

The existence of double standards within the UN undermines the foundations of international law and order and human security. Russia's illegal membership in the United Nations and the UN Security Council calls into question the legitimacy of the entire system that was created to ensure peace and stability in the world.

The fact of the Russian Federation's illegal membership in the UN is indisputable and can only be recognized and used as a basis for further actions and decisions aimed at depriving Russia of its illegal membership.

The following is known for certain:

- The USSR, as a state and geopolitical entity, ceased to exist, not changed its name and territory;
- The heads of state and heads of government of the successor states of the USSR did not have any constitutional authority to make the decisions contained in the Alma-Ata Papers;
- No norms of international law or national legislation contain the term "support" as used in the Alma-Ata Papers;
- The Alma-Ata Papers have never been subjected to judicial or parliamentary scrutiny and have never been recognized as an interstate agreement.
- The letter of December 24, 1991, from the President of the RSFSR to the UN Secretary-General regarding Russia's membership in the UN does not generate any legal consequences, since:
 - The Letter itself was sent to the UN by the leader of a country that had never acquired the status of a member of the UN as an organization in accordance with the requirements of the UN Charter;
 - It is not clear from the text of the Letter which country Mr. Yeltsin represented when signing it: The RSFSR, the Russian Federation (the law on renaming of which was signed by Mr. Yeltsin only on December 25, 1991), or the mythical Russia;
 - The text of the Letter became known only after the plaque on the desk of the Permanent Member of the UN Security Council, which belonged to the USSR, was changed;
 - The mere appeals of the countries of the world, regardless of whether they are members of the UN or not at the time of sending such Letters, do not generate any consequences or create obligations for the UN under the UN Charter;
 - The Letter has never been the subject of study or debate at any meeting of the UN General Assembly or the Security Council, and therefore, the Member States of the Organization have never had the opportunity to support or oppose Russia's admission to the United Nations;
 - The Russian Federation has never ratified the UN Charter or submitted its instrument of ratification through the UN Secretariat for deposit with the U.S. Department of State, as required by the UN Charter;
 - The term "continuator state" is not mentioned in the UN Charter and is not unambiguously defined by public international law;

Thus, an urgent question is on the agenda: what specific scenarios are possible for Russia's expulsion from the UN? The development of such scenarios requires not only legal analysis, but also political will on the part of the international community.

All the proposed options are based solely on the provisions of the UN Charter and existing precedents that have occurred in the activities of the UN itself as an international organization;

The "China scenario" of 1971.

At that time, the UN General Assembly recognized the Republic of China (Taiwan) as an improper representative of the people of all of China. To recognize Russia as an improper representative of the peoples of the USSR, only a simple majority of UNGA member states is needed, exactly the same majority that has been consistently supporting pro-Ukrainian resolutions lately.

Any UN member state can take the initiative to recognize Russia as an improper representative of the USSR and the peoples who inhabited the USSR. Such an initiative does not pose any risks either for the UN or for the country that initiated the adoption of such a special resolution of the UN General Assembly. And this will happen not because Russia is an aggressor state (which contains risks for Ukraine's main partners), but because it is a rogue state in the international arena. The "Chinese precedent" shows that all UN resolutions and documents adopted from 1949 to 1971, when China was represented in the UN by the Republic of China (Taiwan), which did not control mainland China during that period, have not lost their force and are still in effect, so there is no fear of causing international disorder.

The "South African scenario", when the Credentials Committee did not confirm the credentials of the Republic of South Africa from 1969 to 1984 because of apartheid. In the same way, on the grounds of the legal nullity of Russia's membership in the UN and inadequate representation of the peoples of the USSR, it is possible not to confirm the credentials of the Russian delegation for many years, effectively blocking their ability to participate in the work of the UN.

Based on the above facts about the illegality of Russia's membership in the UN, we should move on to another critical issue - responsibility for aggressive actions. This concerns not only the violation of international norms, but also the need to establish justice and punish Russia for waging an aggressive war.

The following options exist to bring Russia to justice for launching and waging an aggressive war in direct violation of the UN Charter:

- The International Criminal Court, but in order to hear a case on charges of aggression, the ICC Charter requires a recommendation from the UN Security Council, which is currently impossible due to the presence of Russia there.
- Establishment of a tribunal similar to the former Yugoslavia tribunal, but this requires the support of the country from which the main potential defendants (Russia) originate, which is currently not possible.

In summary, we come to a deeply disturbing conclusion. Russia's illegitimate membership in the UN, especially in the UN Security Council, seriously undermines the international security system. Russia's misuse of the veto to shield itself and its allies from international condemnation and accountability underscores its failure to play its role as a good faith member of the international community.

As long as Russia continues to usurp the seat of the USSR and abuse its privileges in the UN, the Security Council remains unable to effectively address global security challenges. This is not only a matter of international politics, but also a matter of maintaining peace and security in the world. Therefore, it is imperative to review Russia's status in the UN in order to restore the credibility and effectiveness of this critical organization.