UN COLLECTIVE SECURITY SYSTEM'S RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT & PREPAREDNESS IN PREVENTING WARS

Abstract

The idea of collective security can be better understood by dissecting its foundational assumptions, current applicability, and potential future directions. The fundamental premise of collective security is the recognition that wars are inevitable and that they should be avoided if possible. United Nations Collective Security System refers to the coordinated efforts of all states to maintain calm in the face of threats to world security under the administration of UN Security Council. This article will explore how the United Nations has historically accomplished a lot by laying the groundwork for preventing small disputes from growing into serious risks to world peace. By highlighting the current crisis of Ukraine-Russia, this article will also discuss that the global idea of Collective Security can only be successful if it is robust enough to counter aggression from any power or combination of powers, and if it is activated in response to actual aggression.

Introduction

Two primary structural criteria underpin the UN Collective Security System (hereinafter the UNCSS), and they are mutually supportive. In the first place, Article 24 of the UN Charter states that the Member States have delegated to the Security Council the primary duty for the preservation of international peace and security. Second, all UN Members commit to making themselves accountable to the Security Council at the Council's request in order to help safeguard the peace and security of the international community.[1] Armed forces, support, and facilities, including the rights of passage, required for the purpose of ensuring international peace and security shall be provided in line with a special agreement or accords in accordance

---

[1] Alex J Bellamy, 'Mainstreaming the Responsibility to Protect in the United Nations System: Dilemmas, Challenges and Opportunities' (2013) 5 Global Responsibility to Protect 154.

with article 43 of the UN Charter. The UNCSS is a mechanism under the UN's administration through which its member states work together to ensure domestic peace and security, thereby contributing to global stability. In theory, this mechanism not only has the full backing of the United Nations Security Council and other UN organisations, but also the authority to call on the full resources of all UN member states to implement a wide variety of penalties, including the exclusive use of force.[2] Nevertheless, this approach continues to face severe criticism despite numerous failed attempts at implementation in the past. In this article, the author will attempt to provide a critique of the way in which the UNCSS functions, particularly with regard to responsibility to protect & preparedness in preventing wars.

Collective Security System as a Mechanism for Preventing Wars

Conflicts arise when people act out of unchecked emotion or with malicious intent. Wars are attempts to resolve conflicts; they can also be the result of indefinably vast circumstances of hostility; and they can be planned means of achieving grandiose conquest ambitions.[3] Collective security is a specialised instrument of international policy in that it assumes the central piece of world order is the restraint of military action rather than the guarantee of respect for all legal obligations and seeks to prevent the arbitrary and aggressive use of force rather than providing enforcement mechanisms for the entire body of international law. It also presumes that without altering the basic framework of the international system, this ideal—that is, restraint of armed action—may be realised or at least approximated by a reformation of international policy. Accordingly, the premise of collective security is that countries can be persuaded with moral arguments against the irrational use of force and are receptive to a pragmatic strategy to maintaining international stability. Collective security suggests the employment of diplomatic, economic, and military sanctions as instruments to induce rational decision by potential belligerents to minimise damage to national self-interest.[4] The moral transparency of the situation and the ascription of liability for a trouble to or breach of the peace are other preconditions for a sense of collective security. The idea of aggression is examined, along with the implication that both sides of a violent conflict can be seen as aggressors or victims. Once the perpetrator is known, collective security abandons international morality in favour of the concept of power. Failure of collective security occurs if one of two assumptions,

---

[2] Martin Binder, *The United Nations and the Politics of Selective Humanitarian Intervention* (Springer International Publishing 2017).
[3] Janelle Marie Diller, 'Responsibility of the United Nations and the International Rule of Law' [2016] SSRN Electronic Journal.
[4] Enrico Carisch, Loraine Rickard-Martin and Shawna R Meister, *The Evolution of UN Sanctions : From a Tool of Warfare to a Tool of Peace, Security and Human Rights* (Springer International Publishing 2017).

that responsibility can be confidently ascertained for global conflicts and that governments are rationally determining enough to conduct prudently, proves to be incorrect. The foundation of peace is the belief that powerful states will not risk a catastrophic defeat by starting a conflict, and this belief is based on the deterrent effect of their military might. This resembles a system of defensive alliances related to a balance of power.[5] Collective security also necessitates the fulfilment of a surprisingly intricate set of conditions, such as the subjective requirements concerning the general acceptability of the collective security responsibilities and the objective requirements concerning the suitability of the global situation to the operation of collective security. Collective security's subjective needs are met when a majority of nations agree that maintaining peace is important. The foundational tenet of this approach is that governments and peoples alike must come to accept and embrace the idea that peace cannot be separated from itself. That the fabric of human society is so densely knit and woven that a breach somewhere risks disintegration everywhere is a central tenet of collective security, and it is on this premise that governments and peoples are required to respond.[6] Aggression in one direction, if left unchecked, will inspire and equip the aggressors to strike in other areas. Alternatively, if the use of unlawful force is deemed to be effective in one instance, it undermines the general respect for the notion of order. Collective security necessitates an observable agreement that peace cannot be broken apart, and it then imposes an ideal requirement: allegiance to the international community. That the system will succeed if people everywhere see how closely their own interests align with those of humanity as a whole, to the point that they feel invested in the well-being of every nation rather than merely acknowledging their dependent on others. No nation is strong enough to shoulder the burden of collective security without its people being driven by true compassion for all victims of aggression and dedication to the values of a global system of law and order.[7] Unless it is thoroughly ingrained in governments and peoples that what is good for world peace is inherently good for the nation, the operation of a collective security system must always be unstable. To add to the list of necessities for collective security, all states must be willing to put their fates in its hands. This means that governments must be willing to put their faith in the system's reliability and objectivity if the collective security architecture is to succeed. That is to say, if they entrust their futures to the safety of the group, they will likely act in ways that increase the likelihood

[5] Christine Gray, 'A Crisis of Legitimacy for the UN Collective Security System?' (2007) 56 International and Comparative Law Quarterly 157.

[6] Solomon Hailu, *Promoting Collective Security in Africa : The Roles and Responsibilities of the United Nations, African States, Institutions, and Western Powers* (University Press Of America 2012).

[7] Wolfram F Hanrieder, *Global Peace and Security : Trends and Challenges* (Routledge 2019).

that their faith was well-placed. In addition to internal factors, the fulfilment of a number of preconditions in the external realm is crucial to achieving the objective needs of collective security.[8] Everything beyond one's control, such as the political, legal, and institutional settings, is considered to be part of the external domain. First, a world in which power is widely dispersed is excellent for any kind of collective security system. This means that the best possible scenario is one in which all states have access to the same level of resources, and the worst scenario is one in which a small number of states wield disproportionate influence. Collective security requires the existence of multiple big powers of nearly equal strength. Also, a strong degree of universality in membership is required for a collective security system. As a result, each state is presumed to have the potential to become an aggressor in collective security scenarios. As a result, collective security is a blueprint for a stable global order.[9] The system is meant to protect each country from the specific danger that causes it the most concern. The other premise is that the system would have very few members if every possible aggressor, every state which is or might become the cause of worries of another state, were excluded. This means that no major power can be excluded from or absent from a viable collective security system. Having a major commercial and naval power on the outside is a threat. This is because it is already difficult to effectively apply economic sanctions against the aggressor due to the resistance of these states to collaborate and agree in the violation of their normal rights. For this reason, the theory of collective security is predicated on the idea that non-military measures will be adequate to rein in aggression. The only reason military commitments are acceptable is because they will be used, but economic penalties have the odd property of needing universal application in order to achieve their goals.[10] The last tenet of collective security is that the international community should have access to a greater amount of power than any one state does so that it can be used for aggressive goals. As a result, the idea of collective security is to create a flexible superiority that can be quickly moved to the defence of any aggressor victim and elevate that victim to a position of power. Collective security, in its ideal form, makes global preponderance safe by channelling it toward the goal of ensuring the safety of all members of the international community. As a result, this analysis proves that the strategic and objective application of power diffusion and organisational comprehensiveness is crucial to

---

[8] Khalid Hassani, 'The Authorities of the Security Council within the System of Collective Security' (2013) 10 Journal of Law 163.

[9] Lisa Hultman, Jacob Kathman and Megan Shannon, 'United Nations Peacekeeping and Civilian Protection in Civil War' (2013) 57 American Journal of Political Science <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/ajps.12036>.

[10] Borhan Uddin Khan and Md Mostafa Hosain, 'United Nations Peacekeeping Operations: Determining Responsibility under International Law' [2022] Dhaka University Law Journal 1.

any system of collective security. As a result, collective security has the potential to mobilise up to 90% of the world's strength against any state if the power arrangements are such that no state controls more than 10% of the world's strength.[11] However, if one state controls a large percentage of the world's power resources—then it is highly unlikely that other state can match its strength collectively, and it is obviously impossible to build overwhelming force against it. When a society's defences are comprehensive, it increases the likelihood that it can outgun any potential threat. But the inverse of this is that the likelihood of this happening is reduced.

Defining UN Collective Security System

As a crisis management mechanism, collective security entails an agreement between all nations to respond jointly to assault from any nation. UNCSS is the response to war or aggression by assembling a global military superiority to counter the aggressor. Collective security, by stipulating that all nations will use their combined might to prevent aggression or war against any state, is also seen as a deterrent against aggression.[12] It is predicated on the idea that any threat to the safety and security of the international community is a threat to everyone in it. It is a challenge that calls for international cooperation to solve. The UNCSS also ensures that no state in the globe will be at risk from aggression or war with any other state. Like an insurance policy, this arrangement requires all participating nations to stop hostilities in the event of an attack on one of their citizens. In other words, the UNCSS is a tool for handling crises and balancing power. Its goal is to maintain global tranquilly through crisis management in the event of armed conflict or aggression.[13] The concept of collective security recognises that threats to national security are inevitable and that wars and aggressions will never be completely eradicated from international relations. The UNCSS holds that all nations will join forces to effectively counter any aggression committed anywhere in the world in an effort to restore international tranquilly should such a breach occur. Collective Security is the process of uniting all nations to achieve a worldwide power advantage that can be used to keep the peace and stability of the international system intact. All signatory nations agree to respond collectively to threats to international security with military force. When used against an

---

[11] Joachim Krause and Natalino Ronzitti, *The EU, the UN and Collective Security : Making Multilateralism Effective* (Taylor and Francis 2012).

[12] Bo Long, *The Application of the United Nations Collective Security System in Territorial Disputes* (Lancaster University 2019).

[13] Joseph P Lorenz, *Peace, Power, and the United Nations : A Security System for the Twenty-First Century* (Routledge 2019).

aggressive state, UNCSS can serve as an effective deterrent.[14] As a result of this structure, every nation is aware that if it attacks another, it will be faced with the combined force of the other nations. Consequently, no country ever attempts aggression and war since it knows doing so will result in collective security action against it. Knowing this makes people less likely to start fights or be aggressive towards others. Finally, in the eyes of the UNCSS, the enemy is the act of aggression or war itself, rather than the state that may resort to such actions. As such, a collective security measure can only be taken if there is an active state of war, aggression, or imminent threat of war or aggression. It does not advocate wiping out the aggressor state.[15] Its main purpose is to end the aggression, stop the aggressor from profiting from it, help the victim recover, and bring about a return to international stability and peace. Collective security, then, refers to the promotion of global stability through coordinated international efforts. All nations share an interest in maintaining a safe and secure environment, and this goal can only be attained by concerted international cooperation.[16] All nations can be assured that they will be protected by the United Nations in the event of a global conflict or an act of aggression by another nation. Like an insurance policy, this arrangement requires all participating nations to stop hostilities in the event of an attack on one of their citizens. UNCSS is one the most debated yet very promising strategy for world peace right now. In international affairs, it is a useful tool for averting crises. It was created to defend global stability from invasion and war. The UN Charter establishes a system of collective security to deal with international crises caused by or threatening war, aggression, or other forms of armed conflict anywhere in the world.[17] Collective Security is now widely recognised as a cutting-edge power management tool that may help the international community respond to crises, while the Balance of Power has fallen out of favour.

Roles and Functions of UN Collective Security System

A fundamental necessity of modern international law is for disputants to work out their differences amicably. However, when peaceful means fail to resolve an international issue, the parties involved may be compelled to consider the use of coercive measures or even their armed

---

[14] Hoda Mahmoudi, Michael H Allen and Kate Seaman, *Fundamental Challenges to Global Peace and Security : The Future of Humanity* (Palgrave Macmillan 2022).

[15] Christoph Mikulaschek, James Cockayne and Chris D Perry, 'The United Nations Security Council and Civil War: First Insights from a New Dataset' [2011] SSRN Electronic Journal.

[16] James H Mittelman, 'What Drives Global Security and Insecurity?' (2011) 23 Global Change, Peace & Security 113.

[17] Frederik Naert, 'The United Nations Security Council and War. The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945' (2011) 2 Journal of International Humanitarian Legal Studies 159.

forces. The UNCSS is the correct path to the authorised use of force in each of these scenarios. While the right to self-defence is another valid justification for the deployment of military action, the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) will ultimately want to reassume control of the situation.[18] Furthermore, the UNCSS is supported by a global intergovernmental organisation that comprises virtually all governments on the planet, making it the sole universal collective security system in the modern international community. It goes without saying that no other method or organisation exists that can compare to this one in terms of its ability to handle international issues without resorting to the use of force. Furthermore, a few precedents have demonstrated the enormous benefits for states of performing their relevant activity using the UNCSS mechanism.[19] For example, the liberation of Kuwait in 1991 demonstrates that the UNCSS may help balance the power of smaller or weaker states. It is important to remember that the initial architecture of the UNCSS institutionalised the dominance of the P5 over smaller or weaker governments. So, the great nations are cautious about giving this mechanism more influence. The 2003 invasion of Iraq is evidence that major powers may try to use the UNCSS as a reason to dodge the legal repercussions of acting unilaterally. As seen by the Gulf War and other conflicts, the UNCSS may be activated after a disagreement has escalated to the point where it can no longer be resolved peacefully and has been deemed a threat to international peace and security by the UN Security Council.[20] Similarly, if the parties to a territorial dispute are unable to reach a mutually agreeable resolution, they may submit the issue to the UNCSS for resolution. Finally, in the shadow of superpower politics, if an ally of a superpower is at a disadvantage in territorial conflicts, the superpower in question may also interfere as a third party by citing the UNCSS, as the United States did in the Korean War. As a result, the outcome of the relevant territorial conflicts may be legally altered by the superpowers via non-peaceful means, or at least the other side could be coerced into not taking an overly aggressive stance.

Responsibility to Protect the Interest of People and States

Collective security is a concept that requires some clarification from two related concepts: balance of power and global government. Decentralization is the foundation for a system of checks and balances between nations. States operate independently, not deferring to a supranational authority tasked with regulating the balance of power. States, either alone or in

---

[18] Hitoshi Nasu, 'The UN Security Council's Responsibility and the "Responsibility to Protect"' (2011) 15 Max Planck Yearbook of United Nations Law Online 377.

[19] Hitoshi Nasu, 'The Expanded Conception of Security and International Law: Challenges to the UN Collective Security System' (2011) 3 Amsterdam Law Forum 15.

[20] Alexander Orakhelashvili, *Collective Security* (Oxford University Press 2011).

coalitions that better reflect their shared interests, are always looking to shift the balance of power and establish their place in the world. The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) is an example of a defensive alliance between states that could be formed under this theory in response to real or imagined threats from outside.[21] Such adaptable alliances make possible the frequent realignment of forces. The hope for peace is based on the theory of deterrence through equilibration, which holds that competing claims to power will eventually cancel each other out. On the other side, proponents of global government argue for the establishment of a supranational governmental body with the authority to deploy coercive measures on par with those of a stable nation-state. An institution with the capacity and capability to preserve, by unchallengeable force so far as may be necessary, the order and stability of a global community is imposed on states in this view and they are stripped of their status as centres of power and policy on matters of war and peace.[22] Therefore, the concept of global government is the normative or ideal vision of the international political community operating under a universal rule that does not currently exist. UNCSS is a concept that attempts to manage the issue of power relations between states by imposing a scheme of partially centralised management on a situation in which power remains fused among national units, and it does so by incorporating elements of both balance of power and global government. United Nations as an international organisation with the power to determine when the use of force is unjustified and the power to compel states to work together under its direction in suppressing such use is necessary in a hybrid system where states are denied the legal right to use force at their discretion and agree to follow objective rules governing the threat and use of force.[23] This form of collective security does not go far enough to establish a global government-style monopoly on the use of force. So, a hybrid collective security system like UNCSS can only exert as much authority as its members grant it.

Contribution of UN Collective Security System in Previous Conflicts

The imbalance of power around the world was exposed during World War I. The system failure had potentially disastrous consequences. Due to the unprecedented destruction caused by the war, most countries in the world rejected a balance of power system as the foundation for international security after World War I. Instead, the victors aimed to create a permanent

---

[21] Nikhil Suresh Pareek, 'UN Security Council and Deficit of Collective Security' [2012] SSRN Electronic Journal.

[22] Ramesh Chandra Thakur, *The United Nations, Peace and Security : From Collective Security to the Responsibility to Protect* (Cambridge University Press 2017).

[23] Isobel mname Roele, 'Security Council Working Methods: Working Together for Collective Security' [2017] SSRN Electronic Journal.

mechanism for collective security through the League of Nations, in which the aggression of one nation would be met with retaliation from the rest.[24] Under the arrangement of UNCSS, states are obligated to put at the disposal of the United Nations agreed power necessary for an international peace force to be equipped with accepted types of armaments, which is one of the steps the UN has called for to ensure international peace and security. Under the United Nations, rather than having a formalised collective security regime, a loosely organised Collective Security mechanism took the reins of international willingness to control soldiers in order to further the UN's peace objective.[25] When an aggressor is present, a UNCSS must be put in place to deter further aggression and maintain stability. There is no way for any UN member to remain neutral in this position, and no UN member would knowingly back an aggressor. The combined armies of all the other states should be so overwhelming that the aggressor is forced to end hostilities and retreat for fear of sanctions if it dares to use force. Unwillingness to compromise on national sovereignty is a major flaw in the UNCSS. Until now, states have typically insisted on their freedom to view conflicts through the lens of their national interest and to support or oppose UN action according to that perspective. As a result, collective security is more of an ideal than a common reality.[26] Overreliance of the Security Council on the member-governments for help, particularly the United States, Britain, Germany, Japan, etc., is another issue that has contributed to the failure of the United Nations Collective Security system. As a result of their excessive reliance on one another, several countries have taken unilateral action in times of war without seeking the blessing of the United Nations Security Council. On occasion, they disregard the Security Council's directives not to take action without consulting the council. An even more glaring example is the way the United States and Britain shaped the role of the coalition forces during the Iraq crisis.[27] There is little question that the Security Council's ability to play its role in preserving international peace and security is weakened by the lack of geographical diversity among its members. The main problem is that members who believe their opinions are heard but have no impact on policy on the protection of their interests have become disengaged from U.N. actions pertaining to Collective Security. The UN asked other UN members to send soldiers and other aid to South

---

[24] D Sarooshi, 'The United Nations Collective Security System and the Establishment of Peace' (2000) 53 Current Legal Problems 621.

[25] Tatah Mentan, *The United Nations Organization : (In)Securing Global Peace & Security* (Langaa Research & Publishing Cig 2020).

[26] John Trent and Laura Schnurr, *A United Nations Renaissance What the UN Is, and What It Could Be* (Verlag Barbara Budrich 2017).

[27] Nikolaos K Tsagourias and Nigel D White, *Collective Security : Theory, Law and Practice* (Cambridge University Press 2013).

Korea after learning of North Korea's hostility, and it also requested that the US president appoint a Supreme Commander of the UN Forces. As a result, the United Nations proved its mettle in the face of blatant aggression despite the fact that it lacked its own armed forces, as required by Article 43 of the Charter.[28] Critics, however, asserted that the only reason UN action against North Korea was actually enforced was because the Soviet envoy was absent from Security Council meetings. They said that he would have blocked any action taken against North Korea if he had been present. Their view is that the United States and other UN members who backed enforcement operations were not necessarily showing that they were willing to stand up to aggression because they believed in the Principle of Collective Security.[29] Intervention in Korea was not a case of countries fighting any aggressor anywhere for no reason other than to punish aggression and deter potential aggressors; rather, it was a case of collective military defence against the recognised number-one enemy of the United States and of all countries which associated themselves with its action.

Challenges and Limitations in UN Collective Security System that Minimises its Global Effectiveness

The UN Charter places two restrictions on the idea of Collective Security. It recognises a state's right to use force in self-defence against another state. Putting it into effect, this concept provides a legitimate justification for initiating aggression or a war under the pretext of acting in self-defence. Second, it recognises countries' legal authority to form regional security organisations and defence pacts. It recognises regional security structures as instruments for maintaining stability. Actually, the functioning of regional security systems has been a source of strain on global peace and security. The UNCSS's flawed premise that the aggressor and the form of aggression may be truly and easily determined in the case of an attack on any nation is another key flaw.[30] It is not easy to tell who or what is being aggressive in real life. A common justification for an attacker's violent behaviour is the need for the aggressor to protect it. The lack of a permanent peace keeping army is another fundamental flaw of the UNCSS. Only after the Security Council decides to use force against an aggressor is the process of forming a military force dedicated to collective security begun. It takes a long time to muster the force because of how slow and tough this procedure is. There is a long delay between the start of

---

[28] Thomas G Weiss and Sam Daws, *The Oxford Handbook on the United Nations* (Oxford University Press 2018).

[29] Lawrence D Freedman, Michael W Doyle and Nicholas Sambanis, 'Making War and Building Peace: United Nations Peace Operations' (2006) 85 Foreign Affairs 163.

[30] Simon Jackson and Alanna O'Malley, *The Institution of International Order : From the League of Nations to the United Nations* (Routledge 2018).

hostilities and when the United Nations can send in peacekeepers to restore order, giving the aggressor ample time to reap the benefits of their actions.[31] The UNCSS is predicated on the idea that all participating governments should have an equal voice in policymaking. The principle of equality is not met in practice. Strong governments usually have the upper hand when it comes to collective security choices and actions. When it comes to carrying out a collective security measure, only the most powerful governments can make a real difference. There are instances when a dominant state is hesitant to lend its weight to a collective security effort that does not align perfectly with its own national interests. The high stakes involved in the UNCSS efforts also pose a problem. People should not worry about being persecuted by their own governments, which are able to effectively implement laws against them.[32] On a global scale, though, things seem very different. There are far more imbalances of power. If a minor country, like Nigeria, were to become aggressive, a global society might be able to easily destroy it. However, if a large state like China or Russia were to become aggressive, many more questions would arise. It is one thing for a country to try to enforce a law against a helpless individual, but it is quite another for the United Nations to try to do so against a state that might be nearly as powerful as the rest of the world put together. The proliferation of nuclear weapons only exacerbates the situation. With these kinds of weaponry, an aggressor may obliterate a large portion of the collective defence force in a single stroke. A group member whose own life or death interests were at stake might choose reckless defiance over capitulation in such a situation.[33] A member who does not feel a direct threat to their own critical interests is less inclined to take such a risk. Moreover, states are reluctant to make up their minds in advance to take on such risks, regardless of which the aggressor and the victim might be.

Ukraine-Russia Conflict: A Moment of Truth for UN Collective Security System

As a result of Russia's aggression against Ukraine, the United Nations is in the midst of a catastrophic crisis. Russia uses its veto power at the UN Security Council to hide its own wrongdoing and extortion. The General Assembly of the United Nations passed resolutions with overwhelming majorities condemning Russian aggression in Ukraine and suspending

---

[31] Deepak Mawar, *States Undermining International Law : The League of Nations, United Nations, and Failed Utopianism* (Palgrave Macmillan 2021).
[32] Michael Von, *On Building Peace : Rescuing the Nation-State and Saving the United Nations* (Amsterdam University Press 2017).
[33] Richard Wilcox, 'The Effect of United Nations Peace Operations on Post-Civil War Human Rights' [2012] SSRN Electronic Journal.

Moscow's membership in the Human Rights Council, but these actions cannot mask the acute dilemma that the UN is facing.[34] While the United Nations Security Council is in theory responsible for maintaining international peace and stability, the Russian use of its veto power has rendered the body practically ineffective. The aggressor has the legal and institutional capacity to shield itself from adverse condemnations and resolutions, which makes the situation all the more shocking. The worldwide political collaboration and collective security ideal known as multilateralism is not enough to eradicate enmity, conflict, or the rules of power in this conflict.[35] Without Russia and the revisionist powers who are close to them, as well as the non-aligned governments that are against such an endeavour, a collective security system would become an alliance uniting one portion of the world against another. Therefore, Western powers must prioritise their own bodies without losing sight of a global perspective. But they cannot settle with Europeanist constructivism or pick the incorrect tier of authority. To understand the roots of the Ukraine issue, we must examine the post-Cold War scenario in Europe.[36] The West kept NATO alive, which worsened relations with Russia, rather than including Russia into a collective security structure on an equal basis. Both NATO and the EU extended invitations to Ukraine to join, despite repeated warnings from Moscow that this would be a bad idea. This led to a gradual return to the traditional balance of power arrangement characterised by separate spheres of influence. Russia's inclusion in the Euro-Atlantic security architecture could help avert future wars of a similar nature. Russia and Ukraine should be included into the current collective defence organisation (NATO) to make it more effective as a collective security organization.[37] But the Ukraine conflict has demonstrated how vulnerable the UN's current arms control procedures are. The United Nations needs to at least address these strategic concerns if it wants to have any future influence in debates of peace and security. This does not mean they should go about creating brand new organisations or treaty bodies. At the moment, the UN can facilitate the formation of coalitions by smaller and medium-sized states to promote responsible use of new weapons systems, and bolster lagging arms control

---

[34] Global Policy Journal, 'The Origins of the Ukraine Crisis and the Need for Collective Security between Russia and the West | Global Policy Journal' (*www.globalpolicyjournal.com*2022) <https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/articles/conflict-and-security/origins-ukraine-crisis-and-need-collective-security-between-russia-an>.

[35] Ibrahim Khalifa, 'The Russian-Ukrainian War in the Light of the International Collective Security System and Unilateral Measures' [2022] SSRN Electronic Journal.

[36] Robert Legvold and Roman Solchanyk, 'Ukraine and Russia: The Post-Soviet Transition' (2001) 80 Foreign Affairs 171.

[37] Ekaterina Turkina, 'Russia-Ukraine Crisis: Value-Based and Generational Perspective' (2015) 15 Studies in Ethnicity and Nationalism 185.

agreements on weapons such as landmines and toxic gas.[38] The UN can also investigate measures to reverse the recent fall in UN-based and non-UN-based structures for increasing transparency surrounding military affairs and arms flows. They must work to enhance the United Nations' ability to mediate and conduct fact-finding in internet conflicts, or conflicts involving other emerging weapon technology. The United Nations also have a responsibility to encourage regional confidence-building initiatives. For instance, the Secretary-General has traditionally been tasked with encouraging regional security cooperation.[39] A series of steps to establish trust, beginning with the establishment of military hotlines and culminating in gestures such as prior notification of troop movements and military exercises, allowing adversaries to send military experts to observe such manoeuvres should be introduced.

Conclusion

World superpowers and the five permanent members of the UN Security Council in particular, have historically set the course for the UNCSS. Because the interests of the big five, especially the United States, must be at stake for smaller and medium powers to gain from the Collective Security framework, these countries often feel excluded. The system is poor, but that does not mean it is completely out of the ordinary. The UNCSS is still necessary, but it has some serious flaws that need fixing. These include expanding the Security Council to accommodate the political interests of states seen as orchestrating these new security challenges, and accepting the expanded role of the UN in preventing the spread of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism. Therefore, it is crucial to stress the necessity for a confidence-building measure to be implemented among UN members to establish the necessary solidarity and collaboration for lasting global peace and security. Doing so would be a first step toward the serious reforms being proposed by UN member states, especially those from Asia, Latin America, and Africa, in the form of an expanded Security Council with more equitable representation based on geography and power dynamics.

---

[38] Jean-Sylvestre Mongrenier, 'The UN, Russian Aggression and the Impasses of Collective Security: Elements of Analysis and Response' (*Desk Russie* 17 May 2022) <https://en.desk-russie.eu/2022/05/17/the-un-the-russian-agression.html> accessed 28 August 2022.
[39] Lakshmi Puri, 'The Russia-Ukraine War: The Last Crisis to Break the UN Camel's Back?' (*ORF* 2022) <https://www.orfonline.org/research/the-last-crisis-to-break-the-un-camels-back/>.