

**UNITED NATIONS AND THE CRISIS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY:  
IMPLICATIONS OF INSTITUTIONAL INEFFECTIVENESS IN THE  
ISRAELI-PALESTINIAN CONFLICT**

**Salih, Hussaini Hamza**

**Department of Political Science and International Relations  
Taraba State University, Jalingo; hussainisalih76@gmail.com**

**Abstract**

This paper examines the challenges confronting United Nations (UN) in upholding its collective security mandate and the implications of its failure to maintain global peace and security, particularly in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The paper aimed to assess the implications of the UN's institutional ineffectiveness in maintaining collective security during the Israeli-Palestinian crisis between 2023 to 2025. The research is anchored in structural realism theory. A qualitative research design and descriptive method of analysis were employed, using data obtained from secondary sources. The UN has been engaged in effort to resolve the Israeli-Palestinian conflict since 1948, two years after its establishment. However, the organization's recent behavior in managing the conflict has undermined its credibility and reputation and produced far-reaching consequences. The conflict has led to the deaths of thousands, the destruction of civilian infrastructure, and the placement of more than two million Palestinians into refuges. The findings have shown that the UN's inability to enforce its peace and security mandate significantly affected its institutional legitimacy and global reputation. The study recommends that restoring the UN's trust and credibility is crucial for the effectiveness of future peace initiatives.

**Keywords:** *United Nations, Israel-Palestine Conflict, Collective Security, Crisis*

**Introduction**

The United Nations was founded in 1945 with the principal mandate of preserving international peace and security. The establishment was motivated by the necessity to avert risks to international stability and to safeguard both individuals and states from conflict arising between and among the rival powers. The international system comprises sovereign states with diverse political and economic interests, military capabilities, technological advancements, governance structures, and strategic goals. This diversity often leads to competing national interests that threaten global peace and security. Consequently, over the decades, states have developed institutional mechanisms ranging from diplomatic dialogue to non-aggression pacts, reciprocal defense accords, and formal security alliances to address these factors and to promote collective stability (Ososima, 2023).

On February 18, 2004, former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan emphasized that a threat to one is a threat to all and must be addressed collectively. This principle underpins the requirement for sovereign member states to contribute security forces to the United Nations to prevent attacks by actors that pose existential threats to global peace and security necessitate collective security as a mechanism for coordinated action to avert or respond to assaults on the established international order (Osisomu, 2023). The notion of collective security gained significance between 1931 and 1939, during which many, albeit unsuccessfully, anticipated that the League of Nations could avert conflicts instigated by revisionist powers such as Germany, Italy, and Japan (Laurie, 2025).

The recent practice of collective security by the United Nations, particularly in addressing global threats such as the Israeli-Palestinian conflict from 2023 has revealed significant institutional weaknesses in upholding its core principles of preventing threats and maintaining international peace and security. The discriminatory structure of the UN Security Council has undermined the organization's effectiveness, as decisions often reflect the geopolitical interests of powerful member states. Therefore, the specific objective of this study is to assess the implications of the ineffectiveness of the United Nations Organization to maintain collective security in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict 2020-2025.

### **Literature Review**

#### **United Nations Organization (Institution)**

The United Nations constitutes the second global initiative to uphold international peace and security via collective consensus and coordinated actions among member nations. The League of Nations, its precursor, represented the initial endeavor to create a collective security framework and imparted crucial insights for the establishment of the UN. The League's Covenant, established at the 1919 Peace Conference following World War I, mandated that members uphold and safeguard each other's territorial integrity and political independence against external assault. It additionally specified that any member engaging in warfare contrary to peaceful dispute resolution would be considered to have perpetrated an act of war against all other members (White & Henderson, 2013, as quoted in *Collective Security*).

However, the League's inability to enforce collective military action against aggressor states ultimately led to its failure and the outbreak of the Second World War. Consequently, any international organization that lacks the capacity to compel its members to impose military sanctions against armed aggression cannot be said to uphold genuine collective security.

In response to the failures of the League of Nations and the necessity to avert or mitigate world conflict after the destruction wrought by the Second World War, the Allied Powers commenced plans in 1943 to create a more efficacious international organization based on collective security. On November 1, 1943, the United States, the United Kingdom, the Soviet Union, and China executed the Moscow Declaration, a seminal accord promoting collaborative military efforts for the benefit of the international community. The declaration underscored the necessity for a permanent international entity committed to preserving peace and security, asserting that the signatories would confer and collaborate with other nations to engage in collective action on behalf of the global community (U.S. Department of State, 1963, as cited in *Collective Security*). Over the following two years, this initiative evolved into the *Dumbarton Oaks Proposals* and the *Charter of the United Nations*, signed on June 26, 1945, and became into force on October 24, 1945.

#### **Provisions of the Charter**

The United Nations Charter assigns the principal responsibility for upholding international peace and security to the Security Council. Article 39 of the Charter stipulates that the Security Council is the principal authority responsible for ascertaining the presence of any threat to peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression, and is tasked with making recommendations or determining the necessary actions in accordance with Articles 41 and 42 to uphold or restore international peace and security (Security Council, 2009).

The formation of the United Nations unequivocally indicated that it was not designed to be a pacifist entity. In the concluding session of the San Francisco Conference in 1945, President Truman characterised the UN Charter as “a solid structure upon which we can build a better world” (Truman, 1948). The Charter establishes a more robust constitutional basis for collective security by addressing the vulnerabilities that aggressor states previously exploited under the League of Nations. The Security Council is granted the right to implement coercive measures, enabling it to identify acts of aggression and impose economic or, if required, military sanctions through contributions from member states (William, 1991 cited in Ososima, 2023).

However, despite its basic merits, the UN Charter reveals certain institutional weaknesses. The veto power assigned to the five permanent members of the Security Council persistently undermines the notion of state equality. The veto power has significantly contributed to the institutional stagnation of the United Nations and the ineffectiveness of its peacekeeping and conflict resolution initiatives. The Israeli-Palestinian war, which flared on October 7, 2023, has further highlighted the UN's inadequacies in enforcing collective security and preserving world peace. Fundamental issues compromising its efficacy encompass the continual application of the veto, political fragmentation among member states, partial decision-making, and preferential treatment within the Security Council (Rita, 1991 cited in Ososima, 2023).

### **Collective Security**

Collective security is defined as the threat and implementation of formal collective action to deter, prevent, and rectify transgressions of communal norms, as well as to avert the escalation of existing disputes (Kenneth, 2013 referenced in Laurie, 2025). Collective security is fundamentally a framework for the joint application of force in reaction to a threat or assault on one or more States. Collective security is a collaborative system designed to safeguard against the principal threat to States, namely the employment of military force or warfare.

Moreover, collective security defines a framework through which states in the international system choose to organise themselves to attain the common goal of preserving international peace and security. In the absence of a deliberate framework for interstate relations, a Hobbesian condition of *bellum omnium contra omnes*, or "war of all against all," would prevail, marked by the notion that "might is right," with conflict as the central feature of the international system (James, 2014 cited in Laurie, 2025).

At now, collective security is implemented through a range of political, economic, and military tactics. Decisions by the Security Council pursuant to Chapter VII (sanctions, enforcement mandates), UN peace operations assigned to stabilise conflict zones, and normative frameworks such as the responsibility to protect that reconceptualise atrocity prevention as a collective duty (United Nations, 2024). These procedures demonstrate the contradictory facets of collective security: the legal and institutional power to impose coercive measures, and the practical dependence on member states for military capabilities, financial assets, and political cohesion. Thus, the system's effectiveness is perpetually dependent on the willingness and resource commitments of Member States, as well as its legal mandate (Laurie, 2025).

### **United Nations and Collective Security**

Collective security is a normative and institutional idea which states agree that aggression or grave threats to one member are concern for all, and they bind themselves in principle to respond collectively to preserve international peace (Oxford Public International Law, n.d.). The United Nations Charter embedded this idea in 1945 by assigning primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security to the Security Council while giving the wider membership (General Assembly) a supporting role (United Nations, Charter). In theory, the UN provides both a legal framework and organizational instruments (Security Council mandates, peacekeeping operations, sanctions, and political missions) that operationalise collective-security responses to interstate aggression and to particular threats that risk wider instability (Oxford Public International Law, n.d.; UN Peacekeeping, 2024).

The Security Council is the UN's central collective-security organ, empowered to determine "threats to the peace" and to authorize coercive measures (Chapter VII of the Charter). However, the Council's structure especially the permanent five members (P5) and their veto creates a tension between the ideal of collective security and the reality of great-power politics. When a P5 member uses its veto, Council action can be blocked even when a majority of states want collective measures, producing what scholars call "veto paralysis" and reducing the Council's capacity to deliver the sort of collective response the Charter envisaged (Peters, 2023; General Assembly, 2022). Recent practice around the 2022 Russian invasion of Ukraine illustrated this problem: Security Council draft resolutions on Ukraine were vetoed, and member states resorted to alternative UN mechanisms (e.g., General Assembly action and Uniting for Peace-type measures) to register collective political responses outside the Council's veto-bound structure (Scharf, 2023).

### **Israeli-Palestinian Conflict Experience on Collective Security**

The Israeli-Palestinian experience on collective security will center on the factors and challenges within the United Nations and how these factors rendered the organization peace initiative efforts ineffective, considering the inability to upholds collective security arrangement to maintain peace and security in the middle east particularly the Israeli-Palestinian conflict over two years. These experiences on collective security are;

The foundational idea of collective security presumes that the international community, through the UN, will act in concert when a threat to peace arises that is, when a state attacks another, or civilians are at risk, the UN will respond to restore and maintain peace. In the Israeli-Palestinian case, with large-scale hostilities (for example the October 7, 2023 attack by Hamas and the subsequent Israeli military operations in the Gaza Strip), the expectation would be that the UN implements collective-security measures: ceasefire demands, humanitarian protection, safe corridors. Yet while this is the ideal, the reality has fallen short of it.

Political constraints within the United Nations Security Council (UNSC) especially the use of veto(es) by permanent members have severely affect the council's ability to act justly and impartial. For example, on 20 February 2024 the Council failed to adopt a draft resolution demanding an immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza because the United States cast a veto (UN Coverage, 2024). In June 2025 another resolution calling for an "immediate, unconditional and permanent" ceasefire was blocked by the US veto despite 14 votes in favour (UN

Coverage, 2024). These instances highlight how the collective-security function is undermined when one permanent member vetoes action, thereby preventing a unified international response. Indeed, UN Secretary-General António Guterres described the division in the Security Council as “dangerous” undermined by its inability to act on the Gaza war and other major conflicts (Aljazeera, 2024).

In addition, the institutional fragility of key UN agencies, and the politicization of humanitarian relief, add further erosion to the collective-security promise. For instance, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA), which plays a central role in relief operations in Gaza, has faced funding suspensions and accusations amid the hostilities. These disruptions undermine continuity of services and reduce the credibility of protection efforts.

Finally, the primary enforcement mechanism (the UNSC) often blocked, states and other actors increasingly turn to alternative accountability mechanisms especially the International Criminal Court (ICC) and human rights investigations for redress, rather than expecting UN-led peace and security enforcement. While this is not strictly part of collective security, it underscores how the UN’s inability to act mapping directly to protection gaps means legal mechanisms assume greater prominence.

### **Implications of Institutional Ineffectiveness on Collective Security**

The ineffectiveness of international institutions is measured by the lack of capacity to limit violence, lack of ability to coordinate humanitarian relief and protection, lack of implementation of decisions and resolutions, and lack of capacity to apply legal accountability. Therefore, the implications of the institutional ineffectiveness among others, the most important include the following:

#### **Humanitarian and protection failures**

Institutional paralysis during the 2023 Gaza conflict significantly worsened civilian suffering. Limited access to food, water, medicine, and safe shelter resulted in catastrophic humanitarian outcomes, as UN humanitarian appeals and coordination could not replace the coercive measures needed to ensure safe corridors where belligerents refused to comply. The conflict, triggered by the October 7 Hamas attack on Israel and Israel’s military response, became one of the deadliest episodes in the region’s history. Despite UN Security Council resolutions, including Resolution 2712 (2023) and Resolution 2728 (2024), calling for ceasefires and humanitarian access, their implementation was largely ineffective due to geopolitical deadlock, particularly US abstentions and Israeli rejection of certain directives. This failure contributed to thousands of civilian deaths, widespread famine risk, and severe infrastructure destruction, disproportionately affecting women and children who played no active role in the conflict.

#### **Erosion of international law and selective accountability**

When political shielding prevents uniform application of accountability mechanisms, norms such as prohibition of collective punishment, protection of civilians, and equal application of international criminal justice risk being perceived as conditional. The ICC’s pursuit of warrants in 2024-2025 demonstrated an effort to uphold accountability but also revealed limits where political push-back impeded universal acceptance and enforcement.

### **Regional instability and growth of Extremism and Terrorism**

Since its creation in 1948, the United Nations has attempted to mediate the Israeli–Palestinian conflict through peace initiatives and diplomatic efforts. However, despite over seven decades of involvement, the UN has not succeeded in ending the conflict. The persistence of violence, especially evident during the 2023–2025 Gaza War, highlights the organization's limitations. This ongoing failure has had serious consequences for the stability of the Middle East and continues to pose a threat to global peace. The protracted nature of the conflict is often cited as a key factor behind repeated regional instability and is also linked to the growth of international extremism and terrorism (Landis, 2010 cited in Humphrey 2017).

### **Resurgence of Regional militias and Ideological Radicalism**

These examples demonstrate that despite extensive involvement; the UN has not been able to enforce its mandates or bring about a lasting peace. This sustained failure has emboldened extremist narratives and contributed to the resurgence of regional militias, proxy conflicts, and ideological radicalization, reinforcing the argument that unresolved injustice in Palestine continues to fuel broader insecurity across the Middle East and beyond (Humphrey, 2017).

### **Polarization of Regional Bloc and Religion Disunity**

It was argued that the enduring Israeli–Palestinian conflict inspired foundational jihadist groups like Al-Qaeda, and molded Hamas and Hezbollah (Landis, 2010) cited in (Humphrey, 2017). The conflict was viewed as a driving force behind radical Islamic fundamentalism and its rejection of Western cultural norms. According to this perspective, the dispute has polarized global blocs, exacerbated religious divides (especially between Muslims and Christians), obstructed democratic governance in the Islamic world, and fueled terrorism. The enduring conflict exacerbates divides between Muslim and Christian communities, reinforcing mutual suspicion and reducing opportunities for interfaith dialogue and integration, whether in the Middle East or diasporic contexts in Europe and North America (Humphrey, 2017).

### **Institutional legitimacy and the future of collective security**

The UN's effectiveness as a collective-security institution depends not only on legal design but on political will. Continued paralysis undermines the UN's moral authority and may fuel alternative security architectures (regional coalitions, unilateral actions) that bypass or weaken the UN system. Left unaddressed, these dynamics threaten the post-1945 architecture for managing interstate violence.

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Structural Realism Theory**

Structural realism was chosen for this study because it was relevant and suitable for the research topic. This theory has helped explain the current state of collective security within the UN, particularly regarding the maintenance of international peace and security. As a result, Structural theory, also known as neorealism, emerged in the 1970s as a new way of understanding classical realism.

Kenneth Waltz's seminal work, 'Theory of International Politics' (1979), was the primary vehicle for its promotion. Waltz sought to enhance the scientific rigour of realism by prioritising the structure of the international system, rather than human nature, as the principal determinant of state actions, a departure from classical realists like Hans Morgenthau (Waltz,

1979). Furthermore, John J. Mearsheimer, Stephen Walt, and Robert Gilpin, among others, contributed to the theory's development, each emphasising power distribution, security competition, and structural constraints as key factors in international relations (Mearsheimer, 2001; Walt, 1987).

These scholars collectively posit that national behaviour is not primarily driven by ethical considerations or ideological beliefs; instead, it is shaped by the structural limitations inherent in an anarchic international setting.

The theory rests on several key presumptions. First, the international system is characterised by anarchy, signifying the lack of a central authority capable of enforcing rules or protecting states from one another. Second, states are the principal and rational actors within this system, placing their own survival above all other concerns. Third, all states possess varying degrees of military capability, which compels them to depend on self-help for their security (Waltz, 1979).

Fourth, military force is the primary currency in international relations, and states consistently endeavour to counterbalance threats to prevent subjugation by others. The conduct of states is dictated not by their intrinsic attributes or ethical inclinations, but by their respective standings within the international power hierarchy (Mearsheimer, 2001). These assumptions establish the basis for comprehending why states exhibit competitive behaviour, even within global institutions designed to promote cooperation.

The fundamental concept of structural realism posits that the distribution of power, referred to as polarity, influences global order and dictates the probability of conflict. Waltz's interpretation, frequently referred to as "defensive realism," posits that nations want sufficient authority to guarantee their security while eschewing excessive development that may incite counter-balancing (Waltz, 1979). Structural realism perceives international institutions, such as the United Nations, not as autonomous entities with authentic authority, but as venues through which states advance their interests cooperation, within this framework, materialises only when it aligns with the strategic objectives of dominant actors.

The ongoing Gaza conflict underscores the inherent limitations of collective security within a global landscape marked by power disparities. While the UN Charter obligates member states to collectively respond to threats to international peace and security, structural realism posits that such collective action is rendered impossible when the interests of major powers are at odds. The consistent use of the U.S. veto power prevented the adoption of binding Security Council resolutions, notwithstanding considerable international support for a ceasefire, thereby illustrating that institutional mechanisms are contingent upon national power dynamics (Al Jazeera, 2024). Moreover, the UN's inability to ensure humanitarian access, protect civilians, or prevent further escalation corroborates Waltz's claim that institutions are impotent in the face of the constraints imposed by an anarchic international system.

### **Methodology**

This research adopted a qualitative research design to provide a systematic framework for examining the phenomenon under investigation. Secondary sources such as books, e-books, Journals, published articles and internet were used. Considering the sources of the information, the research heavily relied on qualitative study using printed and non-printed materials that are non-numerical or statistical. Therefore, the study employed descriptive method of analysis

using thematic analysis to interpret the variables identified. The choice of the thematic analysis is informed by the study's qualitative descriptive approach, which allows for the systematic examination of pattern and themes within the data. This is suitable for content analysis of existing information related to the issue (s) under investigation.

### **Research Findings**

The study finds out that the United Nations' inability to achieve a lasting resolution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict has weakened its capacity to enforce collective security and significantly eroded its global legitimacy. This failure has also contributed to a notable decline in the organisation's international credibility and reputation.

The findings further reveal that institutional dysfunction driven largely by the misuse of veto power, deep political divisions, and inconsistent decision-making represents the core structural challenge undermining UN peace intervention efforts in the conflict. These factors have limited diplomatic progress and disrupted the institutional effectiveness of organization peace initiatives.

Additionally, the study establishes that the UN's failure to contain and manage the 2023-2025 phase of the Israeli-Palestinian crisis has generated serious humanitarian and legal consequences. These include widespread violations of international humanitarian standards, large-scale loss of life, destruction of essential civilian infrastructure, and the forced displacement of over two million Palestinians into neighbouring Arab states. The scale and severity of these outcomes continue to highlight major gaps in the UN's conflict prevention and peace enforcement mechanisms.

### **Discussion of Findings**

Firstly, the study revealed that, the institutional ineffectiveness of the United Nations to maintain peace and security in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict 2023-2025 has severely undermined and damaged its credibility in the eyes of many members of the international community. The continued Israeli occupation of Palestinian territories and alleged acts of genocide, coupled with the UN's failure to collective security, has led many nation-states and observers to question the effectiveness and impartiality of the organization. This perceived ineffectiveness risks further weakening the international system, as states may begin to act unilaterally or disregard international norms, seeing the UN as a toothless body incapable of maintaining global peace and justice. In addition, the inability of the UN resolved the protracted conflict paved opportunity to Israel to continue abusing international law by expanding its territory. On 8 August 2025, the Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Nathanyahu in a press release maintained that, Israel has approved expansion to Gaza. The Israel's security cabinet has approved a plan to take over Gaza city. The deadline for the first phase of the offensive is 7 October, according to source (CNN World, 2025).

Territorial disputes and internal political fragmentation further obstruct the peace process. The continued expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank and Gaza has undermined the feasibility of a two-state solution, a key pillar of UN peace resolutions (Akanbi, 2024). As Yusuf (2024) explains, settlement activity not only violates international law but also reduces the negotiating space for any future compromise. Internally, the disunity among Palestinian faction especially between Fatah and Hamas mirrors the fragmentation within Israeli politics,

making it difficult to present unified negotiating positions. This dynamic, noted by Glorious and Adebola (2022), has persistently undermined diplomatic engagements.

Secondly, the findings of this study indicate that structural dysfunction within the United Nations, particularly in the Security Council's decision-making apparatus, significantly undermines the organisation's capacity to respond effectively to contemporary conflicts. A central aspect of this dysfunction is the veto power held by the five permanent members (P5), which allows any one of these states to block substantive resolutions regardless of broader international support. This mechanism, originally intended to maintain great-power unity and prevent unilateral action by powerful states, has frequently produced gridlock in moments of acute crisis, delaying or diluting peace initiatives and weakening collective action. Scholars have argued that the persistent use of veto authority by P5 members has not only slowed diplomatic progress but has also contributed to the perception of the Security Council as an institution in crisis, unable to fulfil its primary responsibility for maintaining international peace and security (Waikhom, 2025).

Closely related to the veto issue are the deep political divisions among Security Council members, which reflect competing national interests rather than shared commitments to multilateral conflict resolution. The influence of geopolitical rivalry within the UNSC means that when powerful member states' strategic interests are engaged, consensus becomes elusive and decision-making stalls. Empirical research supports this view, showing that when P5 interests are at stake, the Council's agenda-setting and responsiveness slow dramatically, thereby limiting the UN's capacity to act promptly and effectively. This dynamic aligns with realist interpretations of international relations, which contend that great-power politics often override institutional norms in global governance structures (Binder & Golub, 2020).

The effect of inconsistent decision-making emerging from political fragmentation further impairs the institutional effectiveness of UN peace operations. In practice, the Council's inability to adopt unified positions on pressing conflicts results in piecemeal or inadequate mandates, which may not empower peacekeeping missions to address complex security situations comprehensively. Such fragmentation has been noted in several conflict contexts where divergent Security Council positions produced ambiguous or non-binding responses, weakening the legitimacy of UN interventions and undermining confidence among member states and local actors alike. This inconsistency not only frustrates diplomatic engagement but may also perpetuate conflict dynamics by failing to create clear expectations or deterrent mechanisms (Daniel, 2024).

Beyond procedural paralysis, these structural challenges carry broader implications for the normative authority of the United Nations as a peace actor. The Security Council's recurrent inability to act decisively in the face of humanitarian crises has prompted global debate about its legitimacy and relevance in the contemporary international order. Critics argue that when collective security becomes subordinate to the strategic calculations of a few powerful states, the Council's credibility suffers, and alternative mechanisms such as regional organisations or emergency special sessions of the General Assembly are increasingly invoked to fill the governance void. The long-term consequence is a diminished capacity for collective security,

potentially eroding trust in the UN's ability to mediate international peace and uphold its charter obligations (Waikhom, 2025).

Finally, the evidence emerging from the 2023–2025 escalation of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict underscores significant shortcomings in the United Nations' capacity to prevent, contain, and manage large-scale conflicts in ways that protect civilians and uphold international humanitarian law (IHL). Despite the UN's normative framework emphasizing civilian protection and conflict prevention, the humanitarian situation in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank has deteriorated dramatically, reflecting systemic gaps in both conflict prevention mechanisms and peace enforcement instruments. Humanitarian reports indicate that military hostilities and restrictions on aid delivery have resulted in severe civilian harm, including widespread displacement, loss of life, and the destruction of basic infrastructure used for civilian life and survival. International monitoring and humanitarian bulletins have documented how prolonged bombardment and siege conditions have systematically undermined civilian safety and essential services, in contradiction of core principles such as distinction and proportionality enshrined in the Geneva Conventions and customary IHL (UN bulletin, 2025).

One of the most pressing consequences of the UN's limited effectiveness is the scale of forced displacement and humanitarian degradation experienced by Palestinians. By late 2024, nearly 1.9 million people in Gaza had already been uprooted due to sustained military operations and associated siege conditions, which humanitarian organizations characterize as forced displacement arising from conflict dynamics, effectively bringing populations to “the extremes of deprivation and want.” (Human right watch, 2024). Furthermore, ongoing offensive operations in the West Bank have compelled tens of thousands more to flee their homes, with some areas described as virtually emptied of their inhabitants due to uninhabitable conditions and repeated attacks on civilian infrastructure (UN bulletin, 2025). Collectively, these displacement patterns not only reflect acute humanitarian distress but also highlight profound failures in international mechanisms designed to avert mass movements of civilians and protect vulnerable populations, representing a stark erosion in the UN's capacity to operationalize early warning and prevention strategies.

In addition to displacement and physical destruction, the broader legal implications of this failure are equally consequential. Independent observers and UN bodies have underscored that restrictions on humanitarian access, attacks on critical civilian infrastructure, and the use of starvation through blockade measures potentially constitute breaches of international humanitarian and human rights law. In numerous monthly bulletins and international assessments, UN experts and human rights authorities have condemned both the conduct of hostilities and the inability of Security Council members to enforce binding orders aimed at halting violations of law and ensuring unhindered humanitarian assistance (UN bulletin, 2025). The limited success of ceasefire arrangements, where they have been implemented, further reflects deep limitations in the UN's peace enforcement mechanisms: ceasefires have been fragile and repeatedly breached, while the planned deployment of international stabilization forces or follow-through on humanitarian access commitments have languished (Frankel, 2025). These outcomes collectively highlight critical structural shortcomings in the global governance architecture for conflict response, underscoring the urgent need to reform and

strengthen international institutions' abilities to uphold humanitarian norms and prevent further catastrophes.

### **Conclusion and Recommendation**

This study concludes that the United Nations' inability to uphold its mandate of maintaining international peace and security in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict between 2023 and 2025 has produced profound geopolitical, ideological, and institutional repercussions. The organization's failure to prevent renewed violence and enforce existing international resolutions has severely undermined its credibility and moral authority as the custodian of collective security. Its inability to act decisively against illegal occupation and the violation of civilian rights has exposed deep structural weaknesses within the UN system, particularly in the Security Council. Consequently, this institutional ineffectiveness has emboldened extremist movements, intensified regional instability, and contributed to the proliferation of proxy conflicts, ideological radicalization, and religious extremism across the Middle East.

### **Recommendations**

Based on the findings of the study, the following recommendations are made;

- i. The United Nations should restore its trust and credibility for the success of future peace initiatives. This depends on the organization's capacity to act impartially and decisively in upholding its foundational principles particularly the prohibition of illegal territorial occupation and the protection of civilians from humanitarian crises.
- ii. The Security Council procedures should be revised or restructure to limit unilateral veto use in mass-atrocity and humanitarian crises, and expand consensus-based decision frameworks. This should be done by given other member states equal opportunity in decision-making and to be part of the security council permanent members.
- iii. The UN must scale early-warning systems and establish rapid humanitarian protection forces with binding compliance mechanisms to prevent large-scale civilian harm and displacement.

### **Reference**

- Akanbi, Y. (2024). *Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the UN Security Resolution to the two states*. Centre for Strategic Peace Studies.
- Al Jazeera. (2024, February 7). *UN chief warns of 'age of chaos' as Security Council stays divided on Gaza*.
- AP News. (2024). *Sexual misconduct allegations in UN missions topped 100 in 2024, UN says*. Associated Press. <https://apnews.com>
- Associated Press. (2024, March 19). *UN chief urges that life-saving aid be 'truly flooded' into Gaza, calling starvation a 'moral outrage'*. AP News. <https://apnews.com/article/2939dce94ce6c4f1084ff3cb8444ce3a>
- Binder, M., & Golub, J. (2020). *Civil Conflict and Agenda-Setting Speed in the United Nations Security Council*.
- CNN World, (2025). *Report on Gaza conflict*.
- Daniel, A. (2024). *An Analysis of The Role of International Organization in Conflict Resolution A Comparative Study*.
- Frankel, J. (2025). *Israel fires mortar into Gaza residential area, wounding at least 10*. Apnews

- Gallagher, A. (2025). *Farewell the Responsibility to Protect? False death, grave consequences. International Affairs, 101(2)*. Oxford University Press.
- Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP). (2025). *Meaningful UN Security Council reform requires aligning principles and practices*. <https://www.gcsp.ch>
- General Assembly. (2022). *Resolution on holding permanent members accountable for use of the veto (A/RES/)*. United Nations Press.
- Glorious, A., & Adebola, T. (2022). Israel-Palestinian question: The failure of diplomacy and the role of international institutions. *Journal of Global Affairs, 9(1)*, 45–63.
- Humphrey, N. (2017). *Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the United Nations' peace initiative. African Journal of Politics and Administrative Studies, 10*. Department of Political Science, Ebonyi State University.
- Human right watch (2024). 'Hopeless, starving and besieged' Israel's forced displacement of Palestinians in Gaza
- Laurie, B. (2025). *Collective security and the United Nations*.
- Mearsheimer, J. J. (2001). *The tragedy of great power politics*. W. W. Norton.
- Osisoma, S. L. (2023). *United Nations and collective security*.
- Peters, A. (2023). *The war in Ukraine and legal limitations on Russian vetoes. Journal of International Law and Politics*. Taylor & Francis Online.
- Press Office of the United Nations. (2024, February 20). *Security Council fails to adopt draft resolution demanding immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza*. United Nations. <https://press.un.org/en/2024/sc15595.doc.htm>
- Press Office of the United Nations. (2025, June 10). *Security Council fails to adopt draft resolution demanding immediate, unconditional and permanent ceasefire in Gaza*. United Nations. <https://press.un.org/en/2025/sc16708.doc.htm>
- Reuters. (2025, October 8). *UN to slash a quarter of peacekeepers globally over lack of funds*. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com>
- Scharf, M. P. (2023). *Power shift: The return of the Uniting for Peace resolution. Case Western Reserve Faculty Publications*. Scholarly Commons.
- United Nations. (n.d.). *Peacekeeping — United Nations Peacekeeping*. United Nations. <https://peacekeeping.un.org>
- United Nations Geneva. (2025, September 10). *Failure to end Gaza war undermining world's credibility, UN chief warns*. UN Geneva. <https://www.ungeneva.org/en/news-media/news/2025/09/110902/failure-end-gaza-war-undermining-worlds-credibility-un-chief-warns>
- United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWA). (2025, February 5). *UNRWA operations update: Funding suspensions and humanitarian impact in Gaza*. UNRWA. <https://www.unrwa.org>
- United Nations Bulletin (2025). The question of Palestine
- Waikhom M, (2022). The United Nations Security Council Veto And Its Impact On Conflict-Related Resolutions (1990–2022)
- Walt, S. M. (1987). *The origins of alliances*. Cornell University Press.
- Waltz, K. N. (1979). *Theory of international politics*. Addison-Wesley.