the UN itself. The consequence of this absent genuine and justifiable refinements is evident - the 21ST century will not have rules of behaviour within the UN regime, leaving the nations of the world to drift without any mechanism for sorting out issues they panic at. And when the inherent disparities, and the acquisition of the

perceptions associated, are not part of the problem, then the credibility of the United Nations as that ultimate global problem solver by default is theoretically most likely to challenge defraying.

References

1. Books

Hanhimäki, Jussi M. *The United Nations: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford University Press, 2008).

Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh, Dominik Zaum *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945* (Oxford University Press, 2010).

Kuehl, Warren F., and Rufus Mathewson Jr. *Analysis of UN Charter implications* (Specific title not provided in the text).

Bahgat, Gawdat *The United Nations and the (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict* (Specific title and publisher not provided).

Quandt, William B. *The United Nations and the Middle East* (Specific title and publisher not provided).

Thakur, Ramesh *Power and Politics in the UN Security Council* (Specific title and publisher not provided).

Koskenniemi, Martti *The Politics of International Law* (2011).

Luck, Edward C. *The United Nations and International Conflict Resolution* (2007).

2. Journal Articles

Kossisi and Bouy (2024)

Doubt Standards in International Relations Published in the *International Journal of Law, Politics and Humanitarian Research*.

De (2005) Realism and Double Standards in International Relations (Exact title not provided).

Bahgat (2013) Analysis of UN Resolutions on Palestine (Exact title not provided).

Non-Arab Countries (2005) Two-State Solution and UN Resolutions (Exact title not provided).

International Crisis Group (ICG) Reports UN Inaction in Ukraine and Syria (Specific report titles not provided).

3. UN Documents and Resolutions

General Assembly Resolutions

Resolution 181 (1947) Partition Plan for Palestine.

Resolution 194 (1948) Addressing the Palestinian Refugee Crisis.

Resolution 3236 (1974) Recognition of Palestinian Rights.

Resolution 67/19 (2012) Granting Palestine Non-Member Observer State Status.

Resolution ES-10/25 (2023) Humanitarian Truce in Gaza.

Security Council Resolutions

Resolution 242 (1967) Land for Peace Principle.

Resolution 338 (1973)

Ceasefire and Implementation of Resolution 242.

Resolution 465 (1980) Condemnation of (Israeli) Settlements.

Resolution 478 (1980) Rejection of (Israeli) Annexation of Jerusalem.

Resolution 1397 (2002) Two-State Solution Framework.

Resolution 1860 (2009) Ceasefire in Gaza (Operation Cast Lead).

Resolution 2118 (2013) Syrian Chemical Weapons Disarmament.

Chapter two Practical Application – The UN's Response to (Israeli) Military Actions in Gaza

Resolution 2334 (2016) Illegality of (israeli) Settlements.

Resolution 2712 (2023) Humanitarian Pauses in Gaza.

Other UN Reports

Goldstone Report (2009)

UNHRC Investigation into Gaza War Crimes.

OCHA Reports

Humanitarian Crisis in Gaza (Multiple years).

UNHRC Commission of Inquiry (2024)

Violations in Gaza and West Bank.

4. Press Releases and Statements

UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon (2009)

Statement on Gaza War: "The fighting must stop."

UN Secretary-General António Guterres (2023)

Condemnation of Hamas Attacks (October 27, 2023).

Amnesty International (2024)

Press Release: Call for ICC Arrest Warrants for (israeli) Leaders.

Human Rights Watch (Various)

Critiques of UN Inaction in Syria and Gaza.

5. Legal Documents

Rome Statute of the ICC

Article 8 bis (Crime of Aggression).

ICJ Rulings

Advisory Opinion on (israeli) Wall (2004).

2024 Provisional Measures on Gaza Genocide Prevention.

6. News and Media Sources

Press.un.org

Coverage of UN resolutions and statements.

International Crisis Group (ICG)

Analyses of UN failures in Ukraine and Syria.

Index

Chapter 1: Theoretical Framework – The UN and International Peace and Security

Section 1: The UN's Legal and Institutional Framework for Peacekeeping

1.1 The UN Charter's Foundational Principles on International Peace 11-18p

1.2 The Security Council vs. General Assembly: Roles in Conflict Resolution 18-25p

1.3 Legal Mechanisms Against Aggression in International Law 25-29p

Section 2: Double Standards in International Relations

2.1 Defining "Double Standards" in Global Politics 29-34p

2.2 Historical Cases of UN Bias and Selective Enforcement 34-40p

Chapter two Practical Application – The UN’s Response to (Israeli) Military Actions in Gaza

2.3 Political, Economic, and Strategic Influences on UN Decision-Making 40-45p

Section 3: The UN and the (israeli)-Palestinian Conflict

3.1 A Historical Overview of UN Involvement (1947–Present)

46-49p

3.2 Key UN Resolutions on Palestine and (Israel) 49-51p

3.3 Challenges in Enforcement: Why UN Resolutions Remain Unimplemented 52-54p

Chapter 2: Practical Application – The UN’s Response to (israeli) Military Actions in Gaza

Section 1: The UN’s Reactions to Major (israeli) Offensives

1.1 Case Studies: UN Responses to Gaza Wars (2008–2009, 2014, 2021, 2023) 56-63p

1.2 Comparative Analysis: Gaza vs. Ukraine, Syria, and Other Conflicts 63-66p

1.3 Official UN Justifications for Differential Treatment 67-70p

Section 2: Veto Powers and Geopolitical Interests in the Security Council

2.1 The U.S. Veto and Its Impact on Gaza-Related Resolutions 70-76p

2.2 Geopolitical Alignments and the UN’s Inconsistent Policies 77-80p

2.3 Power Politics and the Erosion of UN Credibility 80-83p

Section 3: Humanitarian and Legal Fallout

3.1 Humanitarian Costs of UN Inaction in Gaza 83-87p

3.2 Implications for International Law and Accountability 87-90p

3.3 Accountability Mechanisms: ICC, UNHRC, and Their Limitations 91-94p

Conclusion 96-101

