

Role of International Organizations in Collective Security: A Dilemma of International Security Order

Uroosa Ishfaq *

Muneeba Shahid †

Kashif Ashfaq ‡

Abstract

Vol. III, No. I (2018)

Pages: 10 – 14

p- ISSN: 2708-2121

e-ISSN: 2708-3616

L- ISSN: 2708-2121

The role of International Organizations in collective security presents a dilemma in the global order. While these organizations aim to promote international security and cooperation, challenges persist in their effectiveness. This article explores the intricate dynamics of international organizations in maintaining peace and addressing security threats. It delves into the complexities of balancing national interests and collective security objectives. It focuses on how the UN and the League of Nations both carry out the concept of collective security.

Key Words: International Organizations, Collective Security, League of Nations, UN

Collective Security

The decades of experience in the international efforts to achieve world peace so far demonstrate that the conventional ideas of security do not offer sufficient answers to the contemporary problems of interstate conflict and regional instability. In contrast to the dangers to global peace and stability, this crucial and pressing topic of collective security is examined from two viewpoints: liberalism and realism, both of which represent a period when using force as a political weapon was considered acceptable. A new political strategy that, in a global setting, combines with the international security relationship first appeared in the early 20th century ([Hula, 1957](#)).

When we talk about this topic, we surely think of the attempts made by the international community to develop new strategies and tactics that contribute to the development of international confidence and the resolution of the so-called "security dilemma" through widely recognized cooperative efforts. The majority of them believe that by joining the collective security systems, they can increase their security and attain it more easily. This does not exclude them from actively participating in other international organizations, though. Security is an extremely sophisticated and up-to-date topic. Safety is important. Without reference to it, world politics cannot be understood.

The concepts of collective security and defense date from the previous century. The two ideas represent a formal, long-term agreement between groups of nations to safeguard each member's security interests within their shared fields of interest. It is asserted that the term "collective security" refers to the desire for security in a wide sense, avoiding the division of powers into rival camps and refusing to set boundaries that would exclude some powers. The United Nations and the League of Nations both have identified collective security as one of their tenets. Immanuel Kant put out this concept in his book "Perpetual Peace" written near the close of the 18th century, where he claims that one federation of free states will serve as the foundation for international law. A system of collective security deters any member state from taking any action that could jeopardize peace, preventing violence ([Michel](#)).

To ensure security, collective security snuck into sovereign governments. This shows how liberal democracy has a big impact on how secure society is as a whole. Nevertheless, the region's strong economic linkages and shared respect for the law strengthen its unity in the area of collective security. Due to the need for liberal democracies in today's emerging countries, every country in Western Europe is a liberal democracy, which makes this possible ([McCoubrey & Morris, 2000](#)).

An international or regional threat to peace and security constitutes the enemy under a system of collective security. A threat could arise in any area of the world if the collective security system has a global scope. Any nation that violates the collective security system's standards by acting violently, jeopardizing the peace, or significantly going beyond what is considered acceptable behavior is subject to enforcement action. Regardless of where the threat originates within its system of mutual defense, No country is exempt

*M Phil Scholar, Department of Political Science, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan.
Email: uroosa.ishfaq@gmail.com

† M Phil Scholar, Department of Political Science, International Islamic University Islamabad, Pakistan.

‡ Post Graduate Scholar, Department of Journalism and Mass Communication, Abdul Wali Khan University Mardan, KP, Pakistan.

from its duty to uphold peace and security. Alternatively, collective security can be activated. A threatened nation may request assistance from other nations while exercising its innate right to collective self-defense ([Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014](#)).

A commitment by participant states to assist in defending a member state in the event of an attack by a state not affiliated with the organization is known as collective security. It is often formalized by a treaty and organization. The most well-known collective defense organization is NATO, and its infamous Article 5 requires its members to defend one another in the event of an attack. NATO states contributed to assisting the US War on Terror in Afghanistan after the 9/11 attacks on the US. Having its roots in multiparty alliances, the collective defense has advantages as well as disadvantages. On the other hand, it can lower the cost for any one state to adequately provide security by combining and pooling resources ([Hula, 1957](#)).

It is possible to say that collective security has evolved as a result of the countries' growing feeling of a common future. Collective security refers to continuous efforts to reduce the likelihood of conflict that is not directed at any specific nation or coalition of nations. By implementing the new cooperative security strategy, the nations begin to understand that they cannot succeed in their efforts to increase security because one nation's actions could result in a comparable reaction from another, lowering the security of both nations ([Michel](#)).

The League of Nations

Established in the aftermath of World War I, the League of Nations was the first modern organization dedicated to collective security. In the wake of World War I (1914–1918), the League of Nations was established. Still, since the beginning of time, there have been proposals to establish a body wherein the nations of the world might settle their differences. The League was the first association of independent governments designed to be worldwide and committed to conflict resolution and war prevention, and it was founded in 1919 at the Paris Peace Conference ([Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014](#)).

To establish the legal foundation for completing this, the most challenging task the League has ever undertaken, its members included a special provision into the Pact they signed. As stated in Article 10, the League's members pledge to protect each other's current political independence and geographical integrity from outside invasion. In the event of such hostility or danger or threat of such violence, the Council will offer guidance on how to fulfill this obligation ([League of Nations, 2017](#)). The most contentious and much-disputed clause seems to require member states to defend the political independence and territorial integrity of every League member against external aggression. However, the League could not compel them to act; only requested them to do so through its council (upper chamber). Thus, some of the difficulties that would later beset collective security surfaced early on: Is it conceivable to compel states to promise not to forcibly change the status quo in the future? Given that the current situation might not be fair or rational, at least not to everyone, is this even desirable?

How can we account for this failure? Although the League had the legal right to use force, there was ultimately nothing the League could do if a country decided to disdain it since it lacked its army. It was not favorably received when the French suggested creating a global army under League of Nations supervision. The Senate decided against ratifying the Treaty of Versailles because they were afraid that their country might be invaded by foreign forces acting as an agent of a foreign power. As a result, neither the United States nor the newly established, outcast Russian socialist state joined the alliance ([Lorenz, 1999](#)).

The League of Nations collapse served as evidence of the value of liberal democracies. Due to the League's anti-democratic members, problems immediately emerged. Fascist Italy might have been, but fascist Germany wasn't always. Germany left the League as soon as it adopted fascism, which prevented the League from continuing to exist and function. The necessity for a worldwide alliance did not go away even after the League was unable to prevent World War II from breaking out in 1939. Instead, it strengthened the urge to learn from the past and create a new organization better suited to uphold world peace moving forward ([Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014](#)).

The main goal of collective security is to formalize a long-term power balance in which each state agrees to rebuff any military aggression by another state. The theory is founded on the assumption that no state can defeat every other member of the system at once and that, as a result, aggression will always be discouraged (a presumption that becomes challenging when nuclear powers are present).

The prerequisites for collective security are extremely strict. To stop using force for any reason other than defending their territory, all governments must first accept the current situation to a sufficient degree. Secondly, to prevent immobility during a crisis, every state needs to have a consensus on what constitutes violence. Third, even when preventing aggression is far from or at odds with their immediate interests, all states, particularly the major powers, must be ready to use their defense services and/or financial resources. (or to establish, finance, and discover ways to command an international armed force). Fourth, all nations must take proactive measures to stop any violations of the sanctions that could support the declared criminal activity. Due to its inability to fulfill these requirements, the League of Nations' efforts to achieve collective security were unsuccessful ([Birn, 1974](#)).

A strong strategy, according to some, was further hampered by the concept of collective security since, at times, such as in the UK in the middle of the 1930s, the public tended to view the league and collective security as alternatives to national power. It seems that some

thought the various countries might avoid taking any action if the problem of eliminating the tyrants was moved to Geneva. Without question, this deceit was harmful ([Miller, 1999](#)).

The United Nations

The League of Nations was superseded by the United Nations which is a collective security framework, but it was undoubtedly established to address the more serious shortcomings of its forerunner. In contrast to the League, anyone can join the UN. In particular, the UN is a global organization that outlaws the use of war as a tool for pursuing national security. The principle of amicable conflict resolution and collective action when world peace and security are at risk predominates. Two UN collective security actions took place ([Mwagwabi, 2010](#)).

Nothing in the current UN Charter shall impede the inherent right to individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack is launched against a UN member until the Security Council has taken the necessary actions to protect international peace and security. Article 51 of the UN Charter makes this clear. However, this has no bearing on the Security Council's jurisdiction or duty under the current Charter to take any action required to maintain or restore international peace and security. In addition, the Security Council must be promptly notified of any action taken by Members in the exercise of their right to self-defense. A nation that is the target of an armed attack may, in conformity with the Charter, use individual self-defense up until the point that the Security Council uses its intervening mechanisms.

The institution itself, as a universal body, was required to defend international peace and security since these changes had a substantial impact on the stability and relevance of the globe in the final decade of the 20th century. In terms of a framework for collective security, the UN is frequently unsuccessful due to the divergent ideals of its member nations. Due to the Soviet Union's boycott of Council sessions, the UN's campaign against North Korea in 1950 was only somewhat successful ([Ozgersin, 2004](#)).

In 1990, when Iraq invaded Kuwait, the end of the Cold War allowed the UN to again prove its effectiveness for collective security. The action against Iraq was not opposed by the Soviet Union at the time, which declared its willingness to join the Western international community. For the first time since the UN was founded, the Security Council is starting to function as its founders intended, as the Persian Gulf Crisis proved. The UNSC strongly denounced Iraqi aggression during the Persian Gulf Crisis and requested that Kuwait's integrity and sovereignty be restored. Additionally, it voted to embargo Iraq severely economically and militarily, and those sanctions were completely carried out ([Birn, 1974](#)).

The UN did not take any action against Serbia during the 1999 Kosovo crisis. China and Russia opposed the measure in part because meddling in Serbia's internal affairs would open the door for meddling in other countries' internal affairs with comparable dynamics, such as Chechnya in Russia and Tibet in China. Another example is the conflict between Iraq and Iran, in which the Security Council was unable to intervene because it had the necessary authority to do anything as basic as determining who was the aggressor and who was the victim. Russia believes that the UN's capacity needs to be continuously strengthened. The UN must logically adjust to the changing nature of the planet. Additionally, it should increase its influence and safeguard the UN Charter's provisions as well as its international character. The UN Security Council's overhaul is a crucial part of its revival. The moment has arrived to move more quickly towards finding a compromise solution for its growth and improved productivity ([Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014](#)).

Not to get us to paradise, but to get us out of hell is the UN's mission. The UN has been instrumental in settling internal and external conflicts, providing aid in times of need, and developing standards for human rights. This worldwide group has proven to be very inventive in managing the restrictions of power politics during the previous 60 years. But as long as states keep withholding the necessary funds and power, the UN's ability to carry out its mandate will remain restrained ([Aleksovski, Bakreski, & Avramovska, 2014](#)).

Nevertheless, despite its shortcomings in terms of operational efficiency and achieved outcomes for peace measures, the UN's modern orientation and contemporary tendencies are its greatest achievements. As of now, the international organization is working to establish a global political and legal framework where maintaining peace and fostering international cooperation are its top priorities and a promise of the well-being and safety of every member.

One of the most significant accomplishments of the international community in the twentieth century was the establishment of the UN. The UN and its endeavors are undeniably representative of the twentieth century. There is no substitute for this organization and its successful efforts, and there never will be. We have no right to disregard the UN's special status as an international institution. And we must all work to protect and strengthen this global commonwealth ([Lorenz, 1999](#)).

Conclusion

Safety is important. The concept of accepting security, as outlined above, can serve as the foundation for a more peaceful and harmonious future. As a result, the cooperative security system solicits from its member democratic nations a willingness to engage in tighter mutual collaboration, including outside-of-territory initiatives that may compromise their shared security and peace. Three fundamental security components were used to create the collective security system: individual security, collective security, and

stability promotion. Any international security system's success hinges on strong, cohesive leadership, a willingness to compromise, and the members' resolve to stick with it through to the bitter end. This is particularly valid for an advanced organization such as the Cooperative Security System. If one or more of these are absent, the system might not function. It won't be this way because of errors; rather, it will be this way because its actors lack the perseverance and insight necessary to get past the inevitable challenges and miscommunications. But if the leaders are wise, they will be able to get past these challenges, and the tangible manifestation of collective security could give people in this unstable globe new hope.

Recommendations

- Instead of waiting until things get out of hand, the UN should improve its intelligence system to enable it to prevent conflicts from escalating. The UN might receive frequent updates about potential hotspots from the intelligence services of major powers.
- Peacekeeping operations need to move more quickly; it might take up to four months from the moment the Security Council decides to send soldiers to when they arrive on the ground. Governments could assist by having units with specialized training for peacekeeping services prepared for quick deployment.
- All forces must receive the same high-quality training; in Somalia, for instance, Nigerian and Pakistani troops were not adequately educated to handle delicate situations. It would be very beneficial to standardize the level of training and experience of the troops that the UN can rely upon if a core military organization was established to supervise and coordinate the training of UN peacekeeping forces.
- The UN might use the Arab League and NATO more frequently as regional institutions. For instance, it may give the Arab League the go-ahead to patrol the border between Kuwait and Iraq, relieving the burden and cost on UN forces.
- The UN should keep an eye on and control the movement of weaponry to possible flashpoints. For instance, American weapons were used against American soldiers in Somalia, while Iraqi-owned French Mirage jets shot at French soldiers in the Gulf War. The world would be a more peaceful place if the various factions had never received weapons in the first place. Through the implementation of a uniform code of conduct for the main arms exporters, the UN should restrict the sale of weapons internationally.
- The Security Council's permanent membership should be expanded. Many Third World countries have been angered by the USA, Britain, and France's dominance of the UN since the conclusion of the Cold War. The addition of additional permanent members would promote wider cooperation and goodwill while restoring harmony.

References

- Aleksovski, S., Bakreski, O., & Avramovska, B. (2014). Collective Security – The Role of International Organizations –Implications in International Security Order. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 5 (27).
- Birn, D. S. (1974). The League of Nations Union and Collective Security. *Journal of Contemporary History*, 9 (13).
- Hula, E. (1957). Fundamentals of collective security. *Social Sciences*, 24 (1), 1-36.
- League of Nations. (2017) history.com/topics/world-war-i/league-of-nations
- Lorenz, J. P. (1999). *Peace, Power, and the United Nations*. Routledge.
- McCoubrey, H., & Morris, J. (2000). *Regional Peacekeeping in the post-Cold War era*. BRILL.
- Michel, J. (n.d.). Guaranteeing Peace through “Collective Security” in the 20th Century. Retrieved from <https://chne.fr/en/encyclopedia/themes/international-relations/organizing-international-system/guaranteeing-peace-through-%E2%80%9Ccollective-security%E2%80%9D-in-20th-century>
- Miller, L. H. (1999). The Idea and the Reality of Collective Security. *Global Governance*, 303-332.
- Mwagwabi, L. (2010). The Theory of Collective Security and its Limitation in Explaining International Organization: A Critical Analysis. *SSRN*.
- Ozgersin, K. (2004). Collective Security and the United Nations: Collective Security and the United Nations. *Peace Operations Training Institute*.