

United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and Restructuring Debates

Birleşmiş Milletler Güvenlik Konseyi (BMGK) Yönetimi Üzerine Reform Tartışmaları

Yüksel DEMİRKAYA

*Prof. Dr., Marmara University, Faculty of Political Sciences,
Department of Political Science and Public Administration,
ydemirkaya@marmara.edu.tr
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2683-8579>*

Makale Başvuru Tarihi: 19.11.2024

Makale Kabul Tarihi: 31.12.2024

Makale Türü: Araştırma Makalesi

ÖZET

Çalışmanın konusu, Birleşmiş Milletler Güvenlik Konseyi (BMGK) yönetimi üzerine reform tartışmalarıdır. Birleşmiş Milletler (BM), uluslararası alanda en etkili örgüt olarak tanımlanabilir. Bu makalede, BM'nin etkili örgütü olan ve aynı derecede tartışmalı olan, dünya çapında yönetim, kontrol ve gözetim yetkilerine sahip bir süper güç birliği olan Birleşmiş Milletler Güvenlik Konseyi (BMGK) incelenerek, yapılanmasında ve görevlerini yerine getirirken ne tür kurallara bağlı kaldığını ele alarak bu alandaki reformla ilişkin son dönemdeki tartışmalar incelenmiştir. Birçok ülkeyi ve güvenliğini ilgilendiren bir üst kuruluşun geleceğinin şekillenmesinde öneriler sunduğu için çalışma önem kazanmaktadır. Makalenin hazırlanmasında mevzuat analizi yönteminden yararlanılmıştır. Yapılan araştırma neticesinde, kendi kendini atayan ve değiştirilemez daimi üyelikleri olan, istediği kararı veto edebilen üyelere sahip bir örgütün demokratik bir yapıya sahip olduğunun iddia edilemeyeceği ve bu kurumun tarafsız olmasının da beklenemeyeceği sonucuna ulaşılmıştır. BM Güvenlik Konseyi gibi dünya siyasetinde ve güvenlik örgütlerinde etkili söz sahibi olan ülkelerin hükümetlerinin siyasi ve idari iradelerinin özgür olmadığı ve ipotek altına alındığı yönünde güçlü şüpheler bulunmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler:

Reform,

*Güvenlik Konseyi
Yönetimi,*

Birleşmiş Milletler,

ABSTRACT

The subject of the study is the reform discussions on the management of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC). The United Nations (UN) can be defined as the most influential organization in the international arena. In this article, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), which is the most influential organization of the UN and equally controversial, a superpower union with worldwide management, control and surveillance powers, is examined, and the rules it adheres to in its structure and while fulfilling its duties are examined, and the recent discussions on reform in this area are examined. The study gains importance because it offers suggestions in shaping the future of a superior organization that concerns many countries and their security. The method of legislative analysis was used in the preparation of the article. As a result of the research conducted, it was concluded that an organization with self-appointed and unchangeable permanent members, and members who can veto any decision they want, cannot be claimed to have a democratic structure and that this institution cannot be expected to be impartial. There are strong suspicions that the political and administrative wills of the governments of countries that have an effective say in world politics and security organizations such as the UN Security Council are not free and are mortgaged.

Keywords:

Reform,

*Security Council
Administration,*

United Nations,

Önerilen Alıntı (Suggested Citation): DEMİRKAYA, Yüksel (2024), "United Nations Security Council (UNSC) and Restructuring Debates", **Uluslararası Yönetim Akademisi Dergisi**, S.7(4), ss.955-963, Doi: <https://doi.org/10.33712/mana.1588233>

1. INTRODUCTION

Neo-liberalism and globalization, which began in the last quarter of the 20th century and continues to be effective today, have sparked new searches in public administration. These searches have brought about radical changes in social, cultural, economic, and political fields, and by demonstrating their effects on a global scale, various countries have initiated reforms in the fields of economy and then administration. Particularly due to the intensifying political and commercial ties resulting from globalization, a close-knit dialogue environment has emerged between countries, thereby increasing their interdependence in these domains. In order to maintain such international relations in a healthy way, the importance of various international organizations has increased (Demirkaya, 2006). IMF, OECD, SCO, EU, UN and NATO can be counted as important ones. Although these organizations were generally established earlier, they continued to feel their existence more of the last quarter in the 20th century.

Especially since World War II, which was the bloodiest destruction in human history, there has been no major war on a global scale, but political or military struggles between various countries on a local and regional scale have continued to increase. This situation has accelerated recently and there are concerns that it could get out of control and start a major war. It can be claimed that one of the important reasons why local and regional problems cannot be solved between the countries in question is the lack or inadequacy of structures such as mediation, guidance, consultancy, rule-making, arbitration, supervision or protection.

When viewed from this perspective, it can be concluded that the international organizations listed above are inadequate in practice or their spheres of influence are narrow. Naturally, it has unfortunately come to light that the fact that such organizations have sublime duties in theory should not make people (at least their expecting members) trust them too much. It has been stated for many years that such organizations, which cannot fulfill what is expected of them, should undergo a radical renewal both in their structures and in their working systems.

The United Nations (UN) could be defined as the most effective organization in the international arena. In this article, we will examine the United Nations Security Council (UNSC), the most influential and controversial organization within the UN. As a superpower union with global management, control, and surveillance powers, we will explore recent reform debates and the rules it adheres to in its structuring and performance of its duties.

2. ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

The term United Nations was first used by US President Roosevelt in 1942. In 1945, representatives of 50 countries gathered in San Francisco to prepare the UN's operating rules. The UN officially took office on 24 October 1945, which is why every year 24 October is celebrated as UN day. The Security Council is one of the 6 main bodies (*Security Council, General Assembly, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, An International Court of Justice, Secretariat*) organized under the umbrella of the United Nations (Charter of United Nations -CUN- b.3, art.7/ one).

The UN Security Council meets periodically twice a year and the council decides the meeting time. Apart from these periodic meetings, the President of the Council may call the Security Council to meet when he deems it necessary and at the request of any member (CUN b.1, m.3-5). The Security Council, as the most powerful organ of the UN, has the responsibility of ensuring international security and peace (Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council -PSC-, b.5 m. 24-1).

The organization has been operating actively, particularly since the 1990s. It works in the fields such as military operations, economic embargoes, armaments inspections, human rights audits and election observations. Other duties of the Security Council. It can be counted as making recommendations in the election of the UN secretary general, recommending the country representations of the UN, and choosing the members of the International Court of Justice together with the General Assembly.

The Security Council consists of 15 members who are among the UN members. Of these, the USA, China, the United Kingdom, France and Russia are always represented and unelected permanent members of the council (CUN b.23 m.1/2). Each member has one vote and a decision can be taken with 9 votes. Even though UN member states are not members of the Security Council, they can attend meetings but cannot vote. When the Security Council was established by five members in 1945, many of the current states had not yet gained their independence. In the face of increasing membership demands, it was decided to recruit 10 new members in 1965. These members are elected by the General Assembly for a period of 2 years and 5 members are elected

every year to ensure that the members are constantly renewed (CUN b.23 art.1/2). In the selection of members, attention is generally paid to the representation of the main regions of the World.

It should also be noted that there are two types of membership form in the Security Council. As permanent membership and non-permanent membership. In fact, there couldn't be a worse name such as "*permanent and non-permanent*" in an international organization that should be a ground where equal members meet and that takes the task of ensuring peace. Perhaps it is correct to refer to current permanent members as "*unelected and permanent members*" and non-permanent members to be referred to as "*elected and non-permanent*" members. Although this satirical description may seem like a detail, such statements will make the unfair privileges of permanent members more obvious.

The veto power of the permanent members (France, China, United Kingdom, USA, Russia) was a privilege given to the victorious states of World War II, and it was not possible to count all the countries with veto power as superpowers. For example, France was in a complete collapse because it took a heavy economic and military blow in the 2nd World War. The same is true today, as there are countries that are both economically and militarily superior to the existing permanent members. The desire to maintain the veto privilege given to the founding members for life and the power to veto every desired decision within the framework of the conditions of the time has been a matter of debate for an institution that is claimed to be democratic and impartial, and thus forms the basis of the reform discussions that will be examined below.

3. REFORM DEBATES FOR THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

At a time when wars, massacres and international terrorist movements are making the world increasingly unlivable, it is obvious that the Security Council is inadequate and almost unable to produce a solution. In this framework, a comprehensive reform within the Security Council has been discussed in the UN General Assembly in recent years, but a solution has not been reached yet. As a permanent member, the counter efforts of the members who established their "*indestructible kingdoms*" in accordance with the 1945 geopolitical structure are cited as the reason for the inability to reach an agreement. Permanent members seem to be closed to any offers that will expand their clubs and share their power (Paul and Nahary, 2005:1-2). But today, harsh criticisms are made against this oligarchic structure, and alternative improvements are persistently offered. Proposals for Security Council reform began to be voiced in from the early 1990s. Expressing such proposals, namely discussing the status of the Security Council, operations in Iraq and Rwanda and increased activities after the Cold War have been effective. In general, for the Security Council reform, transparency, responsibility and the existence of a fairer representation power in the decision-making mechanism are required.

Today, however, the situation has reached more serious dimensions. On September 12, 2002, George W. Bush challenged the UN and declared that the USA would first work with the UN for a solution; but if the UN could not find a solution, it would disarm Baghdad alone. Washington took the threat even further, giving Bush the authority to use force a month after these statements, even without UN approval. The intended message was "*we don't need a Security Council*" (Glennon, 2003:116).

Although Germany and France wanted more time to be given to the inspectors conducting research in Iraq, England and Spain, in a counterattack, declared that Iraq had used enough distraction tactics and abused the time given to it. Thereupon, Germany and France, who took China and Russia with them, insistently demanded that the inspectors be given more time. For Glennon, this scene consisted of the deadlock of the Security Council, which was set up to maintain peace and stability. This development can be considered a serious threat to global peace. For a while, discomfort was expressed due to the fact that the USA remained the only superpower. In 1998, the French Minister of Foreign Affairs stated that they do not want a unipolar political world and that they are working for a multipolar world. Russia and China, on the other hand, prepared a bilateral agreement and defended multipolarity. Immediately afterwards, Putin stated in his statement that they would not allow a unipolar system, and this statement was supported by China and Germany (Glennon, 2003:118).

The source of general disagreement is actually the US's disbelief in the supremacy of a supranational democratic decision-making mechanism over Nation-state. On the contrary, European democracies believe in the necessity of an international and supranational democratic structure. We have just left behind a century full of bitter experiences that will make it necessary for European states to believe in the necessity of such organizations, but the indifferent attitude of the USA and its certainty for its own sake that history repeats itself seems a bit surprising. Because the USA was actively involved in two great wars in the last century, and although it did not hear the sound of gunfire (*except for some ineffective Japanese bombings*) on its territory, it

was shaken by material and moral losses. In addition, it was one of the countries that were most uneasy about the nuclear warhead missiles directed at its country during the Cold War period.

In this context, the leading countries of the world persistently express their reform demands at the UN and on various platforms. For example, Japan and Germany, which are developed and the 2nd and 3rd richest states in the world in terms of GNP of our time, and India, one of the world's leading nuclear powers, which has attracted attention with its economic and technological growth in recent years (*the world's largest democracy with 6/1 of the world's population*), finally, the most powerful country of South America, Brazil, formed a group (Group Four -G4-) among themselves and demanded permanent membership and veto rights by putting pressure on the permanent members. If Japan and India become permanent members, the number of countries representing Asia will increase to three, thus increasing the weight of Asia. If Germany becomes a permanent member, the representation of Europe will be with four members, of which it is clear that the USA will not want both.

According to Olara A. Otunnu, one of the ex-presidents of the International Peace Academy, it would be very difficult to exclude Germany and Japan as permanent members under today's conditions, but the current members of these two countries can only accept the permanent membership of these two countries without the right of veto (Otunnu, 1994). As the second largest donor of the UN, Japan gives more aid than the United Kingdom, France, China and Russia combined. Therefore, it can be said that Japan is the closest country to permanent membership. As a matter of fact, when Chancellor Gerhard Schröder declared in August 2004 that permanent membership was Germany's natural right, US Secretary of State Condoleezza Rice declared that they could only support Japan due to its special contributions to the UN.

In addition, since Africa is not represented in the Security Council of its own continents, it wants a representation and Nigeria, Egypt and South Africa are among the strongest candidates. Germany and Japan, as the two victors of the 2nd World War, ensure and support them to apply for permanent membership in some other countries with various policies in order not to give the appearance of being a permanent member of a club formed by the victors of this war on their own. However, the important point that should not be ignored here; each new member candidate has regional rivals and attempts to block them. For example, Mexico and Argentina do not want Brazil, Pakistan does not want India, South Korea and China do not want Japan and the Netherlands does not want Germany as permanent representatives.

According to Paul and Nahary (2005:1-2), although new permanent membership offers seem reasonable, it is difficult to find an appropriate and effective ground in practice. For example, a 40-member Security Council may be more democratic, but it will be more difficult for it to work effectively. In addition, the most important obstacle in such reform efforts is the approval of the permanent members. For example, China, one of the permanent members, has declared that it will definitely veto Japan's permanent membership request due to historical/political reasons.

It cannot be claimed that an institution that is stated to be non-democratic based on what it wants to do can work more fairly and effectively. Because the claim that increasing the number of permanent members in the Security Council will make the decision-making mechanism more democratic does not seem like a constructive approach. Because each new member will represent their own country like the existing members and will try to influence UN resolutions in line with their regional/global interests.

As a matter of fact, according to Phyllis Bennis (1994), America, as the strong winner of World War II, led the Security Council to protect and maintain its own interests. In other words, the establishment purpose of the Security Council is an organization established to protect the interests of the founding members rather than to fulfill the duties of today's UN. As a matter of fact, the countries that request new permanent membership want the expiration of these privileges of the existing members rather than the realization of their own membership. For example, German Foreign Minister Joschka Fischer announced that they would agree to joint European representation if France and England renounced their permanent membership seats. In addition, the interior ministers of Muslim countries expressed the necessity of representing a permanent Muslim country in the Security Council at the Organization of the Islamic Conference held in 2005. For this reason, some alternative models are also discussed. For example, the representation of regional unions between countries in the Security Council seems to be a more reasonable and easier solution to understand. As in the example of the European Union, the unions that other regional countries will form among themselves can be represented in the Security Council under the umbrella of the UN.

To be sincere in the creation of a more democratic structure, such solutions should be emphasized. Otherwise, the current oligarchs will not want to disrupt their established order and share their powers, as the efforts will

not find enough international support if some countries are given the privilege of permanent membership by claiming that the current order is anti-democratic. In summary, instead of expanding the permanent membership, this privilege should be completely abolished and a system in which regional alliances would be effective should be developed instead.

Today, more important than the prevention of wars and the use of military power, issues such as world economic development, technological integration, and democratization in public administration should be on the agenda of the UN. In this framework, first of all, the anti-democracy of the current order should be voiced with an international monophonic voice. Indeed, Paul and Nahary (2005:7) assert that if powerful countries like Japan, Germany, India, Brazil, and others renounce their demands for permanent membership and instead advocate for a more democratic structure, they have the potential to at least weaken the veto power of the current permanent members. Thereupon, France announced that it would support this proposal, while the USA stated that it needed time to work on it. China, on the other hand, has declared that it sees this offer as dangerous (Heinlein, 2005).

In addition to these privileges, the permanent members' veto has also entered the treaty preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons as an exception country. In other words, only permanent members with veto power in the UN Security Council can freely produce nuclear weapons. However, there are countries such as India, North Korea, Israel and Pakistan that do not sign the treaty preventing the proliferation of nuclear weapons and produce these weapons.

However, the US still has 480 nuclear weapons in 6 NATO countries in Europe (Kristen, 2005:5). Although it is claimed that the proliferation of these weapons violates the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the USA states that these weapons are under its control and therefore it is not a violation (Kristen, 2005, p.6). The first US nuclear weapon was deployed to Britain in 1954, and as of today, the number of nuclear weapons in Europe is more than China's total stockpile.

Table 1. US Nuclear Weapons in Europe-2005

Country	Nuclear Weapons
Belgium	20
Italy	90
Germany	150
Netherlands	20
Turkey	90
England	110

Source: Kristen, 2005:9.

Although not shown in the table above, it is stated in various reports or articles that the USA has nuclear weapons in some other countries. For example, some events that took place during and after the 1974 Cyprus war made the security of the US nuclear weapons in Europe a matter of debate. This war between Greece and Turkey frightened NATO, and the US had nuclear bombs that could be used in Turkish and Greek warplanes stored in warehouses and had the nuclear warheads removed from Greek missiles. Greece called this a pro-Turkish NATO policy and announced that it would leave NATO. Because the USA did not leave any initiative to Greece by withdrawing all its nuclear weapons in these countries to warehouses. In fact, after the 1967 coup in Greece, the USA thought that its weapons in this country were not safe (Kristen, 2005:25-26). The important point to be underlined here is the existence of Greek initiatives, which greatly worried the USA during the 1974 Cyprus war.

Germany, Turkey, Italy, the Netherlands, and Belgium signed the treaty in 1970 seeking to prevent the proliferation of nuclear weapons, but the United States has nuclear weapons in their countries. However, with the treaty they signed, "*direct or indirect transfer and control of nuclear weapons is prohibited*" (ACDA, 1990:99). A satisfactory explanation has not yet been made on this issue and the silence continues. Although the countries where these weapons are found seem to be privileged at first glance, there appear to be some serious handicaps when we look at the essence of the matter. Let's take a closer look at the example of Turkey; Despite declaring its opposition to the production and use of nuclear weapons by signing the NPT, Turkey still possesses these weapons, which are owned by the USA, and this situation has triggered reactions from other relevant countries. Turkey lacks the necessary technology to produce such weapons and has ceased to possess them. However, Turkey's possession of nuclear weapons in its country, which it lacks the opportunity and authority to use independently, makes it a potential nuclear target. The point to be underlined here is; If the presence of such

weapons in Turkey was necessary for one reason or another, why did Turkey have to sign a treaty that it could not abide by?

After a brief evaluation of the nuclear privileges of the permanent members of the UN Security Council, we will return to the veto power, which is the most important privilege, and give examples of how this right is used in numbers. As a result of the uncontrolled use of their veto rights by the permanent members, the countries listed below have been vetoed at least once in their applications for membership to the UN; Vietnam, Italy, Ireland, Sri Lanka, Portugal, Japan, North Korea, Jordan, Austria, Finland, Libya, Cambodia, Laos, Nepal, Spain, Angola, Mauritania, Bangladesh, Mongolia, and Kuwait. The Soviet Union uses veto power the most in this regard and the USA comes second. China blocked Mongolia by using its veto power only once. France and the United Kingdom, on the other hand, have never used their veto powers in their applications for membership to the UN. It is not acceptable to veto new member applications to an organization that is stated to have been established for the purpose of ensuring peace and security in the world. Therefore, in this context, those who use their veto rights abused their power and formed the basis of distrust towards the Security Council. In the table below, all vetoes used from the beginning of the Security Council to 2004 are listed by country.

Table 2. Vetoes Used by Permanent Members of the UN Security Council

Period	China	France	UK	USA	Russia	Total
1946-2004	5	18	32	80	122	257

As an example of what a powerful privilege the veto power is and how it is used, the vetoes used by the USA against the solution proposals for the problem in a certain region in the UN Security Council are listed in the table below.

Table 3. Some US Vetoes Against UN Security Council Resolutions

1972	Condemnation of the killing of hundreds of civilians by Israeli airstrikes in Syria and Lebanon
1973	Recognition of Palestinian rights and withdrawal from Israeli occupied territories
1976	Condemnation of Israeli killing of Lebanese civilians
1976	Call for Palestinians to govern themselves
1976	Recognition of Palestinian rights
1978	Call for improvement of living conditions of Palestinians
1978	Condemning human rights violations in Israel's occupied territories
1978	Israel's call for the return of exiled people
1978	Demand for Israel to stop violating human rights
1978	Examining the living conditions of Palestinians in the occupied Arab lands
1978	Assistance to the Palestinians
1979	Examining the sovereignty of the occupied Arab countries over their national wealth
1979	Inclusion of Palestinian women in the UN conference on women
1980	Call for Israel to allow displaced people to return
1980	Condemnation of Israel for the living conditions of the Palestinians
1980	Condemnation of Israel's practices in the occupied territories (repeated times)
1980	Calls for Palestinians to be empowered to govern themselves
1981	Calls for Israel to halt excavations in East Jerusalem
1981	Condemnation of Israel for bombing Iraq's nuclear facilities
1981	Call to make it clear that Israel has no say in the Golon Heights
1981	Calling for the Middle East to be regulated as a nuclear-free zone
1981	Recognition of the fundamental rights of Palestinians
1981	Clarifying the status of Qudud
1981	Discussing the poor living conditions of Palestinians in Gaza-Strip
1981	Opposing Israel to open a canal between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean
1981	Discussing the control of national wealth in the occupied Arab and Palestinian territories
1982	Discussing Israel's practices in the occupied territories
1982	Condemnation of Israel's closing of universities in the occupied territories
1982	Condemnation of Israel's invasion of Lebanon

1982	Condemnation of 11 Muslims shot to death by an Israeli in a mosque
1982	Call for Israeli withdrawal from occupied Golon Heights
1984	Condemnation of Israel's attack on Lebanon
1984	Calling on Arab countries and the UN to cooperate
1984	Call for the organization of the Middle East peace conference
1984	Calling for condemnation of Israel and recognition of the fundamental rights of Palestinians
1984	Condemnation of assassination attempt on Palestinian mayor
1984	Condemnation of Israel's failure to open its nuclear facilities to international inspection
1984	Offer of economic aid to the Palestinians
1985	Condemnation of Israel's attack on South Lebanon
1985	Condemnation of Israel for its use of violence against Palestinians
1986	Condemnation of Israel for its use of violence against Lebanese
1986	Israel's call to respect Muslims' holy shrines
1986	Condemnation of Israel's hijacking of Libya's plane
1987	Calling on Israel to abide by the Genoa convention
1987	Calls on Israel to stop deportation of Palestinians
1987	Calling on Israel to withdraw from Lebanon (2 times in a row)
1987	Proposal for cooperation between Arab countries and the UN
1988	Condemnation of Israel's use of violence against Palestinians (5 times in a row)
1989	Call for a solution between Arab countries and Israel
1990	The Security Council's proposal to send observers to the occupied areas in Palestine
1995	Detection of the occupation of East Jerusalem by Israel
1997	Call for Israel to stop establishing settlements in East Jerusalem (2 times in a row)
1999	Call for unarmed observers to be sent to West Bank and Gaza Strip
2001	Calling for condemnation of Israel for its practices of violence in the occupied territories
2002	Condemnation of Israeli soldiers killing a British worker
2003	Condemnation of Israeli Parliament's decision to exile Yasser Arafat
2004	Condemnation of Israel's construction of a wall on Palestinian land
2004	Condemnation of Israel for assassinating Hamas leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin
2004	Israel's condemnation for civilian deaths on the Gaza Strip

Source: www.krysstal.com/

Herman states that there are two main reasons for The USA's unacceptable attitude. First, the US supports Israel (which is not the only country among the 191 members of the UN) to protect its interests in the Middle East and to keep Arab countries in check. The second is the effective work of the powerful Israel lobby in the USA and the media power all over the world (Herman, 2005). Russia and Algeria, in particular, have harshly criticized the US's attempt to prevent Israel's condemnation for the murder of Ahmet Yasin in their last veto (BBC, 2004).

Table 4. Some Other US Vetoes Against UN Security Council Resolutions

1980	Banning the use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapons
1980	Call to suspend nuclear tests
1981	Call for an end to all nuclear tests
1981	Call to ban chemical and biological weapons
1981	Condemnation of South Africa's attack on its neighbors

Source: www.krysstal.com/

Permanent members, also known as founding members, have given this privilege and veto power to themselves, and as stated before, they will not relinquish their privileges in any way. However, in 1949, under the influence of the Cold War and the Communist revolution, China lost its permanent seat on the UN Security Council. Even though Taiwan was replaced, China got this privilege again in 1971. This example shows us that the title of permanent membership can also be questioned. According to Paine, "*the world has never been a permanent*

place to stay, with the UN and the Security Council being the exception, so the ridiculous permanent membership must be removed” (Paine, 1997:2).

4. CONCLUSION

An organization with self-appointed and unchangeable permanent memberships and members who can veto any decision they want cannot be claimed to have a democratic structure, nor can it be expected to be impartial. In today’s world where alternative governance models are disappearing one by one in the face of democracy, it is clear that such an anti-democratic pressure will shake the global balance. Indeed, the US’s indifferent attitude towards the UN during the development of the Second Gulf War and Israel’s massacres in Palestinian territories confirms this. Especially in 2023, when Israel committed a massacre in Gaza that amounted to genocide, the US’s obstruction of the UNSC meetings in favor of Israel caused great reactions in the international arena and initiated mass actions.

Even in western countries such as the US, England, Germany, France and Italy, there have been mass actions condemning Israel’s occupation and massacre process on Palestinian territories and calling on their governments to take counter-action. Despite this, the countries in question have not made any attempt to stop Israel; on the contrary, they have continued to provide Israel with arms. In the face of this dramatic situation, there are strong suspicions that the political and administrative wills of the governments of countries that have an effective say in world politics and security organizations such as the UNSC are not free and are mortgaged.

In the face of such fait accompli, there will definitely be efforts to find alternatives. Because history repeats itself, and when we look at the development processes of the two major world wars in the twentieth century, the efforts of the great powers of the time to share the privileges that each other had and the resulting disagreements are shown as the main reason.

Today, the struggle between the economic, military or imperial power centers on a global scale seems to continue in the form of a controllable crisis management. However, since this struggle damages the belief in mutual trust and cooperation, they cannot contribute to the effective operation of the organizations established for world peace and security, and in fact, they often compete to undermine the process in return. If the fire grows, it does not matter whether you live upstairs or downstairs. We have no choice but to talk and meet on the minimum common ground. Because another world where humanity can live has not yet been discovered.

Examples of how ignoring demands for change and redesign and not taking timely precautions have led to new problems that are difficult to compensate for are frequently seen in history books. A Turkish proverb, “*take precautions while there is an opportunity*”, concisely summarizes what is being said here.

YAZAR BEYANI / AUTHORS’ DECLARATION:

Bu makale Araştırma ve Yayın Etiğine uygundur. Beyan edilecek herhangi bir çıkar çatışması yoktur. Araştırmanın ortaya konulmasında herhangi bir mali destek alınmamıştır. Makale yazım ve intihal/benzerlik açısından kontrol edilmiştir. Makale, “*en az iki dış hakem*” ve “*çift taraflı körleme*” yöntemi ile değerlendirilmiştir. Yazar, dergiye imzalı “*Telif Devir Formu*” belgesi göndermişlerdir. Mevcut çalışma için mevzuat gereği etik izni alınmaya ihtiyaç yoktur. Bu konuda yazarlar tarafından dergiye “*Etik İznine Gerek Olmadığına Dair Beyan Formu*” gönderilmiştir. Yazar, çalışmanın tüm bölümlerine ve aşamalarına tek başına katkıda bulunmuştur. / **This paper complies with Research and Publication Ethics, has no conflict of interest to declare, and has received no financial support. The article has been checked for spelling and plagiarism/similarity. The article was evaluated by “at least two external referees” and “double blinding” method. The author sent a signed “Copyright Transfer Form” to the journal. There is no need to obtain ethical permission for the current study as per the legislation. The “Declaration Form Regarding No Ethics Permission Required” was sent to the journal by the authors on this subject. The author contributed to all sections and stages of the study alone.**

RESOURCES

- ACDA (2009), **International Act of Arms Control and Disarmament**, ACDA Publisher, Washington, D.C.
- BAILEY, Stephen D. and DOWS, Susan (1998), **The Procedure of the UN Security Council**, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 3rd Edition.
- BENNIS, Phyllis (1994), “*Conference on Reform and Restructuring of the Security Council*”, **1994 Conference** (E-Text of Speech), Global Policy Forum Corporate Web Page, <https://archive.globalpolicy.org/the-dark-side-of-natural-resources-st/water-in-conflict/32786-1994-conference-phyllis-bennis.html> (Access Date: 03.08.2024).
- DEMİRKAYA, Yüksel (2006), “*Küreselleşmenin Kamu Yönetimi Üzerine Etkisi: Türkiye Örneği*”, **Marmara Üniversitesi Avrupa Araştırmaları Dergisi**, S.14(2), ss.133-150.
- GLENNON, Michael J. (2003), “*Why the Security Council failed*”, **Foreign Affairs**, S.82(3), ss.15-22, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/2003-05-01/why-security-council-failed> (Access Date: 03.08.2024).
- HENMAN, Peter (2005), “*Voice of America*”, **Global Policy Forum Corporate Web Page** (E-Document), 9 June 2005, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/veto/articles.htm> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).
- KRISTEN, Hans M. (2005), “*U.S. Nuclear Weapons in Europe: A Review of Post-Cold War Policy, Force Levels and War Planning*”, **Natural Resources Defence Council**, <https://www.nrdc.org/> (Access Date: 03.08.2024).
- LAÇİNER, Sadi (2005), “*UN Reform: Focus- Turkey Ideal Permanent Security Council Member Says Analyst*”, **İtalyan Haber Ajansı** (E-News), <http://www.turkishweekly.net/turkce/yorum.php?id=76> (Access Date: 03.08.2024).
- LAURENTI, Joseph (1997), “*Reforming the Security Council: What America Interest?*”, **UNA-USA Corporate Web Page** (E-Document), <https://www.unausa.org/> (Access Date: 03.08.2024).
- O'BRIEN, Tohomas (1997), **The United Nations: Legacy and Reform**, Victoria University of Wellington Publisher, Wellington (New Zealand).
- OTUNNU, Olara A. (1994), “*Conference on Reform and Restructuring of the Security Council*”, **United Nations Corporate Web Page** (E-Text of Speech), 23 May 1994, <http://www.un.org/> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).
- PAINE, Edward (1997), “*What's in a Name? Proposal for a Change in Membership Terminology for the Security Council*”, **Global Policy Forum** (E-Document), 13 July 2005, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/reform/1997/whatsin.htm> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).
- PAUL, James (1997), **Security Council Reform: Arguments About the Future of the United Nations System**, St. Martin's Press, New York (US).
- PAUL, James and NAHARY, Charlotte (2005), “*Theses Towards a Democratic Reform of the UN Security Council*”, **Global Policy Forum** (E-Document), 13 July 2005, <http://www.globalpolicy.org/> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).
- SAROOSHI, Dapo (1999), **The United Nations and Development of Collective Security: The Delegation by the UN Security Council of its Chapter 7 Powers**, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- UNITED NATIONS (n.d.), **Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council**, UN Corporate Web Page, <https://www.un.org/en/sc/> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).
- UNITED NATIONS (1945), **Charter of the United Nations**, UN Corporate Web Page, <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/un-charter> (Access Date: 21.10.2005).