

People's Democratic Republic of Algeria

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research

Hamma Lakhdar University of El-Oued

Faculty of Arts and Languages

Department of Arts and English Language



**The Relationship between the United States and the United
Nations: Cooperation or Domination**

**Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for
Master's Degree in Literature and Civilization**

Submitted by:

ATIK LARBI Afaf

HAMMA-AID Hania

Supervised by:

Dr. YOUMBAI Mohammed Yacine

Board of Examiners:

Professor. NAOUA Mohammed

President

University of El-Oued

Dr. YOUMBAI Med Yacine

Supervisor

University of El-Oued

Dr. GHEDEIR B. Mohamed

Examiner

University of El-Oued

Academic Year: 2024/2025

Dedication

We dedicate this work to:

Our beloved parents: thank you so much for your endless support.

Our families and friends: many thanks for your assistance, affection, and patience.

Finally, thanks to all the people who helped us throughout this work.

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, we are indebted to ALLAH for giving us the strength and guidance to conduct this study.

We would like to express our gratitude to our supervisor Dr. YOUMBAI Mohammed Yacine for his endless guidance and support throughout this dissertation.

Our grateful thanks go to the head of the department, Dr. SAHRAOUI Belgacem,

We thank the member of board of examiners for having accepted to review our work and be part of the examining committee.

We extend our deep appreciation to our teachers in the Department of English at Hamma Lakhdhar University for their instruction and guidance.

Abstract

The U.S. cooperative methods ARE essential in UN specially the resources and leadership that significantly enhance UN operational capacity. However, the American unilateralism and coercive financial practices systematically weaken the UN institutional autonomy. This study aims to investigate relationship between the U.S and the UN. It examines how U.S. engages, supports and undermines governance. This research utilizes both historical and descriptive methods to analyze data in addition to a qualitative approach to collect it. The findings demonstrate that U.S. dominance creates structural contradictions with the UN's foundational principle of sovereign equality. This is particularly evident in repeated vetoes on Israel-Palestine issues and unauthorized military interventions like the 2003 Iraq War. The study concludes that the nature of the U.S - UN relations had multi-faces and that the US is utilizing cooperation to dominate UN's decisions.

Keywords: Institutional Reform, Peacekeeping Operations, Security Council Veto, U.S.-UN relations.

List of Abbreviations and Acronyms

Acronym	Full Form
AFISMA	African-led International Support Mission to Mali
AMISOM	African Union Mission in Somalia
ATMIS	African Union Transition Mission in Somalia
CIA	Central Intelligence Agency
CTED	Counter-Terrorism Executive Directorate
GPOI	Global Peace Operations Initiative
IHR	International Health Regulations
IMF	International Monetary Fund
MINUSMA	United Nations Multidimensional Integrated Stabilization Mission in Mali
P5	Permanent Five (U.S., UK, France, Russia, China)
PKM	Peacekeeping Mission
PKT	Peacekeeping Troops
T/PCC	Troop/Police Contributing Country
U.S. / USA	United States / United States of America
UDHR	Universal Declaration of Human Rights
UN	United Nations
UNGA	United Nations General Assembly
UNHRC	United Nations Human Rights Council
UNICEF	United Nations Children's Emergency Fund
UNMOGIP	United Nations Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan
UNSC	United Nations Security Council
UNSC Resolution	United Nations Security Council Resolution

UNTSO	United Nations Truce Supervision Organization
WFP	World Food Programme
WHO	World Health Organization
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WTO	World Trade Organization

Table of Contents

Dedication	I
Acknowledgements	II
Abstract	III
List of Abbreviations and Acronyms.....	IV
Table of Contents	VI
General Introduction	1

Chapter One: Aspects of Cooperation between the UN and The U.S.

Introduction	7
1.1 The Historical Context of the UN-U.S. Cooperation	7
1.1.1. The Role of the U.S. in the Foundation of the UN.....	7
1.2. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Maintaining World Peace and Security	8
1.2.1 The U.S. Allocation of Funds to Peacekeeping Missions	9
1.2.2 The UN-U.S. Cooperation in Counter Terrorism Efforts	11
1.3 Economic Contributions and Support	13
1.4. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Humanitarian Actions and Development	15
1.4.1. The U.S. Contribution in UN Humanitarian Aid Initiatives.....	15
Conclusion.....	18

Chapter Two: Aspects of U.S. Domination on UN

Introduction 19

2.1. The U.S. Influence and Dominance over International Affairs..... 19

2.2. The U.S. in the Security Council..... 20

2.2.1. The U.S. as a Permanent Security Council Member 20

2.2.2. The U.S. Veto Power and Its Implications 21

2.2. The U.S. Economic Dominance Over the UN 23

2.2.1. U.S. Financial Dominance 24

2.2.2 Tied Aid and Conditional Funding..... 24

2.2.3. UN Authorization for U.S. Military Interventions 26

2.2.4 The U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq (2003)..... 26

2.2.5 The U.S. Military Intervention in Afghanistan (2001)..... 28

2.3.U.S. Unilateral Actions and Challenge to UN Authority 30

Conclusion..... 31

Chapter Three: Cooperation or Domination

Introduction 32

3.1 U.S.-UN Relations: Case Studies in Cooperation..... 32

3.1.1 U.S. Funding of MINMA (Mali, 2013–2023)..... 33

3.1.2 U.S.-UN Counterterrorism Efforts in Somalia (AMISOM/ATMIS, 2007–Present)..... 34

3.1.3 U.S.-UN Humanitarian Response in Yemen (2015–Present)..... 35

3.2 U.S. Dominance in the United Nations: A Case Study Analysis.....	37
3.2.1 VETO Power	37
3.2.2 Iraq War Resolution.....	38
3.2.3 Human Rights Initiatives.....	39
3.2.4 U.S. Leadership in Human Rights Resolutions.....	40
3.2.5 Economic Sanctions and Aid.....	42
3.3 Impact on Global Governance.....	42
3.4 Discussion of Results	44
Conclusion.....	46
General Conclusion	48
References	50
الملخص	588

General Introduction

1. Background of the Study

The relationship between the United States (U.S.) and the United Nations (UN) represents a multilateral cooperation and hegemonic dominance. The U.S.' crucial role in creating the UN following World War II served as the foundation of the UN future decisions (Weiss, 2021). The U.S. uses its geopolitical clout to influence the UN's structure as the main drafter of the organization's charter and as the location of its headquarters in New York. Kennedy (2006) states that the Security Council has the authority of the veto power. Initially, as stated in President Truman's (1949) proclamation of "unflinching support" (p. 4), the U.S. saw the UN as a means of advancing American values of liberal democracy and collective security. During the post-war period, the U.S. accounted for 27–28% of the UN's regular and peacekeeping budgets, solidifying its position as the largest donor to the organization and using funding as a tool of influence as well as a source of conflict (Blanchfield, 2024)

However, these cooperative actions underlined a hidden tension. During the Cold War, the U.S. isolated adversaries like communist China until 1971 and leveraging the General Assembly to contain Soviet expansionism by strategically manipulating the UN (Mazower, 2012,). Therefore, the UN's developed into a more diverse body as decolonization movements started which added Global South members. This gradually diluted U.S. control and led to clashes over issues like Zionism and Palestinian rights (Meisler, 2011,). By the 1980s, U.S. ambivalence crystallized into overt unilateralism: withholding dues to force reforms, rejecting UN conventions, and bypassing Security Council authorization for military interventions, as in the 2003 Iraq War (Luck, 2003, p. 76).

Functionalist perspectives emphasize U.S. cooperation as indispensable to the UN's efficacy. Wertheim (2019) argues that America's funding of peacekeeping operations (27% as of 2023) and leadership in establishing specialized agencies exemplify "pragmatic multilateralism" (p. 112). Similarly, Groom (2003) confirms that U.S. technical support amplifies global public goods. Conversely, **critical-realist analyses** position the U.S. as a self-interested hegemon. They argue that the U.S. manipulate the UN to entrench dominance. Wallerstein (2003) contends that U.S. support is transactional: it cooperates only when the UN aligns with its security goals (e.g., the 1991 Gulf War), but exerts dominance via financial coercion (e.g., Helms-Biden Act linking dues to reforms; p. 48). This camp also critiques the UN's structural biases, noting how Bretton Woods institutions perpetuate U.S.-centric economic hierarchies while marginalizing Global South voices (Acharya, 2016.).

2. Statement of the Problem

The U.S.-UN relations stemmed from America's dual role as both principal supporter and dominant influencer of the organization. The U.S. systematically undermines multilateral principles through strategic use of its Security Council veto, conditional funding that pressures policy outcomes, and unauthorized military interventions violating UN Charter principles. This creates an institutional paradox where the UN's most powerful member simultaneously sustains and subverts its authority. This raises questions about whether genuine collective security can exist when structural inequalities favor one permanent member.

3. Research Questions

The current study attempts to answer the following questions:

- 1- How does the United States of America cooperate with the United Nations ?
- 2- How does the U.S. veto power and conditional funding mechanisms affect the UN Security Council's decision-making?
- 3- What are the implications of U.S.' role on UN decision-making independency?

4. Aims of the Study

The current study aims at examining the role of U.S in the UN organization. The principal aim of this work is to explore the dimensions of the relationship between the United States and the United Nations to determine whether this relationship has been characterized by dominance or cooperation. This aim will be achieved through an investigation into the history of their interactions and the various pillars underpinning this relationship, including financial, humanitarian, and diplomatic aspects.

5. Significance of the Study

The significance of this research lies in the fact that it exhibits two different perspectives on the nature of the interplay between the U.S and the UN through a thorough investigation of the intricate and multifaceted interaction between the two entities and the effect of this interaction on international policies. Furthermore, the study sheds light on the ways the United States utilizes its influence on the UN agencies and institutions to achieve its foreign policy goals and interests. Furthermore, this work provides future research in the field with coherent evidence of the consequences of the American intervention and dominance over the UN agencies.

6. Research Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research design to examine the nature of U.S. engagement with the United Nations. On one hand, in the first and the second chapters historical and descriptive methods are used to tackle the areas of cooperation and dominance between the US and the UN. In the third chapter, on the other hand, the descriptive method is used to explore the modalities through which the US has employed its influence within the UN as an instrument of global dominance.

7. Structure of the Research

The current study is organized into three chapters. The first chapter examines collaborative dimensions including historical foundations of partnership, peacekeeping support, and humanitarian coordination in Yemen. The second chapter analyzes mechanisms of hegemonic influence. The third chapter chooses case studies to assess the nature of the U.S-UN relationship and the U.S real role within the organization.

CHAPTER ONE:

Aspects of Cooperation between the UN and the U.S.

Chapter One: Aspects of Cooperation between the UN and The U.S.

Introduction.....	7
1.1 Historical Context of the UN-U.S. Cooperation	7
1.1.1. U.S. Role in the Foundation of the UN.....	7
1.2. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Maintaining World Peace and Security	8
1.2.1 U.S. Allocation of Funds to Peacekeeping Missions.....	9
1.2.2 UN-U.S. Cooperation in Counter Terrorism Efforts.....	11
1.3 Economic Contributions and Support.....	13
1.4. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Humanitarian Actions and Development	15
1.4.1. U.S. Contribution in UN Humanitarian Aid Initiatives	15
Conclusion	18

Introduction

To better assess the cooperative aspects between the UN and the U.S., the current chapter attempts to track the primary participation of the U.S. in the foundation of the UN organization, along with the creation of its charter and the division of responsibilities and duties among its member states. In addition, the chapter summarizes the main areas where the relationship between the U.S. and the UN is characterized by cooperative interaction and mutual support.

1.1 The Historical Context of the UN-U.S. Cooperation

In the aftermath of World War II, the U.S. played a pivotal function inside the foundation of the United Nations (UN), envisioning it as a forum to save you destiny conflicts, keep world peace, and sell possibilities for worldwide cooperation. Since its established order, the relationship among the UN and the U.S. has been marked via extensive guide, cooperation, and shared targets (Hoopes & Brinkley, 1997).

1.1.1. The Role of the U.S. in the Foundation of the UN

In 1945, the World War distorted the world and the later commenced to aspire international peace. From 25th April to 26th June 1945, representatives of fifty countries gathered in San Francisco for the United Nations Conference on International Organization. Over the next two months, they drafted and signed the United Nations Charter, with a new international organization established for the aim of stopping future world wars. On October 24th, 1945 the UN was officially established as Charter was confirmed by China, France, Soviet Union, United Kingdom, United States and most other signature countries. For seventy-five years, the UN has worked to maintain international peace and security, to provide humanitarian aid to the needy, promote human rights and implement international law. Meanwhile, the UN has also taken the

roles that did not estimate its founders in 1945, including addressing global challenges such as climate change (Schlesinger, 2003)

According to Wertheim (2019), the U.S.' rationale for acceding to the UN originated earlier in the Second World War, between 1940 and 1942. Given the strain of rapidly evolving events, the U.S. government and intellectuals concluded that the country needed not only to actively engage in the war, but also to lead the world in the years that followed. Hence, an international political organization gained support it among unofficial postwar planners in 1941 and later among official State Department planners in 1942. Therefore, it appeared to be an essential tool for carrying out postwar U.S. world leadership.

Rather than limiting U.S. dominance, officials believed the newly formed organization would validate American leadership in the eyes of the public by illustrating the culmination of previous internationalist efforts to eradicate power politics. This was even though the UN's conception was based on an extensive review of the League of Nations, particularly in acknowledging that power politics was a challenge to be overcome (Gaddis, 2018).

1.2. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Maintaining World Peace and Security

The UN Organization (UNO) acts as a great global power, and assumes the responsibility of maintaining peace, security and order among nations. It seeks to resolve disputes and prevent the escalation of both national and international conflicts. Alternatively, The U.S is the primary contributor to UN entities dedicated to promote and maintain international peace, offer political support, financial contributions to cost-effective UN Peacekeeping Missions (PKMs), and alignment with UN counter-terrorism efforts (Luck & Doyle, 2003).

1.2.1 The U.S. Allocation of Funds to Peacekeeping Missions

While the Security Council makes decisions on initiating U.S. training, or Expanding Peacekeeping Mission (PKM), all UN member states to share responsibility for paying them. Accordingly, all members are legally required to contribute their appropriate contributions to peacekeeping agreements and attempts. The General Assembly allocates peacekeeping expenditures U.S. in a specific evaluation scale and an elaborate formula developed by the founding member states. Essentially, this formula takes into consideration, among other factors, the relative economic growth of member states. The five permanent member states of the Security Council are expected to pay a larger proportion because of their responsibility for the preservation of global peace and security (Sitkowski, 2006).

According to the US Congress, financing UN Peace Keeping Troops (PKT) often occur in the context of broader concerns about the dynamic nature of UN peacekeeping. The notion of peacekeeping has changed since the first mission was created in 1948. In essence, the maintenance of "traditional" peace implies the application of ceasefire or peace treated; However, the Security Council has increasingly approved operations in complicated and insecure contexts, with little peace to maintain and no clear results. Peace forces may be necessary to protect people, disarm violent organizations, monitor human rights violations, or help provide humanitarian aid. Such initiatives may increase the budgetary burden for UN members. Some analysts claim that the existing peacekeeping budget cannot adequately meet some of the vast missions established by the Council (Blanchfield, 2024).

Moreover, the authorized budget for the UN peacekeeping missions for the fiscal year 2024/2025 is approximately a total of six billion dollars. This sum funds nine of the eleven UN

peacekeeping missions along with offering technology, assistance, and logistics to all peace operations via international service centers. Surviving peacekeeping operations, the UN Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO) and the UN Military Observer Group in India and Pakistan (UNMOGIP), are funded by the UN general budget. The 26.95% quota makes the U.S. the top contributor among the first ten member states of assessed contributions for UN peacekeeping operations for 2024-2025 (Karlsruud, 2019)

Second, the U.S. works in collaboration with other Member countries of the UN to ensure that peace maintenance operations are clear and reliable. It makes sure that these operations meet their objectives in addition to that it is interested in making soldiers equipped enough, capable of self-defense, and carrying out their orders. Currently, the US Military inspectors and UN Officials contribute to help eight piece of piece, namely Timor-Leste (UNMIT), Middle East (UNTSO), Democratic Republic of Congo (MONUK), Sudan (UNMIS), Ethiopia/Eritrea (UNMEE), Liberia (UNMIL). In the last few years, the USA UN. The UN has taken preventive measures in response to many cases of sexual misconduct and abuse by Peacekeepers (Carnah et al., 2006).

The U.S. derives many benefits from financing the UN peacekeeping troops. According to studies conducted by the U.S. Government Accountability Office, UN peacekeeping operations might be up to eight times more cost-effective than a direct American military intervention by putting U.S. soldiers to a war zone. Seemingly, this does not even account for the political cost of the U.S. intervention, which might be highly costly considering the geopolitical factors surrounding the war and the difficulty to justify any intervention to American taxpayers. In addition, many of the disputes addressed by UN peacekeeping do not seem to have a direct impact on U.S. national security. However, the possibility of the occurrence of humanitarian

crisis, regional conflict, the expansion of terrorist organizations, and manifestations of instability offer reasonable justifications to international intervention and stresses the need for an neutral mediator of peace (Loidolt,2021).

As a result, recognizing the advantages brought to U.S. national security from the efficient PKMs expeditions the U.S. aims to maximize the return on its financial contribution to the UN peacekeeping by strengthening Troop/Policing Contribution (T/PCC) countries' capacity through bilateral partnerships under the Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI). This initiative is handled in collaboration between the State and Defense departments. It promotes improved performance and accountability among peacekeeping contributions while boosting bilateral ties between the U.S. and partner countries. It is both a carrot and a stick, and it exemplifies how U.S. security aid benefits both the U.S. and the rest of the world (Neel, 1990).

In conclusion, the U.S. plays a pivotal role in the existence and the continuance of the UN peacekeeping missions, allocating funds to nearly a quarter of these missions which allows for the maintenance of security and peace in several disrupted areas as long as these countries do not threaten it national security.

1.2.2 The UN-U.S. Cooperation in Counter Terrorism Efforts

9/11 attacks have an immersive death results in America as Al-Qaeda coordinated the hijacking of four commercial airplanes and flew them on routes within the U.S for the purpose of carrying out terrorist-suicide strikes. These planes attacked landmarks of the American military and economy: specifically, the Twin Towers of the World Trade Center in New York and the Pentagon in Washington, D.C. In the immediate aftermath of these terrorist acts on the Twin Towers, on the 28th of September 2001, the UN Security Council (UNSC) passed Resolution

1373, declaring terrorism as a threat to peace and security in the world and placing enforceable obligations on governments to counter it (Elizabeth Stubbins Bates, 2012).

The Security Council Resolution adopted in on the 28th of September 2001 inter alia called upon states parties to the UN to prosecute terrorists, fortify their borders, combat the financing of terrorism, work together with other states in cross-border law enforcement, address the misuse of the internet, and counter-radicalization in prisons. Somewhat later, CTED was created-a body of about fifty experts who answer to the UN's Counter-Terrorism Committee-to monitor the implementation of said resolution; this includes undertaking country visits, while also making suggestions and recommendations (U.S. Department of State, 2009).

It was relatively easy to get an extremely effective and powerful resolution passed in the Security Council, since the towers were near the UN headquarters and the attacks took place just weeks before heads of state were assembling for the opening of the General Assembly. Thus, shortly afterward, the UN General Assembly began to gradually persuade all its members to accept and enforce the resolution. Accordingly, the Council adopted the UN global anti-terrorism strategy based on four pillars: addressing factors that can lead to terrorism, preventing terrorism and fighting terrorism, strengthening the ability of the member countries, and the fight against terrorism. The actions of the General Assembly were more than 1373 as the legislature included 192 member countries. Giving a great deal of legitimacy to the resolution, there are, therefore, no grounds for a single nation to claim dissent. Since the General Assembly is supposed to truly represent everyone, it can lend more opinion to any cause; in contrast, the Security Council can command states to do things that the General Assembly cannot do (Binder & Heupel, 2014).

This flexibility was occasionally beneficial, for example when the UN terrorism framework was established. But it usually allows countries such as China, Egypt, Turkey, Philippines, Russia and the United States to apply terrorist policy to groups that others may not see as a terrorist. The UN and the U.S appear to have worked closely, especially on terrorism. This has led to several ways for them to cooperate in this area. After 9/11, the UN General Assembly tried to form a standard definition of terrorism, but these attempts were unsuccessful, thanks to the unresolved Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the ongoing terrorist versus freedom fighter. The United States and India largely supported this effort. As a result, land can define the concept itself. Generally, the UN and the U.S. have worked well together, mostly on counterterrorism. This has made even more ways for them to work together in this area (Elizabeth Stubbins Bates, 2012).

1.3 Economic Contributions and Support

The system of the UN consists of continuous bodies, which includes programs, peacekeeping efforts, specialized agencies, funds and the organization itself. U.N. -The Charter, approved by the U.S. in 1945, requires each of the member states to contribute financial support to the organization. The contribution system is funded by both assessed and voluntary contributions from the members, where the assessed contributions are legal obligations to be paid by each Member State (Congressional Research Service, 2024).

Currently, the UN agency receives around four billion in yearly contributions, both taxed and voluntary. America is the greatest contributor, accounting for approximately a quarter of the total, nearly equaling the collective contributions of the following four countries combined

(Japan, Germany, Sweden, and the Netherlands). In 1982, the U.S. positioned seventeenth in terms of its per capita contribution, supplying less than \$4.50 per individual (Groom, 2003).

The U.S. contributed 28%, which equals 13.0 billion dollars of the 46.4 billion dollars in UN member government funding in 2023. This includes 6.8 percent of UN funding from U.S. assessed revenues, 21.0 percent from U.S. voluntary revenues, and 0.1 percent from additional U.S. funds. According to the American Congressional Research Service, due to budget complexity, there is no specific number that indicates the overall U.S. contribution to the UN. However, the figure appears to be near 13.0 billion dollars, in addition to an unknown amount of U.S. financing in the "other funding" category (Cato Institute, 2025).

For instance, the U.S. funds the World Bank, which provided the UN \$1.5 billion in 2023. Furthermore, the American Congress contributes to the UN and its affiliated organizations through a variety of accounts, namely: the American Department of State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs appropriations bills. A number of fund line items finance assessed contributions, whereas others support voluntary contributions. However, the Congressional Research Service stated that Congress has partially relinquished its financial authority, stressing that Congress does not explicitly allocate funds to many UN bodies. Instead, it frequently allocates one-time payments to UN-related accounts. As a result, the executive branch has some discretion over how monies are spent, typically with minimal or no congressional input (Edwards and Kyler, 2025).

To conclude, as noted above, the U.S. financial contributions to the UN represent a quarter of the total contributions, making it the largest financial supporter of the agency.

1.4. UN-U.S. Cooperation in Humanitarian Actions and Development

The US -UN interaction in the humanitarian and development fields is one of the most cooperative aspects of their multifaceted conditions. U.S. These initiatives cover many aspects, such as reconstruction after conflict, disaster relief, health care, food security, education, climate change and sustainable development.

1.4.1. The U.S. Contribution in UN Humanitarian Aid Initiatives

The UN and the US collaborate to promote human rights, global stability, and poverty reduction based on shared principles like sustainable development. The US has contributed to the reach and impact of UN activities in the fields of direct credit and strategic cooperation, especially conflict, starvation and natural disaster. Moreover, the management of the American support number is required. UN agencies, including the World Health Organization, UNICEF, The World Food Program and many others.

The World Health Organization (WHO) is a specialized UN organization, established in 1948, which takes a significant responsibility to function as a coordinating agency on international health matters along with assisting nations in responding to health emergencies. The U.S. government (U.S.) has been actively involved with WHO throughout its existence, whether through providing financial and technical assistance or in participating in its governance structure. In addition, The U.S. has been one of WHO's main financial contributors. Over the past few years, the American contributions to the agency varied from \$163 million to \$816 million every year (World Health Organization, 2025).

The U.S. plays an active role in WHO governance, including through the Executive Board and the World Health Assembly. For instance, the U.S. has held a seat on the WHO Executive Board for many years. Historically, the U.S. has been an actively involved participant in the World Health Assembly, sending a substantial delegation each year that is generally led and supervised by a delegate from the Department of Health and Human Services, with numerous other U.S. agencies and departments are also participating. The U.S. was also actively involved in the discussions to build a new pandemic agreement, particularly during the Covid-19 issue, and it is also involved in the recent effort to revise and alter the International Health Regulations (IHR) agreement (KFF, 2025).

Moreover, The U.S. has consistently given technical support to WHO by means of a number of programs and collaborations. This involves U.S. government professionals and resources supporting research and reference laboratory work through WHO cooperating centers⁶, as well as U.S. experts serving on WHO advisory committees and organizations. The U.S. has contributed to WHO cooperating centers in technical areas such as cancer, occupational health, nutrition, chronic illnesses, and health technology improvement. Furthermore, U.S. Government personnel were frequently assigned to or worked as liaisons at WHO headquarters and regional offices, where they collaborated with staff on technical projects on a daily basis(KFF, 2025)

The U.S. collaborated with WHO in response to the Ebola epidemic in 2014 in Africa, and US experts were part of the WHO assignment that visited China in February 2020 to review the response to the COVID-19 pandemic. To build areas with cooperation and coordination, the United States established semi-monthly "strategic dialogue" sessions to provide a regular platform for talks between important US and WHO officials (KFF, 2025).

Along with the contribution to the WHO, the U.S. has a deep association with UNICEF. UNICEF's long-standing and broad collaboration with the U.S. is marked by shared commitment and collaborative effort. U.S. These projects focus on a few key sectors, including health, education, child welfare and gender equality, to name a few. The relationship between the two units is strengthened by cooperation with several US government departments and agencies. The U.S. UNICEF has been the most notable contributor for a long time. In 2023, the U.S. has cemented the position of UNICEF's most important funds in humanitarian response. Moreover, the support of the United States moves beyond financial funds to the critical areas of the UNICEF order. US By the long-term partnership with the Aid Bureau for Global Health, UNICEF can strengthen the mother and child health and vaccination programs. With this collaboration, UNICEF has allowed the vaccination of two billion doses annually in a hundred countries, reaching 45% of the world's children (World Food Program, 2024).

Furthermore, the large contribution of the U.S. to the UN agencies extends to the UN World Food Program (WFP). The World Food Program (WFP) is a global agency within the UN entities that offers food aid to several areas and countries. Founded in 1961, WFP is headquartered in Rome and has offices in 87 countries. It assists millions of people each year and is present in over 120 countries and territories. The U.S. is the greatest contributor overall to the UN World Food Program, accounting for approximately half of all donations obtained by the agency yearly (World Food Program, 2024).

The U.S. offers this support by means of three primary programs, namely the Emergency Food Security Program, the Title II Food for Peace Program, and the McGovern-Dole Food for Education Program. The Food for Peace Initiative is crucial to America's effort to combat world hunger, and it is well-supported by American agricultural enterprises and commodity producer

associations. Every year, Food for Peace donates millions of dollars' worth of American goods to the UN World Food Program. These commodities are produced and acquired in dozens of states around the country. This implies that the program benefits the American agricultural economy while also assisting the U.S. in responding to global hunger situations (World Food Program, 2024).

To summarize, the U.S. cooperation reveals with UN agencies a multifaceted and dynamic relationship between them, characterized by deep and cooperative interaction. The US participation in the initiatives of UN programs and the economic, technical and administrative support it provides has accelerated their development and expansion and enabled them to offer larger services.

Conclusion

This chapter examined the historical origins and evolving cooperative dimensions of the UN–U.S. relationship. It emphasized on U.S. foundational leadership, peacekeeping financing, counter-terrorism collaboration, and humanitarian and development support. It addressed the research question of how and why the U.S. and UN cooperate across multiple domains. The discussion highlighted the United States' pivotal role in UN creation. It has been the largest contributor to peacekeeping and development initiatives and global counter-terrorism efforts. Overall, the chapter's contributions included synthesizing historical and contemporary evidence of U.S.–UN cooperation and laying a conceptual foundation for analyzing how this partnership shapes global governance

CHAPTER TWO:

Aspects of U.S. Domination on UN

Chapter Two: Aspects of U.S. Domination on UN

Introduction	19
2.1. The U.S. Influence and Dominance over International Affairs	19
2.2. The U.S. in the Security Council	20
2.2.1. The U.S. as a Permanent Security Council Member	20
2.2.2. The U.S. Veto Power and Its Implications	21
2.2. The U.S. Economic Dominance Over the UN	23
2.2.1. U.S. Financial Dominance	24
2.2.2 Tied Aid and Conditional Funding.....	24
2.2.3. UN Authorization for U.S. Military Interventions.....	26
2.2.4 The U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq (2003)	26
2.2.5 The U.S. Military Intervention in Afghanistan (2001)	28
2.3.U.S. Unilateral Actions and Challenge to UN Authority	30
Conclusion	31

Introduction

The current chapter examines the United States' dominance within the United Nations system. It represents how the U.S., as a permanent Security Council member with veto power, shapes decisions on international peace and security. The chapter also explores U.S. financial leverage through contributions and conditional funding, alongside the instrumentalities of UN authorization for military interventions.

.2.1. The U.S. Influence and Dominance over International Affairs

In the course of history, the allocation of control in the international order has been unstable, resulting in cyclic successions of growth and collapse. These changes, characterized by varying durations of stability and instability, are a natural element of the worldwide system. Following the demise of the Soviet Union, the Cold War's bipolar structure changed by giving way to a unipolar global order controlled by the USA. This transformation enabled the U.S. to take the position of global hegemon, defining and safeguarding the free international order that it has created. Although the U.S. does not fit into the conventional concept of the empire, it has unquestionably established itself as one of history's most powerful nations. For decades, the U.S. has dominated the world's military, economic, political, technical, and international organizations (Wallerstein, 2003).

Moreover, the UN system is a vehicle for leadership. It can provide credibility to policies and actions. U.S. and the UN system to achieve legitimacy comes at a cost. The UN's legitimacy and leadership potential come at a cost of listening to, convincing, and sometimes compromising with others. The U.S. values global governance organizations such as the Security Council, IMF, and World Bank. To gain the support of others, a leader must not selectively use and discard resources. The U.S. has benefited from the UN system's many

organizations and is expected to continue doing so. American principles are instilled in the work of organizations, including technical and specialized agencies, via the supply of expertise, counsel, and information. The UN system is heavily influenced by American principles, as the U.S. played a significant role in its development (Groom, 2003).

2.2. The U.S. in the Security Council

The Security Council is a fifteen-member group within the U.N. tasked with maintaining international peace, and its resolutions are legally binding. The council's powers include the ability to tell U.N. members to sanction entities or individuals and to "take military action against aggressors." The five permanent council members – the U.S., the U.K., Russia, China, and France – also have the power to veto any resolution, which limits what the council can do to end conflicts and disputes that involve a permanent member or an ally of a permanent member (Luck, 2006).

2.2.1. The U.S. as a Permanent Security Council Member

Following the start of World War II, the League of Nations turned into disband in 1939. By 1941, the British Prime Minister Winston Churchill and U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt had begun speaking about changing the League. They anticipated a global alliance led by "the Four Policemen"—China, the U.S., the UK, and the Soviet Union—who served as the main allied forces' members throughout the war. The UN (UN) Charter was signed in June 1945, little over a month after Triumph in Europe Day, but the concept was pushed as the war went on. A month after Japan's formal surrender on the deck of the U.S. S Missouri, the Charter came into force in October 1945, the U.S. ending the war (Smith, 2013).

According to Smith (2013), the maintenance of international peace and security is primarily the responsibility of the Security Council. This entails spotting any threats to global

peace or violent crimes and urging all parties concerned to reach peaceful resolutions. In addition, the Security Council imposes sanctions, tribunals, or the U.S. In cases of enhancing the force and security of, the right to authorize peace and security or to be authorized to establish it. In other words, the Security Council has the power to impose compulsory restrictions, which are the diplomatic measures taken by member countries against nations, groups or persons who are considered violations of international law. The purpose of this penalty is to force the approved party to return to compliance.

2.2.2. The U.S. Veto Power and Its Implications

Being among the UN's most influential bodies, The Security Council oversees ensuring global peace and security. One of its most powerful and contentious. The means of achieving this objective is "the veto". In essence, the veto is designated exclusively to its five permanent members "the P5": the United States, China, France, Russia and the United Kingdom. It authorizes any of those countries to unilaterally prevent the passage of any resolution, regardless of the extent of other international support (Wouters, 2005).

According to Article twenty-seven of the UN Charter, the UN Security Council's (UNSC) decisions must be approved by nine out of fifteen members, including the permanent members. To arrive at a decision, all five permanent member states must agree, and a negative vote from any of them will result in no conclusion. The veto power had been incorporated in the Charter to meet the demands of the most powerful nations after the end of the Second World War, who were unwilling to sign the Charter without it. The veto power aimed to prohibit the UN from taking direct action against any of its founding members (Nasu, 2009).

The power of the veto appears to tread a fine line of legality under international law. Primarily, blocking resolutions on human rights violations constitute a direct violation of the UN Charter, as Article 24 specifically mandates the Security Council to "maintain international peace and security" through "prompt and effective action." While the prevention of human rights violations, especially in situations that are very serious and human life threatening, typically concerns "international security," the veto of the P5's undermines the Charter responsibility and prohibits "prompt and effective" action (Nasu, 2009).

According to McDougal and Gardner (1948), the veto has faced extensive criticism for exacerbating stalemate and ensuring the geopolitical interests of P5 countries to the detriment of international peace and security. They claim that the veto allows states to be able to act without consequences, preventing only international progress and undermine the legitimacy of the UN Security Council. Concerns about veto are especially acute in the context of international reactions in relation to genocide, war crimes and humanitarian emergencies. For example, the inability of the UN Security Council to take significant measures in Syria (2011) and Gaza (2023-present) is widely cited as examples of positions in which the organization could not comply with its mandate.

In this vein, the U.S. routinely uses its veto power to prevent resolutions concerning human rights violations that conflict with its national interests or its allies'. For instance, the U.S. has regularly used its veto to defend its Israeli ally against attempted UN action seeking an end to Israeli settlement expansion and military actions in the Gaza Strip and the West Bank. By November of 2024, the U.S. had used its veto for the 49th time on Israel-related matters when preventing a resolution approved by ten permanent nations calling for a ceasefire in Gaza. The

U.S. veto marked as U.S. trainable diplomatic cover for Israel as it continues its war on Palestinians (O'dell, 2023).

According to a study by Blue Marble (2023), the U.S. has exercised its veto power against resolutions condemning Israel more frequently than any other council member, forty-five totaling instances. Since 1945, the U.S. has exercised its veto power on eighty-nine Security Council resolutions, with a little over half directed at resolutions critical of Israel. Among the rejected resolutions, thirty-three related to the Israeli occupation of Palestinian areas or the nation's treatment of the Palestinian population (O'dell, 2023). To conclude, the U.S. has a lengthy history of exercising its Security Council veto power to pass or prevent passing resolutions in its favor or in the favor of its allies such as the constant support to Israel.

2.2. The U.S. Economic Dominance Over the UN

There are several causes for the U.S. 's financial dominance over the United Nations. For starters, most UN members were from capitalist and pro-Western nations. Furthermore, the UN's headquarters were hooked up in New York, and the U.S. furnished a sizable part of the finances for its growth. As a result, the U.S. held a robust function in the UN. Other elements that contributed to this were the fact that the U.S. had a major effect on international trade because of the Marshall Plan, where all of Europe (save Spain) had accepted American financial backing from the Marshall Plan. Furthermore, because of its position in the UN and leadership in a unipolar world, America is characterized as the 'World's Policeman.' The U.S. considered itself as the guardian of the 'free world'. As a result, several European colonial powers supported the U.S. since they had not yet achieved independence. The U.S. also became a dominating power in the UN after China was barred from entering during the Civil War, and the seat was instead handed to pro-American Taiwan (Kennedy, 2006).

2.2.1. U.S. Financial Dominance

According to Ruggie (2017), the hostility that the United Nations' monetary practices have elicited in some quarters and agencies is attributable to more than just measurement, expansion, and bureaucracy. A critical political controversy additionally lies on the line: the disparity between monetary contributions and executive authority over allocations of funds. This topic contrasts "have" and "have not" countries, the former accounting for the vast portion of donations, while the latter accounts for the largest percentage of votes. Moreover, the complexities surrounding the U.S.'s financial support to the UN agencies are prevalent, especially with the absence of the only mutually beneficial solution of reciprocal constraint. Nevertheless, the UN Secretariat has contributed to the situation on several occasions. It has done so by being too receptive to very contentious legislative mandates issued by the General Assembly, such as those addressing Palestinian and southern African issues, as well as components of the New International Economic Order. It has used and even sponsored such requirements for its own purposes, such as expanding its bureaucratic chores and generating income. In brief, the Secretariat has achieved increases in its own wages and perks that exceed equivalent compensation at the national level.

2.2.2 Tied Aid and Conditional Funding

To determine if assistance is helpful in terms of assisting donors in achieving foreign policy goals, research has examined the extent to which aid recipients align their policies with donor preferences. One apparent example is China's use of foreign aid to further its one-China policy. Data on U.S. Assistance disbursements from 1985 to 2010 show that bilateral aid is successful in buying votes in the UN General Assembly. Extending these findings beyond

bilateral aid, research indicates that multilateral aid successfully purchases votes. Multilateral financing from the World Bank and the IMF, as well as bilateral U.S. aid, will be increased for temporary UNSC members who voted with the U.S. on all votes, but not for members who defected at least once each year. The Trump administration has pledged to tie overseas useful resource more immediately to international locations' UN (UN) votes, threatening to punish nations who vote in opposition to the U.S. Role with the aid of slicing their overseas assistance. While the administration's harsh rhetoric marks a shift from the current past, the U.S. Has been used to influence UN votes for decades. There are multiple ways to capture UN voting alignment and the picture that emerges depends on how different kinds of votes are counted. In other words, methodology matters (Alvarado & Mendis, 2010).

Recently, the Trump's administration has promised to connect foreign aid more directly to nations' votes at the UN (UN), threatening to cut off foreign aid to countries who vote against the U.S. position. While the administration's harsh rhetoric is not a departure from the history of the U.S., since it has Used aid to influence UN votes for decades. There are several methods for capturing UN voting alignment, and the image that emerges depends on how various. types of votes are counted. Apparently, The Trump administration's challenging implementation of this policy would be laden with challenges, involving disregarding the potential responses of other international powers such as Russia and China in this heated competition for influence which could disproportionately disadvantage democracies and poorer nations in the distribution of UN assistance, and jeopardizing U.S. objectives in areas that are not covered by UN votes. Up to now, it is still unclear how the Trump administration will fulfill its promise (Alvarado & Mendis, 2010).

In sum, there is consistent evidence across situations that assistance donors are effective in leveraging aid flows to influence the voting behavior of aid recipients in a variety of international forums. One caveat in this research is that it is famously difficult to distinguish between buying and rewarding such votes since exchanging votes for aid is a recurrent, planned, and reciprocal engagement between donors and receivers.

2.2.3. UN Authorization for U.S. Military Interventions

As a permanent member, the United States has a deep and significant influence on the decisions of the UN Security Council, especially the decisions affecting global peace and security. This power of influence has enabled the United States to occasionally influence the tale of its military interventions in several countries. Despite the fact that the U.S. military interventions are U.S. usually presented as a necessary step for the humanitarian and international security, the United States' position in the UN raises serious. questions about the legitimacy and legality of these actions. In other words, the U.S. might have exploited the UN system to get support for its military acts (or escape condemnation), as well as the consequences for international law principles and the UN's own credibility. Through the examination of cases such as the American intervention in Iraq and Afghanistan, the ways through which the U.S. may have sought to U.S. e the UN framework to gain international support and mitigate questioning its legitimacy can be examined and evaluated (Antizzo, 2010).

2.2.4 The U.S. Military Intervention in Iraq (2003)

A series of terrorist-related incidents that endangered the U.S. and its interests preceded the events of September 11th. A laundry list of the Iraqi regime's violations of multiple UN Security Council resolutions dating back to 1990 added to the U.S.'s concerns about possible terrorist

attacks. These Security Council resolutions called on Iraq to comply with UN inspectors about its alleged program of storing Weapons of Mass Destruction and to stop its hostile attitude toward its neighbors, especially Kuwait (Campaign Against Sanctions on Iraq, 2004).

Moreover, Western intelligence seems to agree that Iraq was hiding weapons of mass destruction. In 2001, the CIA, allegedly in cooperation with a former Italian military intelligence outfit, created a uranium procurement intelligence report against Iraq to support their WMD accusations. The alleged uranium story was intended to paint the Iraqi government as a regime that was deliberately accumulating yellowcake, or uranium, from Niger. It was a calculated move to undermine the regime's legitimacy in the eyes of the world community, accusing Iraq at the height of its disarmament issue with the UN weapons inspectors, however, rejected these yellowcake allegations since they were deemed to be false (Washington Post Staff, 2019).

According to Sands (2005), the U.S. and Britain have essentially abandoned a new global order that emphasizes the significance of adhering to the UN Charter standards, which they both contributed to creating in the previous century. As demonstrated, for example, by the abuse at the Guantanamo and Abu Ghraib detention camps, the U.S. Administration violated international laws governing the laws of war, human rights, and torture.

Additionally, according to Yoo (2009), wiretapping operations during times of war did not require arrest warrants, and the executive authority of the U.S. president during those times allowed for enhanced interrogation tactics. Moreover, the U.S. president's advantages and authority under these expanded powers greatly exceeded the bounds of peacetime directives. In addition, Yoo (2005) argues that the UNSC has not fulfilled expectations due to many errors,

including failure to reach agreements on Iraq, Bosnia, Rwanda, Sudan and Darfur, and misconceptions of UN Peace Managers in Congo.

According to Articles 24 and 42 of the UN Charter, the UNSC itself may authorize the use of force to eliminate a threat to global peace and security (Shaw, 2003). But in the case of Iraq, the UN was constantly interacting with the Iraqi government and conducting regular evaluations to ascertain the necessity and appropriateness of the sanctions to be levied through the successive SCRs from 1990 to 2002 (United Nations, 2004). However, SCR 1441 of 2002, which the U.S. used as justification for the invasion of Iraq, lacked any known "automaticity" to carry out the war. John D. Negroponte, the U.S. ambassador to the UN, confirmed that SCR 1441 lacked automaticity (United Nations, 2004). In a nutshell, based on the analysis, it can be concluded that the U.S. and its coalition allies did not achieve the threshold for U.S. force as required under the UNSC authorization.

2..2.5 The U.S. Military Intervention in Afghanistan (2001)

In response to the terrorist attacks on 9/11, the US operation initiated freedom in Afghanistan in October 2001 initiated the primary goal was to eliminate the Taliban and dismantle al-Qaeda. The United States and its allies aimed to fight a rebellion, stabilize the nation and help establish a new Afghan government. The unmanned international security aid establishment established a framework for the long-term international military presence, including US forces (Elizabeth Stubbins Bates, 2012).

The complete textual content of Resolution 1368, which became adopted by the UN Security Council in reaction to the assaults on New York, Washington, and Pennsylvania, is appended. It declared its "readiness to take all necessary steps to respond to the terrorist attacks

of 11th of September 2001, and to combat all sorts of terrorism, in accordance with its duties beneath the Charter of the United Nations." It additionally denounced the attacks and stated that it regards such acts, like any act of global terrorism, as a chance to worldwide peace and protection (Henderson, 2018).

The use of force may be authorized by the Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter, which includes international terrorism. This is a strong language in UN parlance (Henderson, 2018). However, it is noted that the Resolution does not specify what needs to be done or by whom. Additionally, the Resolution affirmed that the Security Council is primarily responsible for handling issues pertaining to global peace and security; yet it did not infringe upon the right to self-defense, which it really acknowledged in the preamble.

Henderson (2018) discussed another Security Council Resolution, 1373 (2001), which was approved on September 28. The resolution outlined the steps that all nations must take to fight terrorism, including freezing of assets or facing penalties. Like Resolution 1368, Resolution 1373 allows governments to "take the necessary steps to prevent the performance of terrorist acts." It repeats the need to act in accordance with the UN charter and other international law, as well as the principle of self -defense, but it does not mention how to perform or disregard these mandates. Although it is possible that the United States could have received specific legal approval from the Security Council for its actions in Afghanistan, the United States eventually chose not to pursue such a resolution. Resolutions 1368 and 1373 in the Security Council outline only the basic need to act to fight international terrorism .It is concluded that the UN and many states appeared to agree that the abuses in Afghanistan were justified as self-defense despite the problems mentioned above. The UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan did not explicitly support the

airstrikes in a speech on October 8, 2001, nor did he condemn them, and admitted that states are entitled to both individual and collective self-defenses.

2.3.U.S. Unilateral Actions and Challenge to UN Authority

Since the conclusion of the Cold War, many of America's closest friends have grumbled about the development of American unilateralism. This refers to Washington's inclination to make choices without considering the interests of its allies or the global community. America's attempts to impose trade restrictions on Cuba and Iran, which violate international law, are particularly offensive to its partners. However, the charge of unilateralism goes deeper. Others, including some of America's closest friends, were dismayed by the American decision to stand alone, through the use of its veto, in denying Boutros Boutros-Ghali a second term as Secretary General of the United Nations. They are increasingly troubled by their unwillingness to fund its fair share of the budget of the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and the UN family. They also question whether one member of an alliance should be able to impose its views on the others regarding such an important issue for European security as the expansion of NATO (Maynes, 1999).

The U.S. is the least aligned country with the UN-based multilateral system because it regularly undermines global peace and development through unilateral economic, political, and military policies. While the world is multipolar and the distribution of power is distributed globally, the abuse of the international system prevents the member countries from fully embracing the multilateral system (Lafortune and Sachs ,2024)

According to Lafortune and Sachs (2024) , the U.S. ranks last among the 193 member nations of the United Nations. Hence, he asserts that the U.S. is the least aligned country with

UN multilateralism? This rating is due to its numerous. violations of international agreements use unilateral sanctions, and vote against majority resolutions in the UN General Assembly. Furthermore, They are particularly critical of the United States' imposition of taxes under what he calls false economic pretenses, emphasizing that Trump's claim that the U.S. trade deficit is caused by other countries abusing the U.S. is false, because the deficit is caused by internal reasons, particularly the U.S. government's wide budget deficit and its low national savings rate.

Furthermore, they refer to the broader U.S. approach as "a system of bullying," citing not only taxes but an array of unilateral coercive actions and decisions, from sanctions on individuals and financial institutions to the confiscation of state assets, which have harmed multiple vulnerable populations around the world. Lastly, he states that these policies deny people access to food, water, and healthcare. They boost death rates, arguing that these policies are not only unlawful under the UN Charter but also ethically unacceptable (Lafortune & Sachs, 2024).

Conclusion

This chapter demonstrated the of U.S. dominance within the UN system. The U.S. leveraged its unique position as a Security Council permanent member. It frequently employed its veto power to shield its interests and allies which enabled the exertion of pressure through conditional funding. Furthermore, the U.S. instrumentalized UN authorization processes to legitimize military interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan, Ultimately, recurring unilateral actions by the U.S. frequently challenged the UN's multilateral authority and undermined its effectiveness. This pattern of dominance fundamentally shaped the UN's agenda and actions during this era.

CHAPTER THREE:

Cooperation or Domination

Chapter Three: Cooperation or Domination

Introduction.....	32
3.1 U.S.-UN Relations: Case Studies in Cooperation.....	32
3.1.1 U.S. Funding of MINMA (Mali, 2013–2023).....	33
3.1.2 U.S.-UN Counterterrorism Efforts in Somalia (AMISOM/ATMIS, 2007–Present)	34
3.1.3 U.S.-UN Humanitarian Response in Yemen (2015–Present)	35
3.2 U.S. Dominance in the United Nations: A Case Study Analysis	37
3.2.1 VETO Power.....	37
3.2.2 vIraq War Resolution	38
3.2.3 Human Rights Initiatives	39
3.2.4 U.S. Leadership in Human Rights Resolutions	40
3.2.5 Economic Sanctions and Aid	42
3.3 Impact on Global Governance	42
3.4 Discussion of Results.....	44
Conclusion	46

Introduction

This chapter studies U.S.-UN relations as avenues of cooperation and dominance. It investigates the instances of joint peacekeeping in Mali (MINUSMA), Somalia (AMISOM/ATMIS), and humanitarian coordination in Yemen. In tandem, the mechanisms of U.S. dominance are examined: vetoes, suspicious negotiations over Iraq War resolutions, including those targeting specific human rights initiatives, economic intimidation via sanctions, and aid. These new dynamics present case studies in how multilateral institutions and global governance mechanisms are affected and molded—from collaborative responses to crises to assertions of unilateral power. Some case studies exhibit well-functioning partnerships, while others show the strain caused by asymmetrical influence by the United States. The chapter finally considers whether U.S. hegemony can live comfortably alongside the UN as a multilateral institution established on mutual principles.

3.1 U.S.-UN Relations: Case Studies in Cooperation

The 1990s witnessed negotiations under the banner of the United Nations increasingly becoming the favored conflict resolution mechanism, with the U.S. being the prominent actor in this space. UN operations of peace enforcement were imminent for the successful conduct of the Gulf War in 1991, with U.S. support being crucial for the subsequent rehabilitation operations (Luis Saint-Pierre & de Paula Bigatão, 2017).

The UN military interventions in Somalia (1992) and Bosnia (1995) hinged on active U.S. participation. At the same time, the UN did undertake some peace enforcement actions without Washington's lead. For instance, the French took the lead in Rwanda (1994), while Western European countries got involved in Mozambique (1993), El Salvador (1992), and Guatemala (1996). The big peacekeeping operation in Cambodia (1991–93) arguably had no lead power at

all. U.S. policymakers virtually abandoned UN peacekeeping in the mid-1990s, however, because they faced the prospect of paying an increasing share of the UN dues without being able to shape the agenda. Although the U.S. did pay for the 1993–94 operation in Somalia, Washington chose to support a coalition of partners to remove the emergency relief phase of the operation rather than one organized around the UN. Even so, U.S. support to UN peacekeeping operations had a positive association with success up to the mid-1990s ((Luis Saint-Pierre & de Paula Bigatão, 2017).

3.1.1 U.S. Funding of MINMA (Mali, 2013–2023)

UN Security Council Resolution (UNSCR) (2013) established the UN Multi -Diameter Integrated Stabilization Works in Mali (MINUSMA) to support political transitions and stabilize important population areas in Mali. As of 2013, the United States contributed to MINUSMA forces, giving extra airlift and medical evacuation support, and its state department funded less than five percent of the annual UN budget for the assignment. The U.S. contribution focused on special operational forces and working group personnel with unique skills aimed at building the UN capacity, Malian security forces, and regional forces to counter African extremist groups (Ataullahjan et al., 2020).

The U.S. continued to obtain troops, funds, equipment, and medical evacuation ability throughout the MINUSMA period. Despite recurrent U.S. Department of Defense requests to terminate the assignment no later than September 30, 2023, the U.S. Department of State expanded it by at least one year beyond that deadline. Such a strategy will allow the newly established African-led international support assignment in Mali (AFISMA), which was primarily funded by the U.S., to complete its development before MINUSMA withdrew.

AFISMA was expected to serve as a more agile and better-equipped force than MINUSMA to protect civilians and push back militant groups in Mali (Dieu, 2015).

3.1.2 U.S.-UN Counterterrorism Efforts in Somalia (AMISOM/ATMIS, 2007–Present)

According to Wood (2019), the African Union Mission in Somalia was created in 2007 by the United Nations Security Council. There had been a very distinctive chain of international responses to the al-Shabaab threat, an extremely powerful Islamist militant group affiliated with al-Qaeda. So, it supported the Transitional Federal Government (TFG) of Somalia.

Wood (2019) states that stabilization of the country was the primary concern of AMISOM. Once stabilized, they would allow humanitarian operations to observe the strengthening of local governance systems. In April 2022, AMISOM gave birth to ATMIS, which shall take charge of the transition of security responsibilities to Somali forces by the end of 2024. The operation has pooled forces from Burundi, Djibouti, Ethiopia, Kenya, and Uganda.

From the inception, the U.S. has been the primary external supporter of this regional security endeavor. Washington provided logistical support, training, intelligence sharing, and direct military aid. Chiangi declared that the U.S. has funded 20% of the mission's annual budget. That reflects its strategic interest in countering terrorism and maintaining stability in Africa. With the spike in attacks by al-Shabaab from 2011 to 2019, support from the U.S. also increased. By then, the latter was ramping up its territorial control and asymmetric warfare campaign. During the period, the group intensified its campaign of territorial control and asymmetric warfare. During that time, the financial and military interventions and number of attacks steadily increased. That highlights the limitations of conventional counterterrorism approaches in fragile or failed states (Williams, 2018).

The United States continues to use a hybrid approach to direct kinetic action and capacity building for local forces. Although it brings temporary tactical victories with the capture of Mogadiscio and other strategic places, long-term stabilization remains illusory. Al-Shabaab uses clan divisions, weak governance, and financial deprivation to maintain its rebellion. The joint action of the U.S-UN in Somalia characterizes the opportunities and boundaries of international hiring. It shows how external countries can accommodate the development of extremist violence through targeted funds and calibrate power projections, but it also reflects the constant challenge of achieving permanent peace without parallel investment in political settlement, development and state (Williams, 2018).

3.1.3 U.S.-UN Humanitarian Response in Yemen (2015–Present)

Humanitarian feedback in Yemen with a significant partnership by the government, one of the largest global operations is presented. The number of non-governmental organizations has developed dramatically, and the level of UN staff has increased more than four times since the conflict in 2015 (Apele, 2018). The protracted civil war has resulted in the world's most severe humanitarian crisis, marked by massive displacement and deteriorating food security.

The conflict includes regional powers and internal factions, as well as a coalition led by Saudi Arabia and Iran, supporting conflicting pages. More than 91,000 people have died because of these conditions, which have weakened the basic infrastructure, including health services (Williams, 2018). The political initiative of restarting peace negotiations and granting amnesty to armed groups provides opportunities to improve security and humanitarian conditions, though permanent settlement is still elusive. Humanist artists continue to coordinate efforts through a

close approach, bringing together organizations in fields such as health, logistics, nutrition, and defense.

The UN supports the central role of local volunteers and workers, who provide frontline assistance and critical information on inaccessible areas. The government's responsibility for the coordination of humanitarian activities has widely disappeared in many parts of the country, leaving the UN a major agency in fact. Rapid reductions in government-reimbursed salaries have intensified the operational constraints faced by the formal sector (Williams, 2018).

Health interventions frequently focus on maternal and child populations, adopting delivery mechanisms for situations where health infrastructure no longer functions. Some of the largest UN agencies, including UNICEF and the World Health Organization, serve as the principal mechanisms for resource distribution, procurement, and service delivery. Reliance on direct implementation, rather than partnership with local NGOs, has increased substantially during the conflict. The central coordination structure supports extensive operations, monitors the UN feedback, and manages about two-thirds of the money passing through the country. As the extent of conflict and violence in Yemen increases, the UN has been at the forefront of humanitarian activities.

The U.S. and the UN are engaged in cooperation activities that involve close cooperation when the UN raises issues that the United States has an interest in. This collaboration includes diplomatic consultations on politics, direct financial support, and operational help on the ground. A principal theme of U.S.-UN relations is how well the two can work together in partnership. Examples of cooperative ventures include the U.S. underpinnings of MINMA in Mali (2013–2023), combined U.S.-UN counterterrorism efforts within AMISOM/ATMIS in Somalia (2007 onward), and cooperative humanitarian responses to the crisis in Yemen (2015 onward). The reference case is that of the U.S. as

the dominant partner. Previously observed patterns of dominance and cooperation in U.S.-UN relations therefore endure (Ku, 2003).

U.S. among the world and the cooperation of the UN is important for stability, which is in a shared commitment to peace, security and human development. The U.S. has provided the UN in organizing the framework while the cutting edge-age collaboration provided Peacekeeping Assistance (28%of the PKO budget), anti-terrorism coordination and humanitarian partnership (WHO, UNICEF, WFP). Despite the influence on funds, veto use and coverage diversion and asymmetry in stress, each actor generally shows mutual dependence: UN expands the diplomatic reach and cost-effective disaster control of the US, at the same time the US. Sources and political support allow the UN operational impact. Case studies from Mali to Yemen affirm this symbiosis thrives in which hobbies align, navigating sovereignty worries through pragmatic engagement. Ultimately, this contested but vital partnership—tested by using evolving threats from pandemics to alternate climates—proves that multilateralism anchored in U.S. engagement remains critical for confronting transnational demanding situations, neither of which can be resolved by myself (Ku, 2003).

3.2 U.S. Dominance in the United Nations: A Case Study Analysis

3.2.1 VETO Power

The five permanent members of the UN Security Council revel in the exceptional energy of the veto, which allows any one of them to damn the adoption of a decision. “The sacred veto right remains the justifiable symbol of the privileged status attached to this limited group of states. The special responsibility deriving from permanent membership entails proper use of the veto” (Wouters & Ruys, 2005).

The veto system was designed to protect great powers from adopting decisions likely to lead to a conflict among the permanent members and hence to increase the probability that the Security Council would be able to reach unanimous decisions. However, the veto power is very competing, as it allows the permanent members to inhibit the security council's capacity to respond to the needs of the international community in a timely and appropriate way. This selective bias, for its part, has spurred a growing call to cushion or even abolish veto (Wouters & Ruys, 2005).

Séverine Dusenne proposes that “the veto power remains [an] incomprehensible instrument.” The unique goal—to facilitate a war of words amongst permanent individuals on the way to maintaining the quality chance for unanimity—remains a critical justification for the veto. But the veto also serves to preserve an unequal balance of power within the Security Council, because the burden of Security Council decisions drops mainly on the seven non-permanent members. In addition, it creates a distortion in the decision-making process of the Security Council that results in excessive emphasis on the interests of permanent members compared to those of the broader international community.

3.2.2 Iraq War Resolution

The Iraq War case demonstrates the relative power of the U.S. government within the UN system. The debate and process involving the Bush administration, France, Russia, China, Security Council members, and capital-holding states illustrate the extent of U.S. influence in a complex and sensitive security matter. The administration attempted to secure a strong Security Council condemnation of the regime that was reasonably specific, constitutionally authorized, clearly stated the expected consequences of non-compliance, and obtained the Council's endorsement for the use of force (Berdal, 2003).

The official coordination of the process originated in the UN system; the case was a major topic of the General Assembly's first September session since 1950, and capital-holding states discussed the proposal at the extraordinary meeting of Heads of Government held in the run-up to the session and again at the Millennium Summit two months later. Coordination stopped shortly after the Summit, and Council members provoked the dissolution of the committee headed by the Secretary-General's ambassador, leaving the Security Council to handle the matter alone. Since this experience, the U.S. government has likely regarded UNHRC reform as a complicated process with some scope for influence but little certainty of success (Berdal, 2003).

The case illustrates the dangers of tying confidence in the Council's effectiveness to the success of Operation Iraqi Freedom, the limited consequences of which are by no means obvious. It also explains the emphasis on enhancing the U.S. government's understanding of the UN. The expected consequences are high and varied, the processes complicated and multi-dimensional, and both variables change continuously at unpredictable rates. The government's command of information about the UN system must be improved, and, within the parameters established, a strategy seeking to increase the United States' influence, independence, and flexibility must be developed (Berdal, 2003).

3.2.3 Human Rights Initiatives

Human rights initiatives constitute another major arena for U.S. action at the United Nations. They offer Washington access to annual multilateral forums, an issue area widely regarded as a moral high ground, and a rubric for global leadership on profound social issues (Berdal, 2003). Periodically elaborated features of the U.S. record structure these initiatives.

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) of 1948 showcases a classic reference point. Central documents encouragingly anchor initiatives, safeguarding and advancing an internationalist and cosmopolitan signature. Frequently invoked, the UDHR aligns American commitments closely with its principles. These authoritative associations initially establish conceptual parameters, ideally subtending a single, consistent norm of conduct. The international consensus represented by the UDHR transmits an overarching mandate and the leverage of global unanimity. The Declaration further specifies standards of behavior, championing civil and political rights over social and economic rights. Moreover, the original convention subsequently developed to embody the Declaration reiterates and endorses these distinctions.

Eleanor Roosevelt's leadership at the UN Human Rights Commission similarly provides a classic template. U.S. initiatives highlight her ongoing role as a fundamental source of direction and innovation, citing the celebrated address on the Declaration's tenth anniversary as a compelling summary of commitments. Maintaining the linkage preserves the weighty momentum of historical precedent. Washington's record and elaborate the organizational framework. Initiatives consistently emphasize the statute's promotion through four primary phases: conception, postwar deliberations, worldwide adoption, and extension through additional conventions. The transitional postwar context conveys a heroic vindication of the American project (Berdal, 2003).

3.2.4 U.S. Leadership in Human Rights Resolutions

When humanitarian crises emerge anywhere in the world, the United States and its allies are expected to respond, but the U.S. itself is held to an even higher standard. When the United States, for example, kept Guantanamo open last year on charges of holding detainees too long, the American critics were joined by Guatemala and Nicaragua. When Guantanamo was included

in the United Nations resolution on human rights in the United States, it was lobbied in vain by U.S. congressional leaders for removal (Berdal, 2003).

These criticisms from failing or failed states, together with American protests Soviet and Cuban records on human rights, attract the derision of Gary Bass and Andrew Weiss in scores of books and articles. However, no one can deny U.S. influence within the United Nations. When Bush changed his domestic policy, closed Guantanamo, and opened a desk in the Department of Homeland Security, Cuba and thirty-three other states withdrew the same language from the 2009 resolution. When Bass and Weiss protest U.S. attention to human rights at the United Nations, they also underline the nearly unanimous suspension of the 2008 resolution on Russia's human rights record (Berdal, 2003).

The U.S. paradoxically remains outside most international human rights conventions despite embracing human rights discourse as a foreign policy frame of reference. The organization of the United Nations and the American states promotes both human rights and the U.S. While diplomats helped develop these concepts, the country did not ratify many major treaties (A. Mathews, 2012). More than 60 years after the adoption of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR), the U.S. has ratified three of only seven major international human rights contracts: racial discrimination, civil and political rights, and torture. Although the executive branch negotiates and marks the treaties, the U.S. They must be ratified by the approval of the Senate, as required by law. Signing countries can also issue reservations to refer to areas of disagreement or non-compliance with certain provisions. Understanding the status of the U.S. related to human rights treaties thus refers to its claims of leadership on this issue.

3.2.5 Economic Sanctions and Aid

Along with diplomatic pressure to isolate states, economic sanctions and aid are additional U.S. instruments for ensuring compliance. After the 1953 coup d'état, millions of dollars in aid financed Iran's modernization. U.S. military and intelligence personnel assisted in counterbalancing Soviet influence and domestic opposition. Before the 2003 invasion of Iraq, the U.S. leveraged its position on the UN Security Council to pursue compliance through economic means, including requesting UN support to establish an inspection regime intended to allow weapons purchases under strict conditions. In reaction to Iran's nuclear activities, the U.S. also gained UN support for an initial inspection regimen to verify the accurate declaration of civilian nuclear facilities. At one stage, the U.S. and several allies introduced sanctions on existing trade to encourage the voluntary adoption of more stringent incentives for convergence in support of nonproliferation measures (Christopher Rilea, 2012). Following allegations after the outbreak of the Second Gulf War, opposition to economic sanctions within the UN provided considerable cover for both Iraq and Iran (Swindells, 1996).

3.3 Impact on Global Governance

U.S. dominance has been a critical determinant in the shaping of the UN system since 1945. The organization was constructed within the framework of American values and institutions, and U.S. participation was never contingent upon the UN determining the rules of engagement for American foreign policy. In instances of major interest to the U.S., UN resolutions have often been non-binding, and U.S. pressure has greatly influenced whether states adhere to UN resolutions and decisions (Collins et al., 2013).

American military, economic, political, and strategic ideal power considering that the UN's organization does not stop its action, and the UN system supports, or at least does not criticize,

U.S. objectives and performance (Connoly and Doyle, 2002). National interests set a veto on occasions such as Suez (1956), Taiwan (1971–1973), South Africa (1977–1986), and Nicaragua (1985, 1986). President Reagan’s administration exerted four vetoes in the Security Council, more than any other country during the Cold War. The U.S. likewise played a decisive role in the information manipulations that advocated the Gulf War (1990–1991) and the Kosovo intervention (1999). During the 1990s, the Afghanistan Liberation Front (AFG), the Contras in Nicaragua, and the Resistance Movement of the People of East Timor (Ramelau) enjoyed the support of American military and intelligence units, with the UN then assuming a highly equivocal stance towards these rebel groups (Connoly and Doyle, 2002) .

Upon joining the United Nations, America emerged as the most effective country within the institution. It exerted this power via its sturdy economic impact, navy competencies, and dedicated diplomatic efforts aimed at rebuilding the devastated Europe and Japan of the forties. This dedication contributed to the status quo of groups, which includes the International Monetary Fund (IMF), which furnished monetary assistance to nations in need. Alongside economic engagement, exchange liberalization and financial integration had been pursued as strategic gears to diminish the likelihood of some other main conflict (Connoly and Doyle, 2002).

Diplomacy is regularly likened to a chess game in which each flow can drastically impact the worldwide degree. The United States’ diplomatic efforts throughout the post–World War II generation had been characterized by using transparency and a willingness to share data, thereby fostering an environment conducive to collective development. A terrific undertaking turned into the establishment of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, which represented a commitment to advancing justice and freedom globally. Although the U.S. was among the first

international locations to aid human rights and firmly oppose tyranny, it was additionally the first to violate the human rights provisions enshrined within the Universal Declaration. The Nation, which had an invitation to enroll in the United Nations, declined to take part due to the enterprise's failure to censure the allied Nazis.

3.4 Discussion of Results

The U.S. occupies an unprecedented position inside the worldwide order. Despite a resurgence of terrific-power opposition in the post-Cold War generation, U.S. primacy has continued through the elevated pace of globalization and the proliferation of recent global troubles. This segment assesses the scope of American dominance nowadays by examining a key international organization where the United States nonetheless holds preeminent impact: the United Nations.

Since its inception, the United Nations has enjoyed a uniquely privileged status in the American foreign policy apparatus. The United States is the principal architect of the organization, maintains a permanent seat on the Security Council, provides nearly 30 percent of the United Nations' financial support, and hosts most headquarters and agencies in New York City (Weston Janis, 2011). American strategic interest in the institution makes the United States the only dominant great power that has deliberately chosen to lead in the creation of a multilateral forum, rather than standing outside of potential U.N action as a secondary power (Connolly & Doyle, 2002). Among other reasons, the U.N offers unrivaled opportunities for influence and name recognition across the global spectrum, but the direct material benefits of membership have declined. By the analytical framework established earlier, U.S. dominance within the institution is therefore destined to wane over the longer term.

This section shows that the U.S. The government, as the largest financial supporter of the United Nations, currently pays a quarter of the organization's peacekeeping budget and 22 percent of its regular budget. However, he made the UN. The Peacekeeping Mission has a disproportionately small portion, which includes only 0.2 percent of the total peacekeepers. The United States has these responsibilities due to its unique ability, moral responsibilities, and self-interest, yet its overburdened colleague—its chief partner, the United Kingdom—can weaken peace operations, which are essential tools in politics and foreign relations. The progress of military, financial, and political power that allows the United States to lead the United Nations, also the UN. The Security Council dominates. The U.S. is in a multilateral stage. It is important to maintain the control of this specific club to advance the interests and values.

As the United States contemplates increasing its level of participation in UN peacekeeping, it must recognize that doing so will require more than providing additional troops or funds. An enlarged U.S. role will also reshape the nature of the United Nations as a distinct institution and alter the method by which the U.S. government manages its foreign affairs. In fact, increased commitment presents the very legitimate risk of diluting American dominance in the UN and other international institutions. Before they completely undertake the UN, the United States should thus evaluate the strategic benefits of continued leadership versus the tactical benefits of letting the institution fall under the increasing tide.

The U.S. has had dominant influence over the UN since its inception. There is a close connection between this global power, the largely constructed international order, and the UN system it dominates. Washington has considerably altered the character of the international order, adapting it to its own needs and exploiting the resulting leverage through the UN. This pattern presents a fundamental paradox: although the UN founding document was deliberately designed

to constrain the bilateral use of power, the United States has nevertheless been able to act virtually unilaterally via the Security Council and its veto privilege, resulting in the denial of meaningful multilateral inputs. It has also been capable of shaping the agenda of the General Assembly to wide-ranging effect in both the security and human rights domains. Analysis of evolutionary case studies on the use of the veto, human rights, and economic sanctions demonstrates the extent and mechanisms of America's leverage in the contemporary world order and the character of its ongoing appropriation of that leadership position (MIJA, 2018).

The evaluation of the aspects of dominance between the U.S. and the UN has revealed some significant conclusions. Firstly, the veto aspect: as a permanent member of the Security Council, the U.S. employs considerable authority over UN resolutions through its veto, frequently accepting or rejecting the Council's decisions in accordance with its strategic interests and objectives. Secondly, the financial aspect: the U.S. maintains its economic supremacy over the UN by making huge financial contributions to the organization, its agencies, and programs, such that the withdrawal of these contributions would put it at stake. Thirdly, the military aspect: the U.S. shows the possibility of monopoly, making its own decisions on military interference in other countries, even if these decisions are against the principles and resolutions of the UN, which can reduce the UN's authority and credibility. Finally, the chapter ends with the account of unilateral actions by the U.S., representing a direct challenge to the UN's multilateral system.

Conclusion

Case studies turn out to have duality in the U.S. -UN relationship: operational collaboration coexisted with structural domination. The U.S. support proves to be crucial for the mission of Mali, Somalia, and Yemen, which enables humanitarian and security interventions. On the contrary, veto power, unilateral military actions (e.g., Iraq), and conditional funding methods

underscore the override of U.S. capacities for collective decisions. This asymmetry accelerated discussions about legality and sovereignty in global rule. While shared interests facilitate effective collaboration, the diversion of priority reveals the weakness of the UN in great-power politics. Eventually, the U.S. influence was inevitable for UN operations, yet it challenged the organization's multilateral foundations naturally.

General Conclusion

This study aimed at investigating the nature of the relationship between the U.S and UN. It analyzed both its cooperative contributions and its hegemonic influence. Through a structured analytical framework, the study assessed how U.S. engagement shapes the UN's effectiveness, autonomy, and legitimacy. The study inquired about three research questions: The first research question asked about the aspects of corporation between the U.S and the UN. The second research question asked about the ways in which U.S dominate over U.N. The last research question asked about the nature of the relationship itself through its implications.

The findings demonstrate the following results : Firstly, as per answering the first question, U.S. support to UN is instrumental to enhance the UN operational capacity in peacekeeping (e.g., MINUSMA in Mali) and counter-terrorism (e.g., AMISOM in Somalia).

Secondly, the study confirms that U.S. is dominant over UN through veto power, conditional funding, and unauthorized intervention. These methods have systematically constrained UN autonomy. Consequently, the Security Council was weakened by repeated vetoes on Israel-Palestine, while financial pressures (e.g., defunding UNRWA) politicized humanitarian aid. The Iraq War (2003) further exposed how unilateralism erodes multilateral legitimacy.

Thirdly, the research concludes that while U.S. engagement is indispensable for UN functionality, its hegemonic tendencies create structural contradictions. The UN's founding principle of sovereign equality is compromised by America's influence which raises concerns about institutional fairness.

This study faced certain limitations. First, the access to classified U.S. policy documents was limited. Also, the study focused on post-Cold War cases, which may overlook earlier dynamics. Additionally, the reliance on documented vetoes and funding data, while robust, cannot fully capture informal diplomatic pressures. Future research could expand the temporal scope or incorporate interviews with UN policymakers for deeper qualitative insights. Ultimately, this dissertation underscores the paradox of U.S.-UN relations: American leadership is both a pillar of multilateralism and a challenge to its egalitarian ideals. The study thus contributes to both academic debates on global governance and practical discussions on international institutional reform.

References

- Acharya, A. (2016). *The end of American world order* (2nd ed.). Polity Press.
- Alvarado, J., & Mendis, P. (2010). New Multilateralism in Action for Peace: A Case Study of the US-Led Operation Unified Assistance in the Asian Tsunami Disaster. *Democracy and Security*, 6(2), 97–108. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17419160701410731>
- Antizzo, G. J. (2010). *U.S. Military Intervention in the Post-Cold War Era*. LSU Press.
- Apele, A. (2018). *(Un)Just war: Assessing the legality of the Saudi Arabian-led intervention in Yemen*. [PDF].
- Ataullahjan, A., Gaffey, M. F., Tounkara, M., Diarra, S., Doumbia, S., Bhutta, Z. A., & Bassani, D. G. (2020). *C'estvraimentcompliqué: A case study on the delivery of maternal and child health and nutrition interventions in the conflict-affected regions of Mali*. National Center for Biotechnology Information. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>
- Ataullahjan, A., Gaffey, M. F., Tounkara, M., Diarra, S., Doumbia, S., Bhutta, Z. A., & Bassani, D. G. (2020). *C'estvraimentcompliqué: A case study on the delivery of maternal and child health and nutrition interventions in the conflict-affected regions of Mali*. National Center for Biotechnology Information. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>
- Augusto Lopez-Claros, Dahl, A. L., & Groff, M. (2020). *Global Governance and the Emergence of*

Global Institutions for the 21st Century. Cambridge University Press.

Berdal, M. (2003). *The UN Security Council: Ineffective but indispensable*. [PDF].

Binder, M., & Heupel, M. (2014). The Legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from Recent General Assembly Debates. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(2), 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12134>

Binder, M., & Heupel, M. (2015). The legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from recent General Assembly debates. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(2), 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12134>

Binder, M., & Heupel, M. (2015). The legitimacy of the UN Security Council: Evidence from recent General Assembly debates. *International Studies Quarterly*, 59(2), 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isqu.12134>

Blanchfield, L. (2024). *U.S. funding to the United Nations system* (CRS Report No. R46965). Congressional Research Service. <https://crsreports.congress.gov>

Campaign Against Sanctions on Iraq. (2004). *UN Security Council resolutions relating to Iraq - 1990-2003*. <https://www.casi.org.uk/info/scriraq.html>

Chiangi, M. A. (2024, May 17). . Ssrn.com. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4873209

Collins, E., Jensen, M., Kanev, P., & MacCalla, M. (2013). *Shifting power: US hegemony and the media*. [PDF].

- Connolly, E., & Doyle, J. (2002). *The aftermath of 11 September: Increasing international insecurity*. [PDF].
- Dieu, J. H. (2015). *Building national EOD capacity in Mali*. [PDF].
- Dieu, J. H. (2015). *Building national EOD capacity in Mali*. [PDF].
- Elizabeth Stubbins Bates. (2012). *Terrorism and international law : accountability, remedies, and reform*. Oxford University Press.
- Gaddis, J.L. (2018). *On Grand Strategy*. Penguin.
- Groom, A. J. R. (2003). Functionalism and the UN: A pragmatic approach to global governance. In P. Taylor & A. J. R. Groom (Eds.), *The United Nations at the millennium: The principal organs* (pp. 97–119). Continuum.
- Groom, J. R. (2003). *The United States and the United Nations: Some revolting European thoughts*. https://ciaotest.cc.columbia.edu/olj/jird/jird_jun03_gra01.pdf
- Henderson, C. (2018). *The Use of Force and International Law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hoopes, T., & Brinkley, D. (1997). *FDR and the creation of the U.N.* Yale University Press.
- Karlsrud, J. (2019). Towards UN counter-terrorism operations? *Third World Quarterly*, 40(8), 1540–1556. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2016.1268907>
- Kennedy, P. (2006). *The parliament of man: The past, present and future of the United Nations*. Random House.

- Kennedy, P. (2006). *The parliament of man: The past, present, and future of the United Nations*. Random House.
- KFF. (2005). *The U.S. government and the World Health Organization*. <https://www.kff.org/global-health-policy/fact-sheet/the-u-s-government-and-the-world-health-organization/>
- Lafortune, G., & Sachs, J. D. (2024). The Index of Countries' Support for UN-based Multilateralism: Construction, Verification, and Correlates. *Asian Economic Papers*, 23(3), 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1162/asep_a_00902
- Loidolt, B. (2001). *Doing well by doing good? Strategic competition and United Nations peacekeeping*. <https://inss.ndu.edu/Portals/82/Documents/Strategic%20Perspectives/Strategic-Perspectives-36.pdf>
- Luck, E. C. (2003). The United States and the United Nations: End of an illusion. In E. C. Luck, *Mixed messages: American politics and international organization, 1919–1999* (pp. 65–84). Brookings Institution Press.
- Luck, E. C. (2006). *UN Security Council*. Routledge.
- Matthews, N. A. (2012). "Learning the truth and stating the facts": US State Department claim-making and the construction of "human rights." [PDF].
- Maynes, C. W. (1999). US unilateralism and its dangers. *Review of International Studies*, 25, 515-518.
- Mazower, M. (2012). *Governing the world: The history of an idea*. Penguin Press.

- McDougal, M. S., & Gardner, R. N. (1948). The veto and the charter: An interpretation for survival. *Yale Law Journal*, 57(2), 200-220.
- Meisler, S. (2011). *United Nations: The first fifty years*. Grove Press.
- Mija, V. (2018). *Crisis of the United Nations Security Council*. [PDF].
- Nasu, H. (2009). *International law on peacekeeping : a study of Article 40 of the UN charter*. Martinus Nijhoff Publishers.
- Neel, P. L. (1999). *US funding for the UN* (Master's thesis, Naval Postgraduate School). Defense Technical Information Center. <http://handle.dtic.mil/100.2/ADA371288>
- Phillips, A. L. (2014). *Teaching notes for CHAPTER 4: Mozambique: A chance for peace*. [PDF].
- Rilea, R. C. (2012). *Not-so splendid isolation: An IPE study of Iranian sanction busting*. [PDF].
- Ruggie, J. G. (2017). Multinationals as Global institution: Power, Authority and Relative Autonomy. *Regulation & Governance*, 12(3), 317–333. wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12154>
- Saint-Pierre, H. L., & Bigatão, J. de P. (2017). *As operações de paz da ONU e os atores regionais: Arranjos de cooperação e desafios* [UN peace operations and regional actors: Cooperation arrangements and challenges]. [PDF].
- Sands, P. (2005). *Lawless world: Making and breaking global rules*. Penguin.
- Schlesinger, T. (1995). *North vs. South: Sovereign equality and the environment in the twentieth century*. [PDF].

Shaw, N. M. (2003). *International law* (5th ed.). Cambridge University Press.

Sitkowski, A. (2006). *UN Peacekeeping*. Bloomsbury Publishing USA.

Smith, B., & Thorp, A. (2010, February 26). *The legal basis for the invasion of Afghanistan* (Standard Note No. SN/IA/5340). House of Commons Library. <https://researchbriefings.files.parliament.uk/documents/SN05340/SN05340.pdf>

Smith, R. (2013). “To see Themselves as Others see Them”: The Five Permanent Members of the Security Council and the Human Rights Council’s Universal Periodic Review. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 35(1), 1–32. <https://doi.org/10.1353/hrq.2013.0006>

Swindells, F. (1996). *U.N. sanctions in Haiti: A contradiction under Articles 41 and 55 of the U.N. Charter*. [PDF].

Truman, H. S. (1949). Inaugural address, January 20, 1949. *Public papers of the presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman, 1949* (pp. 1–5). U.S. Government Printing Office.

U.S. Department of State. (2001, November 5). *Fact sheet: The global coalition against terrorism: One year later*. <https://2001-2009.state.gov/s/ct/rls/wh/6947.htm>

UNICEF. (n.d.). *United States of America*. <https://www.unicef.org/partnerships/united-states-america>

United Nations. (n.d.). *History of the UN*. <https://www.un.org/en/about-us/history-of-the-un>

Wallerstein, I. (2003). The U.S. and the UN: Hegemonic tools. *Global Dialogue*, 5(2), 45–49. [https://doi.org/\[insert DOI if available\]](https://doi.org/[insert DOI if available])

- Wallerstein, I. (2003). *The decline of American power: The U.S. in a chaotic world*. The New Press.
- Washington Post Staff. (2019, March 22). Iraq war, WMDs: An intelligence failure or White House spin? *The Washington Post*. <https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2019/03/22/iraq-war-wmds-an-intelligence-failure-or-white-house-spin/>
- Weiss, T. G. (2021). *What's wrong with the United Nations and how to fix it* (3rd ed.). Polity Press.
- Weiss, T. G. (n.d.). *Instrumental internationalism: U.S. foreign policy and the United Nations*. Columbia University. <https://www.columbia.edu/~saw2156/InstrumentalInternationalism.pdf>
- Wertheim, S. (2019). *Tomorrow, the world: The birth of U.S. global supremacy in World War II*. Harvard University Press.
- Weston Janis, M. (2011). *The United States and international law: The United Nations finds a home*. [PDF].
- Williams, P. (2018). Fighting for Peace in Somalia. In *Oxford University Press eBooks*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198724544.001.0001>
- Wood, M. (2019). *Contemporary U.S. counter-terrorism strategy toward Somalia*. [PDF].
- World Food Programme (WFP). (2025). *Annual report 2024*. <https://www.wfp.org/publications/wfp-annual-report-2024>
- World Health Organization. (2025, January 21). *WHO comments on United States' announcement of intent to withdraw*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/21-01-2025-who-comments-on-united-states--announcement-of-intent-to-withdraw>

World Health Organization. (n.d.). *Collaborating*

centres. <https://www.who.int/about/collaboration/collaborating-centres>

Wouters, J. (2005). *Security council reform: a new veto for a new century? (Egmont Paper 9)*.
Academia Press.

Wouters, J., & Ruys, T. (2005). *Security Council reform: A new veto for a new century?* (Egmont
Paper No. 9). Egmont Institute.

Yoo, J. (2009). War powers in the Bush administration. In M. J. Rozell & G. Whitney (Eds.), *Testing
the limits: George W. Bush and the imperial presidency* (pp. 131-156). Rowman & Littlefield.

المخلص

تهدف الدراسة إلى التساؤل حول العلاقة المتناقضة بين الولايات المتحدة والأمم المتحدة، إذ تُعنى بكيفية قيام الولايات المتحدة بدعم الحوكمة من جهة، وتقويضها من أخرى. استخدمت هذه الدراسة منهجاً نوعياً لجمع البيانات، بالإضافة إلى المنهجين التاريخي والوصفي لتحليل ما تم جمعه. وقد كشفت الدراسة عما يلي: ضرورة الأساليب التعاونية للولايات المتحدة، خاصة فيما يتعلق بالموارد والقيادة لتعزيز القدرة التشغيلية للأمم المتحدة بشكل ملحوظ. مع ذلك، فإن النزعة الأحادية الأمريكية والممارسات المالية بالغضب تضعف من استقلالية المؤسسات الأممية. وتُبين النتائج عن هيمنة الولايات المتحدة التي تخلق هياكل متناقضة مع المبدأ الأساسي للأمم المتحدة المتمثل في المساواة السيادية بين الدول، ويبرز ذلك بوضوح في استخدام حق النقض (الفيتو) المتكرر في فلسطين وإسرائيل، والتدخلات العسكرية غير مصرح بها كالتالي حدثت بالعراق عام 2003. تخلص الدراسة إلى أن طبيعة العلاقات بين الولايات المتحدة والأمم المتحدة متعددة الأوجه، وأن الولايات المتحدة تستخدم التعاون كأداة لفرض هيمنتها بشكل أكبر.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الإصلاح المؤسسي، عمليات حفظ السلام، حق النقض في مجلس الأمن، العلاقات الأميركية –

الأممية.