

*The decisions made by the Security Council in the field of international criminal justice (...) should be seen as an aberration. They amount to an imperial exercise of the Council's mandate in the field of collective security, which has no basis in the Charter and should not be accepted as precedent. The supreme executive organ of the United Nations is not the supreme authority of a world state, and must "defer" the exercise of legislative and judicial powers to the competent national or treaty-based institutions.*

(From the concluding chapter)

**The present analysis concludes the International Progress Organization's research project on the mandate and role of the United Nations Security Council under the conditions of the post-Cold War world order. The author questions the legal basis of the ad hoc tribunals for Yugoslavia, Rwanda, and Lebanon; he further evaluates the relationship between the Security Council and the International Criminal Court and makes an assessment of the quasi-judicial role of the supreme executive organ of the United Nations in matters of international terrorism. In view of the Security Council's arrogated powers as "administrator of justice," the author asks whether the international rule of law can be reconciled at all with the imperatives of power politics.**

Editorial Assistant: David Armstrong

ISBN 978-3-900704-25-4  
[www.i-p-o.org](http://www.i-p-o.org)

