

(3)

Q: The UN Security Council is regarded as a tool for the veto wielding powers and a debating forum for non permanent members. Make a case for restructuring the Council with special ~~members~~ emphasis on judicious distribution of Veto powers.

Introduction.

The UNSC was structured in 1945 under the outcome of World War II, not under the strategic map of 2025. Rittberger called the UNSC a "castle of power, not an architecture of equal security".

That design time-lag has produced a perception gap: global power has shifted to multi-nodes, but institutional seats remain frozen in 5 seats. This is not UN failure — this is

UNSC outdated power-mapping

• Erosion of Representational Legitimacy •

According to IMF 2023, G20 $\approx$ 85% of world GDP, yet 4 top G20 economies have no permanent seat. Joshua Goldstein wrote that institutions "lose legitimacy when they represent a memory, not a reality". Power is shared in the economy, yet it is monopolized in security.

• Selective norm enforcement •

Security council report shows US + Russia votes > 100 since 1945 - which is proof that veto is not used for peace; veto is used for

protecting friends. Gaza 2023-2024
and Ukraine 2022-2024 are
both textbook examples where
humanitarian ~~agency~~ urgency existed,
but veto collapsed the
enforcement. In effect UNSC
became a spectacle — not a
stabilizer.

∴ Veto a privilege
not responsibility ∴

Maleeha Lodhi argued that "reform
is not idealism, reform is
realism." Veto is a bargaining
chip, not a neutral device.
So if we abolish veto
entirely — PS will never sign.
But if we discipline veto,
then we don't remove power —
we civilise power.

P5 Power monopoly
Concentration of Authority



Selective Veto Use
Blocking actions based
on ~~Entire~~ national
Interest



Norm inconsistency
Double Standards
&
Selective Outrage



Global distrust
Erosion of UN
legitimacy.

∴ Conditional Veto
is Workable. ∴

A conditional veto provides a realistic reform pathway: the veto should not operate in situations of genocide or ethnic cleaning, and its use must require dual consent of PS plus a majority of the elected ten members.

This balances morality with feasibility — regulating major powers without humiliating them.

∴ Calibrated Expansion ∴

G4 + PAU seat with renewable 10-year tenure is a politically sellable formula. Abdul Sattar wrote that diplomacy moves when "greater cost is attached to non-movement than to

movement". If exclusion damages PS
strategic space - they shift.
But if exclusion protects
their leverage - they freeze.

⚡ Institutional Mismatch ⚡

Today transaction cost of
UNSC paralysis is paid by
victims in kinetic conflict.

Gaza 2023-24 & Ukraine
2022-2024 proved that war
runs on real time, while

UNSC runs on veto
time. So the public

legitimacy collapse is emotional -
not academic - because the
world sees suffering but
sees no enforcement.

Reform Proposal
To increase equity
&
Representation

Distribution fears
PS fears loss of
influence.
Other states ~~fear~~
~~loss~~ ~~of~~
fear rivals gain

Reinforces

PS resistance
Active and Passive
blocking to
maintain status quo

Procedural deadlock
No consensus on process
or Model

Global South Exclusion

South Asia, Latin America, Africa are not marginal theatres; they are central risk zones. When they are absent from permanent decision tables, UNSC becomes an Anglo-Saxon + Eurasian monopoly. For Pakistan this matters directly because regional insecurities - terrorism, cyber destabilization, water stress.

Trust - Not Text -
makes institutional work.

Institutions depend on belief - not only on charter wording. If global south sees UNSC as a stage play - not a rule forum - then resolution legitimacy collapses.

The moral crisis is not that UNSC is weak — the moral crisis is that UNSC is viewed as biased. A biased cop is worse than no cop.

Conclusion

UNSC reform is not a passion project — it is a stability project. Veto should not be abolished; veto should be civilised. Conditional veto + calibrated expansion is the realistic formula. The world of 2025 is not governed by narrative — it is governed by power diffusion. If UNSC becomes fair — it stays central. If UNSC stays centralised — governance will shift outside. UNSC