

When will the United Nations Get Rid of Russia?

During 1919-20, the League of Nations was established by the victorious states after the First World War at the Paris Peace Conference. The preamble to the Charter of the League of Nations reads: “The High Contracting Parties, justice and honor, strictly adhere to the requirements of international law, the rules of conduct of governments recognized from now on, establish the rule of justice and faithfully fulfill all obligations imposed by treaties in mutual relations of organized peoples adopting this Charter establishing the League of Nations.”

On September 18, 1934, the Soviet Union was admitted to the representative club of states. The position of the League of Nations looked more than strange – since the 1920s the USSR has carried out subversive activities in all parts of the world, which are now regarded as terrorist. Moreover, Western politicians knew about the genocide in Ukraine initiated by the Communist government, they knew in Europe and America, and about the repressive policies of their own citizens pursued by the Stalinist regime. For Stalin, joining this international organization was primarily a political step, which was to demonstrate the peacefulness and civilization of the Bolshevik government.

On December 14, 1939, at the initiative of Argentina, the exclusion of the Soviet Union from this international organization was included in the agenda of the 20th session of the Assembly of the League of Nations. The reason was the protests of the international community over the mass bombing by Stalin's aircraft of civilian objects in Finland, including its capital Helsinki. The representative of Portugal, Tak Matta, read out the report and the draft resolution, which was based on the “Regulations on the definition of the aggressor.” After reading the resolution adopted by the Assembly, the Council of the League of Nations adopted a resolution to exclude the Soviet Union from this international organization.

Two days later, traditionally resorting to demagogic verbal equilibria, TASS in a statement accused the League of Nations of indulging in the intrigues of Britain and France:

“First of all, it should be emphasized that the ruling circles of England

OLEG K. ROMANCHUK, PhD, is the editor-in-chief of the magazine “Universum” in Lviv. This article was translated from Ukrainian by Viktoria O. Romanchuk.

and France, dictated by a resolution of the Council of the League of Nations, have neither the moral nor the formal right to speak of Soviet aggression and condemnation of this aggression...It should be further noted that relations between the Soviet Union and Finland are governed by the Treaty of Mutual Assistance and Friendship concluded on December 2 of this year between the People's Government of the Democratic Republic of Finland and the Government of the USSR. This agreement fully ensures peaceful relations between the USSR and Finland and amicably resolves to the satisfaction of both parties, both the issue of ensuring Finland's independence and the security of Leningrad and the issue of expanding Finland's territory at the expense of the USSR by reunifying the Karelian regions with Finland."

We already know well what the so-called "People's Government of the Democratic Republic of Finland" was and how it was formed under Stalin's direct leadership.

One month later, on January 12, 1940, the VUTSVK News (*A major newspaper of the Soviet Ukrainian government – Ed.*) published a demagogic editorial titled The Geneva's Hypocrites. An excerpt of this Bolshevik propaganda explains a lot. "No anti-Soviet trick will save us from exposing the imperialist politicians of London and Paris. The whole world knows that 'it was France and Britain that attacked Germany, taking responsibility for the current war,' it was the 'ruling circles of Britain and France who rudely rejected both Germany's peace proposals and the Soviet Union's attempts to end the war as soon as possible.'" Stalin). The same circles turned the League of Nations into an instrument of war, into the apparatus of the Anglo-French military bloc."

As they say, no comment.

World War II buried the League of Nations. By the decision of the specially convened Assembly, this organization was liquidated on April 18, 1946. It was replaced by the United Nations. Among its founding members were the USSR, Ukrainian SSR and Belarussian SSR.

The charter of this international organization of June 26, 1945, contains three articles that today attract special attention:

"Article 4, paragraph 1. Admission to the Members of the Organization is open to all other peace-loving states...;

"Article 6. A member of the Organization which systematically violates the principles set forth in this Statute may be expelled from the Organization by the General Assembly on the recommendation of the Security Council;

"Article 23, paragraph 1. The Security Council consists of 15 members. The Republic of China, France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and the United States are permanent members of the Security Council. The General Assembly shall elect 10 other members as non-permanent members of the Security Council, paying particular and due regard to the degree of participation of the Members in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the pursuit of other purposes of the Organization and equitable geographical distribution."

There are many reservations about the legitimacy of the Russian Federation's membership in the UN. Lawyers are well aware of the questionable existence of international legal grounds for Russia's membership in this organization.

In particular, the UN Charter does not provide for the possibility of membership in this international organization on the basis of succession. Even from a formal point of view, the Russian Federation is absent from the said Statute. It still represents the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

But this isn't even about that.

The question is: is the Russian Federation a peaceful state? Does it systematically violate UN principles? Does it participate in "the maintenance of international peace and security and the achievement of other goals of the Organization, as well as equitable geographical distribution?" As we can see, the questions are purely rhetorical.

Once in the UN Security Council, the Russian Federation received a special right to vote – "veto." An international paradox: an aggressor state that threatens peace and stability in the world must take care of the world order.

It will be recalled that another article of the Charter of the United Nations (Chapter VII, Article 51) states: "To the measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. Actions taken by Members of the Organization in the exercise of this right to self-defense shall be notified immediately to the Security Council and shall in no way affect the powers and responsibilities of the Security Council under this Statute with respect to any action it deems necessary to maintain international peace and security."

Some Eloquent Facts

On September 25, 2013, Georgian President Mikheil Saakashvili delivered a speech at the 68th session of the UN General Assembly. In particular, he noted the following: "Unlike most states, the Russian Federation is not interested in stable states around. The constant chaos and unrest in neighboring countries is what the Kremlin wants."

In his speech at the UN General Assembly in New York, President Volodymyr Zelenskyy emphasized that the war in Donbas has been going on for five years, and that it has been five years since Russia annexed the Crimean peninsula in Ukraine. Without directly naming the aggressor, Zelenskyy abstractly appealed to the world community: "Today, with thousands of pages of international law and hundreds of organizations dedicated to defending him, our country is defending its sovereignty and territorial integrity, losing its citizens. More than 13,000 dead. 30,000 wounded. One and a half million people are forced to flee their homes."

However, those present in the General Assembly perfectly understood who and what they were talking about. Then more.

UN Secretary General António Guterres presented a report, in which he said the organization he heads recognizes Russia's violation of the Geneva Convention, which deliberately relocates people from the mainland to the Ukrainian Crimea in order to change the demographics of the occupied peninsula, in violation of Art. 51 of the Geneva Convention №4 "On the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War" of 12 August 1949.

What is the response of Russian President Vladimir Putin? He signed the law "On the withdrawal of the declaration made during the ratification of the Additional Protocol to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, relating to the

The question is: is the Russian Federation a peaceful state? Does it systematically violate UN principles? Does it participate in “the maintenance of international peace and security and the achievement of other goals of the Organization, as well as equitable geographical distribution?” As we can see, the questions are purely rhetorical.

Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts.” From now on, this allows Russia to formally avoid criminal liability of the so-called “green men” in international courts.

The UN International Court of Justice has also accepted a complaint in the case of Ukraine against Russia, alleging that Russia has violated the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism in connection with the events in Donbas.

Not all of the sins of modern Russia are listed in the complaint. But even they are enough for an international Themis to decide on some steps or measures to prevent Russia from joining the UN.

It should be noted that there are legal grounds for such a procedure. However, it is extremely difficult to do so – the aggressor country has the right to veto the decision of the Security Council. However, despite the legal casuistry and various political and legal conflicts, Ukrainian diplomats need to raise the already overripe issue of Russia’s membership in the UN Security Council, and thus in the organization itself, which, on the other hand, has long needed a radical reorganization. And the sooner the better. Not only for Ukraine.

Celebrating the centenary of the birth of Oleg Troyanovsky, the USSR’s post-envoy to the UN, Sergei Lavrov spoke of a joke made by an agitated Soviet diplomat at a General Assembly meeting after he was doused with red paint symbolizing blood. “Better red than dead,” said Troyanovsky of the phrase which juxtaposed well with its contrasting phrase, favored by conservative Americans: “Better dead than red.” This was said in 1980 at the height of the Cold War.

I wonder what jokes Sergei Lavrov, Russia’s current envoy to the United Nations and, of course, Vladimir Putin, would be able to utter during the real war with Ukraine if the United Nations began the process of depriving Russia of membership in this international structure? *UQ*