



dipam

DİPLOMATİK İLİŞKİLER ve POLİTİK ARAŞTIRMALAR MERKEZİ
CENTER for DIPLOMATIC AFFAIRS and POLITICAL STUDIES

JANUARY 2023 | No: 25

IS PEACE POSSIBLE IN THE UN SYSTEM?

Israel's attacks on Palestine have been ongoing for more than three months. In this 75-year war, Israel is increasingly violating international law. It is widely believed that Israel has committed war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. Many human rights organizations, such as the Amnesty Organization, have written reports to this regard. As a matter of fact, the only practical resolution adopted at the UN since October 7 has been a short humanitarian pause. UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres' words, his wait at the Rafah border crossing or his urgent convening of the Security Council have been in vain. Because contrary to what should be the case, some members of the

UN have more sanctioning power than the UN itself. This calls into question the UN system's capacity to maintain peace and security, to govern justly and to solve problems.

The UN is not the only organization whose capabilities have been called into question in recent days. Many other organizations as well as the system of a supranational organization such as the European Union have been subjected to criticism. And this criticism is coming not only from outside but also from the European Parliament and some EU member states themselves. Decision-makers in Spain, Belgium, Portugal and many other states have made statements that Israel's crimes should not

be shared. The EU cannot be 'united' on the Palestinian issue.

The problem of the ineffectiveness of international organizations, which this latest stage of the Israeli-Palestinian war has made many people and decision-makers reconsider, also necessitates a look at recent history. Indeed, right after the system of 'Great States' that started in 1815 and ended in 1919, the system of 'International Organizations' that we are in today started with the establishment of the League of Nations. In this respect, evaluating the UN or any other organization on its own may fall short of seeing the whole. Therefore, the failures of the League of Nations and its eventual collapse were, in fact, one of the biggest cracks in this system. The League of Nations process and its fate can provide a good vision for understanding and predicting all the problems that the UN has been involved in and caused.

Looking at the reasons for the League of Nations's failure, some fundamental issues emerge. The first was the question of the League of Nations's mandate. Although the League of Nations was entrusted with the task of maintaining world peace, it was not equipped with the necessary powers. So much so that it could not even take binding decisions. In this context, Italy's attacks on Ethiopia and its subsequent occupation could even be considered as the end of the League of Nations. In that process, the League of Nations decided to embargo Italy and asked Britain to close the Suez Canal, but Britain did not comply with this decision. The League of Nations was an institution with no sanctioning power and limited powers.

Secondly, the League of Nations lacked the necessary infrastructure, organs and staff,

which was another reason for its failure. The existing organs and structure of the organization were quite inadequate. Thirdly, the 'peace' that the League of Nations was supposed to protect was a problematic peace. The League of Nations was established as an annex to the Treaty of Versailles, signed at the Congress of Versailles, where the victors and vanquished of World War I met. Therefore, the League of Nations's concept of peace can be interpreted as a peace that regulates the relationship between the winners and losers of the war, rather than the establishment of a real peace.

Fourthly, the failure of the League of Nations to forbid war, which is the right of states, can be considered as another reason for failure. Although the League of Nations tried to limit the right to war through certain procedures, it could not prevent wars of aggression. Finally, the mandate system, which replaced colonialism, continued the order of exploitation, which was one of the reasons for the failure of the League of Nations to establish peace.

In the aftermath of World War II, the idea of an international organization for world peace was not abandoned, but it became clear that some changes had to be made. In this context, the UN was established partly with the above failures in mind. For example, the League of Nations's jurisdictional crisis was largely solved for the UN, especially with the Security Council's ability to take binding decisions. Again, the infrastructure problem of the League of Nations is not an issue for the UN. In fact, the UN is sometimes considered to be a problem of overgrowth in terms of its spread and expansion. One of the greatest achievements of the UN is that the UN Charter prohibits the use and

threat of force against states. The problems stemming from colonialism can also be considered to have been solved to a large extent. The fact that the peace of the day, which the League of Nations was supposed to ensure, was problematic, is also partly true for the UN. Although conditions are not as bad as they were when the League of Nations was founded, the UN is not far from being a winners' club. Over time and especially today, the UN's problems have become quite visible.

One of the main reasons for the UN's failures is the permanent membership of the US, Russia, Britain, France and China in the Security Council. Their veto power allows them to block a decision on an issue that may even concern the whole world. Another indicator of failure is the UN's selective intervention through the peace mission. For example, the UN, which intervenes in Libya, can arbitrarily refrain from intervening in Israel.

Despite all these problems, it is possible to make systemic adjustments within the UN. World systems, such as International Organizations, are built and destroyed by great wars. The victorious states determine the new order, which makes the system problematic from the start. Instead, in this period of relative peace in the world, it seems wise to make systemic adjustments and not wait for a new world war. As a matter of fact, the civil protests of the peoples showing their support for Palestine, the applications of the world's lawyers to the ICC, the application of the Republic of South Africa (RSA) to the International Court of Justice that Israel is guilty of genocide and many other developments show that the system can still be utilized as well as expressing the desire for change. Within this system, it is particularly important to address the RSA's

application based on Article 36, paragraph 1 of the ICJ Statute and Article 9 of the 1949 Genocide Prevention Convention. The RSA's request for the Court to impose preventive measures in response to the ongoing attacks could lead to an order for Israel to cease the attacks. Considering that the Court's decisions are binding, public pressure on Israel could increase significantly. Again, the conclusion of this case that Israel is guilty of genocide will be a label that Israel will carry for the rest of its future. Of course, it is also important that the rights of the Palestinians are recognized by the ICJ. This case before the Court is a good example of how opportunities within the system can still be seized.

President Recep Tayyip Erdoğan's many criticisms of the system, such as "The world is bigger than five.", are constructive and encourage new arrangements. In this context, some permanent arrangements can be made such as abolishing the veto power of the permanent members, increasing the number of members of the Security Council, increasing the powers of the General Assembly, the General Assembly assuming a supervisory role over the Council's decisions, and the open judicial remedy against the Council's decisions.



DİPLOMATİK İLİŞKİLER ve POLİTİK ARAŞTIRMALAR MERKEZİ
CENTER for DIPLOMATIC AFFAIRS and POLITICAL STUDIES

+90 216 310 30 40 info@dipam.org

+90 216 310 30 50 www.dipam.org

Merdivenköy Mah. Nur Sok. Business İstanbul
A Blok Kat:12 No:115, Kadıköy/İstanbul

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Zehra AYDIN is a specialist at DIPAM. She is a PhD candidate at Marmara University, Department of Political Science and International Relations. Her areas of specialization are international law and peace studies. In addition to these fields, she has also worked in regions such as Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, Libya and on issues such as human rights and the environment.