

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LAW  
MANAGEMENT & HUMANITIES  
[ISSN 2581-5369]

---

Volume 8 | Issue 2  
2025

---

© 2025 International Journal of Law Management & Humanities

Follow this and additional works at: <https://www.ijlmh.com/>

Under the aegis of VidhiAagaz – Inking Your Brain (<https://www.vidhiaagaz.com/>)

---

This article is brought to you for “free” and “open access” by the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities at VidhiAagaz. It has been accepted for inclusion in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities after due review.

In case of any suggestions or complaints, kindly contact [support@vidhiaagaz.com](mailto:support@vidhiaagaz.com).

---

To submit your Manuscript for Publication in the International Journal of Law Management & Humanities, kindly email your Manuscript to [submission@ijlmh.com](mailto:submission@ijlmh.com).

---

# The Effectiveness of the UN Mechanisms in Preventing Genocide: A Critical Review

---

NASHRA ANSARI<sup>1</sup>

## ABSTRACT

*This essay discusses how well the United Nations (UN) has helped to prevent genocides around the world. Genocide is defined as the murder or harm of a person based on his or her race, religion, or nationality. After the atrocities that took place in World War II and the Holocaust, the UN was formed so that such things would never happen again. The UN established laws like the Genocide Convention of 1948 to guide countries on how to avoid genocide. Despite such efforts, genocides have nevertheless taken place, like in Rwanda, Bosnia, and Darfur.*

*This essay explains the reasons why the UN has sometimes failed to avert genocides and how it faces obstacles. Some of these challenges are disagreements among members of the UN, slow response to early signs of genocide, and limited peacekeeping resources. The essay also looks at past genocides to determine at what point the UN's action failed. Through emphasizing cases like the Rwandan Genocide and Darfur, the paper addresses how the actions of the UN were not sufficient and how things might have been improved.*

*The paper also examines how political issues, such as the veto power of the Security Council members, have made it difficult for the UN to act promptly. Finally, it presents some suggestions for improving the UN, such as enhanced early warning mechanisms, faster response to threats, and closer coordination with regional groups and local communities.*

**Keywords:** *Genocide, Holocaust, Disagreement, Peacekeeping.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Genocide, as defined in the 1948 Genocide Convention, is the willful attempt to destroy, either wholly or partially, a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group by killing, causing suffering, or engaging in any other type of act intended to destroy the group. It is one of the most serious breaches of international law and constitutes a danger to humanity. In turn, the United Nations (UN) ratified the Genocide Convention in 1948, in addition to creating institutions like the International Criminal Court (ICC) and tribunals such as the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY), intending to prevent and punish genocide.

Despite all these efforts, the global community has consistently failed to avert genocidal

---

<sup>1</sup> Author is a LL.M. Student at Khwaja Moinuddin Chishti Language University, India.

massacres. A prime example is the 1994 Rwandan Genocide, in which more than 800,000 individuals were murdered. Despite warnings and the deployment of a UN peacekeeping mission, the global community did little to act, leading to the deaths of thousands. This failure underscored the weakness of the UN in averting genocide, particularly when powerful states are not willing to act due to political and strategic interests.

In the same vein, the current crisis in Myanmar, where the government led by the military has been accused of committing genocide against the Rohingya Muslim minority, shows how difficult it is for the UN. Despite extensive documentation of atrocities, the global community has not been able to hold Myanmar accountable because of political interests and Myanmar's sovereignty. The same problems have arisen in Darfur, Sudan, where the UN peacekeeping efforts were useless in stopping the violence against non-Arab populations.

Modern technology has also brought with it new obstacles to preventing genocide. Social media sites, including Facebook, have become tools for inciting violence and promoting hate speech in ethnic and religious wars. Social media was used to fuel violence against the Rohingya in Myanmar and made it more difficult to contain hate speech and genocidal activity.

The efficacy of the UN is also undermined by the structure of the Security Council, where the five permanent members hold veto power. This leads to inaction most of the time, as witnessed with the Syrian crisis, where geopolitical interests stalled meaningful intervention despite widespread atrocities. The invocation of veto power by influential nations provides a major roadblock to prompt and effective action.

To improve genocide prevention, reforms to the UN system, especially in the Security Council, are necessary. Strengthening regional organizations and increasing collaboration with civil society groups can also enhance early intervention and accountability. Moreover, modern technologies must be harnessed to identify and address genocidal threats more efficiently.

In summary, there are legal frameworks, but these have been enforced erratically and ineffectively to stop genocides from happening. A more effective, collaborative, and anticipatory international response is essential in order to prevent future genocides and shield vulnerable populations everywhere.

## **II. LEGAL AND INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS**

To combat and deter the crime of genocide, the global community has established some legal tools and institutional frameworks. These tools are instrumental in identifying, reacting to, and holding accountable those who commit mass atrocities. The most significant among them are

the Genocide Convention, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) norm, the UN Security Council's role, and the Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect.

### **(A) The Genocide Convention (1948)**

The Genocide Convention is the first international treaty that defined genocide as a crime under international law. It obliges states to both prevent and punish genocide. Genocide is legally defined as acts performed to destroy a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group. These include:

- Killing members of the group
- Causing serious bodily or mental harm
- Intentionally creating conditions to kill the group
- Preventing births
- Forcibly transferring children from one group to another

The Convention is enforced in times of war and peace. It makes both individuals, government officers, and leaders accountable for what they do. States that are parties to the Convention are obligated to prosecute all those guilty of genocide, either in their own courts or by resort to international tribunals.

### **(B) The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) Doctrine (2005)**

The Responsibility to Protect (R2P) is a political commitment made by all UN member states in 2005. It was created following the worldwide failure to prevent the genocides in Srebrenica and Rwanda. R2P has three major pillars:

- All states have a responsibility to safeguard their citizens from genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity.
- The international community ought to support states in exercising this responsibility.
- If a state cannot protect its citizens, the global community has to act collectively through diplomatic, humanitarian, or, if all else fails, military measures.

R2P has intensified the international commitment to early warning and rapid response. Its usefulness, however, lies in the hands of powerful states' political will and collaboration between international institutions.

### **(C) The UN Security Council Role**

The United Nations Security Council is empowered to act when peace and security are threatened, such as in the case of genocide. According to Chapter VII of the UN Charter, the

Council may:

- Impose sanctions
- Set up peacekeeping missions
- Approve military intervention

The Council has been involved in previous genocides, including in Darfur and Rwanda. Its capacity to act is, however, usually restricted by the veto power of its five permanent members (P5). If any of these members exercise their veto, action can be prevented, even in instances of mass atrocities. This has led to concerns regarding the fairness and effectiveness of the Council in preventing genocide.

#### **(D) Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect**

The UN Office on Genocide Prevention and the Responsibility to Protect was created to assist early warning, risk assessment, and coordination of actions against preventing genocide and other mass atrocities. The Office:

- Tracks developments globally
- Employs early warning instruments
- Engages with governments, civil society, and regional actors
- Raises awareness and educates about preventing mass atrocities

It also facilitates the application of both the Genocide Convention and the R2P principle. Though it lacks enforcement authority, it is important in offering information, capacity building, and advising action when threats are identified.

### **III. CASE STUDIES**

#### **(A) Rwanda (1994)**

##### **Collapse of Early Warning Systems and the Limitations of UNAMIR**

In 1994, Rwanda witnessed a horrific genocide in which an estimated 800,000 persons, mostly Tutsis and moderate Hutus, were massacred in 100 days. Though there were definite warning signals, the international community did not respond effectively. The United Nations Assistance Mission for Rwanda (UNAMIR) did not have a mandate or sufficient resources to halt the genocide. Demands for reinforcements and a broader mandate were refused, and the mission's constraints were compounded by the withdrawal of major contingents, including the Belgian troops, after the killing of ten Belgian peacekeepers. As a result, UNAMIR was undermanned

and under-equipped, making it ineffective in halting the mass killings.

### **(B) Srebrenica (1995)**

#### **Ineffectiveness of Peacekeeping and Dutchbat's Withdrawal**

In July 1995, in the middle of the Bosnian War, the town of Srebrenica was designated a UN "safe area" and was defended by Dutch peacekeepers, called Dutchbat. When, however, Bosnian Serb forces attacked, the peacekeepers were outnumbered and insufficiently armed. Orders for air support were refused, and Dutchbat troops could not stop the capture of the town. Later, over 8,000 Bosniak men and boys were estranged from the women and killed in what came to be called the Srebrenica massacre. This was meant to open the eyes of the world and highlight the shortcomings of UN peacekeeping missions, especially when mandates are vague and resources lack. The inability to safeguard civilians in Srebrenica is a major stain on the UN's peacekeeping legacy.

### **(C) Darfur (2003–Present)**

#### **Delayed Action by the Security Council and the Role of the International Criminal Court (ICC)**

The war in Sudan's Darfur region started in 2003, resulting in extensive atrocities, such as mass killings, rape, and the displacement of millions. The international community's response was slow despite initial reports of the crimes. It was not until 2005 that the UN Security Council referred the case to the ICC by Resolution 1593. The ICC issued warrants for the arrest of various Sudanese officials, including then-President Omar al-Bashir, for war crimes and crimes against humanity. But the absence of cooperation from the Sudanese government and limited enforcement powers made it difficult to prosecute them. The ongoing conflict and recent flare-ups have prompted reopened inquiries by the ICC into alleged atrocity crimes committed by differing factions, as well as by the Rapid Support Forces (RSF). The Darfur conflict highlights the pitfalls of international bodies in responding early and effectively enough to mass atrocities.

### **(D) Myanmar: The Rohingya Crisis (2017–Present)**

#### **Continued Persecution and International Inaction**

Since 2017, the Rohingya Muslim minority in Myanmar has endured intense persecution, including mass killings, rape, and forced displacement, prompting more than 750,000 to escape to Bangladesh. Despite global condemnation, including a 2023 UN expert report describing the attacks as most likely amounting to crimes against humanity and genocide, the Myanmar military continues its repressive campaign. In recent events, the army and the Arakan Army

have been responsible for mass murders and burnings among Rohingya communities. The UN Security Council has found it difficult to take strong action, often being held back by geopolitical interests and the ability of the permanent members to veto. Attempts to hold Myanmar responsible, including the case in the International Court of Justice, have registered little progress.

#### **(E) China: Uyghur Repression in Xinjiang (2017–Present)**

##### **Systematic Oppression and Allegations of Genocide**

More than a million Uyghurs and other Muslim minority groups have been held in government-run camps since 2017 in China's Xinjiang region. Practices described include forced labor, repression of religious practices, and forced sterilizations. In a 2023 report by the UN, these actions have been said to potentially constitute crimes against humanity. Despite global outcry and sanctions from various nations, the Chinese government refutes all claims and persists with its policies in the area. The international response has been disjointed, with economic interests usually prevailing over human rights issues.

#### **(F) Ethiopia: Tigray Conflict (2020–Present)**

##### **Allegations of Genocide and Ethnic Cleansing**

The fighting in Ethiopia's Tigray region, which started in 2020, has led to widespread atrocities such as mass killings, sexual violence, and forced displacement. Ethiopian and allied forces have been reported to have engaged in acts that may amount to genocide against the Tigrayan people. Despite a ceasefire, abuses persist, and the humanitarian crisis is acute. The international community has moved slowly, and there is restricted access for investigators and humanitarian actors. Demands for justice and accountability have so far failed to achieve meaningful action.

These case studies identify ongoing challenges in the prevention and response to genocide and mass atrocities. Politicization of interests, poverty of resources, and slow decision-making remain an obstacle to proper action despite prevailing legal instruments and international institutions. A more vigorous and concerted approach by the world is needed to fight these serious violations of human rights.

## **IV. CRITICAL ANALYSIS OF UN MECHANISMS**

#### **(A) Political Constraints and Veto Power in the Security Council**

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is primarily responsible for safeguarding international peace and security. However, its capacity is frequently limited by the veto power that its five permanent members (China, France, Russia, the United Kingdom, and the United

States) possess. This veto power enables any of these nations to reject resolutions, including those meant to prevent or halt genocides.

For example, in 1994, when genocide was taking place in Rwanda, the UNSC did not act decisively because of the reluctance of some of the permanent members to intervene. The same has happened in the Syrian war, where constant vetoes have stood in the way of the Council from adopting measures to safeguard civilians. Such political obstacles usually lead to inaction, with atrocities running freely.

### **(B) Lack of Early Intervention**

Early warning systems play a vital role in averting genocides. Yet, the UN has often been faulted for its timidity. In Rwanda, there were obvious signs of looming violence, but the international community did not act in time. The same was true for Darfur, where there were signs of mass atrocities long before substantial action was ever taken. The delays usually result from bureaucratic challenges, insufficient political will, and difficulty in confirming information.

### **(C) Resource and Mandate Limitations in Peacekeeping Operations**

UN peacekeeping operations are usually sent to war-torn areas to safeguard civilians and ensure peace. Nevertheless, these operations are often plagued by poor resources and limited mandates. For instance, in the 1995 Srebrenica massacre, UN peacekeepers could not stop the slaughter of more than 8,000 Bosniak men and boys because they had limited powers and inadequate personnel. These limitations undermine the UN's capacity to respond effectively to crises and safeguard vulnerable groups.

### **(D) Coordination Failures and Bureaucratic Inefficiencies**

The UN's complicated organizational setup can result in coordination issues across its different agencies and departments. Such bureaucratic inefficiencies tend to translate into sluggish responses and patchwork efforts. In the Rohingya crisis in Myanmar, the failure of UN institutions to adopt a common approach compromised prompt and efficient action. Increasing inter-agency coordination and enhancing decision-making efficiencies are necessary for strengthening the responsiveness of the UN to emerging crises.

These challenges highlight the need for UN system reforms to improve its ability to prevent and effectively respond to genocides and mass atrocities.

## **V. RECENT DEVELOPMENTS AND PROPOSALS FOR REFORM**

### **(A) Strengthening the Role of the Office on Genocide Prevention**

The Office of Genocide Prevention and R2P has an important function to play in confronting



early indicators of genocide and mass atrocities. Reinforcing the office entails a broader mandate, greater resources, and enhanced capacity for coordination among UN agencies and with member states. Current developments imply that this office must take a more preventive stance, instead of merely reacting to current crises. Reform suggestions include:

- Greater funding to facilitate improved monitoring and faster action on warning indicators.
- Improved data analysis capacity for more effective tracking of possible dangers and intensifying violence.
- Better engagement with international stakeholders and local communities to attain a fuller understanding of the cultural, political, and social dynamics in regions of conflict.

#### **(B) Increasing Early Warning and Rapid Response Systems**

One of the biggest challenges in the prevention of genocide and mass atrocities is spotting the signs of escalation early enough to take action. Current early warning systems tend to be reactive, waiting until signs of violence appear, when it is too late. Proposals for change in this field include:

- Injecting cutting-edge technology, including artificial intelligence and analytics, to identify patterns of hate speech, incitement to violence, or escalating tensions in the conflict areas.
- Creating a more effective and timely reporting mechanism, through which information from local actors, NGOs, and UN peacekeepers reaches the decision-makers at a fast pace.
- Enhancing the mandate of the UN Special Advisors for the Prevention of Genocide and the Responsibility to Protect, and making sure their evaluations and proposals are implemented immediately.
- Enhancing global cooperation in order to have early warning mechanisms shared and implementable across various international organizations and nations.

#### **(C) Security Council Veto Reform in Mass Atrocity Cases**

The veto power of the Security Council continues to be the biggest hindrance to acting promptly in mass atrocity situations, as the permanent members tend to veto resolutions out of political motives. Demands for reforming the veto mechanism are increasing, with several proposals pending:

- Implementing a veto restraint mechanism, which will bar the application of veto in situations involving mass atrocities such as genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.
- A proposed 'responsibility to protect' override, wherein veto power would be waived in cases where the international community has to intervene to stop genocide or widespread violence.
- Development of a collective security system wherein member states can take action when mass atrocities are pending, without the need for approval from the Security Council.

#### **(D) Increased Cooperation with Regional Organizations and Civil Society**

The UN efforts to prevent mass atrocities and genocide can be strengthened if regional bodies and civil society actors are engaged more in decision-making and response actions. Regional bodies have greater insight into local circumstances and respond more quickly than the UN. Civil society participation offers vital grassroots information and voice. Main proposals are:

- Enhancing regional institutions such as the African Union (AU) or the Organization of American States (OAS) to take a more active part in preventing and reacting to genocide and mass atrocities in their region.
- Enhancing mechanisms of cross-border cooperation, with regional organizations acting together with the UN, combining resources, intelligence, and peacekeeping.
- Involving civil society in reporting and monitoring, ensuring that local organizations are provided with the necessary avenues to report potential atrocities and participate in prevention measures.
- More funding and capacity development for regional NGOs and organizations, ensuring they can act quickly and effectively when atrocities are identified.

These reforms, should they be introduced, would do much to enhance the effectiveness of the UN instruments in preventing genocide and other mass atrocities, with the international community able to react swiftly and assertively in response to unfolding crises.

## **VI. CONCLUSION**

In conclusion, the recent trends and suggestions for enhancing the prevention of genocide and mass atrocities reflect a firm commitment toward a more proactive and effective international response. The proposals to bolster the Office on Genocide Prevention, enhance early warning

systems, reform the Security Council veto, and enhance cooperation with regional organizations and civil society actors are all positive strides in that direction. If these reforms are implemented, they have the potential to significantly improve the UN's capacity to prevent genocides and mass violence ahead of time, safeguarding at-risk populations and fostering international peace.

These reforms would help to generate faster and more concerted reactions in times of crisis, so that the international community can respond more effectively when warning signs of genocide or mass atrocities are detected. By empowering local actors and regional organizations, we can develop a more inclusive and responsive response system. Greater leverage of technology to track threats and emphasis on early intervention are essential components that have the potential to make the UN's work much more effective.

But there are certain key issues that must be resolved for these reforms to be effective. The greatest challenge is the political will of UN member states, particularly the permanent members of the Security Council with veto power. These nations have traditionally been resistant to reforming the veto system, which frequently prevents timely action in crises. Without the cooperation of these influential states, significant progress may prove challenging.

Another concern is the balance between international intervention and respecting the sovereignty of nations. While it is essential to prevent atrocities, it's equally important not to impose solutions that could harm local cultures or political systems. This requires careful planning and understanding of the local context before taking any action. Additionally, the capacity of regional organizations and civil society to act swiftly and effectively is another challenge. Such organizations tend to be under-resourced and can find it difficult to coordinate their activities across various regions.

All these problems notwithstanding, that the discussions on reform are underway is a welcome sign. It indicates that there is increasing awareness of the necessity for more effective prevention mechanisms. If the international community sticks to these reforms, with continuous dialogue and cooperation, actual headway can be achieved in preventing genocide and mass atrocities, making the world safer and fairer for everybody.

\*\*\*\*\*

## VII. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- United Nations, *Genocide: Definition*, United Nations, <https://www.un.org/en/genocide-prevention/definition>
- *Genocide Prevention*, Wikipedia, [https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genocide\\_prevention](https://en.m.wikipedia.org/wiki/Genocide_prevention)
- Jessica A. Stanton, *Never Again All Over Again: The International Community and the Prevention of Genocide*, E-Int'l Relations (Sept. 14, 2013), <https://www.e-ir.info/2013/09/14/never-again-all-over-again-the-international-community-and-the-prevention-of-genocide/>
- *International Efforts to Prevent Genocide*, Freedom GPT Wiki, <https://freedom-gpt-wiki.vercel.app/wiki/international-efforts-to-prevent-genocide>
- *Srebrenica Massacre*, Military Saga, <https://militarysaga.com/srebrenica-massacre/>
- Rocío Quintero, *The Close Relationship Between Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law and the Prevention of Genocide*, 17 **Anuario Mex. Derecho Int'l** 313 (2017), <https://www.elsevier.es/es-revista-anuario-mexicano-derecho-internacional-74-articulo-the-close-relationship-between-serious-S1870465417300326>
- *Massacre in Srebrenica in 1995: Causes*, Vogue Industry, <https://vogueindustry.com/17317963-massacre-in-srebrenica-in-1995-causes>
- *Critical Analysis: Can We Abolish the United Nations Security Council Veto? Thoughts in Honor of the +100,000 People Dead So Far in Syria*, Denver J. Int'l L. & Pol'y (Nov. 18, 2013), <https://djilp.org/critical-analysis-can-we-abolish-the-united-nations-security-council-veto-thoughts-in-honor-of-the-100000-people-dead-so-far-in-syria/>.

\*\*\*\*\*