



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 5

2026

BIRLASHGAN MILLATLAR TASHKILOTINING YAQIN SHARQDAGI O‘RNI

Komiljon Akhmedov

Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universiteti, dotsent (PhD)

Annotatsiya

Yaqin Sharq zamonaviy xalqaro tizimdagi mojarolardan eng ko‘p zarar ko‘rgan hududlardan biri bo‘lib qolmoqda. 1945-yildan buyon United Nations mintaqadagi qurolli mojarolarni boshqarish, muzokaralarga ko‘maklashish, gumanitar yordam yetkazish hamda xalqaro tinchlik va xavfsizlikni ta‘minlashga qaratilgan sa‘y-harakatlarda markaziy o‘rin egallab kelmoqda. Mazkur maqolada BMTning Yaqin Sharqdagi mojarolarni boshqarishdagi samaradorligi to‘rtta tahliliy yo‘nalish asosida baholanadi: tinchlikparvarlik faoliyati, vositachilik, gumanitar javob choralari hamda sanksiyalar kabi majburlovchi vositalar. Tadqiqotda Lebanon, Golan Heights, Iraq, Iran, Syria va Yemen misollariga tayangan holda sifat jihatidan qiyosiy yondashuv qo‘llanilgan. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, BMT mojarolarni jilovlash, sulhga rioya etilishini monitoring qilish va gumanitar faoliyatni muvofiqlashtirish borasida nisbatan ijobiy natijalarga erishgan, ayniqsa mandatlar aniq belgilangan va yirik davlatlar o‘rtasida cheklangan bo‘lsa-da muayyan kelishuv mavjud bo‘lgan holatlarda. Biroq tashkilot siyosiy nizolarning tub sabablarini bartaraf etish, uzoq davom etuvchi fuqarolar urushlarining oldini olish yoki keskin qutblashgan geosiyosiy muhitda qarorlarning ijrosini ta‘minlash borasida kamroq muvaffaqiyat qozongan. United Nations Security Councildagi veto siyosati, mezbon davlat roziligiga qaramlik, moliyaviy cheklovlar hamda parchalangan mintaqaviy raqobat kabi tizimli omillar operatsion samaradorlikni pasaytirishda davom etmoqda. Maqola xulosasiga ko‘ra, United Nations Yaqin Sharqda barcha mojarolarni to‘liq hal etuvchi institut sifatida emas, balki keskinlashuvni yumshata oladigan, diplomatik kanallarni saqlab qoladigan va uzoq muddatli tinchlik barpo etish sa‘y-harakatlarini qo‘llab-quvvatlaydigan barqarorlashtiruvchi institut sifatida hanzuz ajralmas ahamiyatga ega.

Kalit so‘zlar: BMT, diplomatiya, Yaqin Sharq, ziddiyat, insonparvarlik yordami.

РОЛЬ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЁННЫХ НАЦИЙ НА БЛИЖНЕМ ВОСТОКЕ

Комилжон Ахмедов

Университет мировой экономики и дипломатии, доцент (PhD)

Аннотация

Ближний Восток остаётся одним из регионов, наиболее пострадавших от конфликтов в современной международной системе. С 1945 года Организация Объединённых Наций занимает центральное место в усилиях по управлению вооружёнными конфликтами в регионе, содействию переговорам, предоставлению гуманитарной помощи и обеспечению международного мира и безопасности. В статье эффективность ООН в управлении конфликтами на Ближнем Востоке оценивается по четырём аналитическим направлениям: миротворческая деятельность, посредничество, гуманитарное реагирование и принудительные меры, включая санкции. Исследование основано на качественном сравнительном подходе с использованием примеров Ливан, Голанские высоты, Ирак, Иран, Сирия и Йемен. Результаты показывают, что ООН добилась относительно положительных результатов в сдерживании конфликтов, мониторинге соблюдения перемирий и координации гуманитарной деятельности, особенно в случаях, когда мандаты были чётко определены и между крупными державами существовал хотя бы ограниченный консенсус. Однако организация оказалась менее успешной в устранении коренных причин политических конфликтов, предотвращении затяжных гражданских войн и обеспечении исполнения решений в условиях жёстко поляризованной геополитической среды. Такие системные факторы, как политика вето в Совет Безопасности ООН, зависимость от согласия принимающего государства, финансовые ограничения и фрагментированная региональная конкуренция, продолжают снижать операционную эффективность. В заключении статьи подчёркивается, что Организация Объединённых Наций остаётся не институтом полного разрешения всех конфликтов на Ближнем Востоке, а стабилизирующим механизмом, способным снижать эскалацию, сохранять дипломатические каналы и поддерживать долгосрочные усилия по построению мира.

Ключевые слова: ООН, дипломатия, Ближний Восток, конфликт, гуманитарная помощь.

THE ROLE OF THE UNITED NATIONS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

Komiljon Akhmedov

The University of World Economy and Diplomacy, Associate Professor (PhD)

Abstract

The Middle East remains one of the regions most affected by conflicts in the contemporary international system. Since 1945, the United Nations has played a central role in efforts to manage armed conflicts in the region, facilitate negotiations, provide humanitarian assistance, and maintain international peace and security. This article evaluates the effectiveness of the UN in managing Middle Eastern conflicts through four analytical dimensions: peacekeeping activities, mediation, humanitarian response, and coercive instruments such as sanctions. The study applies a qualitative comparative approach using examples from Lebanon, Golan Heights, Iraq, Iran, Syria, and Yemen. The findings demonstrate that the UN has achieved relatively positive outcomes in containing conflicts, monitoring ceasefires, and coordinating humanitarian activities, particularly where mandates were clearly defined and a limited consensus among major powers existed. However, the organization has been less successful in addressing the root causes of political conflicts, preventing prolonged civil wars, or ensuring implementation of decisions within highly polarized geopolitical environments. Structural factors such as veto politics within the United Nations Security Council, dependence on host-state consent, financial constraints, and fragmented regional rivalries continue to undermine operational effectiveness. The article concludes that the United Nations remains indispensable in the Middle East not as an institution capable of fully resolving all conflicts, but as a stabilizing mechanism that can mitigate escalation, preserve diplomatic channels, and support long-term peacebuilding efforts.

Keywords: UN, diplomacy, Middle East, conflict, humanitarian aid.

Due to its strategic location, vast energy resources, ideological significance, and recurring security crises, the Middle East continues to occupy a central position in international politics. Major conflicts involving interstate wars, civil wars, territorial disputes, sectarian violence, and proxy competition have made the region one of the most unstable areas of the international system. Consequently, the United Nations has remained deeply engaged in the region since the earliest years of its existence.

Indeed, some of the UN's earliest political and operational activities were carried out in the Middle East. The Palestine question was debated during the organization's formative period, while the first UN observer mission, the United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), was established in 1948. Similarly, the first large-scale armed peacekeeping force, the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF), was deployed during the 1956 Suez Crisis. Since then, the Middle East has served as a major testing ground for UN diplomacy, peacekeeping operations, humanitarian action, sanctions regimes, and conflict-management mechanisms [1–3].

Despite this long-standing involvement, scholarly and political assessments of UN performance in the Middle East remain deeply divided. Supporters argue that UN missions have prevented the escalation of regional wars, preserved ceasefires, facilitated diplomatic communication, provided humanitarian assistance to millions of civilians, and maintained channels for negotiation during periods of intense political instability. Critics, however, contend that the organization has frequently failed to prevent large-scale violence, remained constrained by great-power rivalry, and struggled to address the underlying political causes of regional conflicts [5–8].

This debate raises an important analytical question: To what extent has the United Nations been effective in managing conflicts in the Middle East?

Rather than treating effectiveness as an abstract or vague concept, this article evaluates UN performance through several measurable criteria, including:

1. Reduction of violence;
2. Durability of ceasefires;
3. Facilitation of political dialogue;
4. Humanitarian access and civilian protection;
5. Institutional legitimacy and continuity of engagement.

The article argues that the United Nations has generally been more successful in conflict management than in conflict resolution. In many cases, the organization has succeeded in reducing immediate escalation and maintaining a minimum level of regional stability without achieving sustainable political settlements. Nevertheless, despite its institutional limitations, the UN remains one of the few

universal multilateral organizations capable of facilitating dialogue and maintaining diplomatic engagement within highly polarized geopolitical environments.

Literature Review

Scholarly literature examining the role of the United Nations in conflict zones generally falls into three major schools of interpretation.

The first school emphasizes the significance and utility of international institutions. Scholars associated with liberal institutionalism argue that the United Nations provides legitimacy, mechanisms for information sharing, mediation platforms, and collective responses that reduce transaction costs among states and facilitate international cooperation. From this perspective, UN peacekeeping operations can stabilize post-conflict environments, reduce the risk of renewed violence, and create conditions conducive to political negotiation and long-term peacebuilding [5]. Liberal institutionalists therefore view the organization as an important instrument for maintaining international order and promoting cooperative security.

The second school adopts a more skeptical position. Realist scholars argue that the United Nations does not function as an independent actor but rather reflects the political interests and strategic calculations of powerful states. According to this perspective, the effectiveness of the UN depends largely on the willingness of major powers to support collective action. Where the interests of influential states converge, the organization may operate effectively; however, where geopolitical rivalry intensifies, institutional paralysis becomes increasingly likely due to political disagreements, veto power competition, and selective implementation of international norms [7]. From a realist standpoint, the UN is therefore constrained structurally by the distribution of power within the international system.

A third perspective focuses on governance, norms, and the social construction of international legitimacy. Constructivist scholars emphasize that even when the organization lacks strong enforcement mechanisms, the United Nations continues to shape international expectations through legal discourse, humanitarian principles, monitoring mechanisms, and reputational pressure [8]. According to this approach, the UN plays a significant role in constructing normative frameworks that influence state behavior, public discourse, and international perceptions of legitimacy. Consequently, the organization's influence extends beyond military or coercive capabilities and includes symbolic, legal, and moral dimensions of global governance.

Within the Middle Eastern context, all three perspectives remain highly relevant. Some studies emphasize the stabilizing role of missions such as the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), highlighting their contributions to ceasefire maintenance, de-escalation, and regional stability [2–3]. Other studies, however, focus on repeated setbacks in conflicts such as Syria, Iraq during earlier periods, and Yemen, where internal fragmentation, external intervention, and geopolitical competition significantly weakened the effectiveness of multilateral diplomacy and limited the organization's ability to achieve sustainable political settlements [9].

Another important strand of literature examines the humanitarian dimension of UN involvement in the region. Researchers have demonstrated that UN agencies—including the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), and the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR)—often become indispensable actors during regional crises, particularly in situations where political negotiations fail or remain deadlocked [10–11]. These agencies provide humanitarian assistance, refugee protection, food security support, healthcare, education, and emergency relief for millions of civilians affected by armed conflict and displacement.

At the same time, the existing literature reveals a noticeable gap. Although numerous studies analyze peacekeeping operations, diplomatic mediation, sanctions regimes, or humanitarian governance separately, there remains a need for integrated assessments that examine these dimensions within a single analytical framework. This article contributes to addressing that gap by applying a multidimensional effectiveness framework that combines institutionalist, realist, and governance-based approaches in evaluating UN engagement in the Middle East.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative comparative case-study methodology. Rather than attempting statistical generalization, the research examines selected UN engagements across the Middle East in order to identify recurring patterns of effectiveness, institutional limitations, and operational challenges. The qualitative approach allows for a deeper examination of the political, humanitarian, and diplomatic

dimensions of UN activity within diverse regional contexts.

Cases Selected

The study focuses on several major cases of United Nations engagement in the Middle East:

1. Lebanon — United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL);
2. Golan Heights — United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF);
3. Iraq — United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI) and earlier UN monitoring frameworks;
4. Iran — sanctions regimes and nuclear diplomacy;
5. Syria — mediation efforts and humanitarian diplomacy;
6. Yemen — mediation initiatives and humanitarian response operations.

These cases were selected because they represent different instruments of UN engagement, including peacekeeping operations, special political missions, sanctions mechanisms, humanitarian assistance, and diplomatic mediation. Collectively, they provide a broad basis for evaluating the multidimensional role of the United Nations in regional conflict management.

Sources

The study relies on a combination of primary and secondary sources, including:

- United Nations resolutions, reports, and official documents;
- academic journal articles and scholarly publications;
- policy analyses and institutional assessments;
- secondary academic literature related to international relations, peacekeeping, and conflict studies.

The use of multiple categories of sources allows for a more balanced and comprehensive analysis of both institutional performance and broader geopolitical dynamics.

Limitations

This article does not attempt to measure classified diplomatic processes or attribute causality exclusively to United Nations actions. In conflict environments, outcomes are shaped simultaneously by numerous domestic, regional, and international actors. Consequently, the analysis recognizes that UN effectiveness is often conditioned by factors beyond the organization’s direct control, including great-power rivalry, regional intervention, local political fragmentation, and changing military realities on the ground.

Analytical Framework: Measuring Effectiveness

In order to evaluate UN performance systematically, the article applies five analytical criteria:

Criterion	Meaning
Violence Reduction	Whether hostilities decreased following UN engagement
Ceasefire Durability	Whether ceasefires or disengagement arrangements remained stable over time
Political Facilitation	Whether negotiations, dialogue, or political agreements advanced
Humanitarian Access	Whether civilians received humanitarian aid, protection, or basic services
Institutional Legitimacy	Whether the UN continued to be recognized as a relevant and acceptable actor

This framework distinguishes between operational success and strategic success. A mission may succeed operationally—for example, by monitoring a ceasefire or reducing short-term violence—while simultaneously failing strategically if no comprehensive political settlement is achieved. Such a distinction is particularly important in the Middle Eastern context, where many conflicts remain unresolved despite long-term international engagement.

UN Peacekeeping Effectiveness in the Middle East

The United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO), established in 1948, remains the oldest active UN peace operation. UNTSO is widely regarded as the foundation of modern UN peacekeeping because many subsequent missions were modeled on its structure and operational principles. Its observers continue to monitor armistice arrangements related to Arab–Israeli conflicts across Israel, Lebanon, Syria, and Jordan. Although UNTSO possesses limited enforcement authority, it has provided continuity, liaison mechanisms, monitoring functions, and field reporting for decades [1].

The United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) was established in 1974 following the Arab–Israeli War in order to supervise the disengagement line between Israel and Syria on the Golan Heights. Despite major regional instability—including the Syrian civil war—the mission has largely succeeded in preserving a relatively stable buffer arrangement between the parties [2]. According to the analytical criteria outlined above, UNDOF represents one of the more successful examples of UN

involvement in the Middle East due to its contribution to violence reduction, durable ceasefire maintenance, and sustained institutional legitimacy.

The United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) was established in 1978 and significantly expanded after the 2006 Lebanon War. Its mandate has included monitoring the cessation of hostilities, supporting the Lebanese Armed Forces, facilitating humanitarian access, and helping reduce escalation in southern Lebanon. Although UNIFIL has not resolved the deeper political causes of instability or eliminated the presence of armed non-state actors, it has frequently contributed to containing incidents that could otherwise escalate into broader interstate confrontation [3]. Consequently, the mission presents a mixed record: limited strategic achievements, but considerable operational significance in maintaining relative stability along sensitive border areas.

The United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI), which concluded its twenty-two-year mandate on 31 December 2025, is generally considered one of the more successful examples of a UN special political mission. Throughout its mandate, UNAMI supported Iraq's transition from large-scale conflict toward relative political stabilization [4]. The mission contributed to political dialogue, electoral assistance, constitutional processes, governance reform, and human rights promotion, before transitioning toward a development-oriented partnership framework. Nevertheless, some analysts and observers argue that the closure of the mission was accelerated by domestic political pressures and the Iraqi government's increasing emphasis on full national sovereignty.

In summary, several broad conclusions may be drawn from the experience of United Nations peacekeeping operations in the Middle East:

- Peacekeeping missions tend to function most effectively where the conflicting parties prefer limited stability over renewed large-scale warfare;
- Clearly defined and realistic mandates generally produce more effective outcomes than overly ambitious or politically expansive mandates;
- Peacekeeping operations cannot substitute for comprehensive political settlements and long-term conflict resolution mechanisms.

Moreover, UN peacekeeping missions depend heavily on the consent of host states, cooperation from conflicting parties, and the availability of financial, logistical, and military resources. These conditions significantly restrict the operational flexibility of missions and often limit the organization's ability to enforce decisions independently. As a result, a gap frequently emerges between the normative objectives of the United Nations and its practical capabilities on the ground. In the Middle Eastern context, peacekeeping has generally functioned more as a buffer mechanism aimed at containing violence than as an instrument capable of producing durable political peace settlements.

UN Mediation and Diplomatic Effectiveness

Beyond peacekeeping activities, the United Nations also performs an important diplomatic role through the Secretary-General, special envoys, mediators, and negotiated international forums. In the Middle East, however, mediation has often proven more politically sensitive and complex than peacekeeping because it directly involves issues of sovereignty, territorial disputes, regime legitimacy, and regional geopolitical competition.

UN diplomacy in the region has frequently concentrated on de-escalation rather than comprehensive settlement. During crises related to Lebanon and Gaza, for example, UN officials have repeatedly relied on shuttle diplomacy, indirect communication, emergency consultations, and back-channel negotiations in order to prevent broader regional escalation. Although such diplomatic efforts rarely attract major international attention, they can play a significant role in preventing immediate military confrontation and preserving limited channels of communication between hostile actors.

The Syrian conflict represents one of the clearest examples of both the necessity and the limitations of UN mediation. Successive UN special envoys attempted to facilitate ceasefire arrangements, constitutional dialogue, political negotiations, and humanitarian access agreements. While these efforts succeeded in maintaining diplomatic channels and securing temporary localized reductions in violence, they failed to produce a comprehensive political transition or a sustainable nationwide settlement [12]. The Syrian case demonstrates that the effectiveness of mediation declines significantly under several conditions:

- when external powers actively support opposing sides in the conflict;
- when domestic actors reject compromise or perceive military victory as achievable;
- when battlefield incentives outweigh diplomatic incentives.

Similarly, UN mediation efforts in Yemen have produced partial yet meaningful outcomes, particularly through localized ceasefires, prisoner exchanges, humanitarian arrangements, and dialogue frameworks. Although a durable nationwide settlement remains unresolved, the United Nations has nevertheless contributed to reducing violence during several periods and preserving communication channels among the parties involved [13].

However, the effectiveness of such diplomatic initiatives remains heavily constrained by geopolitical divisions within the broader international system. While the United Nations provides an institutional platform for dialogue and negotiation, the success of mediation efforts ultimately depends on the political will of the conflicting parties and the degree of consensus among major international powers. Where geopolitical competition intensifies, diplomatic initiatives frequently lose momentum or become politically fragmented.

In addition to mediation efforts, the UN system operates through numerous specialized committees, agencies, and institutional bodies that focus on the political, legal, and humanitarian dimensions of regional conflicts. These structures include committees dedicated to the Palestinian issue, monitoring bodies, investigative mechanisms, and various reporting frameworks. Such institutions produce analytical reports, support international legal norms, maintain institutional continuity, and ensure that long-standing disputes remain visible within the multilateral international agenda. Their contribution is particularly important in sustaining international attention toward protracted conflicts and documenting developments within an internationally recognized legal framework. Nevertheless, the influence of these mechanisms remains largely normative and symbolic, as their practical effectiveness depends significantly on the willingness of member states to implement recommendations and act upon institutional findings.

The United Nations Security Council has also employed sanctions regimes and monitoring mechanisms as instruments of political pressure in the Middle East. Such measures have been implemented in various contexts, most notably in Iraq during the 1990s and in relation to Iran's nuclear programme during the 2000s, primarily in response to regional security concerns and nuclear non-proliferation issues [6]. In addition to sanctions, the United Nations has utilized inspection regimes, monitoring bodies, and verification missions in order to evaluate compliance with international agreements and Security Council resolutions.

Although these instruments can influence state behavior and generate political leverage, their effectiveness remains widely debated within both academic and policy-oriented literature. Supporters argue that sanctions and monitoring mechanisms can pressure governments to alter strategic behavior without resorting to direct military intervention. Critics, however, emphasize that sanctions frequently produce unintended economic and humanitarian consequences, disproportionately affecting civilian populations while failing to generate substantial political change. Consequently, the practical impact of sanctions often remains limited by issues of enforcement, political selectivity, and the ability of targeted states to adapt to external pressure.

Despite its notable contributions across peacekeeping, mediation, and humanitarian governance, the United Nations continues to face persistent structural and political challenges in the Middle East. Political divisions within the Security Council, particularly the use of veto power by permanent members, have repeatedly limited the organization's ability to respond effectively to major regional crises. As a result, UN actions have frequently been confined to conflict management rather than comprehensive conflict resolution. In many cases, the organization has succeeded in containing escalation and mitigating humanitarian consequences without achieving sustainable political settlements.

Humanitarian and Development Support

Alongside its peacekeeping and diplomatic functions, the United Nations plays a central role in promoting humanitarian assistance and sustainable development across the Middle East through a broad network of specialized agencies, funds, and programmes operating within the framework of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. Key institutional actors include the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the World Food Programme (WFP), the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), and the World Health Organization (WHO).

According to recent UN reporting, UNDP programme expenditures in the Arab States region exceeded approximately USD 1.1–1.3 billion annually during 2023–2024, with major emphasis placed on governance reform, climate resilience, post-conflict recovery, and institutional stabilization programmes [14]. At the same time, the World Food Programme has remained the largest humanitarian agency operating in the region, reaching approximately 30–36 million people annually across the Middle East and

neighboring areas, particularly in conflict-affected contexts such as Yemen and Syria [11]. During peak emergency phases in Yemen, WFP assistance reached an estimated 13–15 million beneficiaries per month [11].

UNICEF has likewise played a critical role in advancing human development by delivering educational services, water and sanitation support, child protection mechanisms, and emergency assistance to more than 25 million children across the Middle East and North Africa region, although these figures primarily reflect programme reach rather than continuous service provision [15]. Meanwhile, FAO programmes have concentrated on addressing structural vulnerabilities within regional agricultural and food systems, especially in highly water-scarce environments. The Middle East currently contains 12 of the world's 17 most water-stressed countries, making agricultural sustainability, food security, and water governance central long-term development challenges [16].

In parallel, WHO interventions have focused on strengthening fragile healthcare systems, disease surveillance mechanisms, vaccination programmes, and emergency medical responses in conflict-affected states such as Syria, Iraq, and Yemen [17]. Nevertheless, despite these extensive humanitarian and development efforts, socioeconomic progress across the region remains highly uneven due to ongoing armed conflicts, displacement crises, institutional fragility, and economic instability. Consequently, UN humanitarian and development functions increasingly overlap, creating what scholars frequently describe as a “humanitarian-development nexus” within the regional context [19].

Conclusion

The United Nations is often evaluated as though it were a fully empowered “world government.” In reality, however, it is an intergovernmental institution whose authority and operational capacity remain fundamentally constrained by the political interests and decisions of its member states.

The analysis presented in this article supports several balanced conclusions:

- The United Nations has often demonstrated relative effectiveness in conflict management;
- It has been considerably less successful in achieving comprehensive conflict resolution;
- The organization performs most effectively where mandates remain limited, realistic, and supported by political consensus;
- It performs least effectively where major powers are divided and local actors continue to pursue military victory over political compromise.

Peacekeeping missions such as the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF) and the United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) demonstrate that the UN can contribute to containing violence and preserving relative stability over extended periods of time. Humanitarian agencies continue to provide indispensable assistance for civilian populations affected by war, displacement, and economic crisis. Likewise, mediation initiatives preserve diplomatic channels even within highly polarized and hostile political environments. Nevertheless, the organization remains constrained by state sovereignty, geopolitical rivalry, limited enforcement mechanisms, and dependence on member-state cooperation.

Therefore, the effectiveness of the United Nations should not be measured solely by its ability to “solve” Middle Eastern conflicts entirely. Its broader significance lies in preventing further escalation, preserving international legitimacy for diplomacy, mitigating humanitarian catastrophe, and maintaining pathways for eventual political settlement. In many instances, the absence of UN engagement could have resulted in significantly greater instability and violence.

Looking forward, stronger cooperation between the United Nations and regional stakeholders remains essential. This includes expanding diplomatic engagement in peace processes, increasing donor support—both financial and operational—and strengthening the institutional capacity of UN agencies operating on the ground. Greater investment in preventive diplomacy, early warning systems, conflict-prevention strategies, and local peacebuilding initiatives may also improve long-term regional stability.

Furthermore, deeper engagement with local governments, civil society organizations, and regional actors could strengthen the legitimacy, inclusiveness, and effectiveness of UN initiatives. Ultimately, the future role of the United Nations in the Middle East will depend on its ability to adapt institutionally, maintain multilateral legitimacy, and balance humanitarian responsibilities with the political realities of an increasingly fragmented international order.

REFERENCES

1. United Nations Peacekeeping. United Nations Truce Supervision Organization (UNTSO). – 2026.
2. United Nations Peacekeeping. United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF). – 2026.
3. United Nations Peacekeeping. United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL). – 2026.

4. United Nations Assistance Mission for Iraq (UNAMI). Final Reports and Mandate Closure. – 2025.
5. Bellamy A. J., Williams P. D. Understanding Peacekeeping. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
6. Keohane R. O. After Hegemony: Cooperation and Discord in the World Political Economy. – Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984.
7. Mearsheimer J. J. The False Promise of International Institutions // International Security. – 1994. – Vol. 19(3). – P. 5–49.
8. Finnemore M. National Interests in International Society. – Cornell: Cornell University Press, 1996.
9. Abdelghani H. Evaluating the Role of the United Nations in Managing Middle East Conflicts // Law and Political Science Journal. – 2025. – Vol. 11(1). – P. 562–577.
10. United Nations Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA). Middle East Humanitarian Overview. – 2025.
11. World Food Programme (WFP). Middle East Regional Situation Reports. – 2025.
12. United Nations Special Envoy for Syria. Official Briefings and Reports. – 2025.
13. United Nations Special Envoy for Yemen. Official Briefings and Reports. – 2025.
14. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). Annual Report: Arab States Region. – 2024.
15. UNICEF. Middle East and North Africa Regional Humanitarian Action for Children. – 2024.
16. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO). Water Scarcity in the Near East and North Africa Region. – 2024.
17. World Health Organization (WHO). Health Emergencies in the Eastern Mediterranean Region. – 2024.
18. United Nations. Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. – 2015.
19. OECD. The Humanitarian–Development–Peace Nexus: Interim Progress Review. – 2023.