CONCLUSION
Twentieth century has witnessed the horrors of two World Wars. After each war, mankind has sought to establish a better world order which could ensure peace, security, welfare and justice. After first World War, League of Nations was established which was expected to provide a system of international cooperation and collective security. It was to provide a forum where nations could meet and discuss their disputes. Discussion and negotiation, it was expected, will lead to satisfactory settlement. In fact it was established to prevent accidental war. But the League of Nations miserably failed in its task and the World War II broke out. The United Nations a revised version of the League of Nations came into being. The creation of the United Nations was a standard response of peace-loving nations for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security; to develop friendly relations among nations and to cooperate in solving international problems of an economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character and in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all. However, the United Nations' founding fathers intended the organization to have a leading role in preserving and enforcing international security; this responsibility being vested in the Security Council.
The specific powers conferred on the Security Council in order to carry out its duties were laid down in Chapter VII of the proposals. The Security Council was to perform dual functions. It could investigate any dispute or any situation likely to result in international friction or give rise to a dispute, in order to determine whether its continuance might endanger the maintenance of International peace and security. Depending upon the degree of seriousness of a dispute or a situation, the Council would suggest appropriate procedures for the parties concerned to help the solution of the problem. It would determine the maintenance of international peace and security and take any measure necessary for the maintenance of international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the organization.

Under the Chapter (VI) dealing with the Pacific Settlement of Disputes, any state whether a member of the organization or not, could bring to the attention of the Security Council any dispute or situation likely to disturb international peace and security. Parties to such dispute or situation were obliged first of all, to seek a solution by negotiation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, or judicial settlement or other peaceful means of their own choice, and the council could call upon the parties to settle their dispute by such means. If the
parties to such a dispute or a situation could not settle it by the means including above, they should be of their own accord refer it to the council and the latter should in each case, decide whether or not the continuance of the particular dispute might endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. If such a dispute or situation was considered by the council as injurious to world peace, it was empowered to recommend appropriate procedure or methods of adjustment. Justiciable dispute were normally to be referred to the International Court of Justice and the Council could refer to the Court, for its advice, legal questions connected with other disputes. However, the Council was expressly forbidden from interfering in situation or disputes arising out of matters which by international Law fell exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of state concerned.

Under the Chapter (VII) dealing with the determination of threats to the peace or acts of aggression the Security Council would determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of peace or act of aggression and make recommendation or to decide upon the measures to be taken or to maintain or restore international peace and security. The measures that could be taken by the Council fell within the purview of enforcement action
These measures could or could not include the use of armed forces. The Council could call upon the members of the organization to apply such measures as interruption of economic relations and means of communication and the severance of diplomatic relation. Should these measures prove inadequate, the Council could take armed action by air sea or land forces as may be necessary to maintain and restore peace and security and for this purpose, all members of the United Nations have undertaken to make available to the Security Council on its call armed forces, assistance and facilities for maintaining peace and security.

Hence, in the performance of its functions of the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council had achieved a considerable measure of success in dealing with those situations where its permanent members, for whatever reasons, have had a sufficient interest in the maintenance and restoration of international peace and security. This uses so if they agreed on a common course of action, for example Indonesia crisis; initial stages of Palestine problem in 1950 and Kashmir problem etc.

Only under exceptional conditions has the council been at all effective in dealing with threats to or breach of the
peace where the vital interests of the permanent members have been directly in conflict. But when the communist coup in Czechoslovakia (February 1948) the Soviet Blockade of Berlin (September 1948) and many other issues were brought before the Security Council, they were vetoed by the Big Powers particularly by Soviet Russia.

But when the North Korean attacked the Republic of Korea on June 25, 1950 the Security Council was presented with a unique opportunity to take action in a situation involving the conflicting vital interest of the permanent members. A UN unified command under the UN flag with General Mac Arthur of the US as Supreme Commander was sent to assist the South Korea against the North Korea.

It may be pointed out that the creation of the Unified command in Korea by the Security Council was possible solely because of the fortuitous absence of the Soviet representative. Hence, it was realized by the General Assembly that to prevent matters relating to peace and security from being "frozen" on the Security Council agenda which reduced to "impotence" the organization as a whole, it should assume some of the responsibility of the Council. Consequently, the General Assembly adopted three closely connected resolution, the first of which is usually termed
the 'Uniting for Peace Resolution'. Its intention was to create a nucleus of collective security outside the Security Council. It provides:

"If the Security Council because of the lack of the unanimity of the Permanent members, fails to exercise its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be threat to the peace, breach of peace or act of aggression, the General Assembly will consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures, including in the case of a breach of the peace or act of aggression, the use of armed force when necessary, to maintain or restore international peace and security. If not in session at the time, the General Assembly may meet in an emergency special session within twenty four hours of the request therefor...."

The adoption of the Uniting for Peace Resolution was virtually an amendment of the Charter, making an additional provision as it were to chapter VII, providing for the contingency of the failure by the Security Council to exercise its primary responsibility by
reason of the lack of the unanimity of the permanent members.

In addition to this transfer-device', which greatly enlarged the functions and competence of the General Assembly, it is the important shift of emergence power from the veto-ridden Security Council to the veto-less General Assembly.

The General Assembly of the United Nations as observed by a keen analyst of the United Nations system became over the years the predominant political body of the world organization. The frequent inability of the Security Council to discharge function assigned to it by the Charter has brought a change in the relative powers of the Council and the General Assembly. Member-states have increasingly extended the Assembly's role in questions involving the maintenance or restoration of international peace and security and many of them have looked with every widening hope to this organ for the solution of their problems. Assembly resolution, moreover, while technically only recommendations, have been viewed by some member countries, with regard to certain matters and within certain limits, as legally binding decisions. However, owing to the excessive use of veto, the importance of the Security Council has been lowered in the eyes of the nations and the General Assembly became the only hope of maintaining world order.
A look at the peace-keeping operation by the application of the Uniting for Peace resolution would reveal that what the Security Council had not been able to achieve because of the lack of the unanimity and the consequent use of the veto, the General Assembly could easily do and on several occasions saved the world from disaster. Some Assembly resolutions have affected the means at the disposal of states in their relations by creating new peace-keeping techniques to isolate clashes between smaller nations or within a smaller nation from the large East-West struggle. The communist retreat from South Korea, French and British evacuation of Egypt, the US withdrawal from Lebanon and the Soviet retreat from the Congo after the fall of Lumumba were surely furthered by those techniques. However, these operations had themselves been a source of crisis and the entire United Nations system was threatened as it did not serve the Big powers interests.

There was the crisis over the financing of United Emergency force (UNEF) and the United Nations Congo operation (ONUC) between the Super powers. The financing crisis (the Expenses case) provided the opponents an opportunity to warn that the United Nations is a “sinkingship unworthy of further trust of mankind” and the friends of the United Nations worried that it might not survive. In fact, the crisis that have
paralised the organization, was the product of many factors but the most salient was the persistent refusal of the Soviet Union and France to pay their share of major peace-keeping operation carried on Suez and the Congo. The crisis was not really about money as the amount involved was minor. It was political. It was a consequence of political default by France and Soviet Union without either contention of financial hardship or actual inability. Thereupon, the General Assembly requested the International Court of Justice to advise whether the expenses of the two forces constitute 'the expenses of the organization' within the meaning of Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter of the United Nations. Article 17(2) provides:

"The expenses of the organization shall be borne by the members as apportioned by the General Assembly".

The Court by a vote of 9 to 5, agreed that the financing of the UNEF and ONUC constitute the expenses of the organization within the meaning of Article 17(2) thereby confirming the authority of the General Assembly to make the controversial assessment. The opinion is important as it constitutes the "express judicial approval of the practical transfer of responsibility for the maintenance of peace from the Security Council to the General
Assembly". However, the Soviet Union and France refused to pay even after the advisory opinion. Thereupon the USA and its allies threatened to invoke Article 19 of the Charter which provides:

"A Member of the United Nations which is in arrears in the payment of its financial contribution to the organization shall have no vote in the General Assembly if the amount of its arrears equals or exceeds the amount of its contribution due from it for the preceding two full years. The General Assembly may, nevertheless permit such a member to vote if it is satisfied that the failure to pay is due to conditions beyond the control of the members".

The Soviet Union threatened to leave the organization if it was deprived of its vote in the General Assembly. Eventually, in August 1965, the USA and its allies gave way and agreed not to invoke Article 19; in return, the Soviet Union promised to make a voluntary contribution towards the expenses of the two forces.

The shift of emphasis from the Security Council to the General Assembly has naturally changed the balance of power and influence. The Big Five do not enjoy in the General Assembly the
same privileged position which they have in the Security Council. This logically weakens their grip over the organization. Furthermore, as the result of the expansion of the membership of the General Assembly it has grown from a body of fiftyone (51) members to one hundred fifty-nine (159), because the "universality" not "Selectivity" to guide the principle of admission into the United Nations. The majority of which is non-Western, underdeveloped and who have gained their independence recently. Roughly three-fifths of the total membership belongs to the Afro-Asian regions. Many of them belong to the Third World including ministates which are underdeveloped and the product of decolonization process. They view full membership in the organization as the final stamp of approval on their independence. In addition, the Third World majority feels that further ministate membership would add to their preponderance in the United Nations as their voting behaviour reveals an anti-western attitude. Undoubtedly so far as the voting results of the United Nations are concerned, the position of the USA is weakened after 1960, but in comparison to the USSR, on the combined categories of cold war, peace-keeping, arms control and disarmament issues, the United States continued to be generally successful and the Soviet Union to be unsuccessful. However, anti-western attitude of the Third World - (which includes microstates) has been a source
of irritant for Western nations. They challenged the Big Powers hegemony in the United Nations. As thereafter the process of decolonization began to accelerate the UN became an arena of competition between the West and the Soviet Union for the sympathies of the still largely non-aligned Third World. In the process it became the beneficiary of the concessions which the United States and, to a less extent, the Soviet Union were willing to make in order to cultivate the sympathies of, or 'fraternal association' with, this increasingly numerous Asian and African membership, for it was through the UN that the later sought to make their presence felt. Yet this period of competitive coexistence, did tend to over-estimate the sensitivity of the central balance to Third World pressures and to under-estimate both the tensions and divisions within the Third World itself and the volatile and unpredictable character of politics within so many Third World countries. As this has become evident the UN's ability to act as an instrument for the powerless in wresting concessions from the powerful has tended to diminish or at least been called into question. Hence, the Big Powers become day-by-day disinterested in the functioning of the United Nations. Then there is a need for the amendment of the Charter in such a way as to satisfy all - Big and small. The followings are the suggested amendments of the Charter:
(1) The idea of weighted voting has been suggested to arrest or reverse the voting behaviour in the United Nations (General Assembly) and for the survival of the United Nations one-nations-one vote formula has to be changed.

(2) Universality not selectivity should be the guiding principle of admission in the United Nations. All peace-loving nations are to be admitted. Consequently, the admission-process needs amendment so that the admission of the peace-loving nations could be prevented unnecessarily.

(3) The privileged position of the Permanent members in the Security Council enjoying veto power has also come in sharp criticism. The power is given to them. But this power should be amended in such a way that it is not unnecessarily absurd.

(4) Article 2(7) i.e. provision for noninterference in domestic affairs have been suggested for amendment as under the pretext "domestic jurisdictions" nations try to prevent the UN to impose upon them some sort of amiable solution.
The International Court of Justice lacks compulsory jurisdiction. Consequently, on International legal order through the judicial process is difficult to give the Court compulsory jurisdiction to make it an authoritative interpreter of the Charter, so the Charter needs amendment.

In addition, provision for the establishment of Permanent International Military Force is essential to help innocent states to rearm them in time to take on the aggressor. Hence, for this purpose the Charter needs amendment.

But after all it is necessary to develop cooperation among all powers – great or small, so that the United Nations may be in a position to work effectively for peace and progress and happy, healthy and prosperous international society could be possible.

However, the United Nations is many different thing, and first of all it is a deliberative body in which the nations talk through their representatives. The talk is not itself a guarantee of peace and harmony. There is something to be said for those who contend that the very
process of debate, particularly in public, may influence passions, harden opposing positions and increase tensions. Almost from the day of its creation, two conceptions about the United Nations have been struggling in the public mind: "It can't last", and "its our only hope". Furthermore, the United Nations, which is the symbol of peace, should not only unable to control the race for armaments among the nations, but should itself be engaged in hostilities and in efforts to create an armed force. The security-minded would deprecate the United Nations as impotent to provide security and consider greater national armaments as the only protection against aggression.

The United Nations is a security system. It stands both for the collective use of force to resist aggression, and for the use of constructive and conciliating measures to prevent and strengthen one another. The Charter assumes the need for security, national and regional, as well as collective.

The United Nations is a beginning of a world community and its Charter the beginning of world law. It is in fact our only hope", certainly our only present hope, for achieving the grand objectives of peace, economic well-being and social advancement. At the same time, the community is riven with dissension, the law
fragmentary, and underlying international situation fraught with conflict. There are few practical steps taken by the United Nations which show its strengthening of collective security and the contribution of efforts for negotiation and conciliation. No one has doubted that the most important tasks which the United Nations could undertake are the effective control of atomic energy and the regulation of armaments. No one now hopes that these tasks can be fully accomplished without drastic changes which the United Nations machinery cannot bring by itself. This does not mean that these all-important undertaking should be dropped from the agenda of international discussion. The General Assembly has firmly and rightfully insisted that the unremitting effort to find a basic must go forward. The very fact of continuing discussion is a demonstration that the goal of peaceful regulation will never be surrendered.

Taking as a whole one may conclude as follows:

(1) Few international disputes are really settled;

(2) The UN has played a useful role in "defusing" many disputes that might otherwise lead to international explosions; and
(3) The United Nations encouraged and is encouraging the parties to a dispute to "seek solution by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, resort to regional agencies or arrangements or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Although the UN does not have many striking success in its credit in the handling of political disputes, its services as a mediator have been valuable in several instances. The work of the UN committee, good offices in Indonesia, the services of various UN commissions dealing with Greek frontier incidents, India and Pakistan and Palestine and the indefatigable labours of court Bernadotte and Dr. Ralph Bunch in the delicate negotiation between Jewish and Arab spokesman - all these deserve high commendation, much more than has yet been accorded. Although the efforts of other commissions and committees, such in the UN temporary commission on Korea and the technical committee on Berlin currency and Trade were less fruitful, they were nonetheless conscientious and zealous, and later limited results were due to circumstances "beyond their control". In all of the political disputes the UN played a useful and significant, if sometimes peripheral and limited role. The value of UN presence in such crisis areas as Kashmir, Korea, the Gaza Strip, West Irian, the Congo and Cyprus can hardly be denied, although it is sometimes overlooked or degenerated.
More recently the UN Secretary-General, owing to the better understanding amongst the Big Powers, has played a very important role not only in reducing tension from areas of conflicts but also solving disputes which could have led to a major confrontation involving big powers. While South Africa, Angola and Cuba announced that a ceasefire was in force from Monday. While the South West African People's organization (SWAPO) announced that November 1, 1988 has been set as a definite date for the implementation of United Nations Security Council Resolution 435, independence plan for Namibia - after agreement was reached in the Geneva round of talks between them - Iran and Iraq jumped the UN-declared August 20 truce date to declare that they would stop fighting with immediate effect. For in both the agreements the United Nations played a vital role as an instrument for world peace and justice. While Iran and Iraq stopped the war in line with the UN Security Council resolution 598, the Geneva Agreements has as its guarantor the Security Council's five Permanent members, South Africa after year of defiance has specifically accepted the Security Council resolution 435 on Namibian independence and has asked the Secretary-General to begin its implementation from November 1, 1988.

The United Nations is trying its best for the settlement of Afghan crisis. The "Proximity talk" between Afghanistan and
Pakistan was arranged by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The United Nations held many meetings to solve the problem.

Hence, after six years of tough bargaining, Pakistan and Afghanistan signed a peace accord in Geneva on 13th April 1988 under its aegis in a bid to end the eight year-old strife in Afghanistan which has reportedly claimed thousands of lives. The credit for this achievement goes to an untiring Ecuadorian Mr. Diego Cordovez, who as UN mediator since February 1982, had always been on the move to meet representatives of Pakistan, Afghanistan, Iran, the Soviet Union and the United States. He even contacted deposed King of Afghanistan Zahir Shah and heard the views of the Afghan resistance leaders. It could also not be denied that the United Nations found a significant victory in its effort over the presence of a Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO) in New York against the US Government in its move to close the Palestine Liberation Organization in New York.

Further, it is better to explain that the United Nations was not able to solve all the problems successfully. Some problems are still remained unsolved such as the Kampuchea, West Bank and Arab-Israel conflict and in all these cases the United Nations was only a helpless spectator.
In dealing with the security problems, however, the UN has run into obstructions. The main security agencies of the Security Council - the military staff committee, the commission of conventional armaments, the atomic Energy Commission, prepared elaborate plans which the majority approved, but all of the plans encountered the great powers deadlock has frustrated every effort to implement the security provisions of the Charter and hampered international cooperation everywhere in post-war period. The UN has on many occasions failed while dealing with the security problems but it would be unfair to blame the United Nations for these failures deeply embedded in nationalism, sovereignty and nation-state psychology, and also in the preservation of human race. But after all the UN Charter has tried "to save succeeding generations from the scourage of war" - a pledge given urgency by the advent of nuclear weapons - and members' acceptance of the principle of equal opportunities as giving substance to the notion of an incipient international community. There has, therefore been a process of integration as well as of fragmentation. Integration psychologically and technologically; fragmentation: Politically, culturally and ideologically.

Consequently, the United Nations is the present manifestation of the natural legacy, passed from one generation to the next, of the continuous search for the warless world of peace and
prosperity. It has the aim to demonstrate that eventually all nations may develop mutual trust and resolve conflict. Today it is the only institution that can mirror the opinions of the world and through world opinion forge a common sense of universal justice. It not only can serve as a means for the integration of mankind but also may assist in the substantiation of human values lost a cynical denial of the search for truth engulf humanity.