

Original Paper

Reform of the Backbone of the United Nations

Hanne Christensen^{1*}

¹ Former United Nations staff member, Geneva, Switzerland

* Hanne Christensen, Former United Nations staff member, Elsinore, Denmark

Received: August 14, 2019 Accepted: August 23, 2019 Online Published: September 19, 2019

doi:10.22158/jar.v3n4p279

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.22158/jar.v3n4p279>

Abstract

This paper outlines what can be done to reform the backbone of the United Nations to further the work of the organization. That is the General Assembly, the Security Council and ECOSOC. It shows that the General Assembly can play a stronger role in international peace and security matters by suggesting peace proposals for potential conflicts, and inform the Security Council if, and when, it is not in agreement with measures taken by the Council. The paper comments on ongoing negotiations on Security Council reform and shows the difficulty of reforming the veto clause. It suggests that ECOSOC deals with both economic and social causes of conflicts and develops macro-economic and macro-social strategies to prevent conflict for the General Assembly to recommend to member states and onwards to the Security Council to act on. Some concrete examples are indicated to that effect.

Keywords

UN reform, general assembly, security council, ECOSOC, interaction

1. Introduction

In the United Nations Charter, three of six organs are set out to discuss UN matters. It is first of all the General Assembly, the Security Council, and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC). Initially, there were four such organs, the fourth being the Trusteeship Council, but since it has not been functional since 1994, it is left out here.

All 193 UN member states are represented in the General Assembly, and all can participate in the discussions on an equal footing, no matter the size of population or economic wealth. The Security Council includes a fragment of all UN member states, namely 15. Five are permanent members (China, France, Russia, UK, and the USA) and ten are elected by the General Assembly for an overlapping two-year period at a time on a geographic rotational basis. ECOSOC on its part comprises a sample of 54 member states likewise elected by the Assembly for an overlapping yet three-year term with geographic rotation. Membership of the General Assembly had gradually increased from 46 in 1945,

when the Charter entered into force, to the present level. The Security Council has been enlarged once from 11 to 15 members in 1965, whereas the membership of ECOSOC was adjusted upwards as the membership of the Assembly increased, and a growing number of Non-Governmental organizations has been granted consultative status to the Council. The Charter, in detail, prescribes the work of these three organs. They form the backbone of the United Nations, where matters are reviewed and decisions made-in UNGA and ECOSOC in the form of recommendations, in the Security Council as binding decisions to be implemented by member states. Attempts to reform the UN comprehensively needs to look at these three organs, their interdependence, and interaction.

2. The General Assembly

The General Assembly (UNGA) is the chief organ of the United Nations; the root of all other organs. It is also the only organ with budgetary powers. The Security Council cannot appropriate a single dollar of UN funds. The General Assembly elects two-thirds of the Security Council to represent it in international peace and security matters, the last third consisting of non-electable permanent members. The Security Council annually reports to the General Assembly, which, in turn, can accept or reject the reporting. These reports shall include an account of the measures decided by the Security Council. If the General Assembly cannot see itself in these measures, it can choose to stay silent or criticize the Council and make recommendations for alternative action.

The General Assembly can deal with political matters, falling within the primary responsibility of the Security Council, as set out in Articles 11, 12, 13(1a), 14 and 15 of the Charter. The Assembly cannot legislate, merely initiate studies, recommend principles, norms or standards, propose policies for member states to follow and act on, and encourage the progressive development of international law and its codification. Its powers are mostly advisory with no binding force. A recommendation from the General Assembly often has not only a moral effect, also a political one, especially if the Permanent Five members of the Security Council (the P5s), but not exclusively, choose to pursue the matter, which makes it more effective than legal norms. The unanimously adopted global Sustainable Development Goals provide an example.

Efforts to reform the General Assembly have been going on for some time. In 2005, UNGA established an ad hoc working group on the revitalization of its work as a critical component of the overall reform of the UN, and to make the Assembly a more active player for the management of the world. It happened within a context of the UN summit of Heads of State and Government held the same year that termed the General Assembly “the chief deliberative, policymaking and representative organ of the United Nations”. The working group, which consists of representatives of Member States, has come up with several reform proposals that have been adopted as UNGA resolutions. Hence, the General Assembly is fully aware that reform of UNGA is needed as an essential issue in its own right. Why? Because, UNGA should make full use of the mandate accorded by the Charter, and the Charter assigns a stronger role to the General Assembly than what it has currently and has had for decades, although

trends toward more significant involvement of the Assembly materialized in the past ten years, the past 3-4 years especially so, pursued with determination by the President of the Assembly's 70th session, Mogens Lykketoft. These trends can be further strengthened within the framework of the Charter. Through greater involvement of Member States, the General Assembly can become a more pronounced counterbalance to the Security Council, just as it was intended originally to be.

The General Assembly represents the world community with one member one vote. Every Member State has a say in the Assembly and can speak its mind on big and small. The stronger the General Assembly, the more critical a United Nations organization, well prepared to address the problems of the world population.

Article 10 of the Charter of the United Nations provides that the General Assembly may discuss any matter or question within the Charter. It also provides that it may make recommendations to members of the United Nations and the Security Council in matters on international peace and security, save what is provided for by Article 12 of the Charter: disputes or situations seized by the Security Council. The General Assembly can discuss and draw the attention of the Security Council to situations that might endanger international peace and security (Article 11.3), and it has the power to deny funds for any peace mission devised by the Security Council, if it is found not to be in accord with the purposes and principles of the Charter. Hence, UNGA can be more of a counterbalance to the Security Council than what it is currently and has been for decades.

With the Assembly's ability to draw the attention of the Council to situations arising on the horizon, which may influence international peace and security in the future, it enables the Assembly to make policies for achievement of international peace and security and advise the Security Council on future focus.

Each year the session of the General Assembly is launched by the general debate where every member state is given the floor. It is frequently heads of State and Government, who speak, notably on what the UN should do. If a member state wants to push the UN back to the track of the Charter, it can say so, i.e., that the UN needs to pursue pacific settlement of conflict first of all, thereafter apply sanctions and, when these two options are exhausted, apply armed force—rather than focusing on military might, which has been the trend in the latest decades, where peacekeeping operations increased from 5 in 1990 to 14 in 2019 which is not the intention of the Charter. The sequence of the Charter needs to be restored to the working of the Security Council. That is first and foremost Chapter VI action with a pacific settlement of disputes and conflict, followed by Chapter VII action with forceful measures, i.e., sanctions first, and only apply armed force as a last resort, if peaceful redress has sadly failed. If a member state finds that the Security Council has diverted from the road prescribed by the Charter, it can say so in the general debate and remind the Council of getting back on track. Member states can also make pacific proposals for conflict resolution to the Security Council, for instance, based on research conducted by peace research institutions around the world, which haven't yet been tested out. If 193 member states put their minds to it, jointed by the peace research community, innovative

peacemaking proposals are bound to materialize. Hence, the Security Council would be put into perspective, and the role of the General Assembly as peacemaker would be strengthened vis-à-vis that of the Security Council.

The higher the focus on peace and security and the more concrete pacific proposals for conflict resolution on the part of the General Assembly, the higher the pressure on the Security Council for maintenance of international peace and security without the use of military means.

The General Assembly can discuss the way the Security Council works, its action and inaction, and, if it is not in agreement with it, inform the Security Council of its opinion and recommend it to alter the course of action. According to Article 24.1 of the Charter, member states of the United Nations (that is the General Assembly) “confer on the Security Council primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, and agree that in carrying out its duties under this responsibility the Security Council acts on their behalf”. It is worth noting that the term “confer” refers to two equal partners, comparing notes. The purpose of this provision is to ensure prompt and effective action by the United Nations. It is the primary responsibility, which is referred to, not all the responsibility. The Security Council does not have exclusive responsibility, as affirmed by the International Court of Justice (the *Certain Expenses Advisory Opinion* of 20 July 1962). The General Assembly has a secondary responsibility. It also has the responsibility to monitor whether the Council actually acts on its behalf, and, if it doesn't, to make its opinion known to the Security Council.

Moreover, if the Security Council action is blocked by a veto on a matter falling under the *Responsibility to Protect* doctrine, the General Assembly can exercise its responsibility for maintenance of international peace and security under the *Uniting for Peace* resolution of 1950, rather than wait for the Permanent Five to reach concurrence that may not ensue in time. It can cost thousands of lives to wait. The resolution asserts the right of the General Assembly to step in, when the Security Council is unable to act owing to P5 differences, and make recommendations, including those involving the use of armed force. With a majority of two-thirds of the Security Council, or a majority of the members of the United Nations, an emergency session of the General Assembly can be called within 24 hours, and the General Assembly in principle vote the action through with a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting. In this respect, the General Assembly exercises its secondary responsibility and, at the same time, applies ultimate responsibility. However, since recommendations of the General Assembly do not have binding effects, it would be up to a coalition of the willing among the member states to execute the recommendations. With the moral support of the General Assembly.

This secondary responsibility was last assumed in 2016, when the General Assembly expressed outrage at the recent escalation of violence in Syria, particularly in Aleppo, and demanded an immediate and complete end to all attacks on civilians and civilian objects and all sieges throughout Syria in a resolution passed with a majority close to two-thirds. The resolution was proposed by Canada, following several failed attempts by France to get a similar resolution adopted by the Security Council.

Hence, if the Security Council does not act in accord with the General Assembly's inclination, or if the Council does not act promptly with effective action, the Assembly can criticize the Council for not representing it in the way it should be. If a veto blocks the Security Council, the Assembly can make up for it with a resolution, expressing the recommendation of the United Nations membership, which would denounce the action of the Security Council, as was what happened in the case above.

With active, eloquent Member States in the General Assembly, decisions of the Security Council can be put into perspective and advocated for being set right.

3. The Security Council

The Security Council is the executive organ of the United Nations. It has binding powers as regards enforcement measures for the maintenance of international peace and security (Chapter VII action) and advisory powers as concerns the pacific settlement of disputes (Chapter VI action), and it may request both the General Assembly and ECOSOC to furnish it with information in this respect. Decisions of the Security Council takes precedence over the General Assembly in international peace and security matters as long as the required majority is at hand in the Council and its P5s are concurrently united. What the Security Council decides concerning enforcement measures have binding force, which member states are called upon to execute when breaches of the international peace and security occur, and member states have recognized to carry out the decisions of the Security Council by ratifying the UN Charter.

Reform of the Security Council is necessary to be more representative of the UN membership. The Security Council has been reformed only once since the inauguration of the world organization, when as mentioned, in 1965, its membership was increased to 15, even though reform of the Security Council has been on the agenda of the General Assembly since 1979. Current reform efforts to make the Security Council reflect the world situation of today began some 26 years ago. The General Assembly singled out five issues: a) categories of membership, b) the question of the veto held by the five permanent members, c) regional representation, d) the size of an enlarged Security Council and its working methods, and e) the Security Council-General Assembly relationship. The veto question has been the hardest knot to crack, yet even, if that is left out, opinions still differ on the remaining four issues. A couple of years ago, the message coming out from the negotiations was that agreement had ensued on item c) and part of item d): to ensure regional representation and increase the number of members of the Security Council to make it more representative of the UN membership. However, as per today, results are still pending. Negotiations are sanding up over and again.

The negotiations among the member states are inspired by the report *In Larger Freedom* presented to UNGA by late Kofi Annan in 2005, then secretary-general of the United Nations. Annan was analyzing a Security Council, which had its legitimacy questioned by the majority of the member states because of the Council's composition, which he referred to as anachronistic and insufficiently representative. He argued for a model for the Security Council, which is more broadly representative of the

international community as a whole, as well as of the current geopolitical realities. A model in which the Council's working methods would be more transparent and efficient; and hence, result in a Security Council that would be more legitimate in the eyes of the world. Annan stressed the need to increase in decision-making those member states, which contribute most to the United Nations—not only financially, militarily, and diplomatically as well. He suggested an increase of the membership to 24 members, divided into two models, from which member states can choose. Model A, providing for six new permanent members with no veto right, and three new two-year term non-permanent seats, both of which divided among the major regional areas. Model B, which provides for no new permanent places, but a new category of eight four-year renewable term seats and one new two-year non-permanent and non-renewable seat, also divided among the major regional areas. The question of the veto right of the P5s was left untouched, as P5s were as much against lifting it in 2005, as they still are in 2019.

One problem with Security Council reform is that member states have individual motives, which they wish to pursue and find it difficult, if not unwilling, to negotiate a compromise with other member states. Some member states also entertain P5 aspirations, while actual P5s are against sharing their veto right with others. Rivalry among member states also plays a part in the course of the negotiations. Whatever reform efforts materialize, which are not in accord with the Charter, the Charter will have to be amended accordingly, and that takes ratification of the amendment by two-thirds of the member states, including all the P5s. Hence, revision of the Charter needs to muster at least 129 member states, five of which permanent members of the Security Council.

So far, discussions in the General Assembly of item a) categories of membership have been dealing with the bid for permanent membership of the Security Council at some length. It concentrates on four countries: Brazil, Germany, India, and Japan that all have the support of many countries, including P5s, but not enough to constitute two-thirds of the General Assembly, and each of them have adversaries, arguing against the raise of their standing.

As on b) the veto question, it is generally recognized as a major problem that can paralyze the United Nations—and often has been doing so. It applies to all decisions by the Security Council, except procedural questions. The Charter formulates the veto right of the permanent members as a catch 22. All permanent members have the veto right, and the P5s can veto resolutions, amending it. It is worth noting that the veto right was a sine qua non for the establishment of the United Nations. So far, P5s are not inclined to give up their veto right, nor are they inclined to share it with others. Hence a reform, which abandons the veto is not likely to see the light of the day—at least not at the present times unless there is a change of heart with the Permanent Five. That leaves the question of delimitation of the veto. Some years ago, there was a consensus emerging among the P5s for abstention from vetoing mass atrocities, including crimes indictable to the International Criminal Court, i.e., genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes, and crimes of aggression. However, the situation in Syria during the past few years with the extensive bombardment of civilians and civilian targets points to the contrary. Resolutions to stop the bombing was indeed vetoed or was faced with a threat of a veto (the so-called

“pocket veto”). Still, at the general debate of the General Assembly in September 2018, many member states called for such abstention; a call, which received the support of Emanuel Macron, President of France, which points to the possibility of a change in the future.

There is a general agreement of the need c) to increase regional representation in the Security Council, giving more seats to developing countries in order to consider their opinions on international peace and security matters, not least in the light of the long-lived substantive contribution to the peacekeeping missions of quite a few developing countries. Kofi Annan suggested to increase the regional representation with two new permanent members to Africa and Asia and the Pacific, respectively, and one each to Europe and the Americas, which the General Assembly recognizes the validity of. Still, there is no consensus on which member states those seats should be allocated. Member state rivalry comes into play here in a situation where more than two member states would qualify per region.

On d) the size of an enlarged Security Council, there is interest in increasing it to 24 members, which is a number that would render the Council still effective, while broadening the membership to all parts of the world. It would enlarge the share of General Assembly members in the Security Council to about one-eighth as against the current about one-thirteenth, with a significant part of the increase representing the developing countries. With a 24-member Security Council, the math of its voting procedure would also add up, whether decisions require a simple majority or qualified majority.

Concerning e) the Security Council—General Assembly relationship, there is a growing call from many member states for the devolvement of powers to the General Assembly, especially African ones, as the general debate in September 2018 revealed. Frustration was expressed over an inactive Security Council, notably in connection with the tragic situation in Syria, where civilians are exposed to bombardment, while the Security Council refrains from launching reprisals against the perpetrators. However, there is nothing concrete about what such devolvement would involve.

The question of Security Council legitimacy is at the heart of the reform efforts since the member states, as mentioned, confer on the Security Council the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. That implies that the member states trust that the Security Council will act as they would want it to act, and can see themselves in the action and inaction of the Security Council. Otherwise, the risk is that member states may write off the Council as irrelevant, even neglect to execute the decisions of the Security Council. A reform, which upholds the legitimacy of the Security Council, is a must for the United Nations, the Security Council being a defining organ of the organization.

4. ECOSOC

The Charter assigns ECOSOC the function of “*international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all peoples*” (Preamble). ECOSOC is intended as the forum for discussion of macro-policies that would address the economic and social needs of all peoples on an all-win basis, and it is tasked with the formulation of policy recommendations to the member states and

the United Nations system. ECOSOC is the main organ to furthering both economic and social cooperation, and development worldwide by the Charter. It is responsible for the coordination of the economic and social fields of the UN, especially in regards of the 15 specialized agencies, including the international financial institutions, eight functional commissions and five regional commissions of the UN, and it is mandated to consult with non-governmental organizations. Yet, economic issues have been to a large extent left to international financial institutions, although economic issues constitute a significant part of ECOSOC's mandate, and though economic problems often are root causes of conflict in the form of inequitable resource allocation within a population, where a minority gets the lion's share, the majority little or nothing. Consequently, the balance in the Charter between resolving socio-economic causes of conflict and maintenance of peace and security is not upheld.

Economic and social causes of conflict should be addressed by ECOSOC, in line with Article 55 of the Charter. Where these cannot be resolved or alleviated in time, the Security Council would deal with the consequences, primarily through peaceful settlement and, if that fails, through forceful action recommended in Chapter VII of the Charter. In this connection, ECOSOC "may furnish information to the Security Council and shall assist the Security Council upon its request" (Article 65). As for impoverishment of a large part of the world population, a most potent cause of future conflict, ECOSOC can develop for the General Assembly all-gain macro-economic strategies for the full world and macro-social strategies that would remove causes of conflict and help ensure that "WE THE PEOPLES" who declared the UN Charter advance economically and socially (Article 62.1). Members of ECOSOC would have valuable lessons to share in both areas and could offer input, based on experience gained of what works and what doesn't. The regular sessions of ECOSOC could accommodate that.

ECOSOC is presently far from fully utilized as concerns conflict-prevention and conflict-resolution. ECOSOC could review the detrimental impact of macro-economic conditions on the world population, which, if not resolved, could become a significant source of tomorrow's strife, resulting in a battle between the poor and the rich. In 2018, 26 people owned as much as the 3.8 billion people making up the poorest half of humanity. The inequality has been growing since the financial crisis in 2008-2009, and with it, the potential of instability in the world. We saw a touch of it in 2015 when one million people from the Middle East and Africa made their way into Europe and successfully insisted on the entry in their search for safety and to escape from poverty. ECOSOC could discuss and devise strategies for fair and democratic use of natural resources, instead of benefitting the few at the expense of the many; and for revenues from taxation to help the entire population, including the poor. ECOSOC could also devise strategies on how to arrive at an equal resource distribution within a society so that everybody feels that they are getting a share of it. Here again, input from member states on how to share resources with the entire population in a constructive manner is vital.

With ECOSOC as the forum for discussing and initiating actions and for making recommendations to the General Assembly in both economic and social matters, including effective international economic cooperation for the benefit of all, the General Assembly as the forum for adoption of these strategies, and ECOSOC as responsible for the subsequent coordination of their implementation by the UN specialized agencies, including international financial institutions, the balance between addressing socio-economic causes of conflict and maintenance of peace and security in the Charter would be upheld.

ECOSOC is the place where member states can provide input from the empathic world community into the economic and social causes of conflict. Without empathy, the world would collapse. Ideas could be injected into the discussions of ECOSOC, which ensures societies with room for everybody, in which everybody gets a measure of fortune, not just one chance in life, but many. This means societies with high social cohesion, with a general feeling of responsibility for others, societies based on the conviction that there is potential in everybody, and everybody has the right to a proper life. That is, societies observing the full scale of human rights, and societies with policies to prevent people from sinking to the bottom of society if it can be avoided. This societal model is in demand all over the world but takes international cooperation to achieve.

Social cohesion requires understanding within the population of other people's lives and conditions. That is best obtained in direct encounter and dialogue among people of different social backgrounds, and that requires networking among people, which the civil society and NGO sector can contribute to as a supplement to what people do on their own accord. The more varied the networking, the more understanding ensues, and the better-equipped people will be for understanding one another and feel connected to. As social connectivity increases, social cohesion grows. Member states with vibrant civil societies, in which citizens relate to one another, crisscrossing the entire nation, and a large experienced NGO sector could offer their lessons learned. For instance, what has been achieved with voluntary work for the support of the vulnerable, or from adult education programs where people sign up for a subject of interest and get to know one another or sports programs with a great popular appeal where esprit de corps is developed. The media has a significant role to play in informing of the situation of the entire population of a country so that everybody knows that and where hardship exists, and also that it can be addressed with the support of fellow human beings, the state and government, and NGO institutions. Democratic representation in the governing boards of media institutions is vital to ensure broad-based coverage of the situation of the various population groups in a country. Member states with experience in these matters could offer their advice.

Hence, ECOSOC is the place where member states with a considerable measure of social cohesion in society could share its experiences with developing it, whether it be policies to promote inclusion or even out inequality, two of the well-known factors generating social cohesion, or it is due to other factors. When a part of the world population is faring poorly, it is in the interest of all to find solutions to meet the challenge, for it is not acceptable, and holds the potential for clashes between the poor and

the rich. The Charter sets out the United Nations as the locomotive of international cooperation. ECOSOC is an essential engine for that travel.

The General Assembly could recommend comprehensive discussion of economic and social causes of conflict to be entered on the agenda of ECOSOC, while NGOs with consultative status to ECOSOC could lobby for it worldwide. Subsequently, ECOSOC could devise macro-strategies addressing these causes of conflict for the General Assembly to act on, which go beyond the Sustainable Development Goals and through it to the Security Council. One example would be a macro-economic strategy, which institutionalizes taxation, including tobacco tax, to delimit smoking to keep the population healthy. That could include taxation of the corporate sector with a fixed percentage and of the working population according to the principle that the broadest shoulders carry the most massive load, applied by welfare states in the world. That is taxation of taxpayers based on the ability to pay. With the well-offs paying a higher percentage of tax than other population groups, and social welfare programs for those in need, everybody would get a share of the development of a country, and no one would go hungry. That would reduce inequality among various population groups, and prevent tension in society. In measuring inequality, the Gini-coefficient and Gini-index are useful tools, the smaller, the better, and can measure development in time and enable countries to follow up with appropriate policies, seeking to reduce high values. Countries with experience in making use of the Gini-coefficient and Gini-index for reduction of inequality can provide advice. ECOSOC could also devise strategies to prevent tax frauds in a country and bring multinationals, including the Tech-Giants, to pay tax in the states, in which they operate. No matter whether it is the manufacture of goods or provision of services, so that surplus obtained in a country is subjected to taxation in that country, stays in that country, and contributes to financing social welfare programs for the benefit of its population, while transfers to tax havens would be illegal.

Inspired by the work of Vijay Metha, an example of macro-social strategies would be to establish institutions of peace to counterbalance institutions of war in member states. That is Departments for Peace and Peace Centers in areas of need to give peace a chance to settle in society. The policy of these institutions would be to turn military costs into support for peace and social welfare programs, benefitting the entire population. The Department for Peace, led by a minister, would promote a culture of peace and work for disarmament at home and abroad at the policy level, and allocate public resources to conflict prevention. The Peace Centers, which would be open to the entire population, would bring together people of different walks in life, monitor and prevent tension in society, deal with mediation and reconciliation between antagonistic groups, and activate people with peaceful leisure activities. In short, give people in areas at risk of unrest a meaningful life that would not harm others and prepare them for gainful employment, including idle young people who would otherwise roam the streets of a country, young males, for instance, who could be exposed to radicalization.

Once macro-economic and macro-social strategies are included in a resolution of ECOSOC, the Council can, on the one side, make its recommendations known to the specialized agencies, including

the international financial institutions, for implementation, and pass them on to the General Assembly for discussion and subsequent adoption, on the other. That way, the entire world community would be behind the strategies, and the strategy would be ready for implementation by the member states.

5. Conclusions

There is a dynamic among the three organs of the United Nations. Discussions on economic and social issues, including social and economic roots of conflicts, can be taken up in ECOSOC and presented to the General Assembly as macro-economic and macro-social strategies for the world community to act on. The strategies can then end up as General Assembly resolutions addressed to member states and the Security Council. This way, economic causes, such as uneven allocation of revenues from natural resources in society, which notoriously is a root of conflicts, can be dealt with in peace negotiations under the umbrella of the Security Council, when new societal models for long-lived conflict-ridden member states are reviewed. Likewise, in the case of social roots of conflicts in societies of little cohesion, including social cohesion within the various segments of society that involves misdeeds, such as deep-going discrimination against minorities or extremism exercised against civilians. That can be dealt with in peace negotiations under the umbrella of the Security Council on a peaceful societal model based on the rule of law, which includes protection of minorities and bring extremists and terrorists to book. The General Assembly on its part can ask ECOSOC to devise strategies, addressing these problems, if it finds that ECOSOC is too passive in this regard, and the Security Council can ask ECOSOC to furnish information on economic and social causes of conflicts seized by it, and assist it in how to prevent them.

Further, The General Assembly can act as a watchdog over the Security Council and see to it that Security Council action reflects its opinions, as expressed in Assembly resolutions and choose to take matters in its own hands if it doesn't. It can inform the Council of its view once a year when the Security Council presents its reporting to the Assembly, and, if a veto in the Security Council blocks a decision, it can activate the Uniting for peace procedure to tell the Council to get back on track.

All this requires a UN membership in agreement with it, since the UN is what its member states want it to be, not more not less.

References

- Charter of the United Nations.* (1945). Retrieved from <https://www.un.org/en/sections/un-charter-full-text/>
- Churchill, W. S. (2000). *The Second World War, Vol. VI: Triumph and Tragedy* (pp. 165-169, pp. 274-288). London: The Folio Society.
- Firebaugh, G. (2003). *The New Geography of Global Income Inequality*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Havard University Press.
- Metha, V. (2019). *How Not To Go To War*. Oxford: Catapult.

Report of the Secretary-General: In Larger Freedom. (2005). UN document A/59/2005 of 21 March 2005.

2005 World Summit Outcome Document. (2005). General Assembly Resolution: A/RES/60/1 of 24 October 2005 (para. 149).