

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**The Idea of Peace in the United Nations: A Critical Analysis from Moral
Perspectives**

By – Yodit Walelegn

June, 2020

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCE
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**The Idea of Peace in the United Nations: A Critical Analysis from Moral
Perspectives**

Advisor: Tenna Dewo (Ph.D.)

By: Yodit Walelegn

**A Thesis Submitted to the School of Graduate Studies of Addis Ababa
University in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirement for The Degree of
Masters of Arts in Philosophy**

June, 2020

Addis Ababa

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

**The Idea of Peace in the United Nations: A Critical Analysis from Moral
Perspectives**

By – Yodit Walelegn

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS:

_____ Advisor	_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Examiner	_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Examiner	_____ Signature	_____ Date
_____ Chairman	_____ Signature	_____ Date

June, 2020

Acknowledgment

First, and for most, I thank my God, who gave me the strength to complete this thesis. I would also like to express my profound gratitude to my advisor, Dr. Tenna Dewo. Without his patience, scholarly comments and encouragement, this thesis would not have been completed.

I owe the deepest gratitude to my best friend, Robel Fantu, for his encouragement and support throughout my study. My appreciation also goes to my friends and families; Tadiwos Fantahun, Hiwot Berhanu, Miraf Walelegn, and Wudalem Kasse.

Finally, I would like to express my heartfelt appreciation to my Aunt Sipara Legesse for her endless prayers, love, blessings and encouragement throughout my life.

Abstract

The United Nations (UN) efforts towards the maintenance of international peace and security have been criticized by members, nonmember states, scholars, philosophers and diplomats. The organization's peacekeeping and security missions are influenced by forces other than the Charter as well as the negotiation made on cases. As a result, many demanding occasions of peacekeeping missions of the United Nations have failed. In contradiction with the common goals of the Charter of the UN, during the past three decades, its failures were higher than its success. It has been more productive during the Cold War (1941-1991) than it is after that Cold War.

This thesis aims to explain why the UN could not bring peace as it promised on its Charter. In this connection, it also discusses the contradiction between the interest of veto powers and the Charter. Furthermore, the demand for peacekeeping missions is not treated in accordance with the Charter. Based on this, the present research forwards a critique of the organization's peacekeeping mission from a moral perspective. With this, the thesis recommends Immanuel Kant's arguments on perpetual peace as a solution to the pitfalls of the UN.

Key Words:

Charter, UN, Morality, Superpower, Perpetual Peace, Peacekeeping, Security.

Contents

Introduction.....	I
Chapter One: An Overview on the History of the First and the Second World Wars.....	1
1.1. The Great War (1914 -1918)	1
1.2. The Treaty of Versailles	7
1.3. The League of Nation	10
1.4. The Second World War	13
1.5. The Establishment of the United Nations.....	17
Chapter Two: Peace and Morality.....	23
2.1. General Perception of Peace.....	23
2.2. Peace and Its Relation to Morality.....	29
2.3. The Theory of Just War	35
Chapter Three: Perpetual Peace and the United Nations Peace Keeping Mission.....	39
3.1. The Theory of Perpetual Peace.....	39
3.2. Peacekeeping in the UN	49
Chapter Four: Critical Analysis of the UN Peacekeeping Mission.....	52
4.1. National Interest versus the UN Peacekeeping Mission.....	52
4.2. Towards Cosmopolitan World.....	56
4.3. Conclusion.....	58
Bibliography.....	65

Introduction

The UN engagement on peace and security has been analyzed and criticized by scholars and practitioners. In various predicaments and unresolved cases of peacekeeping missions, state interests were enforced in contrast to the purpose of the Charter to resolve conflicts. The UN Charter, Chapter one, Article one, obliges to maintain international peace and security. It binds to preserve peace and security without any condition.

The vote of superpowers in the UN's system has been influencing peacekeeping or peace enforcement missions. And this has been criticized by different forms for decades. Hence, in connection to this, the present research discusses how these actions are morally permissible. That is because cases are not treated merely by evaluating what happened on the ground. Peacekeeping cases are not treated impartially under the Charter of the UN.

The first chapter of this paper analyzes the historical background of the UN. By examining the major causes of the two world wars and related agreements, I will clarify how it led to the development of the UN. The battles were the main elements for the creation of the LN and later the UN. I will also argue that the nature of these organizations is not about keeping or enforcing peace. Instead, it is about maintaining a balance of power and domination. I will also explain how unjust agreements inflamed different wars.

The second chapter will explain the concept of peace and ethics from different perspectives. The purpose of defining these terms is rooted in the aim of peacekeeping engagements of the UN. Accordingly, in this chapter, after discussing the classifications of peace as external and internal, few peace theories from Eastern and other western traditions will be raised and discussed. In this chapter, I will also mention deontological and consequential ethical theories. Finally, to make clear the connection between ethics and peace, I will discuss just war theory.

Chapter three explores Kant's perpetual peace theory; it discusses his articles (preliminary and definitive) for a peaceful environment, internally as well as externally. Perpetual peace theory argues that peace is maintained among individuals and between states through time if states place their efforts towards it. For effective results in the UN, the system should practice the articles.

The last chapter of this paper is concerned about the UN system and its engagement in the cosmopolitan world. I will discuss Gold, Dore's (2005) critique of the UN, by giving further examples of failed peacekeeping missions. After debating a cosmopolitan world, I will argue the need for perpetual peace and good will to strengthen the organization.

Finally, there will be a concise conclusion, in which I argue the need to strive for peace. In my argument, I will show that through time nations, as well as individuals, are not trailing moral values. Thus, for the UN to necessarily build perpetual peace, countries should be committed to giving away part of their free will from their sovereignty. Accordingly, the UN should serve its primary purpose; or it should be morally right and acceptable universally and act out of duty. It should understand the necessity of peace and act accordingly.

Chapter One

An Overview on the History of the First and the Second World Wars

The historical background of the UN shows the hideous experience that human beings have ever had. As it reveals the history of the two Great Wars, that escalated human misery, it also generally demonstrates the unchanging savage nature of man. While the UN is still struggling to reverse the problem of humanity, its history of success falls behind. This chapter focuses on the history of the two Great Wars, the LN and finally, the UN.

1.1. The Great War (1914 -1918)

At the beginning of the 20th century, different parts of the world were engaged in conflicts, not just with neighboring countries but worldwide. It is less arguable that Europe has played a significant role in the cause of disputes, which led to the First as well as the Second World War. During the First World War, European countries' interest in Africa and Asia has escalated. They were thrilled for conflicts revealing supremacy. The industrial revolution of armaments and scientific discoveries were additional factors that have inflamed the conflict.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, large movements for territorial expansion were a good reason for conflicts. On the one hand, Europeans and other powerful countries like German, Britain, France, and Japan colonized independent countries; as a result of which countries commenced revolutionary attacks. On the other hand, they had decades of unsettled border conflicts. These were the significant challenges of how to define their borders. They also believed in the necessity to reconcile historical failures, where most have lost lands through battlefields and wanted to re-surmount their lands.

The First World War has been one of the greatest disasters that human beings have ever faced in history. The war included most parts of the world that massacred more than 10 million people. It was a disaster for human nature and its results were unexpected. The war had exterminated and savaged man. It has created poverty, genocide, suspicion and hate among nations. People were suspicious and fearful of other countries. Escalation of fear among nations led to the manufacturing of weapons, to have a stronger ability to attack others, and protect citizens. Especially Europeans were competing to develop more advanced weaponry in case of an attack to protect their citizens and/or to launch attacks on the enemy.

The war starting from Europe has escalated into a worldwide conflict. Suspicion, curiosity, and fear between states were the reasons for politicians to develop sophisticated military weapons to protect their own homeland and to attack that of others. The war was also taken as a chance for demonstration of arms like rifles, machine guns, flamethrowers, aircraft, poison gas and tanks. Europeans were planning war against their neighbors and tendered reasons for going to war. They were already convinced that negotiations would not halt the war. It was thought to be a war that was planned to settle significant dissents among Europeans.

For centuries it is believed that war proves manhood and whether soldiers or warriors who fought for their country were heroes or not. And these warriors were to be the lords and governors of their lands. These seem to be true in most wars, even in today's modern world.

European sentiments were nationalistic. They were highly proud of themselves, and each nation believed that it is chosen. Countries like Germany, France, British, and Russia had abhorrent feelings amongst themselves even long before the 19th century. Many European countries, like Germany, France, British, and Italy, were competing for lands and recourses in Europe and

Africa; partly, the scramble for Africa was also ways of clout.

The First World War was believed to end shortly. The German general has schemed wars from two fronts - one with France and the other with Russia. Schlieffen Plan was a war plan named after German field Marshal Alfred Von Schlieffen (1833-1913) during the First World War. The project was plotted after defeating France in six weeks to battle Russia. As this plan had underestimated France and Russia's military capacity, it did not meet its schedule. Russia has recovered sooner after the war with Japan; its army was geared up to wage war before the Schlieffen plan was successful in France; that is, France resisted Germany for more than six weeks.

The Austrians were fighting for the preservation of their historic multinational empire against disintegration provoked by their old adversary Russia. The Russians were fighting for the protection of their Slav kith and kin, for the defense of their national honor, and to fulfill their obligations to their ally France. The French were fighting in self-defense against totally unprovoked aggression by their traditional enemy. The British were fighting to uphold the law of nations and to pre-empt the greatest threat they had faced from the continent since the days of Napoleon. The Germans were fighting on behalf of their one remaining ally, and to repel a Slavic threat from the east that had joined forces with their jealous rivals in the west to stifle their rightful emergence as a World Power. These were the arguments that governments presented to their peoples. But the peoples did not have to be whipped up by the government propaganda. It was in the spirit of

simple patriotic duty that they joined the colors and went to war.

(Michael, 2003, p.33)

The immediate cause of the First World War was the death of Austria-Hungary heir Archduke Franz Ferdinand in Serbia and the failure of Serbians to permit examination of what had happened. In addition to this, countries presented reasons for the First World War to their people. The allied power that was created by Otto von Bismarck (1815 - 1898) in 1882 against the Entente was waiting for the right time to strike. Serbia called upon her ally Russia while Austria-Hungary whooped for Germany. France relayed on Britain and Russia, while Germany gathered her main allies Austria-Hungary and Ottoman Empire, later Italy.

France and Germany have been enemies for decades. Their conflict was also called Franco-Prussian war (1870-1871), where France lost the battle, and Germany created a coalition. As a result, a unified Germany started developing economically and politically, which intimidated Europeans.

For Austria, it was about proving to be the strongest. Russians believed the need to protect Serbia. France was trying to show its strength to Germany. British intended to create a balance of power while Germany (by confronting France and Russia) generally intended to be the rightful world power. Influential countries intensifying their opponents and proposing guardianship for smaller states have also motivated the war. Germany, Austria Hungary and Ottoman Empire allied under Central power versus France, Britain, and Russia under Triple Entente, Italy joined Entente latter.

Subsequently, the need for the balance of power made ways to the formations of an alliance that

seeks power for the impending Great battle. Countries formed a partnership with nations that have similar ideologies, not because of kinship for others but rather to maintain vicious acts of their enemy. It seemed necessary to create a balance of power so that threatened nations will have a partner to attack and protect what they call their own. But nationalistic feeling, the unnecessary competition of countries and pride of military strength pushed countries into conflict. To hold economic power turns out to be the other reason to disregard peace deals.

Germany has manufactured different weapons, one of the most potent killing machines of the time "HMS Dreadnought" has sent alarm to her opponents. Guns were made not just for the sake of protecting the state but to demonstrate supremacy, maneuver and conquer. The military race among Europeans was one of the significant factors that horrified nations into making more sophisticated weapons. The invention of new scientific discoveries gave the confidence to states to wage wars, countries, politicians, military personnel believed that their arms are better than any other nation.

The focal point of the First World War was Europeans. Europe's national interests were the significant causes of the Great War. Nevertheless, European interest was not just within the lands of Europe, preferably all over the world. Scientific discoveries and the industrial revolution were the other cause that has developed their interest in different continents. On the search for new findings (resources), they scramble lands from other continents.

European countries did not just scramble African lands. They dehumanized, enslaved, and selected Africans as warriors in the First World War. However, this war did not apprehend the interests of the colonies. Africa and other colonized nations were forced to be in the war as a

result of the initial European interest. These and some other significant causes made a world that is prompting for war.

At this juncture, the major causes of the First World War are first, the creations of superpowers like Germany, Russia, and Japan; these countries changed the balance of world power. Second, superpowers in Europe and Asia alienated states into two groups, depending on their national interests. The first group is called Triple Alliance (Germany with Austria-Hungary and Italy), and the second group is called Triple Entente (Britain, France, and Russia).

Germany conquering cities of France, Alsace, and Lorraine, and revealing power supremacy for European countries was the third cause of the Great War. For the past centuries, mostly European countries were also facing unsettled territorial and border conflicts. The different measure that has been used by European leaders to control their lands has added up as the cause of the Great War. "In the first decade of the twentieth century, the powers of Europe were engaged in a process of competitive modernization of their armed forces that came to be called, rather the arms race". (Michael, 2003, p. 22)

Forth, the amplification of armaments. States were armed to obtain what they desired. Different weapons were produced and discovered in the industrial revolution. Mainly countries were racing to create a better defense. States also use weapons as show to destroy any future confrontation by any other state. Modern weapons have primarily encouraged the war. It has made false promises to its manufacturers, as states have felt confident that it could get them what they wanted in no time.

In the development of weaponry, most generals believed that they would have their daily lives

back after defeating their enemies in no time. Military weapons, airplanes, submarines, and wireless communications were discovered and used during the Great War. “The powers of Europe all prepared to fight a short war because they could not really contemplate fighting a long one, and the only way to keep the war short was by taking the offensive.” (Michael, 2003, p. 22)

Fifth, living under the shadows of manhood, considering arm conflict as pride, soldiers and generals were trying to prove themselves and others as they are the strongest. In 1914 states could not think of other things than going to war. At the time, instead of peace, nations were too obsessed with the idea of war. Finally, Europeans had wrong expectations of the war. They lost track of time and power. Countries did not estimate the war to last disasters, to kill thousands of civilians and soldiers, to include different parts of the world. The war apprehended almost four years; it has damaged the political, social and economic relations of men.

1.2. The Treaty of Versailles

After the devastating results of the First World War, nations were able to sign the Treaty of Versailles to end the war. The treaty has been successful in ceasing the war, but its failure began while preparing the document. The settlement did not manage to include major countries that cause the conflict, like Germany. With the powerful resistance of France, Germany was excluded from the negotiations of the treaty. France, as well as other countries, believed that the primary cause of the Great War was Germany; as a result, Germany was sentenced for punishment.

With the impression of revenge and anger, countries planned to downsize the political, social and economic aspects of Germany. After massive devastation of the Great War, France,

America, Britain, and some other countries were able to decide the fate of Germany. The treaty was a readymade document presented to be signed by countries that were defeated during the WWI.

The German Officials were stunned and outraged when they heard the terms. In fact, leading experts of the time protested that Germany's paying out such a huge amount could damage the global economy. France and Britain insisted on the payments anyway. The treaty included clauses stating that Germany could be punished further if it failed to pay on time. Although the Germans felt betrayed, their backs were up against a wall. They were forced to sign or risk greater punishment. (Swayze, 2014, p. 14)

While negotiating for the Treaty of Versailles, states had something in mind to influence their overwhelmed opponents, mainly Germany. Germany was the center and a significant cause of the First World War. The main objectives of the Treaty were to punish Germany with a large amount of payment. The treaty was a big humiliation; it had cornered the country to sign an arranged commitment.

For the expenses of WWI, vast amounts of compensation were dumped on Germany; the debt that was imposed on the country was not bearable. The state gave up territories, lost people and sovereignty, army, and especially pride; the country was allowed to have only 100,000 troops. The cities of Alsace and Lorraine were given back to France. Further, as part of compensation, Germany's African colonies were scrambled by France, Britain, Belgium and Japan.

Even though all nations who were part of the war were devastated economically, politically and

socially, they did not have the same interest towards the treaty on the one hand and Germany on the other. The agreement was made revengeful, especially by a vote of France. France wanted Germany to be the weakest nation in the hope of preventing any future war; it also tried to control Germany economically and politically. Britain's intention toward Germany was not as ruthless as France since Germany was an important trade destination. For Britain, as long as her interests were not threatened, it was not keen to wreck Germany into pieces. Italy and Japan, as in France and Britain, sought to expand and redefine their territories. Consequently, the treaty ended the Great War but could not prevent pay backs.

In all the catastrophe of the First World War, the world map was redrawn (even though some bordering tribulations were still unresolved until the Second World War). Germany also had many unresolved issues concerning territorial expansion, nationalism and reconciliation of historical failures; mainly with the old enemy France. Germany and France had decades of disagreement and were not solved. It was not proficient in reconciling border issues among Europeans. These European countries have conflict not just in Europe but also in their colonized territories, like Africa.

The treaty inflamed the extreme and unnecessary impression of nationalism among Europeans. For instance, Germany believed and preached its people as the great nations of all. "Adding soldiers' pensions and allowances to Germany's reparations bill, Wilson realized, would significantly inflate its financial obligations to the Allies." (Slavicek, 2010, p. 56) Finally, firm and unrealistic commitments were included in the treaty to castigate Germany. The document incorporates more of a penalty on the countries that are thought to be the causes. With all these subjugations on Germany, the country assured its needs to stand for revenge; certainly, through time, Germans felt the need for another war.

The Treaty of Versailles was the main agreement that enhanced the League of Nations (LN). It was a covenant used to operate within the LN. The LN was developed by American president Woodrow Wilson, planning for a safer world.

1.3. The League of Nation

Nations condemned the Great War; it has inflicted high losses on all aspects of human life. The magnitudes have attested the need to form an organized international system, which is the League of Nation. Working against the disaster of the Great War, nations realized the importance of global policy. The architects of the League of Nations had just an idea of forming a league. However, detailed operation systems were not yet fully understood. As a result, the League could not avert its central goal, preventing the Second World War. Nevertheless, it contributed to the concept of creating an international organization for peace and security, through discussion and negotiation.

From the Treaty of Versailles American president, Woodrow Wilson (1913-1921) formulated the League of Nations, an order that can impede disputes amongst sovereign nations. Though American senates disagreed to be a member of the LN, Wilson completed 14 points for the League of Nations to be an organization. These points set up international negotiation agendas, to resolve conflicts, which might cause devastating future wars. The League of Nations was intended to be the first world organization and has four scopes covenant, condemnation, arbitration and sanctions.

The League is guided by covenant. It condemns wars while placing arbitration and sanctions on those member states or nations that disobey the covenant. It aimed to stop wars, improve

humanity through disarmament and enforce the Treaty of Versailles. The Versailles treaty that has become the covenant of the LN was signed in 1919. The LN has 58 members after concluding the deals to stop the Great War. In the League of Nations, many necessary superpowers were not members.

Many countries that had less financial, political, economic, and social power joined the League, and these countries were unable to enforce the regulations. The non-membership of a few influential countries of the time, like America, Russia and Germany, partly made the organization unsuccessful. For many reasons, the League of Nations has failed to fulfill its primary missions. The states that did not join the LN were influential in shaping international cooperation. For this and many other reasons, it was challenging to enforce the Versailles Treaty.

Crucial battles of the First World War are caused by different reasons mentioned above. According to the scope and damages made by the war, the League of Nations could not keep its promises; members of the league could not pertain to the covenant. For instance, Germany did not act following the treaty. The weakness of the League and the weak influence of members to force the punishment kept German unrestricted. The LN was like a brief break from the First World War into the Second. The League's goals to the problems existing on the ground were farfetched. It has made promises that were impossible to solve with the power it has.

For instance, Poland in the 1920s took land from Russia, against the treaty of Versailles; the League was soft on the action of Adolf Hitler, conquering territories of neighboring countries. Japan was arming for conflict against China by invading Manchuria, and Italy invaded Ethiopia and many other countries. As time goes, the League was incapable of settling of difference. The

member states were in no shape and experience to defend the League's objectives, instead scuttle for another war.

The League's sanctions were not active in those states who are not respecting the covenant. It has no strict measures or power. It did not include, America, which had endeavored for the creation of international cooperation without being part of it. Because of its ineffectiveness, states did not have trust; powerful countries were unsupportive. The First World War has devastated men, and after years it was forgotten already; as a result, nations were unable to cooperate in the LN.

Countries did not strive to strengthen LN; the sufferings of WWI were left unnoticed as a result of developing the interest of states. The international community was not giving enough attention and energy for world peace; continents like Africa and Asia were still facing colonizers. The LN system was not fully organized; it was problematic to have full operational structure responding to members' country's problems. Many situations on the ground went against or were beyond the capacity of the LN.

They did not have a free hand to reshape the world in conformity with the principles of order and justice or of national self-determination, or even of the traditional balance of power. They were responsible for electorates still in the grip of war fever whose passions and prejudices could not be ignored. (Michael, 2003, p.136)

After the First World War in the operation of the LN, countries were facing many challenges. Leaders were not able to make clear decisions; they were not making an agreement for justice

but revenge. Countries were still in the grip of what they have lost during the WWI; they had planned to strengthen their army and defeat, to compensate for their historical failures. They were in sore of past failures. However, the LN was a show stage, as its major blocks were already shaking. It could not prevent the Second World War, as its problems escalated through time. Countries were not committed to their covenant or arbitration; it was not effective as states have taken their own measures to the problems they are facing.

1.4. The Second World War

The devastating Second World War has taken millions of lives in six years and was a colossal disaster in the history of man. For German this war was against Jews, territorial expansion, wrong nationalistic feelings, a race for power etc. The crucial battle makes it evident how men can be devastating; no religion, education, theology, theories, or discoveries could make the war fair let alone prevent it.

For Adolf Hitler (1889 - 1945), Jews were the leading cause of the failure of Germany in the First World War, and as a result, Germany wanted to penalize Jews. Powerful countries like Russia, Europe, some parts of Asia had dragged in many other countries, including Africa, into the Second worldwide conflict.

Anxious of two crucial wars at a time, France from west and USSR (Russia) from East, Germany plotted and signed an agreement with Russia. During this time, Germany had learned a lesson from WWI in the Schlieffen Plan. Right after signing the Pact Agreement with Russia, in eight days, Germany started a war against France, which it thought was avenging the Treaty of Versailles. In fighting against the states that had humiliated it in the treaty, Germany became the primary cause of the Second World War. For instance, it invaded Poland and killed many

Polish Jews as a result of payback for the decisions made in the Treaty of Versailles. In the Treaty of Versailles, Poland was able to take territories that were forcefully conquered by Germany during WWI.

In Germany, the Treaty of Versailles was followed by rampant inflation and then, after a brief breathing space, by a severe economic depression: it was not unexpected that many Germans responded by looking back to the glorious days of the Wilhelmine Empire. But by 1938, under the Nazis, the economic outlook in Germany had changed. The economic recovery fueled the sense of injustice that had arisen in the aftermath of the First World War. (Bourke, 2001, p.9)

The Nazi party leader Adolf Hitler was not in a position to accept any historical assault of Germany. Hitler nationalized the crime he thought was done on Germany, especially by the Treaty of Versailles. He started padding the Germans with nationalistic feelings; he went on and on with the need to be a great nation again, destined by nature. Speeches of Hitler crammed German's as unique and super race, who should never face disgrace and repay historical failures. In addition to this, by the time of the Second World War, Germany was economically back in her feet. The country has recovered from its economic misery.

As a result, Germans were ready to fight war after war. Every man was prepared emotionally and physically for war. Along with many other lands, Germany scrambled territories of Poland, with USSR; occupied territories of Finland, France, and London. Without impediment, the conflict stretched on and on massacring many.

On the other part of the world, East China and Japan have confronted each other. Japan had

developed interests in Korean resources for many decades. End of 18thc and 19thc, Korea and China had conflicted with Japan. In the conflict between Korea and Japan, China was involved in protecting her trade partner. In 1931 Japan's military power developed the confidence to conquer Manchuria, Northeast China. The combat between Japan and China became part of the Second World War when the war escalated on Marco Polo Bridge. "The Japanese had hoped for a short war, but they underestimated the tenacity of Chinese resistance." (Bourke, 2001, p.58) At the beginning of the Second War, Japanese confidence to defeat China in no time faced unexpected resistance from China.

The Second World War was a quick break from the First World War, and it has many similar features with the First. It can also be said it was the continuation of the First World War since many causes were situated within the objectives of the First. Similarly, with the First, the Second World War had two assemblies, the Axis - Germany, Italy and Japan, and the Allies powers - United States, Soviet Union, France, Great Britain and China.

These assemblies had convinced their people about the need for war. It is reasonable to think that most war results are failures by themselves. However, people tend to choose war over peace. In most parts of the world, conflict was inevitable. People were motivated to put their children, energy, finance, scientific discoveries etc. for war. In this war, different sophisticated weapons like rifles, modern handguns, machine guns, submachine guns, atomic bombs (on Hiroshima and Nagasaki) were used.

The bomb killed approximately 140,000 people immediately. This number does not include those who died days, months, or years later—nor does it include the pica babies.. (pica is the Japanese word for

"flash"), who were subsequently born with abnormalities because of radiation exposure in the womb. (Bourke, 2001, p.179)

Different chemicals that were used during the war were disasters and humiliation for humankind. I believe that the USA bombing of the two Japanese cities tortured and terrorized humanity in the history of man. The action of the country did not just threaten Japan, but also, it has been reflecting the results of going into war with the USA meant. I will explain this in a bit detail later.

In this war, 55 million people died. During the WWII many have lost their families and homes, women were raped, people were enslaved and used for scientific research, children were orphaned, the climate was devastated, children and adults were limbed. And most people were psychologically and physically abused. By the war, all were destroyed. There was no victory. Even the minds that aggravated war ended in tragic devastations. They witnessed the death of their people, who were convinced by themselves for the need of war. The battle was the darkest years that man had ever seen in history. There was no pleasure or pride or hope in it.

I argue that, even in the theory of the state of nature, the threat that men encountered was not as terrible as the threat of the II WW. Obviously, man would not be back to the lands of the state of nature. But if social entities continue to be threatening and dangerous, people might consider disregarding rules. However, it might be unlikely to consider a state of nature rather than a cosmopolitan world. That is after the Second World War nations organized a new international system with a new covenant and formed the United Nations (UN).

1.5. The Establishment of the United Nations

As a result of the mass disasters in the Second World War, nations organized a peace conference to discuss the main problems and causes of the failures of the League of Nations. LN could not prevent the occurrence of the Second World War. In 1945 considering the LN as a model, 51 countries formed the United Nations. The UN took in 192 member countries by 2008 to create collective security. American President Franklin D. Roosevelt (1882-1945) had named the organization as the "United Nations,"; which was officially used in 1942 when 26 countries came into membership and signed the Declaration. The Charter of the UN was ratified after all member states have signed the agreement.

The UN has six principal organs. These are the General Assembly (GA), the Security Council (SC), the Trusteeship Council, the Economic and Social Council, the International Court of Justice, and the Secretariat. (For the relevance of my argument I will be focusing on the SC of the UN). The SC of the UN has five permanent and ten non-permanent members. China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are the five permanent members of the UN, while in every two years, the non-permanent members of the UN are elected by the General Assembly.

The UN is the artifact of states coming together for the peace and security of the world after the Second World War. It is expected that it will deliver an international voice that works for security, peace and social development. Chapter one article, one of the UN Charter claims that the purposes of the UN, after witnessing the two World Wars, is to prevent humans suffering resulting from wars, working together for peace and security. Generally, the UN is putting its efforts against war or conflicts. It suggests friendly relations that would curb causes of

international, regional as well as civil wars. Yet, for different reasons, its actions are doubtful.

The UN Charter, chapter one, article one, claims four purposes - to maintain international peace and security; strengthen friendly relations among nations; achieve international cooperation in solving global problems on economic, social-cultural or humanitarian character, promote and encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms and at last harmonizing the actions of nations.

The requirements for admission of new members are set out in the United Nations Charter, Chapter II and Article 4: [3]

Membership in the United Nations is open to all peace-loving states which accept the obligations contained in the present Charter and, in the judgment of the Organization, are able and willing to carry out these obligations.

The admission of any such state to membership in the United Nations will be effected by a decision of the General Assembly upon the recommendation of the Security Council. (United Nations, Charter of the United Nations, 1945, Article 4)

The organization guides member states and creates necessary conditions for their participation. One of the crucial requirements for a nation to be a member of the UN is to be peace-loving. Chapter two Article four of the UN claims that any peace-loving nation can be a member of the UN. When the UN claims peace-loving as a condition of membership, it is to encourage every nation to love peace and, at the same time, discourage those nations that motivate war. Thus, it

is understandable to identify countries of peace-loving and otherwise. As a result, the UN creates sharp and transparent criteria for accepting membership.

The main focus of the UN was to secure peace; and it had firm commitments on the means of creating international and local order. It is a global system that was created to fill the gap that the League of Nation failed to meet. In addition to its primary purpose, the organization induces in the economic, political, environmental and social issues for fostering peace building.

The UN mainly operates for the preservation and creation of peace by respecting the vote of member states. In the beginning, the UN was successful in decolonizing 80 nations around the world. Colonization was part of many conflicts; it scrambled sovereign territories and resources; it has enslaved human beings, killed thousands of people, created anger and hate among nations.

The UN is one of the most prominent international organizations, incorporating more member states than any other organizations around the world. As one of the most prominent organizations it has faced a lot of challenges throughout its history. In relation to its immense historical failures, there are numerous critiques and analysis. It's Charter and structures have been influenced and directed by those countries that have Veto powers. Its success has been tiny, as the demand of the international community is higher than its delivery. It is a piece of historical evidence that within the UN powerful countries, those who have financial and political influence, take over the vote in making decisions on peacekeeping missions.

It was proven that the LN could not prevent WWII. However, after the coming of the UN, there were no worldwide wars. But this does not necessarily mean that the UN stopped a global war. The UN has faced different challenges that are different from worldwide wars. After the cold

war, most of the problems the organization face were civil wars, like the genocide in Rwanda, Cambodian, Indonesia, Sudan, Burundi, Libya, Somalia, etc. The organization witnessed genocides, civil wars, poverties, diseases, chemical weapons, climate change, etc. In contrast to the LN, even though the UN has more members, more robust rules and regulations, it had faced significant challenges and failed major missions.

From the Six main organs, UN Security Council (UNSC) operates with fifteen members; five are permanent while the rest are non-permanent members who are elected by the General Assembly for two years term. Security Council mainly works for the preservation of peace and security and its members give decisions on which mission to operate. Among the members of the Security Council, permanent members take the primary vote, and they are also called the big five. These members are the superpowers of the international community. They have full acceptance even if they vote against the non-permanent members of the Security Council. The big five in the UN have veto power to vote against any matter and get full acceptance.

The veto power has existed since the League of Nations in 1920. The Big Five States have the veto power because of historical events and financial as well as military capacity. Member countries that have the veto power in the UN are the US, France, Russia, China, and the UK. One of the lessons learned from the League of Nations is stressing the importance of strong cooperation, especially among the superpowers in the international community. It is essential to have these countries because in both the First and the Second World Wars, they were the main actors of the wars.

European countries' problems developed into a worldwide war. The importance of superpowers is as good as the importance of others in this globalized world. For instance, because of the less

interest of the superpowers on peacekeeping missions, failed states were created. And these failed states become threats to the international community. Nevertheless, after the disastrous world wars, nations seem to understand the importance of having more influential countries that cooperate for peace.

It is crucial to have powerful nations in the UN; it is also essential to have a balanced decision-making system. Financial powers are dangerous when it comes to making pure decisions making. For instance, veto powers have been criticized for unbalanced decision making on cases of peacekeeping missions. These powers are also criticized for not opening up for new permanent members. As a result of history, there are only five permanent member states of the Security Council. Consequently, the UN is facing many challenges and criticism (which I will explain later on this paper).

The UN also works for economic and social developments as one way of resolving peace and security problems. Generally speaking, when nations are well developed economically, politically and socially, civil or regional or international wars would not quickly occur. Some conflicts might not lead to war if countries are well educated, equally treated, and free to choose their leaders. People who have property, economic advantage, fair treatment and freedom, will not lose hope in life. Nations will look for peace and further if there are multi polar superpowers, a single or two countries will not manipulate other countries.

The maintenance of international peace and security is the greatest challenge of the United Nations (UN). It is judged by how well it fulfills this goal. It is, however, essential to remember that the organization was created to maintain peace not only by preventing and resolving military conflict but also by promoting economic and social progress and development.

The UN is a nongovernmental organization and has no military force of its own. It is a system of collective sovereign countries, with different interests, to come up for mutual peace. Sovereignty, according to the Britannica Encyclopedia, is the ultimate power, legal independence and acting as the final authority. The UN is composed of states with sovereign rights; however, it has no territory or political party or army. It is not one governmental system operating as a state. The criticism it faces is how such an organization can genuinely prevent war, without biases; how can it treat all of its members morally, equally and justly.

The second chapter discusses the nature of peace and morality. It attempts to define what we mean by peace on one hand and morality on the other. Since our focuses are on the UN peacekeeping mission, and accordingly, its moral values, the chapter will explore what these values are by going through peace and ethical theories. Peace is the primary purpose of the UN, and moral values are essential for their effectiveness.

Chapter Two

Peace and Morality

2.1. General Perception of Peace

To begin with, the concept of peace is related to many other important terms like justice, equality, responsibility, and freedom. Peace can be classified into two major dimensions – internal and external; scoping human relations with the self as well as with the others. External peace is related to terms like justice, equality and responsibility. When these issues are settled within a society as well as in the international community, peace is gained.

If countries are not involved in any type of war, it is considered the country has external peace. Unfair allocations of resources, immoral and irresponsible governing systems, enslavement and other causes have a high probability of leading into wars. External peace is vital to avoid or minimize casualties from any type of armed conflicts. And this can be true only when a society develops a sense of justice, equality, responsibility and freedom.

Internal peace is also another dimension of peace; it is a peaceful condition within a man. Human conditions of mind ought to be peaceful form pleasant surroundings. For instance, we simply say an environment is calm when we see something different from anything disturbing us. For various reasons, many people are psychologically disturbed even in a relatively just and equal system of states. These circumstances of mind might be in peace, maybe, when a person is visiting a park or enjoying anything refreshing. A lot has been said about peace of mind. Different perspectives are given by religious doctrines, philosophers, psychologists, etc. The theory of peace of mind has complex and more in-depth insights, which will not be discussed in

detail in this paper.

The theories of peace have been the center of social, political and economic dialogue for centuries. It affects all aspects of society. People have been arguing on the ways, needs and definitions of peace. While some people were trying to formulate it for the sake of itself and others as means for other ends: philosophers, politicians, religious institutions and leaders defined peace in various ways. For this paper, I will take some general definitions made by scholars, focusing on some aspects of external peace relations with morality within states. I firmly believe, however, that internal peace is as important as the external one as both are interdependent.

The lexical definition of peace is the state of no war. Or it is the time when war or conflict ends, where states have no internal as well as external conflicts. It is also taken as something opposite to war. Peace is a state of no war or conflict with armaments or no killing as a result of societal or racial conflicts. Peace is something desirable. It gives assurance of life that might vanish through wars or conflicts.

Under normal circumstances, if there are no enforcing factors to declare war, it is morally right and reasonable for a person to look for peace. Generally, human beings desire a long life, and one way of securing it is having peaceful conditions in all aspects. It can be said peace is desirable by all men and is a necessity for humanity. Peace is highly related to ethical values: respect for human rights, friendship, dignity and other terms. War kills human beings and violates social values. Killing violates the fundamental right of human beings. Even if people argue about the necessity of war, men should always desire for peace. And fighting in all the

circumstances violates human rights and undermines the dignity of man.

Indian origin teaching, Buddhism (6thc BCE) views peace from an internal and external perspective. The ideology of Buddhism looks at the external causes of conflict as consequences derived from a general orientation common to all living beings: avoiding harm and obtaining happiness. The nature of a person in preventing harm and obtaining happiness results in peace. If people desire to live an ultimately happy life with less injury Buddhism teaches, they should avoid what is causing harm to others, physically and verbally, at a personal level.

People are anxious about physical violence and resent harsh words. The material and verbal harm we inflict upon others result in conflicts that, in turn, would bring harm to us and cost our happiness. A man should be vigilant not to inflict any injury, physical or verbal, on any person. If not, this might bring about conflict.

Buddha means “enlightened,” and Buddhism’s theory of peace formulates what it calls “Four Noble truths.” This theory argues that man out of the need to fulfill his desire goes to conflict, and the way to address this conflict necessitates peace. When a man fails to meet his needs, he faces unsatisfactory life. However, if man fairly obtains what has desired, the probability of conflict to occur is less. Buddhism teaches that some behaviors of man lead to violence, such as killing, misbehaving, telling a lie and using drugs.

For Buddhist violence starts in mind, internal causes, as a process of addressing underneath desires of peace and happiness. For this theory, anything that goes against joy, leading to harm, causes conflict and anxiety among men. For peace balancing man’s needs against the process of acquiring it is essential. And these can be achieved through just life, which is the way for peace.

Buddha claims to live peacefully naturally man lives in longing, and one should avoid any sort of physical or verbal harm. Buddha's explanation of peace goes deeper by claiming the internal peace of man, which is 'Peace of Mind' (This is very complex to cover on this paper).

The philosophy of Confucius (551 – 479 BC) claims that peace is desirable, and to ensure it; people have to be kind, honest, polite, wise and obedient. To maintain peace, respect is necessary ahead of anything. Government and governors should be the models for a peace deal, and their citizens should learn from them. “..... Confucians oppose war because they believe that war is contrary to the Way ('Dao'), and brings about nothing but suffering, injuries, social injustice and disorder” (Yao, 2004, p. 90) In other words, a Confucian theory of peace explains that peace is a necessity of life, because war diverts human being out of the way, path. That is, to say, war violates the 'fundamental principle of life.' The theory argues unless it is necessary to use military forces to bring down tyranny and chaos, peace is the fundamental way of living in harmony.

The mentioned theory is highly concerned about the balance of peace and war. It is necessary to make war when it is essential to guide men into the “Way”. For Confucius, war must be made if it is needed to do so. To put it differently, conflicts should not be made for wrong reasons: resentment or retribution. In everyday life, men should be ethical and be on the path of cultivating the self continuously, under any circumstances.

The relation among men should accordingly be modest, and these men should respect and treat others. Maturity results in doing the right thing. If men lack maturity, then they think only for their profit. An immature person could not understand the very nature and necessity of having

society. Also, a community should learn ethics from his or her government, and the government shall have the capacity to teach.

One of the social contract theorist Thomas Hobbes (1588 – 1679) claims that men entered into the social contract as the contract punish ‘brutish’ and ‘nasty’ personality, protecting citizens from crime and war. The agreement regulates man’s character through the rule of law. According to Hobbes, peaceful life is achieved when men live in a social contract rather than living under the state of nature, which has less law enforcement and poor structure. Humans form states basically to avoid war and create trust among themselves, resulting in peace. Furthermore, to protect a man’s needs and wants, rules are necessary. The social contract punishes those who are violent, physically or verbally or morally; and rewards peace for those who are obedient to the contract.

Hobbes argues that man in ‘state of nature’ was living undesirable life: solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short, as he calls it. As a response to these, Hobbes alleged that men formed the social contract for which all will give up some freedom to the “Leviathan.” The “Leviathan” is a ruler that has the power to control and deliver peace to the society. For Hobbes, men gave up full natural freedom that he or she had in the state of nature, to the Leviathan, who is expected to eliminate the continuity of fear of death existing in the state of nature. For him, absolute power shall be given to the monarch so that he or she removes the conditions that existed in the state of nature. Hobbes's idea of “Leviathan” is more than peacekeeping; it has more substantial implications than just keeping the peace.

The Norwegian scholar Johan Galtung (Born in 1930) explains that peace is the absence of

violence, not only personal or direct but also structural or indirect. The manifestations of structural violence are uneven distribution of wealth, resources as well as power. That is, he argues peace is both the absence of personal or direct violence and the presence of social justice. He prefers to use the formulations “absence of violence” and “presence of social justice”: the former is negative peace, whereas the latter is a positive (equal distribution of power and resources) peace.

Galtung's theory of peace as positive and negative explains the former as the absence of structural violence and the later as the absence of personal destruction. Lack of structural violence means positive peace where there is no war or terrorism among states or within a country. For Buddhism, this leads to the disturbance of the internal and external realm of man which may lead to war.

Since positive peace does not promise justice or safety, through time, it may lead to civil war, negative peace. For instance, most civil wars in Africa are the result of the unequal distribution of resources. Galtung also explains how to achieve peace through the promising of social justice and equal distribution of wealth. For example, in the past decades, Sudan was not in war. But the Sudanese had been committing genocide, in one of its regions Darfur, as a result of resource distribution.

Peace is against conflict and war. It has the power of controlling the interest of an individual, families and nations, as a whole. Man, always desires for peace. War prompts death and damages social, economic and political relations. Historically it can also be witnessed that the endless need (or want) of men leading into conflicts and disagreements.

I argue that regardless of desire for peace, men are shoved into wars because of the unsatisfied desire for property and power. For instance, wars of colonization in Africa and Asia, recourse conflict in Europe, civil wars in a different part of the world were motivated by the unsatisfied nature of men.

For a society to be in peace, it is essential not just for itself but also for other important things such as justice, equality, respect, etc. Order is vital among individuals. Fair treatment of each group of communities and nations should be there just as it is between individuals. For this purpose, governors should be powerful with respect to keeping peace, since its failure cost human life.

Peace is closely related to human moral values. If nations are ethical, they have less affinity to attack others unethically. Even in the state of war, moral values are necessary so that it will not be a war of extermination and dehumanization. Thus, moral values have a significant contribution for peaceful internal and external environment.

2.2. Peace and Its Relation to Morality

Ruth Benedict (1887-1948) argued that moral standards are relative depending on the cultures of societies. Moral values are understood differently in different communities. Not all moral values are viewed in the standards of western civilizations. Keeping aside the idea that morality or ethical values are subjective or relative and other theories of the non-existence of universal ethical or moral values, ethical values are all about right and or wrong conduct. For my arguments, I will take the deontological theory of the German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724 – 1804), to describe ethical values or moral judgments accordingly.

Kant explains that we can judge ethical values in terms of the performance of a duty (though rules are permanently changing depending on cultures, countries' interests, time and revolution.) of man without looking at its consequence. Deontological theory stresses on respecting rules out of duty rather than balancing or changing ethical theories by its consequences. Without looking at the outcomes of actions, which is bad or good, one should act out of duty. There is a need to do something by respecting laws.

However, as rules are dependent on permanently changing by issues of cultures, interests, and actions it is likely to be changed through time. For instance, early marriage is wrong by law, or it is a duty of man to fight against it, among western cultures, but in most African countries, it was a duty of parents to find husbands or wives for their children. That is as there are no universally written moral values, but there are tunes of them. It is challenging to set a universally workable living duty to shape human behavior.

The deontological argument of Kant can be doubted for what could be when critical problems occur. For instance, we say killing is morally wrong, but in self-defense or accidents, execution might be the only decision.

Besides, it is the moral obligation of governance to safeguard national interests. Sometimes this contrasts with not harming others for the sake of protecting national interests. For example, Ethiopia and Eritrea had been in border conflict for national importance (conflicts are common on the consumption of natural resources), which can be taken as morally right when looked over from each side of the story. Both countries are ethically correct in the sense of seeking responsibilities and devoting themselves to their independent national interest.

Consequentialist argues that actions are valued morally as right or wrong, depending on their outcomes. Consequentialist claims that the ends justify the means. Where rather than obeying universal moral laws or performing one's duty, values are judged by their consequences. For this theory, there are no universal right or wrong actions. For instance, most countries protect their national interests by any means, depending on the consequences that are good for the state.

However, since war outcomes violate the fundamental rights of man (which will not be national interest) and usually does not have the right end in most cases, peace is preferable. For the consequentialist, no universal rules are shaping human behavior, but any nation does not prefer the end of war as its consequence will take human life. This theory argues that countries should act assuming the result, where in the case of conflict, the end is not desirable. Either people act out of duty or expecting the consequence of going to war; generally, war is not profitable.

And I argue for deontological ethical theory (between Deontological and Consequential). I prefer this ethical theory because a deontological ethical theory strictly applies to duty. The consequential ethical theory seemed to risk people's life. Many war cases can be resolved through negotiations; however, consequentialist might be motivated to go to war (by killing a few, to save something) even if the outcome of any war is death.

Here I am not arguing about the wars that should be done necessarily, as the war for decolonization. But what I am saying is that, for example, dropping the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, from the perspective of deontology was absolutely morally wrong. However, at the time, with these bombings, many Americans approved the results as the right decisions. In my understanding, this theory demanded peace not for the sake of economic,

political and or social goals but rather for its own purpose.

Deontological ethical theory claims that a man should act out of duty without calculating the outcome of the action. If a man acts in accordance with his duty, then his actions are morally right. And this duty is universally understandable through reasoning. Within a deontological moral context, it is obligatory to live peacefully and think of peace rather than war. Commitment guides men to peace rather than to war. Therefore, war is an ethically lousy act, keeping aside the theory of just war and some necessary wars that have to be made.

As it has been mentioned above, Galtung's theory of peace is the absence of direct and or indirect violence. Peace is discerned from many different aspects of human relations. If a man is violated and his properties are taken by force; as a result, that man is violated. Or when a person's family is attacked, the results might trigger immediate misconduct of the person where this, in turn, might escalate into the society. For me, peace can be taken as the basic need of man because where there is war, there will be much humanitarian chaos. At the time of war there are all kinds of human violations, and where there are violations of peace (or any sort of a breach), there will be many judgments that need an ethical instrument.

In all the justification and realization of peace, it is appropriate to discuss deontological values side by side. This ethical value has a critical balancing power to realize the decisions of war or peace. The scopes of deontological ethical theory help us understand what the content of peace. That is, peace highly advocates living together, and the moral values of deontology sets conditions of how to live together.

It is a fact that individuals live among and within society and necessarily need to live and learn

how to live within communities. Naturally, human beings have and at least think how they should live with others in the lights of morality and other related issues. Since at the state level, it is challenging to maintain fairness and honesty for each person, man necessarily has to evaluate his actions as right or wrong. Buddha asserts that man should be protected from every sort of abuse, verbal or physical.

An individual act within a society affects the whole nation when it is evaluated ethically. For instance, Buddha and Confucius are good examples in shaping their own society as well as the global community.

Historically individuals were the immediate cause of war, and different ideologies such as fundamentalism and nationalism. are other causes of wars and conflict. For instance, the assassination of Austro-Hungarian heir, Archduke Franz and his wife was the immediate cause for the WWI; Uganda's third president Idi Amin Dada (1925 – 2003) and some other leaders, especially African presidents or warlords have been the cause of civil wars and deaths of millions. Of course, causes of conflicts are not the result of a nighttime process, or they are not the result of a one-time problem that occurs between individuals as well as states.

In this connection, it should be noted that causers of wars are usually nations or individuals who lack morality. For instance, the civil war in South Sudan or Somalia or Central Africa, etc. go back to the time of colonization. Colonizers who lacked morality and were reasons for wars looted the wealth to which they were not entitled.

Colonization in Africa was the leading cause of most civil and state wars. Colonizers did not only end up forcefully taking resources. But also, they inflicted time bombs that had blasted in

many colonized cities after the departure of colonizers. For instance, Rwanda's genocide of 1994 killed 800,000 Tutsi minorities by the Hutu majority. Though the conflict between the two tribes existed for decades, Germans and Belgians were parts of the reason for the genocidal acts of Hutu. For their political purpose, the colonizers had used Tutsi minorities as personnel to control Rwanda. When they decolonized the country, they motivated hatred between Tutsi and Hutu.

All over Africa, colonizers used racial, religious, cultural differences among Africans as a method of subjugating their colonies. But after the decolonization of Africa, these methods have opened ways for new conflicts.

In this example of colonization, the deontic ethical theory in relation to peace, colonization is wrong by itself as it devalues humanity. It used different mechanisms to subdue colonies; it was condemned by the UN as it has been immoral and unacceptable, leading to massive conflict. Out of duty, man shall be treated as an end rather than as a means to a particular goal. In colonization, human beings had been used as a means to a specific goal. When humanity works towards the universal understanding of using man as an end in itself, the need for conflict ceases to prevail.

For Kant, a priori reason, without calculating the outcome of an action, should force a man to fulfill his or her moral duty out of goodwill. Ethically peace is morally desirable. As Buddha and others have argued, since men govern states, it is the obligation of the individual man, and collective men, to avoid verbal or physical abuse for preventing civil or any sort of conflict. Further, it is ethically wrong to kill one another or be a cause of it, for the purpose of fulfilling

the political interest of a nation or individuals. Thus, a war in and of itself is wrong. In other words, there are no wars that can be valuable for their own sake. A nation can justify the need for war, but it cannot avoid paying the price of it.

2.3. The Theory of Just War

In the beginning, Christian doctrines had developed the just war theory. Understandably, Christian doctrines have been one of the modest teachings for believing that - people should give the other part of their faces when they are bitten on their right or left faces. The Bible teaches that man should be in his or her best behavior when he or she is attacked by some other persons he or she should refrain himself or herself from attacking back. He or she should be ethically right, good and fit following God. He or she should respect all the commands of the Bible with the help of God himself. These commands of the Bible generally do not give any concession to any sort of violence and bad manners. Even in conditions where a person is attacked, he or she is not accepted to strike back as a sort of revenge or even sometimes self-defense.

Jesus forbids retaliation, forbids hatred, and, contrary to what is thought common sense, returns only love when confronted or receiving abuse, harassment, evil itself, and even death! (Slattery, 2007, p. 75)

In the Old Testament, the Bible teaches how God's society should go to war against the enemy when it is necessary. But in the New Testament, it is strictly forbidden to attack any person as sort of self-defense, revenge, or for the sake of just attacking. The New Testament almost has

no defense for the theory of Just War. In the teachings of Jesus Christ (Christian religion doctrine), violence or harming others is not accepted. Since all men are brothers and sisters, humans cannot reason hate.

Men should love, respect, bond, be obedient and responsible with one another and God. The word of God should guide all. And in his teachings, Jesus himself showed how respectful men should be for one another. Nevertheless, people have been calming different scriptures to defend the Just War theory.

Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274) has developed the theory of just war. Aquinas formulated Just war theory on how who and when war ought to be done. For him, a state shall go to war when authorized, given permission, if the causes are verified out of good intention. War shall be waged only after all the ways to agree is exhausted. In battle, nations should consider civilians, women, children and hospitals who shall not be part of the war. After the end of any conflict, the subjugator should treat the defeated fairly.

In the scriptures of the Bible, it is evident that God loves everyone and does not want anyone to suffer. Because Adam was disobedient to God (the first man on earth according to the Bible), all men were cursed and born sinners. Since then, God was looking for ways to purify men. God's nature hates sin, and no sin goes unpunished, for man to be saved from this inherent sin God sent Jesus, his only son, to be sacrificed for the sins men committed.

After the coming of Jesus, the New Testament was included in the Bible. Jesus was about loving, caring and living together as it has been mentioned. It is about giving the right face when the left is bitten. This book neither preaches about war nor justifies war in Christianity.

Just war theory reasons out the conditions and necessities of going to war, when nations are left with no other option, after all resolutions have been tried, and nothing else works. There must be a hard-core reason for why a country should waste resources, lives, money and time just for killing others. Authorities should convince the military personal and other people, why war is necessary. For authorities to use any kind of force that is impacting the lives of men should be morally balancing in the minds and hearts of its peoples. But history books say a lot of different things from what wars should be. The First and Second World Wars can be good examples. As both wars are farfetched from being just and morally acceptable, it was a rather heinous act of men.

Some of the questions on just war theory are how war is judged and by whom? What are the limitations of other options rather than conflict? For centuries nations were waging wars for unjust reasons, which can be defined depending on the period that has occurred. At times it was about the expansion of borders or purifying race or preaching religious doctrines or self-defense.

All nations have their justifications for causes of wars. For instance, almost at the end of the Second World War United States of America bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki, killing 120,000 people instantly from both cities. Even though Japanese resistance in the war was one of the deadliest US responses was unnecessary as it has killed many civilians. These bombings did not target the soldiers but civilians. Even though using any nuclear weapons by any nation can never be justified, the USA bombed civilians.

One of the most influential nations in the Second World War has used nuclear weapons for the reasons that are not justifiable if evaluated by the international community or by neutral

analysis. Thus, if a strong nation like the US dropped deadliest weapons on the civilians during the Second World War and if strongest nations triggered the heinous First World War, then what makes us believe after all this experience these same nations will work for peace in the UN. Or what is the reason that these strong nations will be able to justify wars and curse the unjust one?

Kant explains the conditions of creating perpetual peace in the international phenomena, where he argues the possibilities to rule out the suffering of man. I discuss the Kantian theory of lasting peace into the UN structure might add value, even though it sounds preposterous.

Chapter Three

Perpetual Peace and the United Nation Peace Keeping Mission

3.1. The Theory of Perpetual Peace

The German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, has developed enormous works on various theories like morality, epistemology, and metaphysics. Kant has different views, but I will focus on his theory of perpetual peace and morality for this paper. Before the LN and the UN, Kant has predicted the need for a sort of league of a nation; where states will have internal as well as external peace, by addressing conflicts through negotiations. In contrast to the Realist political theory, Kant argues for the possibility and necessity of peace through international organization or cooperation, where he claims that with conditions, states can form a confederation of nations.

The realist school of thought argues that there is no one government or organization or power governing the world as a whole. As a state is governed by one political entity, the international community does not have a governmental body that acts independently. This theory asserts that countries desire military power and security and do not intend to behave morally. States are usually self-interested and do not desire merit: they are threatening and will do anything to undertake others.

In the state of nature, man is free from any law except the natural laws. Often, as a result of practicing freedom, man violates others' freedom and he is violated by others leading into an endless disagreement. According to Hobbes, unending violation of the state of nature made man's life nasty, brutish, poor and short. To avoid such a state of endless violation, man created a society, as Hobbes has argued on his state of nature theory. In this theory man gave up some of

his freedom and took responsibility to form the rule of law.

Likewise, the state's rights shall be preserved, or be limited, to live peacefully with other countries. It is vital to have international league binding states, as stated by Kant. For Kant, this is possible by the Republican governing system, which is relatively peaceful than any other. Republicans, in his terms, promise human rights not just among individuals but also between states; it enables countries to cooperate within societies as well as each other. The nature of nations is partly what the realist theory claims. As a result, it is challenging for the perpetual peace theory of Kant.

Regardless of the conceptual revolution of a republic, democracy, or other political ideologies, Kant argues that citizens governed by republican ideologies are peaceful than any others. The interpretation of this ideologies changes through time, depending on historical, theoretical and other effects. Kant argues that republicans respect human rights and focuses on the covenant; it promises freedom, equality and the rule of law; it does not urge an oppressor, enacted through their representative.

Republicans are not governed by the majority but rather by covenant. The three branches of government legislative, executive and judiciary operate separately, even though this is also true in the theory of democracy. For Kant, democracy gives all these rights as republican, but he argues that democracy is problematic as it is majority rule it might undermine the minorities. In this regard's republicans are farfetched from realist ideology. Nevertheless, internal peace is not sufficient to have a secure environment since states enter into conflict with other countries. As a result, for him, republicans should govern internally; when republicans form a confederation,

they can promise external peace (in the League of Nation).

It is morally reasonable to keep an environment safe, to avoid deprivation of life through war. For Kant, man has a moral duty to create safety. He argues that the form of society needs law and power to implement states should be cosmopolitan; creating a cosmopolitan world is necessary. In the beginning, Kant argues that a cosmopolitan world with coercive power is necessary to create a peaceful international relation. Still, later, he stated that natural forces are better than coercive forces.

Hobbes's theory of the Leviathan has stated the necessity of covenant among citizens, together with coercive power punishing those who do not respect the law. Hobbes's social contract theory has less effect in the international community, especially in the UN, where the UN has a covenant with zero coercive power. However, the method of Leviathan is dangerous to be used by the UN system. This is because it advises the strict use of coercive control, where the current situation of the UN is unlikely to have any sort of military power.

It is important to note that the UN is an organization in an organization format rather than in-state form. Of course, as in the Hobbes theory of the state, the UN should have governance with or without coercive power without interfering with state internal affairs.

Kant has projected perpetual peace articles: 'Preliminary' and 'Definitive' articles (Orend, 2017, p.351): the former consists of six and the later three articles. These articles guide actions of states that need to be taken, in long as well as short term, for perpetual peace. The preliminary articles need to be implemented in the short term, while the definitive articles are established through time. Kant's arguments on these proposals are to minimize wars and create

a peaceful environment guided through human reasoning. Although the proposals are needy concerning practical international communication; and pure to consider current complex agendas of states or organizations, they help us grasp the concept of perpetual peace.

The Preliminary articles are (Orend, 2017, p. 351)

1. No treaty of peace shall be considered valid as such if it was made with a secret reservation of the material for a future war.

The preliminary article's first step is after a war. It is not advisable to sign a peace treaty that has future war in mind; because it shall not avoid conflict permanently, and the signed peace treaty will not become ineffective. For instance, South Sudan has signed a cease-fire agreement between rivals to stop the civil war, which has developed from political disagreement into ethnic conflicts but has not yet settled the civil war. The country has signed separate agreements to cease the civil war, not keeping in mind the perpetual peace of Kant's theory, or by keeping in mind the moral duty to stop the war. Yet, these agreements were not as effective as the country is still in conflict.

2. No independently existing state, whether it be large or small, may be acquired by another state by inheritance, exchange, purchase or gift.

This article stands for the sovereign rights of states. Hobbes argues that the social contract theory evolved out of the fear and hate of brutish or nasty life; the social contract theory has developed property rights and the mentality of how to live among individuals. Property and in state cases, natural resources are factors of disagreement among nations. As a result, society

should be cautious about it. And this can be taken as the origin of how a man should live, among individuals and states, to avoid brutish life. Even though states should not interfere with other sovereign states, there are important occasions to do so; it is arguable and fair to ask when, why and how is the way to interfere with a sovereign nation.

For instance, the conflict in Somalia existed for decades. But this independent state should not be in domination by any other state, where at the same time the international community should respond to its problems: poverty, civil war, ethnic war, extremism, piracy, etc. It is the moral duty of states to support Somalia, but it is also a moral duty for states not to interfere in sovereign state affairs. By merging and balancing the two: the necessity of interference into an independent state and respecting sovereign state, Somalia should be assisted.

3. Standing armies will gradually be abolished altogether.

As a matter of fact, nuclear weapons have been developing since the Second World War; because of which countries have been threats to one another. Historically it can be stated that the development of different weapons has encouraged and mounted confidence of the owner states to war. It is difficult to estimate how and when armies will be threats; nevertheless, Kant has discussed the abolishment of armies, through time. History makes it evident that weapons encourage war and peril. For this reason, Kant proposed the abolishment of armies.

For Kant, weapons are encouragements for arms race; countries are not developing them just for the sake of protection but also for attacking as a result of promoting endless and complicated interests of humanity. Countries are manufacturing machine guns that can kill as many people as possible at once and; they put it into a show worldwide.

4. No national debt shall be contracted in connection with the external affairs of the state.

The World Bank and the International Monetary Fund are international organizations that provide loans, in a different form, for developing countries. These groups are good examples that can explain the fourth article: loans are used as a weapon to influence independent state policies. On many occasions, the conditions of debt are contradicting state's internal affairs.

In addition, these organizations portray themselves as their debt is the best tool to minimize interstate undemocratic actions or corrupt governors. Debts cannot set the neutral ground for negotiation. That is, the organizations used their financial support to escalate their interest in a given independent state; this, of course, is not the goal of the organization but rather the actors of it.

5. No state shall forcibly interfere in the constitution and government of another country.

States are forbidden to interfere in the constitutional rights of others. Countries did not elucidate the question on 'what ground' to interfere with an independent country's internal affairs could be reasonable. Without a response to this question, cases have been witnessed as states were feeling responsible to interfere with other constitutions. For instance, during the cold war, the two major conflicting sides, USA and USSR, were directly interfering with the rules and regulations of many African states, and loans were given depending on their ideologies.

During the First, as well as the Second World War states were forced to battle other wars that did not concern them. They were mandated to take sides between the allies. After forming allies' states were forced to side the belief of their partners. For instance, African countries

were forced to take the ideologies of socialism. Even today, while many African countries have their way of governing system, they were cornered to shape their ideologies into Westernization.

6. No state at war with another shall permit such acts of hostility as would make mutual confidence impossible during a future time of peace. Such acts include the employment of assassins or poisoners, breach of agreements, the instigation of treason within the enemy state, etc.

War sometimes occurs to settle disagreement that could not be resolved otherwise. No states, according to Kant, are executed by other countries since all are equal in the eyes of all. However, the current situation is farfetched from this idea as financially dominant states penalize other states. The confrontation between the United States of America and Iraq can be taken as an example.

War should not be a mission of execution or extermination. Two or more parties in conflict should never think of eliminating the enemy; for instance, genocidal acts. The act of annihilation on war leads to an undesirable end: vicious or absurd.

At this point, it should be noted that the executions made by Adolf Hitler of Germany or Idi Amin Dada of Uganda and other similar cases were partly the result of a mental problem; lack of internal peace. Regardless of such claims, in times of war, states should be fair and respectful of agreements made with their enemies. As in just war concept, they shall consider the need for peace and end of the war. This is because peace after war shall not be promising and continue to remain threatening for further severe war. Yet these days it is difficult to talk about just war

since most wars are civil wars made among ethnic groups, political, religious, ideological, tribes or races difference.

While it is evident that seeking solutions for these wars is complicated and long-lasting, they are easily fueled, or usually created, by the interests of governors or other states. For instance, the South Sudan conflict that started between political rivalries led to ethnic strife between Dinka and Nuer. This conflict takes time for the political leaders to get what they want or to remain undefeated.

The three Definitive Articles of Kant are not merely a cessation of hostilities, but a foundation of peace. These Definitive articles are:

1. The civil constitution of every state shall be republican.

Kant has argued that republicans contain three principles 'freedom as a man', 'dependence on legislation as a subject,' and 'legal equality as citizens.' To realize social contract theory, as Hobbes has claimed it, and be in agreement, living equally and justly can reasonably avoid 'brutish and nasty life.' It is natural to need security and reasonable to find it within the social contract, where part of responsibilities and freedom is given.

In my understanding, states are not safe just by taking ideologies like republican, democrats or monarchs. It is witnessed that kings and aristocrats have ruled centuries than democrats and Republicans. This is because, in the eras of democrats and republicans, many wars are waged. These two ideologies and related concepts tend to promise a type of system that cannot be kept. For instance, for more than decades, African culture, political, social and economic networks

have been forced to change into these concepts. While Africans have ways of governing their people, they were forced to use the European system.

Nevertheless, the time had already brought humanity into today's political system, whereby states need to define and take the political system that is workable for its citizens. For instance, even though many have criticized Ethiopia it has been advocating a developmental state. China's developmental state has been criticized by the Westerner's though China was able to attain rapid economic growth. In these conditions' democrats, republicans or monarchs govern countries depending on their situation. I agree that ideologies can bring change and improvement (advancement). But this doctrine should apply to both the internal and external conditions of a country.

Furthermore, for effectiveness, ideologies have to respect and value human rights. Most African countries claimed to be working hard to democratize their countries while the reality falls behind for decades. As if they are the only guardian who can keep their country safe, it has been difficult for the leaders to give up power for the others. Fair election and leadership have just become a dream; many people die during elections, and yet there are no strong opposition parties.

To prolong their stay in power, leaders either create ethnic conflicts or re-write the constitution. For example, Angola, Republic of Congo, Eritrea, Chad, Sudan, Uganda, Cameroon, Equatorial Guinea, and Zimbabwe once were listed as countries with long-serving presidents by the journal African Vault, 2017. The presidents of these countries had served at least for more than fifteen years, and yet none is gravely encouraged to share power or discouraged by the

international organizations as a result of complex interests that everyone has.

2. The right of nations shall be based on a federation of Free states.

Human beings have created a state of a contract to live peacefully among themselves. Likewise, men should respect the commitment of the international community, as the globe is interconnected. For instance, conflict in South Sudan and Somalia threatens Ethiopia's national security and each individual's life, which in turn may lead to endless insecurity in the region. Because of these, it is advisable and reasonable to live peacefully not only within a state but also among states. Further international terrorist groups like al-Shabab, fundamentalist, ISIS, etc. do their own best to destabilize the international community. It is unlikely, however, to think of a federation of the states; currently, the global system is more realistic than the former.

The UN is not federation of states, but organizations composed of states. This organization's system is biased since it reflects that a few countries decide the fate of the organization. In the 1990s, the UN has shown severe failure in conflict resolution as well as peacekeeping and enforcement. Even today, many cases in countries such as Syria, South Sudan, Libya and Yemen are forgotten as a result of these countries' national interests. It can be argued that the outcome of the league is not as expected.

3. Cosmopolitan right shall be limited to conditions of universal hospitality.

If there are tolerance and hospitality, then any citizen can live and create a property as he or she desires, as all parts of the world are not naturally entitled to anyone. A man should have the right to move and own property not because there are agreements that allow him, but because it

is his or her natural right.

As a migrant being man shall be left to live anywhere his choice. Nevertheless, this is imaginary these days as man finds it hard to be hospitable everywhere. This is to say that there are no scientific findings that have proven where man came and where he is going. But, even in well-structured states (“modern states”), racism and border conflicts are inevitable, neighboring nations are hostile when it comes to their border. It can be said that the struggle for the control of natural resources has returned man into the Stone Age.

Human reasoning guides man for peace rather than war as man is a social being; he or she should be peaceful out of duty. Kant’s theory of perpetual peace advocated for a cosmopolitan world where man is friendly to others, based upon his reasoning. Moral legislation condemns war as it goes against the very nature of man. Accordingly, the UN should be a cosmopolitan, that it should have moral values to condemn and prevent war.

3.2. Peacekeeping in the UN

As it has been mentioned in chapter two, peace has a complex nature and is not yet entirely defined. For some people, peace is a state of mind; for others it is a state of men’s relation between and among societies. Peace of Mind and soul is essential in men’s relationships as a group or individual. For instance, a leader with no peace of mind might result in a fragile state, be a terrorist.

Politically, peace is an issue for most states because either state is part of conflict or peace negotiation. Historically, international organizations were formed because of the necessity for preventing violence, conflict, or war by establishing other means of war that is negotiation. In

everyday life of men circumstances, peaceful nations are desirable since it avoids death emerging from conflicts and or war. For centuries battles have been used as an expression of heroism within society and as a means to peace. Particularly, in this chapter, I will focus on peaceful relations among UN peacekeeping missions is managing civil or states wars and using moral values.

The outcome of the First and Second World Wars was miscalculated by the agents who carried out the wars. Its cost was more than the plans of the agents; it massacred lives, desolated resources and damaged nature. In both wars, leaders and military agents thought that the wars would end quickly and recover life as soon as possible, even though the wars had more enormous consequences with respect to time and all types of expenses. The wars were the failure of humanity that brought neither peace nor proved heroism. They, however, were successful in fabricating new power relations.

These wars were also the major causes for the creations of world allies that were created mainly not for the sake of peace but for constituting a balance of power. The international peace organizations, namely, League of Nation and United Nations were created one after the other. The international organization, namely LN, was born after the First World War and died after the Second World War and was replaced by the UN. Before these wars, the LN and later on the UN were theoretically constructed by Kant's theory of perpetual peace.

Political Realism argues that the world is anarchical; since there is no universal international government or laws that govern the interaction of one state with other states. With this analogy, in state of nature, individuals were in a state of anarchy; since there were no covenants or

common law binding nations into joint government. Later, individuals managed to form government or political entity binding men amongst themselves.

Nevertheless, because of the complex nature of the world, after states are formed, these states could not form an international organization. As in realist theory, even though individuals were at stake to create a society governmental organization or empire, the global communities do not require common government. It believes that the international system can exist as it has sovereign authority to do what even necessary.

In contrast to realist theory (the world does not have one ruling system), the world system is intertwined as many states are affected by one another. For decades the USA and Russia have been meddling in the internal affairs of countries such as Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Iran and Iraq in the Middle East, especially after the incident of 9/11. The first goal was to drain any future terrorist attack from its source while later; it can be argued that the case has been used for many unrealistic reasoning. Under all these, the UN is partly involved as both countries are the permanent members of the Security Council.

A state is the most selfish entity of the world; it finds it difficult to compromise between national interest and UN peacekeeping deals. It is also a fact that many national interests cannot be compromised under any circumstances. Yet many issues that can be compromised are defended as they are not negotiable. For example, many land issues in Africa are valued as life and death matter, while the continent is rich in land resources. Africans can negotiate and put aside their difference through negotiation. Thus, the UN should effort to create a balance of power among nations, and it should have grounds of discussion to minimize disasters.

Chapter Four

Critical Analysis of the UN Peacekeeping Mission

4.1. National Interest versus the UN Peacekeeping Mission

There are many forgotten war cases around the world. Some still exist, and others are due to cease through time, leaving a historic tragedy behind. Countries like Syria, Yemen, Afghanistan, Somalia, Central Africa, Burkina Faso, Libya and Iran have been in wars and violence for years, and many other African and Middle East countries are predicted to enter into a war zone in the coming few years.

The report of the International Crisis Group claims that around ten countries in a different zone in 2020 will face conflict, for example, Afghanistan, Yemen, Ethiopia, Libya, Iran. These and others that are not in this list had been in civil wars for years. Some of these were exhaustively talked about and now are forgotten. And many others were just ignored by the UN as either because they are not within the national interest of the superpowers or they are beyond the capacity of the UNSC.

The United Nations was founded on the bedrock of a great ideal: that the nations of the world could draw together and defend certain fundamental principles that were common to all mankind, and in so doing, deter the outbreak of aggression as well as protect international peace. (Gold, 2005, p. 221)

As it has been mentioned in the first chapter, the UN's primary purpose was to create a

fundamental principle for all humanity; that works for the peaceful cosmopolitan world. Peace is a necessity for humankind; thus, it shall be kept by the international system. Under the supervision of the UN, if there are hostilities, then nations should come together and settle it. This is because it is morally right to create a safe world, especially in today's globalized world.

The deontological ethical theory of Kant argues that actions should be guided according to duty. For Kant, religious preaching, goodness, or love shall not guide human behaviors, but it is out of that morality that duty emerges. For example, if a person wants to violate laws, then he should think about what the results could be if everyone did the same act (the Golden rule).

For Kant, every law should work universally. If killing is morally wrong in Africa, then it is also wrong in every part of the world. Reason makes people understand universal wrong and right, good and bad actions. For Kant, moral values should not vary or be limited because of different preaching and understanding of religious, ethical, or psychological theories.

For him, without religious, ethical, or psychological teachings, morality should be formulated by reason. According to this theory, it means there is a common universal understanding of what virtue can be or is. The Moral quality of things or actions shall not be judged within the scope of any teaching other than the deontic principle. A man should act and behave well, not because of a religious or social institution slightly out of universal understanding and reasoning. For Kant, one religious aspect teaching might guide man to make the scarification of man. But a man should say no to any scarifications of a person because his reasons teach him killing is terrible in and of itself.

What joint interests would bring the diverse countries of the new UN

together? What common principles would bond the UN together as its membership expanded? What would be their agenda for a better world?

(Gold, 2005, p. 27)

Partly from this understanding, we can use the same application on the UN system. Kant's idea of perpetual peace should be applied according to this moral understanding of values. Any nation acting in the UN can see peace values according to Kant's universal theory of morality. For example, the non-interference of UN troops in Rwanda genocide was wrong. At the time of the Rwanda genocide, UN troops on the ground were advising the head office of the UN where there are attempts of genocide by Hutus on Tutsis. The Hutus were getting ready to attack the Tutsis, and the UN troops very much understood these attempts leading to the genocidal acts. But they were told not to take actions against the attempt they minimized the forces on the ground.

The United Nations has faced many challenges in keeping peace and security. Some of them have good results, while many remained unsolved or left bad scars in history. For instance, in Rwanda, the UN has failed to prevent the genocide that has killed 800,000 people in just three months. In Uganda, it could not stop the death of 300,000 people under the rule of former president Idi Amin Dada. Yemen and Syria are still in wars. No country assumed that the genocide committed in Rwanda or the previous civil war that took place in Uganda and Angola, or the war that is currently being waged in Syria or Yemen as serious events. To control these events are not in the interests of superpowers at this time.

At the end of WWII, in 1945, nations had clearly understood the need to form a joint power to

stop the deplorable results of the war. Of course, these were possible only when aggressors kept their weapons aside to advance by negotiations.

Countries have different understandings of the need of the UN. They have their ways to explain what international organizations should do. They have different perspectives on the idea of protecting citizens' dimensions. Today states should effort for the common understanding of the need for peacekeeping and can negotiate for how to handle cases. An organization built with good moral intention, in addition to good negotiation on situations, has a higher possibility of solving conflicts.

The UN does need not only negotiation but also coercive power. Without its military power, the UN cannot adequately protect and defend its basic peace and security needs. A state necessarily requires a powerful army that can protect its nation from civil war as well and external aggressions. A country without an army is like a dog without teeth. It requires protecting its citizens from any rebellion power within a country and from a foreign invasion.

It is also a fact that state governors need a robust and obedient army to control its citizens and safeguarding the territorial integrity of the country. In-state of nature where everyone has excess freedom, man has no typical protector, all protect his or herself and property. But now with the state, man has common protector, law and justice. Similarly, the UN requires its own military power to protect and secure peace.

However, it shall be kept in mind once military powers are created, checks and balances must be made so that the organization will not be a total dictator. Military force is necessary because states are armed than the organization. And whenever aggressor states exist, the UN shall

intervene with full power before any aggression states.

4.2. Towards Cosmopolitan World

As has been mentioned in the first chapter for decades, the United Nations Security Council (SC) has only five permanent members. As a result, it has been criticized. The UN represents more than 190 member states; however, the permanent members of the SC do not consent other members to be a part of it. The SC controls the major decisions of the General Assembly in accordance with the permanent member state's self-interest.

There are four major flaws in the design of the Security Council which cause it to be dysfunctional and these flaws are currently ignored in the reform process. The four flaws are: inequality, exclusiveness, rotating seats, and representation. (Lattila, 2019, p.7)

Cosmopolitanism is a term used to explain *cosmos*, meaning the world polis, which is a self-governing political unit. It promotes the universal values of human beings. It advocates moral universalism that, for example, claims that the attack in 9/11 in the USA is equal to the daily death experienced in Syria, Yemen, Central Africa, Somalia, etc. It focuses on the individual capacity and needs to interact with and understand other cultures and lifestyles. In other words, it upholds a universal understanding of human rights.

The cosmopolitan world is not yet fully practiced; it is more theoretical than practical when we see states and communities pushing each other. As we evaluate the global situation, in contrast with inter-cultural interaction; it is unfair, racist, open for terrorism and insecure. Nations are, in a different manner, both for and against the cosmopolitan world. That is, while technological

developments like Facebook and other social media construct an interconnection at the same time, they teach anti interculturalism.

..the differences between permanent and non-permanent seats produce a highly unequal and inefficient Security Council. The five permanent members (P5) – Britain, France, United States, Russia and China – possess permanent seats and have the privilege of the veto whilst the status of non-permanent member is low. (Lattila, 2019, p.1)

The Charter of the UN assigns five permanent members to make basic and final veto decisions in the Security Council. Usually, these permanent members have different understandings and interests in many countries facing civil wars, poverty, genocide, etc. For example, countries like Rwanda, Yemen, Syria, Crimea, Bosnia and Somalia. were left without assistance when they faced challenges.

In this regard, the G4 (Germany, Japan, India, and Brazil), Uniting for Consensus (UFC) (Italy, Spain, Argentina, Canada, Mexico, South Korea, and Pakistan), Africa Union (two seats and five non- permanent membership), L69 (40 developing countries) (six permanent and six non-permanent seats), the Arab group and ACT (twenty one smaller members like Ireland, Uruguay, and others.) are all requesting and are criticizing the P5 (permanent members).

The GA criticized the unequal treatment of the UN requesting for additional permanent seats in the SC P5. This situation in itself is one proof of the resistance towards cosmopolitan interaction, where any situation against the permanent members is disregarded.

Nations have the right not to love or like each other, but it's a necessary fact to understand and

respect the interests of one another. This is because society is essential and is the main reason that holds humanity together. In the cases mentioned above, the veto powers have been voting against inclusiveness; from the 190 above members of the UN, only five gives the important and last decision. This contradicts cosmopolitanism.

4.3. Conclusion

The main objective of the UN is to create and keep peace throughout the world. It is a fact that the main actors of peace are men. Peace is created and maintained among men and societies in equal and just political system. To ensure peace, every person must be part of keeping and creating peace since, naturally, men desire a good life. Commonly within a society, peace is maintained and created through the efforts of individuals in systems that protect citizens. For a peaceful nation and society, a political system based on equality and justice is a necessary condition. Individuals establish a society for protecting their life and family through equal and just treatment. While men are successful in building a political system, at least in many countries, nations are not successful in setting the UN to keep peace.

The UN was supposed to help define that code of conduct for states, particularly through its nonbinding resolutions in its main bodies, the General Assembly and the Security Council. But what happened when those principles were eroded by the UN itself? It is here that the UN let the world down. Instead of providing the glue for world order, it supplied the fuel for chaos. (Gold, 2005, p.223)

In the book *Tower of Babel*, Gold exposed that throughout its history, the UN could not keep the intended peace, as it becomes a mere tool of few countries. As he explains, the UN could

not keep peace as member states have elapsed the organization's purpose, where the organization's moral clarity was replaced with a sarcastic moral equivalence. In the first sense, nations needed to have peace before anything, while on the second; it was more of giving an unbalanced explanation for what shall be done in different areas.

For instance, the Rwanda genocide was informed to the Head quarters of the UN. After the consequences of the Rwanda genocide, as a response to this incident, the UN reasoned the impossibility of sending troops because of the harshness of the case. While the UNSC should stand together with civilians for peace, Rwanda and many others were left for their attackers. This is mainly because of the apathy of UNSC permanent members. Similar excuses were given with Srebrenica and many other massacres.

The UN's moral equivalence affects not just its ability to enforce its resolutions or to empower its commissions and other bodies to act decisively. The resolutions themselves—whether issued by the Security Council or the General Assembly—are dripping in moral. (Gold, 2005, p. 113)

It has been a while since Somalia, Yemen, Central Africa, Syria; the UN tried to secure peace around the world and was less successful in relation to its first goals. In these “modernization period,” states should be more secure than before. But the world is facing war after war and organizations in contrast to their interest are not to the rescue. After the Cold War, most nations hopped the UN is or will be capable of controlling conflicts among nations.

Article one of the Charter of the UN utters the main purposes and principles of the organization is prevention and removal of threats to peace, developing friendly relations, achieving

international cooperation, and enhancing harmonization for common ends. In this article of the Charter, nations agreed to ensure peace.

No nation stands against this purpose as most of them desire peace and have agreed to this Charter. But in most conflicting cases, especially strong countries stand against it for the national interest. This is what happened in the case of Syria, Rwanda, Central Africa, Libya, Iran, Afghanistan etc. It has always been the case that nations defended their own finance and other capacities when things go outside their national interest.

Clearly, the UN cannot serve as the ultimate protector of international peace and security. It just doesn't work. The experience of the 1990s shows that we cannot rely on UN peacekeeping forces in the world's trouble spots. (Gold, 2005, p. 231)

In connection to this, I argue that, it is morally acceptable to say, with whatever cost the UN shall keep international peace at the state level as well as local. For an organization that is created to maintain peace without prior condition, it is morally valid to condemn war and punish those against it. As states are developing globalization, most nations desire peace and the UN can be taken as a hope to create peaceful interaction with neighbors as well as the international community. If the UN efforts are towards peace, it is logical to say it should have a structure that will not make some dependent and the others independent.

Countries that are financially supporting the UN are literally managing the Peace and Security Council of the organization. It supports finance, not for the sake of international security or safety but for securing the national interest of the state. It is morally wrong to bribe an international organization decision making through financing since, without justice and

equality, it is almost impossible to keep any sort of peace.

The international political system is a reciprocation system; it is realistic to give support and divert decision making. But morally, it is wrong to trade peace with finance for recovering national interest. Peace should guard the poor or rich. It is ethically invalid to intervene in peace deals only when it includes national interest. It is obvious that no peace interest goes against any national interest.

States are not in total disagreement, but because of the greedy nature of some states, the UN system is abused. Disregarding moral equivalence, men can formulate a universal ethical theory. Kant's perpetual peace is worth trying before nations become beyond the power of the UN. In most peacekeeping missions of the UN, it is known the danger it inflicts on nations, but no necessary measures are taken as a result of moral equivalence. This happens when nations don't see the mission as some input to their national interest.

It is morally unjust for the UN to see any nation suffering from wars. Many countries have suffered genocidal acts, wars and civil wars while they are part and parcel of the UN. This is not because nations do not have a moral understanding of the need for keeping peace but greed. The UN should focus on improving the quality of human life through the cultivation of a good man and a good society.

For Kant, no war is just good or can end any other war. War for him is the humiliation of human beings, against human development, morality and equality. For this purpose, it needs to revise its Charter that has been in operation for more than 50 years. It should demilitarize each nation and hold for itself a prominent position, and also, should strengthen regional

organizations like Africa Union, European Union and others.

As it is a fact that a state cannot give up part of its sovereignty to any organization, it is also difficult to form a military that is composed of all nations with a neutral budgeting system. By neutral budgeting system, I mean aid for the sake of social values rather than expecting to repay. Even though Africa is resourceful, it is incapable of extracting its resources to change it into actual finance. It is also a fact that creating durable military power for the UN might be possible, but in the long run, its consequences might be creating an anarchic international system.

Men might not face the Third World War at any future time, but it is reasonable to think that moral values are decreasing through time; with all the technological development, men are not able to be shape behaviors in order to have a peaceful international community. Thus, without moral values, human behaviors might be difficult to handle and guide how to live together.

Kant explains that moral man desires peace out of reason, even in a state of nature, where every man is treated as a result of practicing unlimited freedom reason tries to rule out conflict. For him, reasoning limits human freedom and is used universally as human beings correspond through reason.

Kant also claims the goodwill of man for a successful moral life. Any use of force for the preservation of peace goes against the general rule of acting out of duty. For him, man or state should act well through reason rather than being modulated by the consequence of action. Man is the end in itself, not the means to a goal. It is very likely to find a state that is not interfering with any other sovereign nation. States one way or the other are involved in other countries

internal affairs. When interfering with other national affairs is committed, it is not because humanity is seen as an end but rather as a means to other goals and the acquisition of resources, and power.

Globalization is the major pushing factor that increases interference and interaction among nations. It is difficult for states to stay out of the business of other states or be out of the global situation. Countries or states should create a cosmopolitan world that tolerates and serves the individual as well as states. This is possible out of goodwill and the need for peace around the world. It is morally reasonable for any individual to feel safe and be secured at any corner of the world. This reasoning shall bring humanity to formulate a cosmopolitan world with the UN, which is one of the already existing strong national bonds.

The UN shall respect and treat all states equally and justly. It is morally wrong to trade votes with finance, where the highly financing states of the UN shape the vote as desired. If the UN keeps serving a few states, it will be less useful as it is now. Eventually, it will not create a long-standing cosmopolitan world that will avoid the possibility of the Third World War. Its goal of keeping peace will be dependent on the interest of few countries, as a result of which it fails to control the manufacturing of weapons and nuclear bombs. But it should be kept in mind that the UN shall create a balancing power so that other stateless controlling giants will not be created.

Of course, it is hardcore to separate states and the UN as the main actors are states. In the UN, there are many unfair leaders for their nations; for instance, the previous leader of Sudan, according to the UN estimation, who is accountable for the genocide in Darfur, killing 300,000

people. Until the day that the Sudanese overthrow Omar al-Bashir he was a respected leader in the UN.

In this case, Al-Bashir should have been condemned just for the genocide he created in Darfur, ignoring all other misfortunes of the country under his governance. Al-Bashir was supposed to face ICC (International Criminal Court) while he was still president. The UN should be alert in condemning any misconduct of leaders. This is also because there are universal understandings of right and wrong action, which is supported in the Human Rights sections of the UN.

The UN has forgotten its historical background (the First and Second World War). It is used as a tool for the permanent SC to interfere in the affairs of sovereign nations immorally. This is because states are biased on their national interest. They disregard the moral values that hold men together, and the need to keep everyone safe for the sake of everyone.

Keeping the peace is keeping national interest. It is morally satisfying and good to treat humanity equally and justly as per general principles. If nations become less greedy and more concerned about nurturing the intercultural nature of humanity, it will ensure peace and security.

Bibliography

Bourke, J. (2001). *The Second World War: a people's history*. Oxford University Press.

Britannica, I. E. (1957). *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Encyclopedia Britannica, Incorporated.

<https://www.britannica.com/event/World-War-II>

Collier, P. (2003). *The Second World War, Vol. 4: The Mediterranean 1940-1945*.

Routledge.

Crimes, A. E. W. *Rwanda: The Preventable Genocide* International panel of eminent personalities.

Demont - Biaggi, F. (Ed.). (2017). *The Nature of Peace and the Morality of Armed Conflict* (pp. 1-333). Palgrave Macmillan.

Easley, E. (2004). *The War over Perpetual Peace: an exploration into the history of a foundational international relations text*. Springer.

Gall, T. L. (2004). *World mark encyclopedia of the nations*. Gale.

Gold, D. (2005). *Tower of Babel: How the United Nations Has Fueled Global Chaos*. Crown Forum.

Goldstein, J. (2007). *A heart full of peace*. Simon and Schuster.

Kant, I. (2006). *Toward perpetual peace and other writings on politics, peace, and history*. Yale University Press.

Kinsella, D. T., & Carr, C. L. (Eds.). (2007). *The morality of war: a reader*. London: Lynne

Rienner Publishers.

Lattila, V. (2019). *A New proposal for UN Security Council Reform*. Oxford Research Group *Breaking the Cycle of Violence*.

Keating, T. F., & Knight, W. A. (Eds.). (2004). *Building sustainable peace*. United Nations University Press.

Kleingeld, P. (2006). *Kant's theory of peace*.

Michael, H. (2003). *The First World War, A Very Short Introduction*.

Orend, B. (2017). Immanuel Kant (1724–1804). In *Just War Thinkers* (pp. 168-179). Routledge.

Reed, C., & Ryall, D. (2007). *The price of peace: just war in the twenty-first century*.

Rotblat, J., & Ikeda, D. (2006). *A quest for global peace: Rotblat and Ikeda on war, ethics and the nuclear threat*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Slattery, W. M. (2007). *Jesus the Warrior? Historical Christian Perspectives & Problems on the Morality of War & the Waging of Peace*. Marquette University Press.

Slavicek, L. C. (2010). *The Treaty of Versailles*. Info base Publishing.

Snauwaert, D. T. (2004). The Bush doctrine and just war theory. *The online journal of peace and conflict resolution*, 6(1), 121-135.

Swayze, A. (2014). *The End of World War I: The Treaty of Versailles and Its Tragic Legacy* (*World War I: Remembering the Great War*). Crabtree Pub. Co.

Teixeira, P., & da Silva, P. T. (2003). *The Security Council at the dawn of the twenty-first*

century: to what extent is it willing and able to maintain international peace and security?.

United Nations Publications UNIDIR.

United States. President (1945-1953: Truman). (1945). *The Charter of the United Nations with the Statute of the International Court of Justice Annexed Thereto: Address by the President of the United States Delivered Before the Senate on July 2, 1945 Presenting the Charter of the United Nations, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice Annexed Thereto: and a Message from the President of the United States Transmitting a Certified Copy of the Charter of the United Nations, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice Annexed Thereto.....*US Government Printing Office.

Wendt, F. (2016). *Compromise, peace and public justification: Political morality beyond justice.* Springer.

Yao, X. (2004). Conflict, peace and ethical solutions: A Confucian Perspective on War. *Sungkyun Journal of East Asian Studies*, 4(2), 89-111.

<https://www.cfr.org/blog/why-no-one-talking-about-un-security-council-reform-anymore>

<https://www.oxfordresearchgroup.org.uk/blog/a-new-proposal-for-un-security-council-reform>

<https://www.un.org/press/en/2018/ga12091.doc.htm>