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Abstract

Utilizing Critical Theory, through its neo-Gramscian and Frankfurt School dimensions, as the theoretical framework, this study aims to explain how the institutions, such as the United Nations, of an international system transform together with the structure – the international system. More specifically our aim is to explain the lack of transformation of only one body, the Security Council, of that specific institution, the United Nations.

Analyzing the press releases of the United Nations General Assembly in 1996, 1997, 2000, and 2006 and examining 337 statements from the Member States through Critical Theory to be able to understand and explain how and why it hasn’t been possible to reform, or transform, the United Nations Security Council in the last 14 years since the establishment of the Open-Ended Working Group as a group to particularly deal with the question of reform. The analysis suggests that the current debates in the United Nations concerning the reform of the Security Council is unable to produce a successful transformation of that body because it is not possible for an institution to finalize its own transformation independent from that of the structure as a whole.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
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</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
<td>European Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G-4</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>The United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LON</td>
<td>League of Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAM</td>
<td>Non-Aligned Movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NIEO</td>
<td>New International Economic Order</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OECD</td>
<td>Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPEC</td>
<td>Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P-5</td>
<td>Permanent Five Members of the United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>Small Five</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>The United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFC</td>
<td>Uniting For Consensus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN</td>
<td>The United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN GA</td>
<td>The United Nations General Assembly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN SC</td>
<td>The United Nations Security Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Chapter I: Research Outline

1.1 Introduction

The world has been witnessing a significant transformation in the last three decades. The power of change, on the horizontal dimension, influences a very broad sphere. The range of change affects almost every aspect of human life varying from politics to economics, culture, identity, religion, state, society, etc. On the vertical dimension, its effects are also very broad. Especially with the impacts of globalization, the effects of change can be observed in the lowest level, such as even in a small village, and also in higher levels, such as in a particular society or international society.

One might choose a starting point, or a turning point according to his/her way of looking at the things in his/her study, however, I would like to consider the economic crisis of the 1970s, like Robert W. Cox, as an important starting point. According to Cox, “the world economic crisis appears as a threshold – a phase of transition between the definable structures of the recent past and the as yet unclear structures of the emerging future.” The increasing criticisms towards the values, basic principles and functioning of the neo-liberal hegemonic world order, as Cox names it, has been followed by the increasing demands for a “New International Economic Order” (NIEO). At the end of 1980s came the sudden collapse of the Soviet Union bringing an end to the Cold War and to the bipolar international system. Increasing ethnic conflicts, economic and political problems and an intensive fluctuation transformed the structure into an uncertainty. Then the process continued with other well-known events, such as the 9/11 terrorist attacks, the invasion of Afghanistan, and Iraq, etc. All these in total led many scholars, politicians, etc. to try to analyze and understand the nature of this ongoing transformation process.

2 New International Economic Order, “The New International Economic Order (NIEO) was a set of proposals put forward during the 1970s by developing countries through the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development to promote their interests by improving their terms of trade, increasing development assistance, developed-country tariff reductions, and other means. It was meant to be a revision of the international economic system in favor of Third World countries, replacing the Bretton Woods system, which had benefited the leading states that had created it — especially the United States.”, [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_International_Economic_Order](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_International_Economic_Order), (2007-03-17).
Understanding change and the factors/reasons behind it has been one of the main concerns of many social scientists. This problematic led to another question which was order. Many have been analyzing how this change/transformation could lead to stability or to the establishment of a certain social, political and international order, or World Order.

1.2 Definition of the Problem and Delimitation

Following this brief overview of the transformation process in the structure, we can now move specifically to the institutional dimension of the phenomenon.

It is one of our main concerns that there is a relationship between a certain historical structure and its institutions. In our case, we focus on one international institution, namely the United Nations (UN), as an institutional reflection of a certain historical structure. According to the theory, the institutions are valid, effective and harmonious within their own particular historical structure. Theoretically, when there is a transformation in the structural base, then a transformation process starts also in these institutions in order to adapt to the new environment (structure). This adaptation can happen with the replacement of the old institutions with new ones, or by just reforming the old ones.4

Here we should also explain in what sense we use the term international institution. We use international institution in the Coxian sense “as a process that takes in world power relations – a process in which hegemony becomes institutionalized. When a particular formal intergovernmental institution is established, it crystallizes the hegemonic consensus of a particular time in relation to a particular global task or set of global tasks. Hence hegemony comprises the environmental variables relevant to decision making in international organization.”5

The UN is the basic international institution which the current international system is built on. It came into existence as the basic international institution of the new international order after the Second World War, and today it has been the most extensive (192 member states) and the most important international institution since its foundation in 1945.

Within the UN, we can say that the Security Council (SC), which holds the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security\(^6\), is the most powerful body. For instance, it can investigate any dispute which might lead to international conflict; it can suggest ways of solving disputes; it may call upon members to apply economic sanctions on some certain members, and it may take action by air, sea or land forces to maintain or restore international peace and security.\(^7\) In addition, the SC also gives some crucial privileges – for example the veto power – to a limited number of states\(^8\) in it.

Hence, SC is probably the most argued organ of the UN. During these discussions some reform proposals\(^9\) were brought into discussion before, and some little changes were made, but the main debated issues, especially since the end of the Cold War, which necessitate a significant transformation in many aspects of the body, are still waiting to be solved.

The main aim of our theoretical framework, Critical Theory, is to understand the large-scaled transformations in the international system, such as the transformation that we are experiencing now. We, deriving from the general aims of our theoretical framework, aim more specifically to understand how the institutions, such as the United Nations, of an international system transform together with the system. More specifically our aim is to understand the transformation of only one body, the Security Council, of that specific institution, the UN. As Cox says “some institutions successfully adapt to a changing hegemony, others fail to”\(^10\), our focus will be on the question of transformation of the UN SC, and why there is no change in the structure of the SC yet. Although it is an institution which has been highly criticized due to its “old” structure, why it hasn’t been possible to transform this body into a new structure yet? While speaking of criticisms, we can speak about the general issues about the SC, such as legitimacy, efficiency, openness, representativeness, etc., and also criticisms due to its increasing working pace after the end of the Cold War.

---


\(^8\) The victorious states of the WWII: France, U.S.A., United Kingdom, China, Russia (Formerly U.S.S.R).


Furthermore, we can mention a few case examples, such as Bosnia, Rwanda, and more recently Lebanon, etc. in which it has also been criticized for its lack of ability to maintain the international peace and security with its current “old” form.

There are also some other concerns about the current situation of the SC. According to Hans Köchler the UN, under the circumstances at the beginning of the 1990s, regrettably was becoming the instrument for the shaping of a mono-polar world order. Especially right after the end of the Cold War the SC started to play a more active role which caused attracting the world’s attention on it. We can say that this was one of the important factors which started the discussions on the current composition, and thus unrepresentativeness, of the SC. In addition to that its distribution of power and influence, which has been claimed that reflected the realities of the world of 1945, has also been criticized.

However, due to the dramatic changes in the post-Cold War era, which were mentioned above, the SC in particular and the UN in general as the political agencies (institution) have come under pressure to adapt to the new situation (structure) in order to retain their legitimacy and relevance in a changing world. Childers argue that in order to tackle the range of urgent problems, the UN’s machinery and capacity must be streamlined and strengthened. In line with Childers, many academicians agree on the necessity of a change/reform in the SC, but when it comes to the realization of these ideas there occur different points of views on what kind of a change/reform is needed and for what purpose.

Our biggest argument in the thesis is that the current debates in the UN concerning the reform of the SC is unable to produce a successful transformation of that body because it is not possible for an institution to finalize its own transformation independent from that of the structure as a whole.

This study is going to examine the relationship/link between the structure, world order(s), and the international institutions, the UN, which are particular world order has been built on.

---

13 Ibid.
14 Childers, Eskine, Urquhart, Brian, ibid.
15 For Example: Jeffrey Laurenti, Chithra KarunaKaran, James A. Paul, Karl Limbert, Joseph E. Schwartzberg.
When a new world order is established, either the previous international institution has been reformed or a new one has been established.\textsuperscript{17} The relationship between the structure and the institutions, or in other words the world order(s) and international institutions, is going to be examined when analyzing the reform debates in the UN. Since UN is a very complex and a huge organization, this paper focuses on the analysis of a change/reform in particular in the SC.

1.3 Research Questions, Aims of the Thesis and Motivation

Recalling the general discussions that started intensively with the end of the Cold War in regard to a comprehensive reform of the UN machinery in general and the SC in particular, and also recalling the formal initiatives that have been started in the UN in 1993 with the establishment of the Open Ended Working Group on the SC reform, we can see that it has been 17 years since the end of the Cold War, and 14 years since the establishment of the Open Ended Working Group that the reform issue of the SC is being broadly discussed. Hence, despite these intensive efforts, attempts and negotiations in the last 17 years, the issue still continues in the discussion level and cannot move to a next stage in which the discussions can be realized, and transformed into some concrete changes in the structure of the SC. Just to make a comparison we can remember that building the whole UN system took 3 years in total, however the attempts of reforming only one of its organs, the SC, not to forget that there is still no significant progress, took, until now, 13 years, and moreover the current position does not present any hope to think that this situation will change significantly in the positive direction in the near future. Deriving from the thoughts and arguments that have been explained above, our main question will focus on understanding the lack of a reform in the institutional dimension of the international system.

Research Questions

Also considering the three dimensions of our theoretical framework (explanatory, normative and emancipatory), our questions will be classified respectively according to this categorization. In that regard, the main question which will be dealt in explanatory dimension of the thesis is;

\textsuperscript{17} Davutoglu. ibid. pp. 45-48.
1. Why there is no significant progress in the reform (change, transformation, etc.) process of the UN Security Council? Or in other words, why the UN Security Council couldn’t be transformed into a new form?

In order to operationalize this main question, two sub-questions will be examined.

1.1. How is the transformation in the international system (the structure) been perceived by the UN membership in the General Assembly (GA)?

With this sub-question, it is aimed to understand how the Member States relate the transformation of the structure with the transformation of the institution, in general with the UN, and in particular with the SC. Through the analysis of their statements about the SC reform, we aim to see, for instance, whether they see these two transformations (structure & institution) as inter-related, or not, and if so, then how do these different levels influence each other.

1.2. Is there any tendency in the general debates of the UN GA on the discussions of the SC reform which can be considered as the reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement in the international system that has the potential of becoming a historic bloc?

By examining this question, we will be able to understand whether there is any reflection of the transformations of structure in general on the institutional dimension. Additionally we will be able to understand whether there is any seed of a counter-hegemonic movement which can lead to the establishment of a historic bloc, or is there a transformismo occurring in the UN. Furthermore, we will be able to understand how do the Member States perceive the current world order, for instance whether it is a hegemonic one, or a non-hegemonic one, etc., Examining the discussions in the GA in order to understand the tendencies of both the members, especially the permanent five, and the non-members of the Security Council will serve to these purposes. These two sub-questions in total will help us to understand why there is no significant progress in the reform process of the UN Security Council?

In addition to these questions, there will also be a normative and emancipatory part in our thesis, and they will deal with two other questions which are;
2. How can the current proposals and models for the reform of the SC, which are on the table (United for Consensus, African Proposal, G-4, and S-5), be evaluated from a Critical Theory perspective?

3. How a change/reform could be possible in the UN Security Council?

The second question, our normative question, deals particularly with the question of whether the current proposals, models, etc. meet the general demands, main considerations and arguments of the Critical Theory. In short it can also be formulated as how the SC should be reformed according to Critical Theory? This part, of course, will not go into details and analyze all debated aspects of the SC reform issue and come up with some concrete and detailed reform proposals. The thesis is not meant to be a study to function as a reform proposal; instead, it is aimed looking at the discussions on the SC reform in general.

As for the third question, which is our emancipatory question, we will be trying to operationalize the emancipatory aims of Critical Theory, pointing out to the unnecessary constraints or obstacles that prevent a successful reform in the SC, and trying to give an idea about how a change/reform could be possible.

**The Aims**

As it has been mentioned above, the main aim of our theoretical framework, Critical Theory, is to understand the large-scaled transformations in the international system. Deriving from the general aims of our theoretical framework, we have three basic aims in this study, and we call these aims, in line with the three different dimensions of our theoretical framework, as explanatory, normative and emancipatory aims. Our explanatory aim is more specifically to understand how the institutions, such as the United Nations Security Council, of an international system transform together with the system, and in relation with this, secondly why it hasn’t been possible to transform that particular body during the 14 years of reform process. Our normative aim is to understand whether what kind of changes Critical Theory would foresee, based on its main assumptions, arguments and considerations, in the UN SC. Finally, our emancipatory aim is try to analyze the debates on the SC reform, and determine the current unnecessary constraints in front of a successful reform, and give an idea about how a change/reform could be possible in the SC.
Having these thoughts in our mind, we expect to see a relation between the rise and the fall of the world orders and the reformation of the institutions of the previous orders, i.e. the UN Security Council. Furthermore we expect to find out whether how the SC can be reformed and developed according to the requirements and needs of the current international system.

In conclusion, we believe that there’s an urgent necessity to make these reforms for a better and sustainable international order in which each state may feel itself in peace and harmony with the other states. Therefore the aim of this thesis is to make a contribution for a better understanding of the debate on the reform of the Security Council and also come up with some suggestions.

**Motivations**

First of all, the current debate in the literature, concerning the SC reform, is going on about the models, numbers and word-games. Therefore the lack of a Critical approach on the reform of the SC should be filled with a study.

Secondly, the importance of the SC is also another motivation for us to study on this subject. To begin with, it can be considered as a small reflection of the power-relations in the international system. In that sense, it serves as a core body in the international system. In addition to that, its primary role in maintenance of peace and security in the international system also makes it a very important body.

It’s a vital problem both for the nation-states and the international community to overcome this problem and to reorganize the unrepresentative and undemocratic character of the SC to build a more legitimate, open, strong and democratic organization. Without a democratic and legitimate SC, the world may become less secure. A bad scenario would be a break-down of the UN or at least becoming non-functioning. Each state may follow its own way and the world may go into a really chaotic situation.

**1.4 Theoretical and Empirical Literature**

We believe that in this study it will be useful to examine this subject from a Critical Theory perspective because Critical Theory makes emphasis on the unequal and unjust structure of the prevailing social/international order, and seeks the possible ways of replacing this order with an alternative, just, equal one.
Cox argues that “the perspectives of different historical periods favor one or the other kind of theory. Periods of apparent stability or fixity in power relations favor the problem-solving approach. The Cold War was one such period.” On the other hand, “a condition of uncertainty in power relations beckons to critical theory as people seek to understand the opportunities and risks of change. Thus the events of the 1970s generated a sense of greater fluidity in power relationship, of a many-faceted crisis, crossing the threshold of uncertainty and opening the opportunity for a new development of critical theory directed to the problems of world order.”

In line with Cox’s arguments, we chose Critical Theory because of three reasons:

1) Because of our purpose. Different kinds of purposes have been described above. Our purposes, which are to explain why there hasn’t been any reform in the SC and furthermore seek the ways of transforming it, lead us to Critical Theory.

2) Because of the fact that, different historical periods favor different theories. Our historical period, which is a transitory one, as Cox names it, favors a Critical Theory approach.

3) Because Critical Theory not only provides a framework to understand and explain the examined phenomenon, but also provides the normative and emancipatory tools in order to open up the possibilities for change and alternative world orders.

In this study the theoretical framework is derived from different sources of Critical Theory, but we benefited mainly from two strands of Critical Theory. The first strand is Neo-Gramscianism in which it includes writers such as Robert W. Cox, Stephen Gill. As the second strand we used the normative dimension of the Critical Theory which can be found in the writings of Andrew Linklater, Richard Ashley, and so on. Theoretical literature which can be found in the writings of the critical theorists, i.e. Robert W. Cox, Andrew Linklater, Max Horkheimer, etc. have been the primary sources for the theoretical framework of the thesis.

As for the main empirical literature, the texts of GA Press Releases and the reports of the Secretary-General have been used. It can be asked whether why we chose the GA Press

---

19 Ibid., p. 90.
Releases as our main empirical source, what is included in these releases, and whether they can be used in order to answer all of our questions – explanatory, normative and emancipatory. Furthermore, it can be argued whether the empirical material used is sufficient, or not.

First of all, we can begin with the nature of these press releases. GA Press Releases includes the statements of various Member States concerning the different debated topics of the Security Council reform issue. In these documents, one can find how the Member States perceive the reform process, why they think the reform is necessary, and how they think that the reform *should* and *should not* be. However, these releases should not be considered as just ordinary collection of statements, instead they should be regarded as the indicators through which the tendencies of the international community concerning the reform of the UN SC can be grasped, and analyzed. This is mainly because; 1) the UN is considered as the most important institution of the international system, and the UN is the platform in which the SC reform process will be finalized, 2) the majority of the releases are the outcomes of the meetings that have been done in the UN GA in which every member of the international community is equally represented. In that regard, we consider these GA releases as the outcomes of a small reflection of the power-relations in the international system. Also we should not forget that it is the Member States which are the main actors of this reform process, so what matters the most in this process is actually their positions and opinions concerning the reform of the UN SC. Therefore, it can be argued that the GA press releases have a crucial importance in providing the opinions of the whole UN membership concerning the reform issue.

Finally considering these explanations, it can be argued that the content of these releases provides the suitable material for our explanatory, normative and emancipatory questions because the Member States both explain how they perceive the reform process in general and also why and how a reform *should* be.

Secondly, the reason for using the texts of GA Press Releases comes from our concern about grasping the general tendency of the whole UN membership, instead of some specific Member States. Since the GA is the body in which all the member states have been equally represented, we thought that the analysis, which has been derived from the discussions within it could provide us a better, and perhaps healthier, understanding of the whole debate.
Thirdly, concerning the sufficiency of the empirical material, we can argue that the chosen material provides the researcher sufficient data in order to make his analysis. As has been mentioned above, the discussions on the SC reform within the UN is a process of 14 years until now. It starts with the establishment of the Open-Ended Working Group at the end of 1993 and continues until 2007. Since it was not possible to analyze the debates in every year, we decided to choose three sets of press releases, one from the beginning, one from the middle and one from the end. In that regard, we aimed to grasp the tendencies of the debates as a whole. As a result we chose to analyze the debates in 1996, 1997, 2000 and 2006. We decided to add the debates in 1997 to the beginning part, simply because the number of the Member States involved in the debates in 1996 was not sufficient in comparison to 2000 and 2006. During the analysis of the debates of these four years, in total we analyzed 337 statements from Member States, 3 speeches from Secretary-Generals, and 3 speeches from the GA Presidents.

In addition to that, as secondary sources, reform proposals of various research institutions, think-tank organizations, and writings of different academicians and scholars as well as a range of other information sources about the Security Council’s activities and influence have also been used in order to enrich the content of the analysis.

1.5 Methodology

**Research Strategy: Qualitative Research**

By research strategy, Bryman means a general orientation to the conduct of social research. In that regard, we can mainly speak of two strategies in social research which are qualitative and quantitative research strategies. It can be said that each research strategy is generally associated with certain epistemological, ontological concerns. As Bryman puts forward for instance, while generally quantitative research strategy entails a deductive approach, embodies a view of social reality as an external or objective reality and finally incorporates the norms of the natural scientific model and of positivism, qualitative research, on the other
hand, usually emphasizes an inductive approach, rejects the norms of natural scientific model and of positivism and embodies a view of social reality as a constantly shifting emergent property of individuals’ creation.\(^{23}\)

In our study, a qualitative research strategy has been utilized. In accordance with the general characteristics of this strategy, our approach is also going to be inductive, interpretive and constructionist. By induction, it is meant drawing generalizable inferences out of observations.\(^{24}\) By interpretivism, we point out to the epistemological concerns of this study. In that regard, this study, by being interpretive, shares the view that the subject matter of social sciences – people and institutions – is fundamentally different from that of the natural sciences.\(^{25}\) Finally, by constructionist, we point out to the ontological concerns of this study, and we share an ontological position that asserts that social phenomena and their meanings are continually being accomplished by social actors, in contrast to objectivism which implies that social phenomena and their meanings have an existence that is independent of social factors.\(^{26}\)

This research strategy has usually been criticized for being too impressionistic and subjective because the findings of the analysis rely too much on the researcher’s perception of what is important and what is not\(^{27}\), however we believe that still it is the most appropriate research strategy to be utilized in our study due to its general characteristics.

**Collection of Data**

As has been mentioned above, the empirical data has mainly been collected from the press releases of the UN GA. Four sets of press releases have been used in this study.

In 1996, three sets of press releases\(^{28}\) have been analyzed. The first two are the speeches of UN Secretary-General in 1996, Boutros Boutros-Ghali, and the third one is a debate in the GA in which 8 Member States delivered statements.


\(^{24}\) Ibid. p. 9.

\(^{25}\) Ibid. p. 13.

\(^{26}\) Ibid. p. 16-17.

\(^{27}\) Ibid. p. 284.

\(^{28}\) 1) SG/SM/5906, 2) SG/SM/5944, 3) GA/9098
In 1997, six sets of press releases\textsuperscript{29} have been analyzed. The first three are the speeches of GA President Razali Ismail given to the GA, and the latter three are the outcomes of general debates in the GA in which 44 Member States, in total, delivered statements.

In 2000, two sets of press releases\textsuperscript{30} have been analyzed. Both are the outcomes of general debates in the GA in which 122 Member States, in total, delivered statements.

Finally in 2006, three sets of press releases\textsuperscript{31} have been analyzed in total. Two of them are the outcomes of general debates in the GA in which 163 Member States\textsuperscript{32}, in total, delivered statements, and the other is the speech given by the former Secretary-General Kofi Annan to the General Assembly.

\textit{Analysis of Data}

In different parts of the analysis – by different parts of the analysis we mean the analyses of different research questions – we focused on different concepts in the statements because the analysis of the documents for each question required focusing on different aspects of the documents. For instance, since our main problematic has been to understand how and why there has been no significant transformation or reform in the UN Security Council, in the analysis of this question, we mainly focused on the concepts of change, transformation, hegemony, etc., and tried to see how the Member States perceived the change in the structure.

In the analysis of the second and third research questions, which were normative and emancipatory in essence, we focused on the reform proposal models which have been debated in the GA, and tried to evaluate them by using the normative and emancipatory basis of Critical Theory. In that regard, our main focus was on the concepts, such as democracy, equality, justice, legitimacy, etc., and how these terms have been used by Member States in different proposal models, and how they are thought to be brought into practice in the structure of the SC.

\textsuperscript{29} 1) GA/9222, 2) GA/9232, 3) GA/9251, 4) GA/9306, 5) GA/9314, 6) GA/9373

\textsuperscript{30} 1) GA/9764, 2) GA/9824, GA/9825, GA/9826, GA/9827

\textsuperscript{31} 1) GA/10484, GA/10485 2) SG/SM/10650, 3) GA/10552, GA/10553

\textsuperscript{32} The list of the Member States whose statements have been analyzed in 1996, 1997, 2000 and 2006 has been added as an annex at the end of the thesis.
Chapter II: Theoretical Framework: Critical Theory

The theoretical framework in this study has been constructed in accordance with Horkheimer's definition that a Critical Theory is adequate only if it meets three criteria: it must be explanatory, practical, and normative, all at the same time. As for the explanatory dimension Critical Theorists try to combine philosophy and social sciences, therefore they aim to explain what is wrong with current social reality, and understand the social transformations and order.\footnote{33}{“Critical Theory”. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. \url{http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/critical-theory/} (2007-03-14).}

For the practical dimension, which is also their emancipatory goal, they aim to identify the factors to change the society and overcome all circumstances that limit human freedom because Critical Theorists “do not merely seek to provide the means to achieve some independent goal, but rather seek ‘human emancipation’ in circumstances of domination and oppression.”\footnote{34}{Idem.}

In addition to these two dimensions, there is also the normative dimension through which Critical Theorists aim to provide clear norms for criticisms of the current society, and open up the possibilities for a social transformation.\footnote{35}{Idem.} For Horkheimer a capitalist society could be transformed only by becoming more democratic, to make it such that “all conditions of social life that are controllable by human beings depend on real consensus” in a rational society. The normative orientation of Critical Theory, at least in its form of a critical social inquiry, is therefore towards the transformation of capitalism into a “real democracy” in which such control could be exercised.\footnote{36}{Idem.}

In this study, deriving from these considerations, we will try to build our theoretical framework as a three-dimensional framework. In doing that, we will use different strands of Critical Theory to serve for the different dimensions of our theoretical framework.

Richard Wyn Jones argues that there are two main sets of influences acting upon critical international relations theory. The first is Frankfurter School critical theory, whose leading
figures include Max Horkheimer, Theodor Adorno and more recently Jürgen Habermas. The second is the writings of Antonio Gramsci.37

These two strands of Critical Theory, under the titles of Neo-Gramscianism and Frankfurt School, will be utilized in our study to serve these three dimensions that have been mentioned above. We believe that a theory, which is explanatory, practical (emancipatory) and normative at the same time, could be the most relevant in analyzing the change/ transformation or more properly the reform of the UN Security Council. We plan to utilize Neo-Gramscian strand first in our explanatory dimension where the discussions on the SC reform will be analyzed and the question of why there hasn’t been any transformation will be answered, since Gramsci’s contributions have mainly been through his concepts of hegemony and historic bloc which provides a series of powerful analytical tools to understand and explain the social transformations and orders.38 Secondly, Neo-Gramscian strand will be utilized in the emancipatory dimension. On the other hand, Frankfurt School’s contribution on Critical International Relations Theory has been through their concepts, such as emancipation, democracy, communicative rationality, therefore this strand will be utilized in the mainly in the normative dimension of our study. While in the emancipatory dimension we will be analyzing the unnecessary constraints in front of a successful transformation/reform in the United Nations Security Council, its normative side, with its normative concepts, tools, etc., will determine the direction of the transformation, and how this transformation should be, and also serve as a guide in pursuing this emancipatory aim.

So our theoretical framework as a whole will have explanatory, normative and emancipatory (practical) dimensions. While Neo-Gramscian strand of Critical Theory will serve for the explanatory dimension, Frankfurt School strand, together with its adapted version to international relations, will be used for the normative and emancipatory dimensions.

38 Ibid. p. 6.
2.1 Explanatory Dimension

2.1.1 Neo-Gramscianism

Timothy J. Sinclair argues that Cox’s main focus has been on the global change either from above (world order) or from below (social forces). According to Sinclair, Cox’s method of understanding global change, strongly historical in perspective and through the concepts such as hegemony, historic bloc, counter-hegemony etc., represents a challenge to conventional ontological assumptions about international relations. Thus, Robert W. Cox considers his approach as a way of analyzing power relations in world politics from the angle of power relations in productions. In his study, *Production, Power, and World Order*, he aims to understand the current historical change from the standpoint of a reciprocal relationship between power and production.

Deriving from the aims of our theoretical framework in understanding and explaining change, transformation in the international system; we particularly aim to analyze the transformation on the institutional level, which is the UN SC reform in our case. In the explanatory dimension of our theoretical framework, Neo-Gramscian strand of Critical Theory, which will mainly be derived from the writings of Robert W. Cox, will be utilized here to serve that purpose.

Two Kinds of Theory

To begin describing Neo-Gramscian Critical Theory, we will first briefly talk about Horkheimer’s famous distinction between traditional theories and the critical theory, and secondly explore the Coxian derivation from this distinction. Beginning with such a section will help us to provide necessary background information about the differences of Critical Theory than traditional theories. We believe that such a clarification is necessary due to two reasons: a) Through this clarification, we can explain why we chose Critical Theory, but not a traditional theory or problem-solving theory, in our study; b) Also, we can explain why studying the reform of the UN SC through a Critical Theory, not through a traditional theory, is more acceptable.

According to Horkheimer there are two kinds of theories which are traditional theories on one hand, and critical theory on the other. Traditional theories assume that there is an external world ‘out there’ to study, and that an inquiring subject can study this world in a balanced and objective manner by withdrawing from the world it investigates, and leaving behind any ideological beliefs, values, or opinions which would invalidate the inquiry. In contrast, critical theory acknowledges that theories are always embedded in social and political life, so according to Horkheimer there can be no such thing as a value-free social analysis or theory.

Critical theory can be distinguished from a traditional theory according to a specific practical purpose. According to Horkheimer a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human emancipation, to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them. Also in his essay *Traditional and Critical Theory*, Horkheimer argues that critical theory is a social theory oriented toward critiquing and changing society as a whole, in contrast to traditional theory which is oriented only to understanding or explaining it. Moving from that, he argues that critical theory’s main interest is not legitimizing or consolidating the existing social forms, but instead providing the alternative ways to emancipate from the existing social forms’ domination.

Like Horkheimer’s distinction between traditional theories and critical theory, Cox also argues that there are two kinds of theories; one is the traditional theory (or problem-solving theory as Cox calls it), and the other is critical theory. Again similar to Horkheimer, these two kinds of theories are the outcomes of two different purposes for theorizing. As outlined in Cox’s well-known argument that “theory is always for someone and for some purpose”, different purposes can lead to different kinds of theories.

The first purpose, which is to be a guide to help solve the problems posed within the terms of the particular perspective which was the point of departure, leads to *problem-solving theory*. The other purpose, in contrast, “is to become clearly aware of the perspective which gives rise to theorizing, and its relation to other perspectives (to achieve a perspective on perspectives); and to open up the possibility of choosing a different valid perspective from which the
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43 Burchill, ibid. p. 139.
problematic becomes one of creating and alternative world.”\(^{46}\) Hence, this purpose leads to *critical theory*.

As has been mentioned above, the first purpose gives rise to *problem-solving theory*. It takes the world as it finds it, with the prevailing social and power relationships and the institutions into which they are organized, as the given framework for action. It aims to solve the particular problems, and make these relationships and institutions work smoothly.\(^{47}\) In that sense, problem-solving theory can be regarded as a theory which has a tendency to legitimize the prevailing social and political structures. For instance; problem-solving theories assume that the major components of the system, such as states, are not subject to fundamental change. They provide the limits of the system in which the action occurs, and as a result, it is actually the action, not the limits of the system that is the focus of problem-solving theories.\(^{48}\)

On the other hand, unlike problem-solving theory, critical theory “stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about. Critical theory does not take institutions and social power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing.”\(^{49}\) Cox also argues that Critical theory is a theory of history dealing not just with the past but also with a continuing process of historical change, and a changing reality.

Critical theory and problem-solving theories also share some common points. First of all, Cox argues that Critical theory contains problem-solving theory within itself, and thus the problem-solving theories can be represented in the broader perspective of critical theory.\(^{50}\)

**Framework for Action: Historical Structure**

Here we will explain the framework (historical structure) in which the action takes place, and through which our method (historical materialism) will be operationalized. However, first we need to give some brief information about historical materialism.

\(^{46}\) Ibid. p. 88.
\(^{47}\) Ibid. p. 88.
\(^{50}\) Ibid. 89-90.
In this study, we will be using Cox’s method which is historical materialism. This method will be operationalized with the tool of historical structure that has been developed by Cox himself also. First of all, historical materialism “sees conflict as a possible cause of structural change.”\(^{51}\), and in that sense, it “is sensitive to the dialectical possibilities of change in the sphere of production which could affect the other spheres, such as those of the state and world order.”\(^{52}\) Secondly, historical materialism adds a vertical dimension of power by its focus on imperialism to the horizontal dimension of rivalry among the most powerful states. This dimension opens up the possibilities to understand the dominance and subordination of metropole over hinterland, center over periphery, in a world political economy.\(^{53}\) Thirdly, historical materialism enlarges the realist perspective, which is mainly focused on the role of the state and its uniqueness as an actor in the international system, through its concern with the relationship between the state and civil society.\(^{54}\)

So, what is a historical structure then? A historical structure is a “particular combination of thought patterns, material conditions, and human institutions which has a certain coherence among its elements. This structure does not determine the people’s action in any mechanical sense but constitute the context of habits, pressures, expectations, and constraints within which action takes place.”\(^{55}\) One can consider the international system as a historical structure with its particular thought patterns, material conditions and human institutions. In our study, we will also be using this historical structure as a framework when analyzing the transformation of one of its elements, namely the institutions. We will particularly be focusing on the institutional dimension of the structure, the United Nations Security Council, and try to analyze the transformation of it.

According to Cox, “the method of historical structures is one of representing what can be called limited totalities. The historical structure does not represent the whole world but rather a particular sphere of human activity in its historically located totality. (…) Historical structures are contrast models, like ideal types they provide, in a logically coherent form, a

\(^{51}\) Ibid. p. 95.  
\(^{52}\) Ibid. p. 97.  
\(^{53}\) Ibid. p. 95-96.  
\(^{54}\) Ibid. p. 95-96.  
\(^{55}\) Ibid. p. 96.
simplified representation of a complex reality and an expression of tendencies, limited in their applicability in time and space, rather then fully realized developments.”

In Cox’s words, the notion of a framework for action or historical structure, at its most abstract, is a picture of a particular configuration of forces which are material capabilities, ideas and institutions. According to Cox “this configuration does not determine actions in any direct mechanical way but imposes pressures and constraints. Individuals and groups may move with the pressures or resist and oppose them, but they cannot ignore them. To the extent that they do successfully resist a prevailing historical structure, they buttress their actions with an alternative, emerging configuration of forces, a rival structure.”

According to Cox, these categories of forces, expressed as potentials, interact in a structure: material capabilities, ideas, and institutions. There is no one-way determinism need to be assumed among these three; instead the relationships can be assumed to be reciprocal. Furthermore, the question of which way the lines of force run is always a historical question to be answered by a study of the particular case.

As seen above, Cox draws the general framework, but leaves it to the practitioners to decide whether in which way do the forces run, and how do they affect each other. As he explains, these are to be historical questions, and to be answered by the study of the particular case. Keeping in mind that there is more of a cyclical relationship among the elements of the
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56 Ibid. p. 100.
57 Ibid. p. 98.
58 Ibid. p. 98.
59 Ibid. p. 98.
structure, we believe that, in our particular case which is the reform of the UN SC, the role of the ideas/ideational dimension play a more fundamental role in the structure together with the material capabilities/material dimension. Their relationship, reciprocal in essence, plays a more primary role, and they together influence the institutional dimension. The transformation in the ideas and the material capabilities is having a triggering effect on the institutional level, especially on the initiatives which make change or transformation in the institutional dimension possible.

After giving a general view of the structure now we can first briefly explain the elements in the structure, and then give some information about how they interact with each other in the structure.

According to Cox, “material capabilities are productive and destructive potentials. In their dynamic form these exist as technological and organizational capabilities, and in their accumulated forms as natural resources which technology can transform, stocks of equipment (for example, industries and armaments), and the wealth which can command these.”  

Ideas, on the other hand, are broadly of two kinds. “One kind consists of intersubjective meanings, or those shared notions of the nature of social relations which tend to perpetuate habits and expectations of behavior.” As an example to intersubjective meaning in contemporary world politics, Cox explains the notions that people are organized and commanded by states which have authority over defined territories; that states relate to one another through diplomatic agents; that certain rules apply for the protection of diplomatic agents as being in the common interest of all states; and that certain kinds of behavior are to be expected when conflict arises between states, such as negotiation, confrontation, or war.

According to Cox, “the other kind of ideas relevant to a historical structure is collective images of social order held by different groups of people. These are differing views as to both the nature and the legitimacy of prevailing power relations, the meanings of justice and public good, and for so forth.” Collective images here may refer to the different theoretical frameworks (realist, idealist, Marxist, critical, etc.) which dominate the discipline of the
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60 Ibid. p. 98.
61 Ibid. p. 98.
62 Ibid. p. 98.
63 Ibid. p. 99.
International Relations in certain periods*, and the understanding of the relations among nations. Their clash (dialectic relationship) with each other opens up potentials for alternative paths of development for the emergence of an alternative order. The characteristics of the order that they foresee is built together with their own understanding of such normative concepts, legitimacy, justice, public good, the changing character of the collective security, etc.

Furthermore, “whereas intersubjective meanings are broadly common throughout a particular historical structure and constitute the common ground of social discourse (including conflict), collective images may be several and opposed.” According to Cox “the clash of rival collective images provides evidence of the potential for alternative paths of development and raises questions as to the possible material and institutional basis for the emergence of an alternative structure.”64 How ideas in general, and how the clash of rival collective images in particular affect the process of transformation in the Security Council will be explored in the next chapter. The discussions on the SC reform will be analyzed in order to explain how these different ideas affect the institutional level and how do they construct the background for the establishment of an alternative world order together with its alternative institutions.

Finally, institutions functions in stabilizing and perpetuating a particular order. “Institutions reflect the power relations prevailing at their point of origin and tend, at least initially, to encourage collective images consistent with these power relations.”65 In that regard, the establishment of League of Nations (LON), and the United Nations (UN) was a way of stabilizing and perpetuating certain world orders. One of the factors that maintained their legitimacy is that they reflected the power relations of their time. At that point, it is understandable that it is one of the main arguments that the UN SC should be reformed because it doesn’t reflect the power relations of today’s world.

Our analysis will mainly be based upon this framework, this three dimensional historical structure, in order to understand the roles and functions of different elements in the structure; how do they interact with each other, and how the institutional level is being influenced by the other two. Or to put more properly, this framework will be used to understand why there’s no
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* For example, Idealism in the inter-war period, and Realism after the Second World War.
64 Ibid. p. 99.
65 Ibid. p. 99.
transformation/reform in the institutional level which is the UN SC in our study. We will mainly be looking how the transformation in two of the elements, ideas and material capabilities, has affected the “transformation” in the institutional level. The historical structure is going to be used as the framework in which the action takes place, and we will particularly be dealing with the transformation of one constituting elements of that structure – the institutions.

Cox applies the method of historical structures to three levels, or spheres of activity which are; 1) Organization of production, more particularly with regard to the social forces engendered by the production process, 2) Forms of state as derived from a study of state/society complexes, and 3) World orders, that is, the particular configurations of forces which successively define the problematic of war or peace for the ensemble of states. Each of these levels can be studied as a succession of dominant and emergent rival structures.66

![Figure 2: Spheres of Activity of Historical Structure](image)

How these three levels are related with each other? And how this structure, as a whole, functions? According to Cox, these three levels are interrelated. “Changes in the organization of production generate new social forces which, in turn, bring about changes in the structure of states; and the generalization of changes in the structure of states alters the problematic of world order.”68 The framework or structure within which action takes place is to be viewed from the bottom or from outside in terms of the conflicts which arise within it and open the possibility of its transformation. For instance, as E.H. Carr argued, the incorporation of the
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66 Ibid. p. 100.
68 Ibid. p. 100.
industrial workers (a new social force) as participants within western states from the late
nineteenth century accentuated the movement of these states toward economic nationalism
and imperialism (a new form of state), which brought about a fragmentation of the world
economy and a more conflictual phase of international relations (the new structure of world
order)."69

So, how this framework is going to be used in our study? First of all, as Cox says, historical
structure constitutes the framework in which the action takes place, and thus constitutes the
problematic. In our study, we are trying to understand the nature of transformation/change by
using this framework, and thus our main problematic is the lack of transformation in the
institutional level of the structure. Secondly, according to Cox both the theory and the action
are shaped by the problematic. In that regard, our problematic leads us to Critical Theory
since understanding what is wrong in current structures, and trying to find the ways for
transformation are main concerns of this approach.

2.1.2 Theoretical Tools

2.1.2.1 Hegemony and World Orders

Hegemony

The term “Hegemon” originated in the Ancient Greek, and derives from the word hegeisthai
(meaning, “to lead”). In more recent times, the term “Hegemony” is used to refer to a specific
kind of dominance of one group over the others. This kind of dominance could use the threat
of force or not, and dictate the rules of trade to its advantage.70

According to Marxist theory, hegemony is the dominance of one class (bourgeoisie) over the
others, especially over proletariat. However, in Gramsci, the term is used for any type of
domination, determined by class or not.71 Antonio Gramsci developed the concept of
hegemony deriving from, but also by criticizing Marxist explanations. The basic premise of

69 Ibid. p. 100.
71 Pilou, R. “Hegemony: Methods and Hypotheses, A Historical-Comparative Perspective”.
the theory of hegemony of Gramsci is that man is not ruled by force alone, but also by ideas. True control, Gramsci believed, is achieved not by coercion but by gaining the people’s consent for this control. This is not done by the army, but through ideas which where created by intellectuals. Hence, what he observed that any politically dominant class is also ideologically dominant; that is, it keeps its position because the dominated classes accept its moral and intellectual leadership. In details, for hegemony to occur, a class should succeed in persuading the other classes of the society to accept its own moral, political and cultural values.

According to Gramsci, hegemony is not only a strategy of the bourgeoisie class to take the control of the state, in the same manner the working class can (or more properly, should) develop its own hegemony in order to control the state. In doing this, the working class should take into account the interests of the other groups and social forces, and have to find a way to combine their interests with its own interests. In addition, in order to achieve hegemony, the working class should patiently establish an alliance with other social groups and classes, and create a new historic bloc.

Deriving from Gramsci, Cox uses hegemony,

“as a meaning more than the dominance of a single world power. It means the dominance of a particular kind where the dominant state creates an order based ideologically on a broad measure of consent, functioning according to general principles that in fact ensure the continuing supremacy of the leading state of states and leading social classes but at the same time offer some measure or prospect of satisfaction to the less powerful. In such an order, production in particular countries becomes connected through the mechanisms of a world economy and linked into world systems of production. In non-hegemonic phases of world order these tendencies are reversed.”

Moving from the framework for action and its elements, it can be said that hegemony maintains stability in the structure which “is based on a coherent conjunction or fit between a
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configuration of material power, the prevalent collective image of world order (including certain norms) and a set of institutions which administer the order with a certain semblance of universality (that is, not just as the overt instruments of a particular state’s dominance.)”  

In that sense, “the notion of hegemony as a fit between power, ideas, and institutions makes it possible to deal with some of the problems in the theory of state dominance as the necessary condition for a stable international order; it allows for lags and leads in hegemony.”  

Hegemony, in international relations, was understood as an expression of broadly-based consent of the world nations, states, etc. through the acceptance of the hegemon’s ideas which are also supported by material resources and institutions.  

As an example to hegemonic periods in the historical structure, Cox mentions Pax-Brittanica and Pax-Americana. He argues that the periods of the pax-Britannica and the pax-Americana satisfy this definition of hegemony.  

When we look at the reflections of hegemony on the institutional dimension, Cox argues that there is a close connection between institutionalization and what Gramsci called hegemony. Institutions provide ways of dealing with conflicts so as to minimize the use of force. Furthermore, institutions may become the anchor for such a hegemonic strategy since they lend themselves both to the representations of diverse interests and to the universalization of policy.  

However, hegemony cannot be reduced to an institutional dimension. Therefore, one must be aware of allowing a focus upon institutions to obscure either changes in the relationship of material forces, or to the emergence of ideological challenge to an erstwhile prevailing order. (…) Finally, institutions may be an expression of hegemony, but they cannot be taken as identical to hegemony.  
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77 Ibid. p. 104.  
79 Hegemony of Pax-Britannica: “Founded on sea power (material capabilities), the norms of liberal economics (ideas), but there were no formal international institution.”. Cox. (1996). “Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory”. ibid. p. 103-104.  
80 Hegemony of Pax-Americana: “A revised liberalism of Bretton Woods (ideas), the strength of US corporations (material capabilities), and a great number of formal international institutions (institutions).”. Cox. (1996). “Social Forces, States, and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory”. ibid. p. 104.  
81 Ibid. p. 103.  
82 Ibid. p. 99.  
83 Ibid. p. 99-100.
Cox argues that “one mechanism through which the universal norms of a world hegemony are expressed is the international organization. Indeed, international organization functions as the process through which the institutions of hegemony and its ideology are developed. Among the features of international organization which express its hegemonic role are the following: (1) the institutions embody the rules which facilitate the expansion of hegemonic world orders; (2) they are themselves the product of the hegemonic world order; (3) they ideologically legitimate the norms of the world order; (4) they co-opt the elites from peripheral countries; and (5) they absorb counter-hegemonic ideas.”

World Orders

According to Cox there can be different kinds of world order, and “a principal distinction between structures of world order lies in whether or not the order is hegemonic.” So, there are different forms of world orders which can be:

1. Non-Hegemonic Order
2. Hegemonic Order (Pax-Brittanica, Pax-Americana)
3. Transformation Period (Order is not yet settled, the previous order is continuing, to a certain extent, with the ideas, material capabilities and institutions of the previous order.)

Apart from this distinction between different kinds of world orders, the world orders occur, generally, successively. “Each successive structure of world order was characterized by the emergence of new forms of state, new historic blocs, and new configurations of production relations.” In relation with this, the differences “between one structure of world order and its successor are shaped by the forms of state and of production, and stabilized structures of world order in turn provide a framework conducive to certain forms of state and of production.”
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Three successive structures of world order have been examined in Cox’s study as a framework for considering transformations in forms of state and consequential shifts in the patterns of production relations. These are:\textsuperscript{88}

1. The coming of the liberal international economy (a period that can be roughly dated 1789 – 1873)
2. The era of rival imperialisms (1873 – 1945)
3. The neo-liberal world order (post World War II)

\textbf{2.1.1.2 Counter-Hegemony & Historic Bloc}

Historic Bloc is an important element of Gramsci’s concept of counter-hegemony. Understanding the formation of a historic bloc helps us to understand the process of the formation of a counter-hegemonic movement and how a change may happen in an established order, and a new order can be built. Since our main aim and problematic is to understand the change or reform of the UN SC, these two tools will be very important in our analysis.

According to Cox, for a historical bloc to rise, there must be a hegemonic power. Once the hegemony has been established domestically, it can be expanded to the world scale through the international expansion of a particular mode of social relations of production. This can further become supported by mechanisms of international organizations.\textsuperscript{89}

So, how counter-hegemony can be achieved in a society under the hegemony of the bourgeoisie? Gramsci points out to two ways of challenging hegemony. The first one he calls “the war of movement”.\textsuperscript{90} The main aim here is to have a quick success through a sudden frontal attack. Deriving from the Bolshevik Revolution experience, Gramsci claims that this kind of challenge may work more efficiently for societies where the state power is centralized and the civil society is weak, such as Russia. The second way is called “the war of position”. This, in contrast to the first one, is suggested for the societies with a comparatively strong civil society and a less centralized state power, such as Western European countries. This way

requires a long struggle primarily through the institutions of civil society.\textsuperscript{91} In this way, “the revolutionary forces have to take the civil society before they take the state, and therefore have to build a coalition of oppositional groups under a hegemonic banner which usurps the dominant or prevailing hegemony.”\textsuperscript{92}

According to Gramsci, counter-hegemony is related with building up the basis of an alternative state and society upon the leadership of the working class, and creating alternative institutions and alternative intellectual resources within existing society, and building bridges between workers and other subordinate classes. Counter-hegemony can be established within an existing hegemony while resisting the pressures against the framework of bourgeois hegemony.\textsuperscript{93}

There is also another concept, passive revolution, which helps us to understand the concept of hegemony and the prospects for counter-hegemonic movements. “This concept is a counterpart to the concept of hegemony in that it describes the condition of a non-hegemonic society, one in which no dominant class has been able to establish a hegemony in Gramsci’s sense of the term. Today, this notion of passive revolution, together with its components, caesarism and transformismo, is particularly apposite to industrializing Third World countries.”\textsuperscript{94}

Through transformismo, talented elites are being co-opted from peripheral countries into international institutions. Individuals from peripheral countries, though they may come to international institutions with the idea of working from within to change the system, are condemned to work within the structures of passive revolution because transformismo absorbs potentially counter-hegemonic ideas and makes these ideas consistent with hegemonic doctrine. “At best these elites will help transfer elements of ‘modernization’ to the peripheries but only as these are consistent with the interests of established local powers.”\textsuperscript{95}

\textsuperscript{91} “Antonio Gramsci and Hegemony”. \url{http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~janzb/courses/phi4804/gramsci1} (2006-12-18).
\textsuperscript{94} Ibid. p. 130-131.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid. p. 139.
2.1.2.3 Structural Transformation/Change

Another important tool in Neo-Gramscianism is structural transformation. In general, Cox’s main focus has been on the change in the international system either from above or from below. Together with other related concepts, such as hegemony, historic bloc, counter-hegemony etc., structural transformation helps us his way of understanding of the change in the international system. Deriving from this, we will be able to utilize this tool in understanding the change on the institutional dimension, the UN SC, of the international system, or the structure.

Cox, departing from Braudel’s conceptualizing, claims that there are three different kinds of changes in the international system. In fact, he says, the contemporary world order is characterized by change, and actually, change never stops. Among these three different types of change, the first is called day-to-day change which has a direct impact on the individuals. The second one is called “the conjunctural change” which occurs within an acceptable time period, such as ten, twenty or fifty years. In addition, beyond these two, there is the very long run – the longue durée – that might cover a number of centuries and which focuses on the broadest patterns and structures.96

1) Day-to-day changes, 2) Conjunctural Changes, 3) Structural Changes

As Cox explains, the most obvious recent instance of conjunctural change is “the apparent end of the Cold War, which is perceived to have fundamentally transformed the preexisting pattern of relations between states. East-West tensions are no longer thought by most observers to dominate the inter-state system.”97

In addition to that, “the Second Gulf War – the US and coalition campaign against Iraq – made transparent a change in the structure of global politics. The change was not the transition to a post-Cold War order proclaimed by US political leaders. Rather it was the shift from a hegemonic to a tributary system.”98 This shift, according to Cox, had been going on since the early 1970s. “Retrospectively, it has begun with the US defeat in Vietnam, and the

97 Ibid. p. 4.
‘Nixon Shocks’ that undid the Bretton Woods system. Since that time, the more or less spontaneous consensual hegemonic leadership the United States had commanded in the non-Soviet world turned into a sequence of bargained deals, mostly taking the form of financial quid pro quo for US military cover.”

As seen above, Cox argues that with the Vietnam defeat and the ‘Nixon Shocks’, the clear US hegemony started to fade or decline, and it can be argued that after that point, it turned into a consensual hegemony.

2.2 Normative Dimension

2.2.1 Frankfurt School Critical Theory

As it has been mentioned before, Frankfurt School Critical Theory, through its adapted version to international relations, will be used in the normative and emancipatory dimensions of our theoretical framework. In this section, we will briefly touch to some focal normative concepts. Through these normative tools, we will be able to critically analyze the reform debates concerning the current structure of the UN SC.

In Linklater’s words, Critical Theory’s normative aims can be summed up in this way: “It is to increase the spheres of social interaction that are governed by dialogue and consent rather than power and force; to expand the number of human beings who have access to a speech community that has the potential to become universal; and to create socioeconomic preconditions of effective, as opposed to nominal, involvement for all members of that community.”

99 Ibid. p. 33.
2.2.2 Theoretical Tools

2.2.2.1 (Global) Democracy

Democracy is an unfinished project of modernity according to the critical theorists. Firstly, critical theorists criticize the liberal democratic capitalist form of democracy, and they believe that a more democratic form, which they call “Radical Democracy”, should be established. The task of radical democracy, Mouffe claims, is to deepen the democratic project of modernity. Habermas, for example, “opposes substantive democracy, by which he means a system where the majority can change the very nature of the Government; can redefine the basic rights of the citizen; can impose its own notions of justice, property, the right to inherit, education, of right and wrong, on all of the people.” Critical theorists claim that democracy, in means of liberal democracy, is not open to any differences in the society, hence actually a form of domination of the majority over any kind of minorities. Radical democracy, on the other hand, demands the recognition of difference and maximum pluralism without destroying the community. Critical theorists basically aim to transform the contemporary capitalist democracy into a more consensual form of democracy which they call radical democracy.

Critical international theorists basically try to apply the ideas of critical social theorists to the international level. Deriving their thoughts from Habermas’ communicative rationality, and other critical theorists, they aim to transform the current international system to a more democratic one. The relationship between individuals, non-governmental organizations and other groups must be improved by communicative rationality by bringing their ideas, problems and thoughts to the international organizations more often. Habermas believes that this will make the international political system more democratic. Critical theorists aim to build an international system which is open to any difference, such as identity, religion, ethnicity, gender, nationality, and hence more democratic.

Critical theorists also suggest international and non-governmental organizations to have a place in the international system as the basic units besides states. They support maximum pluralism in the international system without destroying it.

103 For example: The domination of one ideology, identity, ethnicity, gender over the others.
2.2.2.2 (Global) Justice and Equality

Critical theory makes emphasis on the unequal and unjust structure of the current international order. Critical theorists seek to analyze critically the sources of inequality, injustice and domination that shape global power relations, and they find the answer to their search in the realist assumption that state is the basic unit in international system. Critical theorists think that peoples, individuals, international organizations, non-governmental organizations must also be represented in the international system as well as the states to provide global justice and equality.

Andrew Linklater argues that “justice considerations have moved to the centre of the discipline as questions about transnational justice (justice between individuals within world society) have become as important as international justice (justice between the societies within the system of states).”

The basic structure of international society should ensure justice and equality between different cultures. Linklater says “no contemporary account of order and justice international relations will be complete unless it addresses the issue of justice between different species.”

In conclusion, we can sum up our words with Richard Devetak’s sentence which says critical theory is committed to extending the rational, just, equal and democratic organization of political life beyond the level of the state to the whole humanity.

2.3 Emancipatory Dimension

2.3.1 Neo-Gramscianism & Frankfurt School Critical Theory

In this section, in line with the emancipatory aim of the Critical Theory, we will seek the ways to open up the possibilities for a transformation in the UN Security Council in accordance with its normative basis.

---

105 Ibid. p. 476.
Through its critiques on realism and neo-realism, Critical Theorists claimed that the other theories (traditional theories) are only contributing to the reproduction of the domination in the international system, and thus legitimizing the prevailing world orders, the ideas and the institutions within these world orders. However Critical Theory instead tries to remove the barriers in front of the people which limit their understanding of the real factors that actually built such institutions and world orders, and helps them to emancipate from these illusionary barriers.

In line with the arguments that have been mentioned above Critical Theory aims to remove the unnecessary constraints on human and open a possibility to liberate them and lead to emancipation. In Cox’s description, Critical Theory tries to contribute to the emancipation of the human beings by not taking the prevailing orders, the institutions and social and power relations for granted, but instead asking how that order and institutions, etc. came about. In addition, the general aim of Critical Theory can be summed up as in the following that it aims to provide a guide to strategic action for bringing an emancipated alternative order.107

According to Habermas, all three traditions in the philosophy of social science (positivism, hermeneutics and critical social theory) are constituted upon a particular ‘knowledge-constitutive interest’. And in that sense, Critical Theory’s interest is in transcending the limits upon the subjects’ capacity for self-determination.108 “It is constituted by an emancipatory interest in understanding the possibility of freeing social actors from unnecessary constraints.”109

The biggest attempt to show how Critical Theory can be used in the development of a post-realist analysis of international relations came into existence with Robert Cox approach on “world politics which relies on historical materialism to analyze the alternative paths of historical development and to assess the prospects for a politics of universal emancipation.”110

As Linklater argues “its importance is exemplified by Cox’s distinction between ‘problem-solving’ and ‘critical’ theories of international relations. The former ‘takes the world as it

---

108 Ibid. p. 9.
109 Ibid. p. 9.
110 Ibid. p. 27.
finds it, with the prevailing social and political relations and the institutions into which they are organized, as the given framework for action. A critical perspective ‘stands apart from the prevailing order of the world and asks how that order came about’.

Furthermore, “Critical theory, unlike problem-solving theory, does not take institutions and social and power relations for granted but calls them into question by concerning itself with their origins and how and whether they might be in the process of changing’.

In contrast to problem-solving theories, “Critical theory allows for a normative choice in favor of a social and political order different from the prevailing order, but it limits the range of choice to alternative orders which are feasible transformations of the existing world. A principle objective of critical theory, therefore, is to clarify this range of possible alternatives.” In that regard, Critical theory “contains an element of utopianism in the sense that it can represent a coherent picture of an alternative order, but its utopianism is constrained by its comprehension of historical process. It must reject improbable alternatives just as it rejects the permanency of the existing order”.

Finally, Cox discusses “the rise of nationalist and socialist forces in the Third World and their resultant challenge to the contemporary international economic system.” He considers this challenge as “a counter-hegemony based on a Third World coalition against core country dominance and aiming towards the autonomous development of peripheral claims and the termination of the core-peripheral relationship.” Cox argues that “the possibility of a counter-hegemonic challenge lies very largely in the future development of state structures in the Third World.”

---

111 Ibid. p. 28.
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2.3.2 Theoretical Tools

2.3.2.1 Universal Emancipation

Members of the Frankfurt School, deriving from the classical Greek idea, claimed that human reason is an instrument of enlightenment and emancipation. Their approach was also deeply influenced by Marx’s argument that social theory is a critical activity which can help to liberate human beings from the alienating social and political institutions created by the dead generations.\footnote{Ibid. p. 22.}

Using Cox’s probably the most quoted sentence that theory is always for someone and for some purpose, and deriving from his distinction between problem-solving and critical theories, Cox argues that critical theory is also for someone and for some purpose. So in that case, Critical Theory’s main purpose is to provide emancipation.

According to Horkheimer’s well-known distinction, critical theory may be distinguished from a traditional theory according to a specific practical purpose: a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human emancipation to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them.\footnote{Horkheimer, Max. ibid.} Deriving from Marx’s thoughts, emancipation has a very central role in the writings of critical theorists. In Habermas’ epistemology, critical knowledge was conceptualized as knowledge that enabled human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection. Emancipation means, according to critical approach, freeing someone from the control of another or setting free from the power of another.\footnote{For example: From slavery, dependence or tyranny.}

Unfortunately, when we look at the critical theory, we can’t see a systematic application of these emancipatory ideas to the international political system. Richard Wyn Jones says, for instance, that there have been no systematic considerations of how critical international theory can help generate, support, or sustain emancipatory politics beyond the seminar room or conference hotel.\footnote{Richard Wyn Jones. “Security, Strategy, and Critical Theory”. \url{http://www.ciaonet.org/book/wynjones/wynjones06.html}. (2005-10-16).} But deriving from the thoughts about emancipation, we can claim that an international system which doesn’t produce any kind of domination of one state over the others would be the international system that critical theory aims.
Chapter III: The Analysis of the UN Security Council Reform Debates

3.1 The Reform of the UN Security Council: A Brief Historical Overview

As we mentioned before, there has been an ongoing comprehensive transformation in the world in general and particularly in the international system especially after the end of the Cold War. This period has been considered as another “turning point” in the world history, thus motivated countless attempts which tried to understand and explain the nature of transformation, and the characteristics of the newly emerging international system.

Brian Urquart, for instance, argued that

“the world has entered a period of great instability, characterized by long-standing international rivalries and resentments, intense ethnic and religious turmoil, a vast flow of arms and military technology, domestic disintegration, poverty and deep economic inequalities, instantaneous communication throughout the world, population pressures, natural and ecological disasters, the security of vital resources, and huge movements of population. In such a situation, no one nation, or even a partnership of two or three powerful nations, is going to be able to assume the role of world arbitrator and policeman, even supposing the other nations would accept it, which they are most unlikely to do. The United Nations, therefore, must be brought to maturity to take that role.”

What did the end of the Cold War bring to the international system, and what kind of reflections they had on the United Nations in general, and on the Security Council in particular? To begin with, it can be argued that the global scene in the 1990s was considerably different from that of 1940s, and the SC for example, didn’t reflect the realities of the international political system anymore. Eskine Childers says that the UN system was operating in a world of much greater complexity and danger than when the UN was founded.

---

122 The bulk of the content in this section has been taken from an academic paper which was presented by me in a graduate conference held in Paris between 19-20 June in 2006. Yilmaz, Feyzullah (2006). New World Order(s) and New Arrangements in International Organizations: The Necessity of a Reform in the United Nations Security Council. 1st Graduate Conference: Order and Disorder in a Changing World. The American Graduate School of International Relations and Diplomacy. 19-20 June in 2006.
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First of all, the relative decline of France and Britain – two permanent member states of the SC – in power compared to other states, most notably to Germany and Japan, had arose lots of debates about their permanent seats in the Council. For instance, Germany and Japan had appeared as the world’s second and third largest economies after the Cold War, and they were still considered in the same position within the UN as Cape Verde. Besides Germany and Japan, some developing countries such as India, Brazil and Nigeria were also complaining about the structure of both the UN and SC, and looking for a permanent seat in the SC. Furthermore the rise of European Union (EU) as a new, “united” global economical and political actor was also one of the important changes for the post-Cold War era. The process of decolonization and admission of a large number of newly independent states to UN, together the fall of the Berlin Wall and the collapse of the Soviet Union, brought a dramatic shift in the distribution of power in the international economical and political order. Such events, of course, put the UN in general and the SC in particular in a totally different position from that they had previously acted.126

Due to the collapse of the Soviet Union, the world had seen a temporary cooperation among the big powers of the international system.127 This change had also important reflections in the UN and in the SC. First, the end of the Cold war brought a reasonable hope for peace and security. Secondly, the Gulf War, where the UN founders reaffirmed and showed the effectiveness of collective security including every major power.128 In relation to this, the changing attitudes of Russia and China made the SC work more efficiently than ever before in its history. In 1990s, the SC suddenly started to work at full steam. From the early 1990s, it began to launch an unprecedented number and range of peace operations, to meet more frequently than in the past and to pass more resolutions, such as in Kuwait, Cambodia, Namibia, Afghanistan, Iran – Iraq conflict, thus emerging as a powerful actor in areas of conflict or potential conflict.129

As for another reflection of the transformation process on the SC, Former Secretary-General Kofi Annan says that when he took “the job a decade ago, there were 20.000 United Nations peacekeepers in the field. Today there are over 90.000 deployed, and if they are to comply


126 Bourantis, ibid.
127 Ibid.
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fully with the mandates the Security Council has now given to them in Lebanon, Timor-Lest, and Sudan, the total will surge nearly to 140,000 troops. It will not be easy to raise such number of troops from countries which feel inadequately represented in the Council that is deciding the mandates.”

In accordance with the transformations in the international system, the demands to reform the UN’s most visible organ to the outside world, the Security Council, and bring it in line with the new realities of the twenty-first century have been intensified too, otherwise the Council might lose its authority and credibility in the world. In that respect an Open-Ended Working group has been established in the General Assembly in “January 1994 to discuss the question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council and other Council-related matters.”

Although a very long time has passed since the establishment of the open-ended working group – it has been acknowledged as the working group with the longest history of all the high-level working groups chaired by the President of the GA – there is still not a significant progress in the SC reform issue. After 15-years of discussions, one can see statements, such as that of Japan’s, “On the question of expanding the membership, there still existed differences of positions with regards to the size, scope and modalities of expansion” which shows how far the Security Council reform had gone in the past 15-years.

Now, we will continue with the analysis part of our study in which we will analyze the ongoing debate in the GA concerning the SC reform, and try to explain why it hasn’t been possible so far to transform that body.

3.2 The Explanatory Analysis

In this part, we will be dealing with our first question, which is our explanatory question, and try to analyze why there hasn’t been any significant progress in the reform process of the UN

Security Council? Or in other words, why the reform didn’t take place in the UN Security Council so far? Apart from this main question, we will have two sub-questions, which will be explained later, that will be used as complementary elements in answering our main question.

As has been explained in the outline, our main problematic is to understand how and why, despite the transformations in the other dimensions of the structure, namely the ideas and the material capabilities, there has been no transformation\(^{135}\) in the institutional dimension, which is the UN Security Council in our study.

In order to examine this problematic, first we need to recall how change occurs, according to our theoretical framework\(^{136}\), in the structure in general, and in the different dimensions of the structure in particular. According to the theory, these three elements (ideas, material capabilities and institutions) in the structure are interrelated. The “changes in the organization of production generate new social forces which, in turn, bring about changes in the structure of states; and the generalization of changes in the structure of states alters the problematic of world order.”\(^{137}\)

---

\(^{135}\) In this study, for the changes in the structure in general or the changes in any of the dimensions of the structure (ideas, material capabilities, and institutions) in particular, the term \textit{transformation} has been used. (For instance: the transformation of the structure, structural transformation, the transformation of the ideas, the transformation of the institution, etc.) However for the changes within the institutional dimension in practice, or so to say, in the real world out there, for instance in the UN Security Council, the term \textit{reform} has been used. (For instance: the reform of the UN Security Council, the reform of the UN, the UN reform, etc.) Finally, the term \textit{change} has been used in a more general meaning when not specifically referring to one of these above.

\(^{136}\) As has been described in the theoretical section, here, we will be operationalizing the Coxian framework for action, which is historical structure.

In addition to that the theory says that the “individuals and groups [in the structure] may move with the pressures or resist and oppose them, but they cannot ignore them. To the extent that they do successfully resist a prevailing historical structure, they buttress their actions with an alternative, emerging configuration of forces, a rival structure.”

According to the theory, due to the changes in the mode of production, new social groups start emerging, and these new social groups begin their initiatives, either hegemonic or counter-hegemonic depending on the character of the prevailing order, first in the domestic level, and then extending it to the international level by building alliances with other social forces in other states who share similar or same interests, aims, goals, etc., and finally build a historic bloc. The appearance of such a historic bloc is the indicator of the transformation in the different dimensions of the structure in particular and the transformation of the structure itself in general, thus, it shows that the emergence of an alternative world order is in progress. Therefore after the forming of a historic bloc, these changes trigger the change in the form of state, and a new form or forms of state start emerging. The transformation in the institutional dimension follows this process, and finally the whole process of transformation reaches to another stable position with the establishment of a new alternative world order.

In a simplified form, the process can be described as follows: change in the mode of production (also in material capabilities and ideas) → the emergence of new social groups or forces → the starting of the counter-hegemonic or hegemonic movement in the domestic level → building alliances with other social forces in the international level and forming a historic bloc → the emergence of a new form of state → the change in the institutions → the emergence of a new alternative world order.

*Analysis of the Main Question: Part I*

After that background information, now we will be examining our two sub-questions (1.1 and 1.2) in order to operationalize our main question.

---
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1.1. How is the transformation in the international system (the structure) been perceived by the UN membership in the General Assembly?

With this sub-question, it is aimed to understand how the Member States relate the transformation of the structure with the transformation of the institution, in general with the UN, and in particular with the SC. Through the analysis of their statements about the SC reform, we aim to see, for instance, whether they see these two transformations (structure & institution) as inter-related, or not, and if so, then how do these different levels influence each other.

Examining this question will help us to understand how the transformation in the structure, both in the ideas and in the material capabilities dimensions, has been perceived in the institutional dimension of the structure – which is the United Nations in our study. During the analysis, the emphasis will be given to how the transformation, particularly in the social forces and ideas, has been perceived in the institution, the UN. This, in turn, will help us to understand whether there is any reflection of the transformations of ideas and material capabilities on the institutional dimension.

When operationalizing this question, we will be analyzing the discussions have been done in the UN General Assembly (GA) on the UN Security Council reform. By examining the discussions in the GA, we will be able to understand the tendencies of both the members, especially the permanent five, and the non-members of the Security Council.

The UN, as an international institution, is for sure the broadest platform which hosts different interests, ideas, political and ideological, etc. orientations, and within the UN, we can say that the GA is considered in the same manner, since it is the most representative body of the UN in which all member states are equally represented. Moving from this, the discussions in the GA on the reform of the Security Council will be considered as the reflections, on the international level, of different ideas, interests, political and ideological orientations of different social forces. In addition, we will be analyzing the discussions in order to understand whether there is or can be a counter-hegemonic movement, which can lead to the forming of a historic bloc, causing a transformation in the institution, and resulting with the establishment of a new alternative world order.
In this part, we first analyzed the statements that have been delivered to the GA in 1996, 1997, 2000 and 2006 by various Member States to see how they relate the transformation in the structure that occurred, and is continuing to occur, with the transformation in the institution. After examining these statements, we decided to classify them in five main groups in which the Member States focused on different aspects of the transformation in the structure, or so-to-say the change in the international system.

In the first group, we brought together the statements which help us to understand how the Member States perceive the transformation in the structure. Among the Member States, the most commonly used way of explaining the transformation in the structure has been relating the transformation with the end of the Cold War or with the end of the Second World War.

For instance, Mongolia relates the “current world realities” with the consequences of the changes occurred since the end of the Cold War and the end of the bipolar world order. In the same manner Ecuador relates these “new realities” with the post-Cold War world.\footnote{Press Release. GA/10484. http://www.un.org/News/Press/docs/2006/ga10484.doc.htm. (2007-02-10).}


In a more comprehensive manner, Peru points out to the changing distribution of global power when explaining the main factors that caused the transformation in the structure. According to


Peru, “the global power had only been modified, as a result of great geopolitical cataclysms, wars, overextension of empires and economic and technological decadence.” In that, we can argue that it points out to the significant transformations in the world, such as the economic crisis of the 1970s, and the political turning point of the 1990s with the collapse of the Soviet Union and with the end of the Cold War, etc.

These changes in the international system had important reflections on the functioning of the Security Council, and as Boutros-Boutros Ghali explains, these changes made it necessary for the Council to adapt itself to the new realities of the time: “Since the beginning of this decade, the Security Council has become a far more active and effective decision-making body than it was during the Cold War period. The Council is an impressive example that structures and mechanisms available to us can adapt and evolve to meet new challenges. In crisis after crisis over the past few years, those who have sat on the Council have been part of a transforming and positive process of change.” Furthermore, he gives some statistics concerning the increasing activity of the Council: “To illustrate, in 1987, the Council met 49 times, adopted 14 resolutions and issued nine presidential statements. Last year, in 1995, the Council met 130 times, adopted 66 resolutions and issued 63 presidential statements.”

In a broader perspective, “for the period 1946 – 1989, the annual average number of passed resolutions was fifteen; since then the average has been more than sixty. The Council has moved from roughly one decision per month to one per week.” This was, indeed a dramatic change, as Peter Wallenstein indicates.

In the second group of the statements, we brought together the statements which help us to understand what kind of changes the Member States see in the structure, particularly in the social forces and ideas, and how they relate these changes with the transformation in the institution.

---

For instance, Belgium points out that “the world had changed and, with that, the center of power. New actors and regional Powers had emerged.”\(^{152}\) Republic of Korea says furthermore, “the emergence of a number of medium-powered countries able to make meaningful contributions to international peace and security had been a significant and promising development in international relations over the last 50 years.”\(^{153}\) However, besides the changes in the number of medium powers, or new regional powers, as Singapore points out, there has also been some changes in the so-called Superpowers of the international system: “The five most powerful members of the international community in 1945 were not the five most powerful members in 2000.”\(^{154}\)

In order to point out to the different members of the international system in different eras, or to different social forces of the structure, Mauritius compares the old and new realities by saying that “everyone knew that in 1945 Africa did not belong to Africans and neither did Asia belong to Asians. The same could have been said at the time about the countries of Latin America and the Caribbean.”\(^{155}\) In the same way, Kenya states that many things have changed since 1945, in particular, “Africa in 1945 was rather insignificant; today, Africa had 53 States represented in the United Nations – in other words, nearly one third of the total membership of the Organization, yet the institutions and organs had not changed to accommodate that reality.”\(^{156}\) In addition Italy points out that “since 1945, decolonization and the end of the Cold War had led to the emergence of over 100 new Member States, yet there had been no corresponding change.”\(^{157}\)

Briefly put, many Member States argued that there should be a reform (an adaptation) in the Security Council in accordance with the transformations in the structure, first due to the changes in the number and character of the social forces in it.

For instance, Iraq says that “the world had changed dramatically since the Council’s inception some 60 years ago. Indeed, there were many more States today playing active and substantial roles in international relations.”\(^{158}\)


roles in determining international affairs, so it was clear that the Council’s membership must be enlarged to make it a more democratic reflection of the new century.”

As Nicaragua states the United Nations had been created in a much different world from today, and since then the international system has seen important changes, for instance due to the increasing number of its members, particularly from developing countries. Due to these changes, it is argued that the United Nations as a whole, with the Security Council of course, should adapt to the new situation. “Although the number of Member States had almost quadrupled since 1945, the increase had not been reflected in the Council’s integration.”

In addition, Turkey argues that “the reform efforts had to take into consideration the fundamental changes which had taken place in the world since the founding of the United Nations, as well as the evolving nature of the distribution of international power. It was necessary to acknowledge that a significant and increasing number of countries had gained prominence and ever widening economic and political influence in their respective regions.”

As Indonesia clearly puts “it was now universally recognized that the membership and structure inherited in 1945 was outdated and obsolete, and did not reflect the political, economic and demographic realities of the time. Permanent Members remained the same, while developing countries continued to be disfranchised – an anomaly which could not be perpetuated. Two thirds of the world’s population in the developing countries was without representation in the permanent membership.”

In relation with that Cambodia states that “the rationale to democratize the Council was initiated on the legitimate need of Member States, which had grown from 51 to 189 (now 192), with a view to adapting the United Nations system on a wider context in a rapidly changing world. A reform of the Security Council was, indeed, mandatory following the Cold War.”

In addition to the emergence of new actors (new social forces), there have also been changes in another element of the structure, the ideas, which also have been related with the transformation in the institution, or more precisely with the reform of the UN Security Council. Member States argued that there should be a reform (an adaptation) in the Security

Council in accordance with the transformations in the structure, this time due to the changes in the transformations of ideas in it.

For instance Israel highlights “the trend towards democracy after the end of the Cold War, the sweeping tide of globalization, and the rise of new economic powers which profoundly affected altering the shape of the world, and the ways in which nations related to each other.” In addition, Czech Republic points out to the significant changes that occurred in the international system, such as, the changes in the nature of the threats to international peace and security. It says that “today’s world was facing new threats, such as terrorism, in addition to the more traditional conflicts between States.”

Furthermore, while the main actors in the international scene in 1945 were governments, today civil society, other international agencies and the private sector were increasingly becoming active players in the world scene, even vying for equal partnerships in addressing global issues and challenges.” Moreover, it is believed that “these improvements will further the democratization of the international system itself [because] states in every part of the world are now aware that issues they once considered internal and subject to their policy decisions alone now are affected by vast forces of globalization.”

It is also been argued that “participation, legitimation and democratization will be keys to the common progress of the international community of States as we move into the next century. All three can be served by Security Council reform.” So, in this recognition, due to these changes in the ideational dimension of the structure, it is believed that there should be a change in the institutional dimension also: “States simply will not accept a situation in which global issues are dealt with by representatives of only a few of the wealthiest and most powerful States, acting often behind closed doors.”

---

In the third group of the statements, after analyzing how the Member States perceive the transformation in the structure, we brought together the statements which help us to understand what kind of a relationship the Member States see between the transformation in the structure and the transformation in the institution.

There is a significant number of Member States which emphasizes the necessity of a reform in the United Nations in general and in the Security Council in particular in order to adapt to changes that occurred during the transformation of the structure. They briefly claim that there needs to be a change in the institution, the UN Security Council, simply because there have been significant changes in the world. In that sense, they believe that the Security Council should be reformed in order to reflect the realities of today’s world. Examples to such statements can be Japan’s words that “the Security Council should be recreated as a body that reflected the tremendous changes in the international community”\(^\text{168}\), or Ireland’s words that “the Council needed to better reflect contemporary global realities”\(^\text{169}\), or Guatemala’s that “the Council should be better reflecting the contemporary international order”\(^\text{170}\). In accordance with the examples above, we can also mention Venezuela’s statement in which it says that “the changes registered on the international scene were good reason to adapt the United Nation to the exigencies of today”\(^\text{171}\), or Djibouti’s statement that “a properly reconstituted Security Council reflecting the reality of today’s interconnected world was essential for global development, peace and security”\(^\text{172}\), or Kuwait’s that the Security Council should be reformed to make it “capable to face the challenges of the next century.”\(^\text{173}\)

Furthermore, for Ethiopia, “the Security Council reform was an initiative to bring the Council in line with the realities of international politics at the beginning of the twenty-first century”\(^\text{174}\), because as Lao People’s Democratic Republic says “major changes had taken place in the world since 1945, and the Council should adapt itself to the new global


realities.” 175 In the same manner Morocco claims that the Council should be adapted to the current state of international relations after 60 years of change. 176

Some Member States clearly emphasize the necessity of a reform in the UN Security Council by mentioning the changes in the structure. For instance, Singapore says that “today’s world was different from 1945, yet, the Council remained essentially unchanged” 177, or Mauritius says that “the Council had undergone very little change in the past five decades and had obviously reached a point where it could no longer meet the needs of a rapidly evolving and ever-changing geopolitical environment” 178; Ecuador says that “there were new realities in the post-Cold War world, and those realities required an organ entrusted with peace and international security to be more representative, more democratic and more transparent in its negotiations and decisions.” 179

Some Member States, such as Costa Rica, Sweden, Greece, etc., emphasize the importance of the Council reform by saying that “the Council reform was essential to the future of the United Nations” 180, or “the Security Council reform was essential to the overall reform of the United Nations” 181, or “in order to effectively face serious global threats and challenges, the Council could not lag behind. The demand for reform was urgent.” 182

Furthermore it is believed that “Security Council reform is essential in order to sustain the Council’s authority, legitimacy and effectiveness” 183, and “the world’s future would depend on whether Member States were successful in creating a new United Nations and its new Security Council, capable of dealing effectively with issues of international community was expected to face.” 184

In case of a failure in reforming the Council, some Member States, such as Latvia, try to attract the attentions to the importance of the reform issue and warn other Members by saying that “the United Nations risked becoming irrelevant if it did not continually evolve to offer a coherent response to changing global conditions.” 185 or Belgium, in another example, says that “the Council must either adapt to changing geopolitical realities, or lose its prestige and authority.” 186 In addition to these warnings, Nepal says that “the Council reform needed to be pursued with a renewed sense of urgency. That was mainly because the Council neither reflected present-day political and economic realities, nor was it representative of the increased United Nations membership since 1965.” 187 And due to these reasons, “the credibility of and confidence in the Council were steadily eroding; there were legitimate concerns that the Council had lost touch with its constituency.” 188

As Germany rightly states that “the outside world, to a very large extent, identified the United Nations with its most visible organ, the Security Council.” 189 Therefore, “a United Nations that claimed to have reformed itself without having brought the Council into the twenty-first century would continue to lose authority and credibility around the world.” 190 In relation to that Nauru asserts that “the Council no longer reflected today’s geopolitical realities, but rather a 1945 balance of power that was obsolete. The inaction in reforming all principal organs of the United Nations was a ‘kink’ in the system, which only weakens the Organization’s structure and erode its effectiveness.” 191

Moreover, India argues that the problems concerning the current situation of the Council in fact was merely a symptom of a much deeper crisis – the Cold War ended, leaving a vacuum, yet no new equilibrium had taken its place. The global pattern of governance was in fundamental crisis and the United Nations could not effectively reform itself. Though its limbs were in the twenty-first century, its head and heart remained behind.” 192 Furthermore India argued that “the Security Council seemed to be reaching the end of its shelf life as

structural cracks had appeared. Cracks and fissures were showing around its foundations, much like the current state of the crumbling Headquarters building.”

Finally former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan says that “no reform of the United Nations will be complete without reform of the Security Council. And indeed, so long as the Council remains unreformed, the whole process of transforming governance in other parts of the system is handicapped by the perception of an inequitable distribution of power. The world has changed dramatically since 1945, and the Security Council must change, too.”

As Senegal’s representative briefly puts, “institutions that did not evolve with the times lost their efficacy, credibility and even their representative quality.”

In the fourth group, we brought together the statements which help us to understand how the Member States perceive the character of transformation in the structure, or the character of the changing/transformation process in general.

First, in one speech of the Secretary-General Boutros-Boutros Ghali, he defines this period as an unprecedented period in world history from which both the peril and potential may come out and mark the years ahead. Some of the Member States, such as Argentina, perceived this process as the transformation process of “an international system that was evolving painfully.” As an example to painful evolving of the international system, Costa Rica points out to long series of bloody and damaging conflicts worldwide after the end of the Cold War which can also be related with the speech of Boutros-Boutros Ghali, and be considered as the peril that came out of the transformation process. In addition to these, some Member States perceived the transformation as a “transition into the twenty-first century”, such as Republic of Korea, while some perceived it as a transition to a “new international situation”, for instance Sweden.

Some Member States emphasize the changing character of the international system, and in that regard, they perceive the transformation, in Japan’s words, as the “tremendous changes in the international community”\(^{201}\), or in Cambodia’s words, as “the world as rapidly changing following the Cold War.”\(^{202}\) Furthermore, Mauritius attracts the attentions on the “rapidly evolving” and “ever-changing” character of the geopolitical environment or the present world.\(^{203}\) In addition to that, the former Secretary-General Kofi Annan considers the current the world as changing dramatically since 1945.\(^{204}\) In the same manner, Iraq\(^{205}\), Uruguay\(^{206}\) and Honduras\(^{207}\) call this change as dramatic and drastic, while Angola, for instance, draws attention to radically changing character of the world both politically and economically, and to the strength of the change in transforming old realities.\(^{208}\) Emphasizing on the ongoing change in the international system, San Marino says that “the world was at a chilling and unproductive standstill, while impatience and mistrust was brewing among Member States.”\(^{209}\)

Finally there are also some Member States, such as Poland and Dominican Republic, which perceive the transformation period as a process leading the international system into the new millennium, or in other words, to the twenty-first century.\(^{210}\)

In the fifth (final) group, we brought together the statements which help us to understand how the Member States perceive the future of the current ongoing transformation in the structure.

Among these statements, there are some which make emphasis on the current ongoing transformation in the structure and to the emergence of a new international order. For them, the transformation process was feeding new emerging realities for a new era. For instance, as Swaziland claims that the current changes in the structure bring the transformation of the


international system and, in turn, “the emergence of a new international world order.”

Turkey, on the other hand, relates the ongoing transformation process with the fundamental changes which had taken place in the world and claims that there is a new evolving nature of the distribution of international power.

Similar to these, Amre Mousa from Egypt explains on which values and norms an international order should be built, and in doing that he draws attention to the ongoing changes in the prevailing international system, and to the possible emergence of a new international order with new values and norms. Furthermore, the statements have been done by Guatemala, Panama and El Salvador can also be mentioned in that regard. According to them, first of all the world was different now, and it was not the bi-polar world of the Cold War. In addition to this the changes and the “new” realities occurred in the international system over the last decade, which are also mentioned above by other Member States, were the signs of the beginning of a new era of international relations, or a new and contemporary international order.

There are also some Member States which emphasize the current new character of the world in general. In defining the new character of this situation, they generally use the concept of “new realities” which in essence indicates that the Member States perceive the current situation significantly different than before. Examples of usages of such concepts, with little differences, can be seen in many of the statements, for instance: “contemporary geopolitical realities” by Kazakhstan, “modern political realities” by El Salvador, “vital needs of the twenty-first century” by Honduras, “world’s current realities” by Andorra, “geopolitical and economic realities of today’s world” by Sri Lanka, “current geopolitical realities” by Venezuela, “realities of the twenty-first century” by Ukraine, “current geopolitical realities” by Malaysia, “contemporary geopolitical realities” by Greece, “realities of

international politics at the beginning of the twenty-first century"\textsuperscript{219} by Ethiopia, and finally “the twenty-first century realities”\textsuperscript{220} by Denmark.

\textit{A General Analysis of the Important Points: Part I}

As a short overview, now we can summarize some of the important points that have been put forward above.

First of all, we tried to understand how the Member States perceive the transformation in the structure. It can be argued that they generally relate this transformation with some historically important political and economical events, such as the end of the Second World War and the end of the Cold War. They perceive these events as the factors causing the modification of global distribution of power, and thus causing the transformation of the structure.

Secondly, we tried to understand what kind of changes the Member States see in the structure in details, for instance in the social forces and in ideational dimensions of the structure, and how they relate these changes with the transformation in the institution. In our analysis, we observed that the Member States emphasize to the emergence of new actors (the social forces dimension) in the international system, both new medium-powered countries, and other countries, which joined the international community especially after the decolonization process and after the end of the Cold War. In addition, they also emphasize some changes in the ideational dimension of the structure, such as the changing character of the international system, and the ways in which nations are related to each other. Moreover, the trend towards a more democratic international system, the increasing involvement of civil society, NGOs and other non-State actors in the international system can be counted as the other changes in the ideational dimension that the Member States emphasize.

Thirdly, we tried to comprehend how the Member States relate the transformation of the structure with the transformation of the institution. In that, we noticed that they simply draw a parallelism between these two transformations, and they perceive the transformation of the institution as something very necessary, urgent, and even vital in some examples, due to the transformation that occurred in the structure.

In short, according to the Member States, the UN Security Council should be reformed in order to adapt to the current new realities. In that regard, we can argue that the Member States perceive the interaction in the structure as we explained in the theoretical section. As Cox states, these categories of forces interact in a structure: material capabilities, ideas, and institutions, and there is no one-way determinism need to be assumed among these three; instead the relationships can be assumed to be reciprocal. However, Cox leaves it to the practitioner to decide whether in which way the forces run, and how they affect each other.\textsuperscript{221}

According to our theory, change occurs in the structure in general, and in the different dimensions of the structure in particular. According to the theory, these three elements (ideas, material capabilities and institutions) in the structure are interrelated. The “changes in the organization of production generate new social forces which, in turn, bring about changes in the structure of states; and the generalization of changes in the structure of states alters the problematic of world order.”\textsuperscript{222}

In our analysis, we can argue that, in our particular case, the role of the ideas/ideational dimension play a more fundamental role in the structure together with the material capabilities/material dimension. As seen above, the Member States primarily emphasize the transformations in the other dimensions of the structure, and then relate these transformations with the necessity of a transformation in the institutional dimension. In that sense, we can argue that the Member States think that the other two elements (ideas, material capabilities) in the structure, together, influence the institutional dimension. The transformation in the ideas and the material capabilities is having a triggering effect on the institutional level, especially on the initiatives which make change or transformation in the institutional dimension possible.

Fourthly, we tried to understand how the Member States identify the character of the transformation in the structure, or the character of changing process in general. In our analysis, we saw that they consider the current period as a rapidly evolving/changing transition process with lots of uncertainties. It is an ongoing, painful transition process for them, which is dramatically and rapidly changing and transforming old realities. Finally, it is a standstill situation from which both the peril and the potential may come out, and which will lead the international system into the new structure.

\textsuperscript{221} Cox. (1996). ibid. p. 98.
\textsuperscript{222} Ibid. p. 100.
Fifthly, we tried to comprehend how the Member States see the future of the current ongoing transformation process. It can be claimed that they perceive this transformation process as a period which later will lead to the emergence of a new era built upon a new international order, or a new structure.

Finally, in answering our main question that why there hasn’t been any transformation in the institutional dimension, or in other words a reform in the UN Security Council, it can be argued that it is mainly because the structure is a transforming entity together with all its elements, and because it has not yet settled down with a new world order and new institutions in it. According to our theory, there are three kinds of change in the international system, which are day-to-day change, conjunctural change and structural change, also known as the *longue durée.* In addition to that, according to Cox, the end of the Cold War is considered as the most recent conjunctural change which is contained in a broader structural change. The conjunctural change occurs within ten, twenty or fifty years, while the structural change may take a century or more. As has been seen in our analysis, both these two kinds of transformations have been identified by the Member States. In line with our theoretical considerations, we can argue that they consider the transformation process which started since the end of the Second World War as an example of a structural transformation, while they consider the Cold War as an example of conjunctural transformation which is included in the structural transformation.

Therefore, the ongoing transformation of the structure as a whole is one of the most important factors that make it difficult to finalize the transformation of the institutions because it is both dependent on the transformation of the structure as a whole and also dependent on the transformation of the other elements in the structure in particular. The finalization of the transformation process, both in other two elements of the structure and in the structure as a whole, is a necessary condition for the finalization of the transformation of the institutions. The structure is a transforming entity together with all its elements, and because it has not yet settled down with a new world order and new institutions in it. According to our theory, there are three kinds of change in the international system, which are day-to-day change, conjunctural change and structural change, also known as the *longue durée.* In addition to that, according to Cox, the end of the Cold War is considered as the most recent conjunctural change which is contained in a broader structural change. The conjunctural change occurs within ten, twenty or fifty years, while the structural change may take a century or more. As has been seen in our analysis, both these two kinds of transformations have been identified by the Member States. In line with our theoretical considerations, we can argue that they consider the transformation process which started since the end of the Second World War as an example of a structural transformation, while they consider the Cold War as an example of conjunctural transformation which is included in the structural transformation.

Therefore, the ongoing transformation of the structure as a whole is one of the most important factors that make it difficult to finalize the transformation of the institutions because it is both dependent on the transformation of the structure as a whole and also dependent on the transformation of the other elements in the structure in particular. The finalization of the transformation process, both in other two elements of the structure and in the structure as a whole, is a necessary condition for the finalization of the transformation of the institutions.
whole, will make it possible to transform the institutional dimension also. Finally, with the completion of transformation of each of its elements, including the institutions, the transformation of the structure will be completed, and a new structure will take place.

**Analysis of the Main Question: Part II**

1.2. Is there any tendency in the general debates of the GA on the discussions of the SC reform which can be considered as the reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement in the international system that has the potential of becoming a historic bloc?

By examining this question, we will be able to understand whether there is any reflection of the transformations of ideas and material capabilities on the institutional dimension, in addition, how the Member States perceive the current world order, for instance whether it is a hegemonic one, or a non-hegemonic one, etc.? Furthermore, we will be able to observe specifically whether there is any seed of a counter-hegemonic movement which can lead to the establishment of a historic bloc, and thus leading to the emergence of a new alternative world order, etc. Most of the theoretical considerations of Neo-Gramscianism, such as counter-hegemony, historic bloc, structural transformation, transformismo, etc., will be operationalized during this analysis. Examining the discussions in the GA in order to understand the tendencies of both the members, especially the permanent five, and the non-members of the Security Council will serve to these purposes.

In this section, we will be analyzing again the same four different sets of press releases in which the discussions on the SC reform in 1996, 1997, 2000, and 2006 can be found.

Recalling our theory, we can say that first due to the changes in the mode of production, new social groups start emerging, and these new social groups begin their initiatives, either hegemonic or counter-hegemonic depending on the character of the prevailing order, first in the domestic level, and then extending it to the international level by building alliances with other social forces in other states who share similar or same interests, aims, goals, etc., and finally build a historic bloc. The appearance of such a historic bloc is the indicator of the transformation in the different dimensions of the structure in particular and the transformation of the structure itself in general, thus, it shows that the emergence of an alternative world order is in progress. Therefore after the forming of a historic bloc, these changes trigger the
change in the form of state, and a new form or forms of state start emerging. The transformation in the institutional dimension follows this process, and finally the whole process of transformation reaches to another stable position with the establishment of a new alternative world order.

In a simplified form, the process can be described as follows: change in the mode of production (also in material capabilities and ideas) → the emergence of new social groups or forces → the starting of the counter-hegemonic or hegemonic movement in the domestic level → building alliances with other social forces in the international level and forming a historic bloc → the emergence of a new form of state → the change in the institutions → the emergence of a new alternative world order.

First of all, since Cox explains the changes in the mode of production and the emergence of new social forces in his book in details, we will not be repeating that here. Here, we will be looking at the institutional dimension, the UN, and try to see the reflections of these changes in the Security Council reform debates.

Secondly, as it has been analyzed in the previous section (1.1), we observed that there is a significant reflection of the transformation in the material and ideational dimensions of the structure on the institutional dimension, or more precisely on the UN in our case. Both the transformations in the material capabilities and ideas and the emergence of new social forces have had their reflections on the institutional dimension, and the change has been considered as a structural change which included the conjunctural change within it.

Now, as the third step, we will be looking at the debates in the GA to see whether there is any development which can be considered as a counter-hegemonic movement. However, before going into that, we first need to identify the character of the current world order, and see whether it is a hegemonic one or a non-hegemonic one. The reason for that is according to the theory first there must be a hegemonic world order, so that a counter-hegemonic movement can grow up. In other words, if the prevailing world order is not hegemonic, then there cannot be a counter-hegemonic movement.

---

So, our first question at this point is whether the current world order is hegemonic, or not. First of all, according to the theory, hegemony “is a coherent conjunction or fit between power, ideas and institutions.”

In practice, we can argue that this coherent conjunction or fit between these elements of the structure has been broken. This is because the main two elements of the structure (power and ideas) have been in a transformation process, since 1970s according to Cox, which is in turn affecting the institutions in the structure and causing the transformation of the institutions also.

In addition, again according to the theory, there is a close connection between the institutions and the hegemony. In that sense, the institutions both reflect the hegemonic character of a prevailing world order since they have a stabilizing function, and they also provide a legitimate background for the hegemonic power to pursue its hegemonic position. Moving from the ongoing reform debates about the current situation of the institution, the UN Security Council in our case, since the end of the Cold War, we can argue again that the fit in that point has been broken.

However, does the absence of coherence among these different elements of the structure indicate that the character of the current world order is not hegemonic? At that point we can turn to our theory again, and see what the theory says for such kind of a situation. According to Cox, there can be two main different characteristics of a world order which are hegemonic and non-hegemonic. However, a hegemonic world order can also be a consensual hegemonic order which implies that the prevailing hegemonic order is weakening and a transformation process is taking place. Cox names the period since the 1970s as a shift from a hegemonic world order to a consensual one which is still a hegemonic world order, however a weakening one.

Finally, moving from the discussion above, we will also be using Cox’s definition for the current world order and consider it as a hegemonic one, but a consensual one. Now, we can turn back to our point, and look at the debates in the GA to see whether there is any development which can be considered as a counter-hegemonic movement, or not.

---

227 Ibid. p. 33.
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During our analysis of the debates in the GA when trying to see whether there can be any movement which can be considered as the reflections of a counter-hegemonic movement, we focused on a few points. First, we analyzed how many times, by which Member States, and in which context the term “hegemony” has been used during the debates in the GA. Secondly, even though they didn’t contain the term “hegemonic”, or “hegemony”, we examined the statements which were critical in essence and have been directed to the Permanent Five (P-5) and to their privileged positions in the Council. When doing that, we both examined the statements which were general criticisms towards the P-5, and also particularly the statements on the veto privilege of the P-5. These two kinds of criticisms, one general and one specific, as a whole provide us the perception of the majority of the GA toward the “hegemonic” position of the P-5, and toward their “hegemonic instruments”, such as the veto power.

Thirdly, we examined the involvement of the Non-Aligned Movement (NAM) in the debates, since it is the largest single group in the UN which provides a common platform for the Member States whose statements and actions can be considered as counter-hegemonic. In that sense, we examined how many Member States related their statements with that of the NAM, how many Member States supported NAM’s ideas, and has NAM succeeded or failed in any of its initiatives during the reform process.

Firstly, concerning the usages of the term “hegemony” during the Security Council reform debates, we found just two statements. In one of them, Cuba uses it in the context of the “hegemonic interests of the Council members.” In addition Cuba calls these Member States as “a minority group of countries that had no interest in reforming the Council, because they benefited from the status quo,”231 which is the current prevailing hegemony. In its second usage, it has been mentioned by Paraguay to point out to “hegemonic interests” of the P-5.232 So, it can be argued that the concept “hegemony” hasn’t been widely utilized in the discourse of the statements that can be considered as “counter-hegemonic”.

Secondly, in our analysis, we examined the statements which were directed towards the P-5 and to their privileges even though they didn’t contain the specific the terms, such as “hegemonic”, or “hegemony”, however which can still be considered in the context of a “counter-hegemonic” discourse.

Starting with the general statements, we can first mention the emphasis of the representative of Nauru on “the present global upheaval”\(^{233}\) which demanded that the reform issue be finalized urgently and without further delay. In that respect, we can also mention Mauritius’ question in which it asks “for how long shall we continue to deny almost 3 billion people of the world a fair and just representation on the Security Council?”\(^{234}\) Furthermore, Spain also says that “there was a ‘natural majority’ in favor of reforming the Security Council, while a minority was blocking progress towards that reform.”\(^{235}\) Such terms in these statements, for instance “global upheaval”, “3 billion people of the world” and “natural majority”, can be interpreted as the reflections of a counter-hegemonic discourse, and while specifically targeting the minority of the Permanent Members of the Council in their criticisms, pointing out to the majority of the other Member States as a “single” body united for the enforcement of the reform of the Council.

In more specific statements, the current standstill situation of the SC reform has generally been related with the lack of will and effort of the Permanent Members of the Council. It has been claimed that the Permanent Members were preventing the progress in the reform process due to their desire to continue with the status quo without having any significant change in their privileged situations. As Philippines argues “the perpetuation of the status quo would only serve the interests of the Permanent Five.”\(^{236}\)

For instance, Singapore comes up with an idea why there is no progress in the SC reform yet, and he argues that “the root cause of the stalemate on Security Council reform was that no great Power was willing to submit its own vital interests to United Nations jurisdiction. The Great Powers did not want a strong United Nations, but one that was just credible enough to serve as an effective instrument of their will and policy. Only small countries were more inclined to take the United Nations on its own terms.”\(^{237}\) In the same manner, Lithuania argues that “one of the reasons reform was stalled was that the five permanent members of the Security Council did not want their privileges taken away, diluted or shared.”\(^{238}\)


Pakistan says that “a small minority, seeking to promote their own narrow national interests, had blocked progress on the reform question.”\(^{239}\)

In addition to these, Singapore argues that “the entire Security Council reform process was in danger of being lost in wilderness of logical contradictions and ambiguities. It was not clear that the current permanent members really wanted change except on their own terms and without any erosion of their current status. Crucial ambiguities in their positions had held up progress and would continue to do so unless clarified.”\(^{240}\)

In a similar way, Saint Kitts and Nevis also points his criticisms toward the P-5, and argues that “reforms would have to balance and protect the interests of all Member States and not simply appear to reward or benefit a privileged few. The United Nations should ensure the concerns of Member States, particularly of those in the developing world.”\(^{241}\)

Finally, we can also mention Turkey’s criticisms that “it seemed that the Permanent Members and a limited group of others, all fearing the loss of their ‘exclusive club rights’, were unwilling to strive to make the Council truly transparent and accountable”\(^{242}\), or Burkina Faso’s that “as long as the current Permanent Members did not seriously reconsider their position, no progress could be achieved.”\(^{243}\)

Permanent Five has also been criticized for their focus on their national interests instead of the interests of the international community when fulfilling their roles and responsibilities in the Council.

Singapore, for instance, says that “if the Security Council was to move from primary responsibility for international peace and security to global peace and security, there had to be a serious change of mindset among Council members, especially the Permanent Members. To


carry out their responsibilities seriously, they would have to put global interests ahead of national interests.”

Among these criticisms which were directed to the P-5 in general, there were also some criticisms which were directed specifically to the USA. For instance, Cuba speaks of the latest crisis in the occupied Palestinian territories just before the Israel – Lebanese War, and argues that “the Council totally paralyzed by the opposition of one Permanent Member. Thus, it was clear: today’s Security Council was efficient only in preserving the interests of the Permanent Members.” In addition to that, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea says that “the Security Council served to maintain the superpower status of the United States rather than international peace and security.” Finally, it can be claimed that Argentina points to the USA when saying “not a single State, not even the most powerful, was able to obtain everything it wanted, and that fact must be kept in mind during the current debate.”

Related with these general criticisms that were directed to P-5, now we will particularly be focusing on the statements which criticized the veto privilege of the P-5. As veto is probably the most important “hegemonic” tool of the P-5, the criticisms towards this tool can be interpreted as the reflections of a “counter-hegemonic” discourse too.

First of all, we can put forward the general criticisms towards the veto power. In one group of these criticisms, the veto power has been considered obsolete considering the present political realities. Furthermore, as Thailand points out “with the sole exception of the Permanent Five Members of the Council, Member States found the veto and its present practice outdated and unacceptable.”

---

In the second group of criticisms, the veto has been considered as an anti-democratic\textsuperscript{250} and anachronistic\textsuperscript{251} tool which was contrary to the principles that the UN was built on, such as the sovereign equality of the States.

As Cuba puts forward “the veto was anachronistic, anti-democratic privilege that should disappear [because] the opposition of one Permanent Member could prevent the will of the other 188 [now 191] Member States.”\textsuperscript{252}

In the final group of criticisms, some of the Member States draw parallelisms between the veto power and the aim of pursuing of self-interests. As Uruguay claims for instance that “the veto had never been used to respond to the collective interest of the international community, but only to satisfy the national interests of the Permanent Members.”\textsuperscript{253}

Similar expressions can be found in the statements of, for instance, Algeria in which it says that “the simple threat of veto had been exploited by countries for their own interest”\textsuperscript{254}, or Panama that claims that “the veto had lead to the Permanent Five avoiding their responsibilities when it was in their national interest to do so.”\textsuperscript{255}

Secondly, we can continue with the statements in which the Member States expressed their opinions about how the veto power should look like. Here, our analysis will be presented in two different time periods: 1) in the first part, the statements that have been delivered in 1996, 1997 and 2000 will be analyzed, and 2) in the second part, the statements in 2006 will be analyzed. This analytical separation will help us to understand the continuity and change in the positions of the Member States concerning the veto issue.

Beginning with the first part, due to high number of the Member States who expressed their opinions on this issue, this time we will not be presenting all the statements here in details.


Instead, we will draw a chart and place the Member States in it according to their opinions on the veto issue. In the chart, we will categorize the States in three groups: 1) those who want veto to be completely eliminated 2) those who want it to be gradually eliminated (first limitation and then elimination) and 3) those who want it to be limited. In addition to the chart, we will also be giving some sample statements from a few Member States in each of the groups in order to help the reader to understand the tendencies of the Member States in general.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complete Elimination</th>
<th>Senegal, Croatia, Cuba, Venezuela</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gradual Elimination</td>
<td>Vietnam, Swaziland, Syria, Guyana, Djibouti, Fiji, Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan, Ecuador, Kuwait, Tunisia, Cambodia, Rwanda, Nepal, Bulgaria, El Salvador, Sudan, Paraguay, Lithuania, Lesotho, Iran, Panama, Malaysia, Peru, Brazil, Kenya, Brunei Darussalam, Nigeria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limitation</td>
<td>Denmark, Sweden, Iceland, Finland, Norway, Belgium, Mexico, Bhutan, Singapore, Egypt, Ukraine, Paraguay, Slovenia, Ireland, Guatemala, Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Tendencies of the UN Membership Concerning the Veto Power of the P-5

Complete Elimination:

As it can be seen from the chart, the Member States who expressed their opinions in favor of abolishing the veto are in minority with just 4 supporters. While Venezuela argues that “the veto must be abolished in consonance with the principle of the sovereign equality of
States”\textsuperscript{256} Senegal considers it “to be anachronistic and discriminatory, and wishes for the ultimate abolition of the concept.”\textsuperscript{257}

**Gradual Elimination:**

The second group is the largest one with 28 supporters. The common goal of the Member States in this group is to first limit the scope of the veto according to certain constraints, and then continuing with a process leading to its complete elimination. In that group, the most commonly used expression in the statements of the Member States is curtailing the veto, with a view to its gradual elimination. For instance, Kenya says that “the veto power should be progressively curtailed and eventually eliminated”\textsuperscript{258} or Brunei Darussalam says that “use of the veto should be curtailed, with a view to its eventual elimination”\textsuperscript{259}.

Similar statements are, for instance, Brazil’s words that it “favored a curtailment of the veto, with a view to its gradual elimination”\textsuperscript{260}, Nigeria’s support for “the curtailment of the use of the veto, and even supported its abolition”\textsuperscript{261}, or Peru’s words that “the veto must be eliminated and, until that occurred, restricted to actions taken by the Council under Chapter VII of the Charter.”\textsuperscript{262}

**Limitation**

In the third group, there are 16 Member States who supports of putting some limitations on the veto power.

The most proposed limitation is that the veto should only be applied to actions taken under Chapter VII of the Charter. For instance, Lithuania says that “the five permanent members might agree to limit, by voluntary declarations, the scope of application of their veto right to Chapter VII of the United Nations Charter.” In a similar way, El Salvador says that “the veto should be confined to issues under Chapter VII of the Charter,” Paraguay says that “the veto should be restricted exclusively to matters coming under Chapter VII of the Charter” and Guatemala also feels that “the veto power granted by the Charter should be limited to action under Chapter VII of the Charter.”

Another proposed limitation is that the Member States who uses the veto power should explain the reasons of it. As Denmark says that “a permanent member would have to state the reasons why it had decided to exercise its right of veto in a given situation” or as Singapore suggests “the Permanent Members of the Council should explain to the General Assembly of their usages of both the formal and the informal veto.”

A final proposal for limitation is to limit the areas that the veto power can be used. In that part, Member States argue that the issues which are related with human rights, genocide, and crimes against humanity should be in a safe area which cannot be vetoed by a Permanent Member.

In the second part, now we will be analyzing the statements in 2006 in order to see the continuity and change in the positions of Member States concerning the veto issue.

However, before continuing with the statements of 2006, we can first present the final picture of the issue at the end of the debate in 2000. As Japan puts forward, “while three Permanent Members did not address the veto issue, the representative of the United States said the veto had real value in helping the Council maintain international peace and security, and that it
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would continue to oppose any effort to limit it.” Further more “the representative of Russian Federation said the veto was not a privilege, but a serious factor for ensuring consensus and effectiveness of Security Council decisions. The veto was the backbone of the coherent work of the Council, a guarantee against arbitrariness of unilateral actions against the interests of the United Nations Members on whose behalf the Council acted.” Apart from these two, the other three Permanent Members stayed silent on the veto issue. Nevertheless, it was clear, as Rwanda pointed out that “all signs show that none of the Permanent Five was ready to surrender its veto.”

So, in 2006, there have been just a few statements which touched to the veto issue, and even from these ones, it is possible to trace the words of despair. For instance, one of the Member States which had the “toughest” critical stance on the veto issue was Singapore in 2000, and in 2006, Singapore says that “the reality must be accepted that the Permanent Five Members would not give up their veto right.” Another Member which had a similar position was Pakistan, and in 2006 Pakistan says that “now it was clear that the P-5 would neither surrender nor share the veto.” Furthermore, clearly showing the despair of the majority of the Member States, Ghana says that “while his country acknowledged that the Five Permanent Council Members saw the veto as an important tool in the discharge of their responsibilities, it stifled discussion.”

Apart from these, there were just a few Member States who expressed their opinions about the veto issue; however they did not seem hopeful at all. Their position, which can be summed up as “we cannot eliminate it, so let’s at least try to limit its usage”, can be seen in the expressions of Iraq, for instance, that “they should be seeking to limit the use of the veto to instances where the Council was acting under Chapter VII or when it was acting to alleviate grave human right violations.”
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275 Mauritius, Bahrain, Kuwait, Vietnam, Uruguay and Malaysia
The analysis of the statements of the Member States concerning the veto issue has been done in order to see the continuity and change in their positions, which in turn helps us to analyze, through this veto issue example, whether there has been a transformismo in that process, or not. Here, the transformismo, as one of our Neo-Gramscian theoretical tools, is applied to the discussions of the veto issue to see how elites of certain countries, “though they may come to international institutions with the idea of working from within to change the system, are condemned to work within the structures of passive revolution because transformismo absorbs potentially counter-hegemonic ideas and makes these ideas consistent with hegemonic doctrine.”

In our analysis, in which we observed a significant number of Member States, in total 48 some of which were really very tough and harsh in their criticisms, who focused on the veto issue and clearly opposed to this privilege (4 complete elimination, 28 gradual elimination and 16 limitation requests) can be perceived as the initial stance of these Member States. However, after 6 years, what we see in the debates of 2006 is completely another picture in which just 6 Member States continue to clearly support the idea of limitation of veto. Furthermore, some Member States, such as Singapore and Pakistan, which had the toughest stances against the veto privilege in 2000, comes to a new point in 2006, and admits the “reality” of the fact that “P-5 would neither surrender nor share the veto.”

Moving from this empirical finding, it can be argued that a certain degree of transformismo took place during the SC reform debates on the veto issue due to the changes in the positions of many Member States. It can be said that transformismo absorbed the potential counter-hegemonic ideas about the veto issue, and made these ideas consistent with the hegemonic doctrine.

Thirdly, about the NAM’s involvement in the reform debates, we can point out to a few findings. First of all, throughout the reform process, according to our observation, NAM’s position has been shared and supported by 26 countries. Recalling that NAM has 112 Member States in total, the number of 26 might sound small, however we should keep in mind that in our analysis we counted only the Member States who delivered a statement on
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278 Swaziland, Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Pakistan, Bhutan, Vietnam, Algeria, India, Turkey, Laos, UAE, Brunei Darussalam, Gambia, Antigua and Barbuda, Honduras, Tunisia, Ghana, Ecuador, Rwanda, Sudan, Myanmar, Saudi Arabia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Venezuela.
the SC reform issue, which means not all the NAM Members delivered statements in the GA. In addition to that, among the Members of the NAM who made a speech in the GA, some just didn’t mention their support clearly in their statements, so we didn’t count them also. Finally, we only analyzed the debates in 1996, 1997, 2000 and 2006, not in the other years. These can be put forward as the reasons why the number doesn’t look so big.

Related with the second point, we tried to understand whether NAM, as a single unit, has succeeded or failed in any of its initiatives during the reform process. In that regard, we can mention one important success and one important weakness of the NAM during the process. It can be said that NAM’s success has been due to its strong and united stance during the debates to pass a resolution in the GA concerning the changes in the structure of the Council which required Charter amendment. With this resolution, NAM has succeeded in equalizing the approval of any significant change in the Council in accordance with the constraints of article 108 of the UN Charter, which means preventing the enforcement of any important change, such as an expansion in the Council, in the structure of the Council without the approval of the two thirds of the Member States, which Egypt calls a safety net for instance. This was certainly an achievement for the majority of the GA against the “quick-fix” reform proposals in the Council.

On the other hand, the weakness of the NAM can be seen especially in the second phase of the reform process in which the general discussions were over, and when particular reform proposals were being debated. While in the first phase, the involvement NAM as an umbrella platform in the process has been significant, in the second phase, we can say that NAM couldn’t play such an important role due to its inability in proposing an alternative, complete and united reform proposal under its own title. This caused the splitting up of the movement’s involvement in the reform process as a united initiative and the coming out of various reform proposals which were prepared and supported by lesser number of Member States. This,
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280 The reform proposals which didn’t have a comprehensive perspective and which just tried to finish the reform process with some quick and small changes in the structure of the Council has been named as ‘quick-fix’ solutions by many of the Member States. Reforming the Council’s structure by adding Japan, Germany and a few developing countries is the most referred quick-fix solution.
indeed, was a disadvantage for the future of these various reform proposals and for their acceptability.

*A General Analysis of the Important Points: Part II*

After analyzing the change or the transformation in the structure and considering it as an example of structural transformation in the Coxian sense, in the second part (1.2) we moved one step further and tried to see whether there is any tendency in the general debates of the GA on the discussions of the SC reform which can be considered as the reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement in the international system that has the potential of becoming a historic bloc?

The reason why we focused on the counter-hegemonic movement is that according to Gramsci, it is considered as, so-to-say, a very important turning point in the transformation process of the structure. A counter-hegemonic movement leads to the establishment of a historic bloc which later can lead to the establishment of an alternative world order.

As Gramsci says, counter-hegemony is related with building up the basis of an alternative state and society upon the leadership of the working class, and creating alternative institutions and alternative intellectual resources within existing society, and building bridges between workers and other subordinate classes. Counter-hegemony can be established within an existing hegemony while resisting the pressures against the framework of bourgeois hegemony.²⁸¹ In the international level, counter-hegemony plays more or less the same role. It is related with building up the basis of an alternative world order, creating alternative institutions, etc.

In our particular case, the existence of the reflections a counter-hegemonic movement in the debates of the GA will help us to understand the roots of a possible historic bloc that might appear in the future which can lead to the finalization of the transformation process in the structure. Moreover, all these will help us to understand, particularly, the current situation of transformation in the institutional level, and provide us the necessary data in order to answer our main question, for instance why there hasn’t been any significant reform in the UN Security Council yet, is it likely to happen in the near future, and finally will the current institution be replaced with an alternative institution, etc.

Moving from our empirical findings, first we can say that there has been a structural transformation going on. Secondly, the current character of the world order is a hegemonic one, but a consensual hegemonic, as Cox names it. Thirdly, since it is a hegemonic world order, even though a consensual one, it opens the possibilities for a counter-hegemonic movement. Hence, fourthly, can we speak of the reflections of a counter-hegemonic movement in the institutional level? Moving from our empirical findings, it can be argued that there are significant reflections of a counter-hegemonic movement in the institutional level. First of all, we can mention the critical statements which were directed particularly to the P-5 and to their privileges. These can be considered as the statements which fall into the boundaries of a counter-hegemonic discourse. Secondly, we can present the NAM as an important platform which provides a common background to the Member States whose actions and words can be considered within the limits of a counter-hegemonic movement. Since NAM is the single largest group in the UN, it holds the potential for providing the necessary ideological and material support for a counter-hegemonic movement.

After defining the current “upheaval” within the UN as a movement which can be considered as the reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement, we can move one step further, in accordance with our theoretical considerations, and ask whether this counter-hegemonic movement holds the potential to lead to a historic bloc, or not.

In that regard, we can argue that, even though there seems to be a counter-hegemonic movement, due to its significant weaknesses, it cannot lead to the establishment of a historic bloc. One significant weakness as has been shown in our analysis is that there is not yet a clear counter-hegemonic discourse which has been shared by the members of this movement. Instead, there are other kinds of statements or expressions which can be considered within the boundaries of a counter-hegemonic discourse. The second weakness is related with the platform, the Non-Aligned Movement, which motivates and carries the counter-hegemonic movement. As has been shown in our analysis, the NAM, especially in the long run, is not capable of bringing various strands of the counter-hegemonic movement, and uniting them under a single umbrella, and lead to the establishment of a historic bloc. As a third weakness, we can mention the impact of transformismo on the counter-hegemonic movement. In our analysis, the capacity of transformismo to absorb the counter-hegemonic ideas has been seen in the example of veto issue.
The analyses have been done in 1.1 and 1.2 sections together provide us the necessary data to answer our main question of why there is no significant progress in the reform process of the UN Security Council? Or in other words, why the reform didn’t take place in the UN Security Council so far which is an institutional example of the structure? In the final analysis, it can be argued that even though the reflections of a counter-hegemonic movement can be observed in the UN, it is not yet strong and united enough in order to lead to the forming of a historic bloc. The existence of a historic bloc is the indicator of the transformation in the different dimensions of the structure in particular and the transformation of the structure itself in general, thus, it shows that the emergence of an alternative world order is in progress. Therefore after the forming of a historic bloc, these changes trigger the change in the form of state, and a new form or forms of state start emerging. The transformation in the institutional dimension follows this process, and finally the whole process of transformation reaches to another stable position with the establishment of a new alternative world order. However, due to the fact that there is not yet a historic bloc, the current ongoing structural transformation process, even though it continues at the moment, doesn’t lead to the finalization of the transformation process of the institutional dimension which finally will be followed with the establishment of an alternative world order.

3.3 The Normative Analysis

In this part, we will be dealing with our second question, which is our normative question, and try to examine how the current proposals, models, etc. for the reform of the SC can be evaluated from a Critical Theory perspective, and whether the current proposals, models, etc. meet the general demands, main considerations and arguments of the Critical Theory, or not.

In short, the question can also be formulated as how the SC should be reformed according to Critical Theory? This part, of course, will not go into details and analyze all debated aspects of the SC reform issue and come up with some concrete and detailed reform proposals. The thesis is not meant to be a study to function as a reform proposal, instead, it is aimed looking at the discussions on the SC reform in general, and evaluating them through the normative basis of the Critical Theory.

In this section, we will be evaluating four reform proposal models which have been discussed in the GA. The first proposal was introduced on 11 July 2005, and known as the “Group of
The second proposal was tabled on 26 July 2005, and co-sponsored by the Member States known as “Uniting for Consensus”. The third one is the “African Union Proposal” dated on 18 July 2005, and the last one is a proposal known as the “Small Five”.

Before starting evaluating and criticizing them, first, we should give some brief information about the content of these reform proposals.

Group of Four Resolution (G-4) has mainly been prepared by those Member States who aspire to become a permanent member in the reformed Council, such as Japan, Germany, India and Brazil. The model suggests that the Council’s membership increased from 15 to 25, by adding 6 permanent and 4 non-permanent members. The new permanent members would be elected, as follows: two from African States, two from Asian States, one from Latina American and Caribbean States, and one from Western European and other States. In addition to that, the 4 non-permanent members would be elected, as follows: one from African States, one from Asian States, one from Eastern European States, and one from Latin American and Caribbean States. Concerning the veto and other privileges of the permanent members, this model suggests that the new members will have the same rights with the existing permanent members; however the new permanent members will not use the veto power until its future has been clarified. Furthermore, the number of affirmative votes will be increased from 9 to 14, and a review mechanism for a reevaluation of the representativeness of the Council will be started after 15 years from the reform.

The second proposal, Uniting for Consensus (UFC), has been proposed by Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Italy, Malta, Mexico, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Spain and Turkey. According to UFC, the Council should consist of 25 members, with the current
permanent five members staying the only permanent members. UFC suggests an increase only in the number of non-permanent members which will serve for a term of two-years with a possibility of immediate re-election, and these seats should be distributed by each geographical group as follows: 6 from African States; 5 from Asian States; 4 from Latin American and Caribbean States; 3 from Western European and other States; 2 from Eastern European States. Furthermore, UFC suggests that the number of affirmative votes will be increased from 9 to 15, and about the veto power, UFC suggests that there should be a restraint in the use of veto.

The African Union Proposal (AUP) has been prepared and supported by the African States, and suggests granting Africa 2 permanent and 5 non-permanent seats with the same privileges, including the veto, as the other permanent members of the Council. In total, Council’s membership should be increased from 15 to 26. These additional 11 seats should be distributed as follows: 2 permanent seats and 2 non-permanent seats for African States, 2 permanent seats and 1 non-permanent seat for Asian States, 1 non-permanent seat for Easter European States, 1 permanent seat and 1 non-permanent seat for Latin American and Caribbean States, and 1 permanent seat for Western European and other States.

Finally there is a proposal which is called as Small Five (S-5). This proposal is particularly concerned with the working methods of the Council and focuses on improvements which can enhance the accountability, transparency and inclusiveness of its work. Concerning the veto, the model suggests that a permanent member should explain the reasons of its usage of veto. Furthermore, no permanent member should cast a non-concurring vote in the sense of Article 27, paragraph 3, of the Charter in the event of genocide, crimes against humanity and serious violations of international humanitarian law.

Evaluating the content of the proposals presented above in details would go beyond the purposes and limits of our study. Therefore, here, we will briefly be touching to some general
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290 UN Charter, Art. 27, Para. 3: “Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.”. http://www.un.org/aboutun/charter/. (2007-04-08).
concepts and, by using the normative basis of Critical Theory, try to evaluate and criticize the four proposals that were presented above.

If we are to follow Linklater’s words in which he sums up Critical Theory’s normative aims that “it is to increase the spheres of social interaction that are governed by dialogue and consent rather than power and force; to expand the number of human beings who have access to a speech community that has the potential to become universal; and to create socioeconomic preconditions of effective, as opposed to nominal, involvement for all members of that community.”

The SC reform in essence is an attempt to increase the spheres of interaction that are governed by dialogue and consent rather than power and force. The attempts to increase the number of the Member States in the Council can be considered as expanding the number of human beings who have access to a speech community. The expansion of the Council in that sense aims to increase the representativeness of the Council and embrace the underrepresented parts, such as developing countries, Asia, Africa, Latin America, etc., of the international community. These four proposals, sharing these same aims, might have different ways of realizing these aims; however they can still be considered as in line with the normative aims of Critical Theory.

Recalling the “Radical Democracy” understanding of Critical Theory, which briefly means the deepening of the democratic project of modernity, as Mouffe claims, the proposals above can be called as contributing to the normative aims of Critical Theory since they all aim to strengthen the current democratic situation of the Council and try to make it more democratic. In that regard, the most important development is that these proposals try to increase the representativeness of the Council by adding Member States from the underrepresented parts of the international community. However, the biggest conflict at this point is to balance the requests to increase the representativeness of the Council and at the same time maintain the efficiency of it. Simply put, it has been argued that a certain limit should be put in expanding the numbers of the Council in order to maintain the efficiency of it. This is also in line with the idea of Radical Democracy, because while Radical Democracy
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demands the recognition of difference and maximum pluralism on one hand, it also aims to do this without destroying the community.  

Increasing the numbers of the Member States in the Council can also be related with the equality and justice notions of Critical Theory, since Critical theorists think that peoples, individuals, international organizations, non-governmental organizations must also be represented in the international system as well as the states to provide global justice and equality. As it can be remembered from the criticisms of many African States during the debates in the GA, they claimed that increasing the number of the African States in the Council will help to the reparation of the historical injustices that have been done against Africa. As Linklater says the international system which ensures the international justice and equality between different cultures, etc. is the international society which the Critical Theory aims to build.  

In that regard, it can be claimed that the current proposals, even though sharing some of these aims in essence, are considerably weak in meeting the normative goals of Critical Theory since they only propose an increase in the number of the States, not the other actors in the international system.

In addition to strengthening the representative character of the Council, other proposals, such as enhancing the transparency of the working methods, including the constraints on the usage of veto privilege, and the permanency issue are all important attempts in order to deepen the democratic character of the Council. In that regard, S-5 model can be perceived as an important model that can contribute to the democratization of the working methods, including their suggestion on the usage of veto. Finally, the UFC’s concerns about permanency issue is should also be mentioned as a positive contribution. As UFC suggests, the reform should not include the addition of further new permanent members to the Council since the notion of permanency in essence contradicts with the idea of democracy. Actually the current structure of the Council in which exist five permanent members already contradicts with the idea of democracy; however, due to the strong oppositions of the P-5, it is not possible, at the moment, to remove the permanent situations of the existing permanent members. Therefore, the UFC at least tries to not to further this anachronistic situation, and also anti-democratic according to UFC, by opposing to the addition of further new permanent members.
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In sum, we can argue that the general overview of the proposals show that they are not in a contradictory position with the basic concerns, assumptions, and considerations of the Critical Theory to how the transformation of such an institution should be, and how an alternative institution should be created.

### 3.4 The Emancipatory Analysis

In this part, we will be dealing with our third question, which is our emancipatory question, and try to examine how a change/reform could be possible in the UN Security Council?

According to Critical Theory, following Marx’s contention, social theory is a critical activity which can help to liberate human beings from the alienating social and political institutions created by the ‘dead generations’. In Horkheimer’s words, unlike traditional theory, “the aim of critical theory was to understand how socially-created constraints upon the freedom of human subjects could be reduced and, where possible, eliminated.”

When examining our first question, we tried to analyze why it hasn’t been possible, so far, to reform the UN Security Council, and in this section, in line with the emancipatory aims of Critical Theory, we will now try to point out to the unnecessary constraints or obstacles that prevent a successful reform in the SC, and try to give an idea, moving from the theoretical considerations, about how a change/reform could be possible.

As has been pointed out in Cox’s writings, “each successive structure of world order was characterized by the emergence of new forms of state, new historic blocs, and new configurations of production relations.” In that sense, we analyzed the debates in the GA in order to see whether there is any movement which can be considered as the reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement, which in turn can lead to the forming of a historic bloc. In our analysis, we observed that, even though there exists a movement which can be considered as a reflection of a counter-hegemonic movement, yet it is not capable of building a historic bloc which might lead to the establishment of an alternative world order.
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Therefore it can be argued that one of the most important obstacles or missing factors in front of a successful transformation in the institutional level is the absence of a historic bloc. According to the theory, the role and the functions of a historic bloc is seen in the process towards the transformation of the structure, so that a change may happen in an established order, and a new order can be built. As a result, for the recent reflections of the counter-hegemonic movement in the UN to become successful, it should lead to the forming of a historic bloc.

In our analysis in the previous sections, we observed that the character of the prevailing world order can be named as a “weakening hegemony” or a “transition period”. Consequently, we can argue that there is still a possibility of constructing an alternative historic bloc and move towards the establishment of an alternative world order. In that regard, when we analyze the current debates in the SC reform, we can argue that there is no significant sign or step of constructing an alternative historic bloc which can lead to the establishment of an alternative world order. There are many different “counter-hegemonic” actors which compete with each other. The Non-Aligned Movement and the African States seem the strongest blocs in the UN, however they are still far from achieving a united position to form an alternative historic bloc. The NAM serves more like a platform in which Member Stats can express their “counter-hegemonic” ideas, but it is a platform to which the Member States are loosely bounded. Furthermore, the NAM also lacks a leader country. When we examine the debates in the UN, we can see that Pakistan, Venezuela and Cuba are always in the front; however they cannot motivate other members. Finally, when it comes to the discussion of the more concrete issues about the reform of the SC, we can argue that the Member States move together with their regional partner and neighbor countries.

At that point comes the question of how the current counter-hegemonic movement can form an alternative historic bloc? As has been explained in our theoretical section, there are mainly two ways of challenging a prevailing hegemony which are war of movement and war of position.\(^{299}\) However, Cox claims that “there is very little likelihood of a war of movement at the international level through which radicals would seize control of the superstructure of international institutions.”\(^{300}\) Looking at the character of the current counter-hegemonic movement, it can be argued that it is more of a war of position rather than a war of movement.

\(^{299}\) Forgacs, D. ibid. p. 222-230.
going on at present. As a result, we can claim that the current war of position should continue during the UN Security Council reform process in order to bring the movement into success.

At that point, we should also pay attention to the examples of transformismo occurring in the international institutions. As “Daniel Patrick Moynihan claims, Third World radicals do not control international institutions. Even if they did, they could achieve nothing by it” because their struggle and counter-hegemonic ideas could be absorbed by transformismo. As has been seen in the example of the veto issue, there exists a potential of transformismo which is capable of absorbing counter-hegemonic ideas. In that regard, for the maintenance of the strength of the current counter-hegemonic movement, there shouldn’t be left any space for further transformismo.

Furthermore, more precisely, we can argue that the strengthening of the current counter-hegemonic movement can be sustained by building closer and more united initiatives. In that sense, the divided character of the counter-hegemonic movement, especially in the second phase of the reform debates where the particular reform proposals are being discussed, should be overcome. At that point, the most likely candidate that can serve as a uniting factor for all counter-hegemonic initiatives, the NAM should increase its involvement in the second phase of the debates. This can be maintained by preparing a single reform proposal model under the title of NAM, instead of different smaller reform models, such as UFC, or AUP.

In short, moving from our theoretical arguments, it can be claimed that without a strong and united counter-hegemonic movement, it is not possible to form a historic bloc, which is a very important step in building hegemony in the international level, thus opening up the path for the transformation towards an alternative world order. Consequently, the way to open up the possibilities for a successful transformation on the institutional level is to achieve in forming a historic bloc first, then the rest might follow.
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Chapter IV: Conclusion

“This is the working group with the longest history of all the high-level working groups chaired by the President of the General Assembly. It was established on 3 December 1993 by resolution 48/26. Several permanent representatives who helped to conceive and elaborate further the mandate of this working group are no longer here at the United Nations.”

Razali Ismail, the GA president in 1997, was giving a speech to the GA speaking on the Open-Ended Working Group on the Security Council Reform, and its “long” three years of working process which he called as the longest working group has ever been held by the GA. Simply, he was warning the General Assembly by reminding them of this fact. In addition to Razali Ismail’s warnings, after 13 years of functioning, South Africa was criticizing the same body by saying that “a mechanism was needed to replace the faltering Open-Ended Working Group – which repeatedly failed to find common ground on critical issues and in negotiating a way to bridge the differences on Council enlargement.”

Ten more years have passed since Razali Ismail’s speech, countless meetings have been done, and various reform proposal models are being discussed, yet the Member States are still widely divided even in most fundamental issues, and as a result, now in 2007, there is still no significant progress in the UN Security Council reform issue. The frustration increases among the Member States after intensive discussions on the issue for almost 20 years so far, and the question still remains unanswered: When there will be a Security Council reform?

GA President Razali was very hopeful in 1997, and was expecting a strong momentum going to be gained in the process in the following year, and hopefully the reform issue could be finalized by 1998. However, how could he know that the solution was too far away then and even far away from the point that has been reached in 2007?

Moving from this problematic, as has been mentioned in our thesis several times, we mainly tried to understand and explain why it hasn’t been possible to reform the UN Security Council which is the institutional element of the structure. According to our theoretical framework, there should have been a transformation on the institutional level too, due to the

transformations in the other two dimensions, namely the material capabilities, and ideas, because the institutions have been valid, effective and harmonious within their own world orders.

As has been put forward before, our main argument in the thesis was that the current debates in the UN concerning the reform of the SC is unable to produce a successful transformation of that body because it is not possible for an institution to finalize its own transformation independent from that of the structure as a whole. In accordance with this, as we already observed in our analysis, it has been perceived that the structure is transforming as a whole together with each of its constituting elements, ideas, material capabilities and institutions. However, there is not yet a stability in the structure, and the transformation process is still continuing. Therefore, there is not yet a reached consensus or stability in the transformation process of the institutions either, which means the reform of the UN Security Council in our case.

As it has been explained in details in the explanatory dimension of our analysis, there has been an ongoing transformation taking place both in the structure as a whole, and also in each of the elements of the structure in particular. Therefore, in accordance with this, we observed that the main reason was the transitory character of the structure in front of the “successful” reform of the UN Security Council. According to Baaz, “in a transformative period, when an old order is fading away and a new one is emerging, turbulence often arises”. In that light, the current stalemate on the reform of the UN SC can well be considered as a reflection of this transitory character of the world order, because the present world order is also considered as a weakening of a hegemony which indicates a period of transformation. Therefore, since we are in the transformation process, there is not yet any result/consequence of the process in institutional form, because institutions are built in accordance with the values, norms, ideas, etc. of the hegemonic world order, and they function, in one sense, as an instrument which helps the maintenance of the existing hegemonic world order. In that sense, we can argue that they change together with the transformation of the world order. One significant reflection of the question of why a concrete solution cannot be maintained can be seen in the statements of many Member States in which, after 10 years of discussions, they suggest making some transitory or temporary changes instead of long-lasting reforms.

In addition to this, as Netherlands argued once, many complicating factors remained “despite the increasing call to deal with the issue of Security Council reform. One that was perhaps less often expressed was that Member States were hesitant to replace the existing power structure with a new fixed power structure. Any solution should, in that view, reflect the fact that the world was dynamic and today’s likely candidates for a permanent seat could be different ones tomorrow.”  

This can be seen as a general reflection of the tendency of the Member States in the UN towards the reform of the SC. The Member States perceive the reform process as a part of a wider process of transformation which is taking place in the structure in general, and consequently they want to keep the current power structure in the SC until a new power structure is established. The world is in a dynamic situation at the moment, and without a settling has been achieved in the structure first, it is not likely to see a reform in the institutions in it.

However “a transformative period contains several alternative futures; simply put, it constitutes a formative period – a crossroad, with different possible outcomes.” That means, first, even now a change is possible in the UN Security Council, however since this is still the transformation period, this can be a transitory or temporary change, as some Member States calls for it at the moment, which will maintain the stability until the structure will find its new balance later, and when a new order is established. Secondly, it means that this transitory period will find a new stability sooner or later with the establishment of a new world order with new institutions in it.

Speaking of the several alternative futures, we can relate this with the future world order prospects of Cox. As Cox rightly states it is not trying to predict the future, but rather drawing attention to factors which could incline an emerging world order. Here, moving from Cox’s theoretical considerations, we will try to evaluate the four reform proposals which are being discussed in the UN.

According to Cox the first possible future world order could be built upon the emerging of a new hegemony.
“The inter-state power configuration that could maintain this world order, provided its member states conformed to this model, is a coalition centering upon the United States, the Federal Republic of Germany, and Japan, with the support of other OECD states, the cooptation of a few of the more industrialized Third World countries, such as Brazil, and of leading conservative OPEC countries, and the possibility of revived detente allowing for a greater linkage of the possibility of the Soviet sphere into the world economy of international production.”

The second possible outcome is a non-hegemonic world structure of conflicting power centers.

And finally according to Cox, a third and more remotely possible outcome would be “the development of a counter-hegemony based on a Third World coalition against core country dominance and aiming toward the autonomous development of peripheral countries and the termination of the core-periphery relationship. A counter-hegemony would consist of a coherent view of an alternative world order, backed by a concentration of power sufficient to maintain a challenge to core countries.”

When we examine the current debates in the SC reform issue, we can argue that a matching can be done between the possible future prospects that Cox make and the proposals on the table. For instance, G-4 resolution can be matched with the first possible future prospect of Cox which is based on a coalition, the USA being in the center and surrounded by Germany, Japan, Brazil and some other Organization of the Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) and Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries. As it can be recalled from the G-4 resolution, it aims to reform the Council by adding primarily Germany, Japan, India and Brazil, and then a few more countries from the developing world in order to increase the representativeness of it.

The second possible outcome, which is thought to be a non-hegemonic world order, can be matched with the proposals of UFC and AUP. Their proposals, although being critical in essence, are not seen as the strongest candidates of the reform issue. With these two reform proposal models, the Member States in the UN seems to be divided into three main groups
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gathered around different reform proposals, G-4, UFC, and AUP. Consequently, it can be argued that an outcome of this process, if it leads to the establishment of a new world order, could be a non-hegemonic one with various conflicting power centers.

Finally, a third possible outcome would be “the development of a counter-hegemony based on a Third World coalition against core country dominance and aiming toward the autonomous development of peripheral countries and the termination of the core-periphery relationship.” However, we can argue, moving from our findings in the empirical section, that the present circumstances are not yet mature enough to produce a successful counter-hegemonic movement due to the absence of a historic bloc, and thus not able to establish an alternative new world order. As has been discussed in the previous sections, the strongest candidate for such a situation could be the NAM, probably, because it is the single largest group within the UN which can gather the Member States which have some kind of ideas which might be considered as counter-hegemonic. However, since this is not likely to occur soon, the third future prospect seems far to reach.

Moving from our observations, it can be argued that the current stalemate in the reform process is likely to continue. In our study, we basically tried to understand and explain why the institutional transformation didn’t take place so far, however whether how and when the reform of the UN Security Council will be finalized still remains as a question.

Finally, at that point, there can be seen an increasing demand coming from the Member States for transitory or temporary solutions, however, as has been explained before, the temporary solutions can just be capable of freezing the discussion for a while, but not capable of solving the ongoing problems. Therefore, even if agreed on a temporary solution, sooner or later, the demands for a comprehensive reform will rise again.
Annex

4 March 1996: Secretary-General of the United Nations, Boutros Boutros-Ghali

1 April 1996: Secretary-General Boutros Boutros-Ghali

24 September 1996: Poland, Denmark, Japan, Canada, Egypt, Costa Rica, Moldova, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea

10 March 1997: President of the United Nations General Assembly, Razali Ismail

8 April 1997: President of the United Nations General Assembly, Razali Ismail

10 June 1997: President of the United Nations General Assembly, Razali Ismail


29 September 1997: Singapore, Egypt, New Zealand, Saint Kitt and Nevis, Republic of Korea, Sudan, Israel, Republic of Moldova

4 December 1997: China, the USA, Pakistan, Nigeria, Ukraine, Swaziland, Egypt, Sweden, Argentina, Japan, Lebanon, Syria, Canada, Turkey, Malaysia, Colombia, Spain, Malta, Lithuania, Latvia, Slovenia, San Marino, Fiji, Belgium, Viet Nam, El Salvador, Paraguay, Portugal.

9 December 1997: Slovenia

13 September 2000: Croatia, Belgium, South Africa, Japan, Egypt, Viet Nam, Barbados, Mexico, Denmark, Burkina Faso, Mauritania, Guinea-Bissau, Iraq, Spain, Kuwait

16 November 2000 (a): Croatia, Mexico, Australia, Bhutan, Viet Nam, Japan, France, Singapore, Algeria, Germany, Ukraine, Cuba, Senegal, Ireland, South Africa, the USA, India, Guatemala
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16 November 2000 (b): Spain, New Zealand, Togo, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, China, Argentina, Indonesia, Angola, the UK, Turkey, Canada, Peru, Republic of Korea, Myanmar, UAE, Burkina Faso, Venezuela, Portugal, Egypt, Italy, Brazil, Kenya, Czech Republic, Denmark, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Belarus, Belgium, Colombia, Malta, Kyrgyzstan, Romania, Cyprus, Yemen, San Marino, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Mongolia, Gambia, Nigeria

17 November 2000 (a): Libya

17 November 2000 (b): Uruguay, Papua New Guinea, Costa Rica, Pakistan, Thailand, Antigua and Barbuda, Kazakhstan, Madagascar, Hungary, Slovenia, Honduras, Philippines, Malaysia, Lesotho, Iran, Panama, Paraguay, Nicaragua, United Republic of Tanzania, Lithuania

17 November 2000 (c): Turkmenistan, Rwanda, Tunisia, Russia, Guyana, Djibouti, Poland, Fiji, Ghana, Federated States of Micronesia, Syria, Ecuador, Kuwait, Cambodia, Dominican Republic, Nauru, Republic of Moldova, Israel, Nepal, Chile, Albania, El Salvador, the Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Sudan, Grenada, Greece, Ethiopia, Iraq, Cameroon

20 July 2006: Germany, Japan, Costa Rica, Algeria, Pakistan, Netherlands, Armenia, Egypt, Switzerland, Italy, South Africa, Jordan, Nicaragua, Liechtenstein, San Marino, Cuba, Portugal, Sweden, Botswana, Peru, Mauritius, Denmark, Uganda, Nigeria, Brazil, Russian Federation, Indonesia, Colombia, Jamaica, China, Argentina, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Belgium, Iraq, Qatar, Guatemala, Iceland, New Zealand, Mongolia, Finland, Australia, France, Poland, Singapore, Spain, Senegal, Ghana, United Kingdom, Bulgaria, Slovenia, Chile, Mexico

20 July 2006: Mali, Nauru, Korea, Sudan, the USA, Kazakhstan, India, Cyprus, Malaysia, Sri Lanka, Republic of Korea, Slovakia, El Salvador, Libya, Myanmar, Greece, Ethiopia, Maldives, Nepal, Viet Nam, Bhutan, Venezuela, Fiji, Honduras, Norway, Solomon Islands, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Romania, Andorra, Saudi Arabia, Uruguay, Benin, Malta

21 September 2006: Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan
11 December 2006: Bahrain, Pakistan, Egypt, Senegal, the USA, Qatar, Cuba, Ukraine, Barbados, UAE, Kuwait, Bahrain, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, Tunisia, Saudi Arabia, Czech Republic, Costa Rica, San Marino, Colombia, Jordan, Netherlands, Japan, Turkey, Viet Nam, Germany, Iceland, China, Myanmar, Brazil, Lao People’s Democratic Republic, Singapore, Finland, Mexico

12 December 2006: Italy, Mauritius, Algeria, India, Niger, Malaysia, Democratic People’s Republic of Korea, Argentina, Russian Federation, Iran, Bhutan, Belarus, Republic of Korea, Denmark, Honduras, Indonesia, Venezuela, Guatemala, Chile, France, Poland, Portugal, Cambodia, South Africa, El Salvador, Kazakhstan, Iraq, Ghana, Uruguay, Spain, Nigeria, Libya, the UK, Greece, Latvia, Norway, Rwanda, Sweden, Cyprus, Malta, Uganda, Paraguay
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