

# Problems of Broadening the so-called UN Security Council

As long as democracy has not been adopted for the so-called the United Nations Organization, which is the highest political institution in the world, nobody will take notice of or care for any talk or call concerning democracy in any state across the world. So long as the treatment is oriented towards the U.N Security Council, the world is not serious in reforming the United Nations.

The nations of the world are represented by the existing General Assembly. Yet, this General Assembly amounts to nothing more than a Hyde Park Speakers' Corner, a fantasy. It is nothing but an unnecessary drain on expenses to cover the intercontinental trips made by state delegates to New York to take part in its ridiculous funny act.

It has no powers, no responsibilities and no respect. It provides only insults and disdain for the nations which send their representatives to the General Assembly, without making any binding decision regarding the security and peace of their peoples. All binding decisions are issued by a limited group in the UN Security Council which does not represent the whole world. Even this limited group is subject to a veto from any of the owners of the right to veto. By a single decision, a single veto and a simple signal from a state that has a permanent seat, all the efficiencies of the United Nations will be nullified... and all decisions are made void and stopped immediately after the use of veto. The will and decisions of approximately two hundred member nations in the General Assembly, which has no power, will be snubbed.

The so-called UN Security Council is an ugly, forceful and horrible instrument of dictatorship... it is as an executioner's whip with no appeal against its judgment even if its judgment is unfair, biased and harmful.

The reform of the United Nations, and the realization of democracy therein, necessitates that the powers of the Security Council be transferred to the General Assembly wherein all states are members, that binding democratic decisions should be those of the General Assembly, and that the Security Council shall only be an instrument for the execution of such decisions.

## Problems of Broadening the UN Security Council:

1 The European Union, for example, is now heading to be a single state represented by one foreign minister, one market, a single currency and one army. Let us imagine that such a unitary state has several permanent seats in the UN Security Council. It has two permanent seats at present, and if Germany were acquired the veto, to which it is a candidate, such a Union will have three permanent seats and this in itself constitutes a dangerous international problem. If Germany is granted such a seat, what will be the position of Italy? Italy will be aggrieved and deprived of its right. This is another problem.

Suppose that Italy is given a seat, how can a single Union be granted four permanent seats? This is another big problem. Let us imagine that the former Soviet Union possesses numerous permanent seats in the Security Council and let us also imagine that the American Union, "the United States of America", does now possess several permanent seats, what will the case look like? And who has the right to deprive Greece or Turkey from their right like others? This is again an inevitable problem.

2 Then the African Union. This Union is on its way to becoming a single state. Will it be given more than a single seat? Thus the problem of the European Union will be repeated. And if the African Union is given only a single seat in anticipation of it becoming a single state in the future, then who will be entitled to the seat so long as such a seat belongs to the African Union? Thus no single state member of the African Union will have the right to enjoy such a seat. It is for the whole of Africa and not for any particular state. This is also a problem.

3 Then if India is given a seat, and it is already a candidate for it, doesn't that mean the escalation of the degree of challenge with Pakistan, the nuclear state? Is that in the interest of world peace? On the contrary, it is a dangerous threat to world peace. And if Japan is given a seat, and it is a candidate for that, doesn't that mean the escalation of the challenge for North Korea that has a nuclear problem, and for China and Indonesia? If India and Japan are given a permanent seat, does that not mean the escalation of the boiling degree of the Chinese hydrogen kiln? Is it really for the benefit of world peace? On the contrary, it sooner rather than later jeopardizes world peace much more than at any time before.

4 If this right is granted to Turkey, who would have the right to deprive Iran or the Ukraine of the same right? It is obviously a problem. If Egypt is given this seat, for which it is a candidate, and which she may deserve, what will be the position of its traditional Israeli enemy? The Israeli lobby in America and elsewhere will definitely object to the right of Egypt to claim the seat. It is an inescapable dilemma and another dangerous threat for peace in the Middle East. Should the UN Security Council be broadened to such an extent who will then object to the right of Indonesia to have a permanent seat? This, no doubt would create an unavoidable additional problem.

For a non-nuclear country to become a permanent member of the Security Council does not seem sensible. This is an international mockery making such a country, and others alike, an anecdote.

The notion of broadening the UN Security Council could expose world peace to new dangers and would initiate a cold war that may soon turn hot. It would be a grave mistake should such steps be taken. However, if the proposed reforms of the United Nations are indeed for promoting peace and democracy among nations in the world, the powers of the Security Council should be the sole responsibility of the General Assembly. In this manner, democracy would be achieved in the United Nations. Similarly the seat of the Security Council will be of no importance and competitions and disputes to acquire such seat will come to a halt.

The world will ruin itself if it thinks of broadening the Security Council and disdained the General Assembly, as is the case at present. A powerful call for the withdrawal from the United Nations will appear prominently and on a wider scale. I personally will be the first of those calling for it.

Oh God witness that I have conveyed.

**MUAMMAR ALGATHAFI**

<http://www.algathafi.org>

