

VETO POWER AS A DIPLOMATIC COVER FOR NATIONAL INTERESTS OF BEARING MEMBERS IN UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL: IMPLICATIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY

Kia, B.

*National Open University of Nigeria,
Port Harcourt Study Centre, Rivers State
E-mail: kiabariledum@yahoo.com*

Ojie, P. A.

University of Uyo, Uyo, Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria

Kidi, Z. D.

Bayelsa State College of Arts and Science, Yenogoa, Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The study centred on the notion of how veto bearing members of UN manage veto power to protect individual national interest. Using realism and national interest as the operational framework, the study found that China and Russia, used pre-charter references to principle of non intervention and sovereign immunity as an excuse to neutralized collective actions towards enhancing global peace when their interest are at stake. The result was loss of thousands of lives and the displacement of million of people across the globe. However, the implication remained that unless UN veto members rise above individual national interests to an unusual degree, they will find it difficult to set the tone which could launch effective management of global security in the years ahead.

Key words: Veto power, diplomatic cover, national interest, united nations, global peaceand security

INTRODUCTION

United Nations was established by 51 countries in 1945, in response to the horrors of the Second World War. The actual language of the United Nations charter succinctly put the purpose of the organization in the following wordings:

To save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our life time has brought untold sorrow to mankind, and to reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human persons in the equal rights of men and women and of nations large and small, and to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained, and to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom.

Today, with 192 member countries it represents the most universal organization, known to exist for the promotion of global peace and security. The formation of this organization brought relief and optimism to people throughout the world. New leaders found ways to cooperate on range of international issues. The United Nations Security Council is being handed the opportunity to minister that resources, diplomacy, and political will that can combine to save succeeding generation from the much emphasized "scourge of war", with this development, many held the hope that the spirit of cooperation in the security council would set a precedent, that nations of the world might find a new willingness to work together, as an international community, to resolve conflicts through peaceful negotiation and diplomacy.

However, the share-out of power on the Security Council is now widely acknowledged to be unfair and unreasonable. The super power interests have destroyed the Network of norms, rules and structure of new "logic of peace" builds on mutual concern through selfish use of veto power. It is against this background that the paper seeks to examine the use of veto power by bearing

members and how it affects the management of global security.

The framework of analysis employed in this study is realism. The intellectual roots of this school of thought, is traced to the works of various centuries philosophers. For instance, Hecydidides, writings of Kautuya, Niccolo Machiavelli, Thomas Hobbes, Car E. H., Kennan F. George, Hans J. Morgenthau (1948), Reinhold N., and Thompson W. Kenneth. They, profoundly influence contemporary world's views.

The tenet of this political paradigm is based on the premise that world politics is essentially and unchangeably, a struggle among self-interested states for power and position under anarchy, with each competing, state pursuing its National Interest (Charles, 2007). The purpose of State craft is National Survival in a hostile environment. To this end, within the realist theoretical postulation, no means are more important than the acquisition of power, and no principle is more important than self help. Given this line of thought, we may argue that a state's philosophical or critical preferences are neither good nor bad. What matters is whether they serve its self interest.

The realist defined national interest in terms of National Security, and maintains that National Security must be defined as integrity of the "National" territory and its institutions (Asobie, 2002). Realist maintained that the pursuit of National Interest demands that a statesman should focus on those essential, which national power dictates. (Hasmorgethan, 1978) the fact here is that, statesman would be acting against the National interest if he concentrated on the desirable goals dictated by either ethical or ideological considerations, a sense of legal obligation, sentimental attachment to, sympathy for, certain states or persons or groups of persons. George Kennan cited in (Asobie, 2002), argue that a nation should try to conduct its foreign policy in accordance with both its concrete National Interest, moderated by the moral or ethical principles inherent in the spirit of its civilization.

COMPOSITION AND VOTING PROCEDURE OF ACTION

Unlike the United Nations General Assembly which draws membership from the world as a single social Community, the United Nations Security Council has restricted membership. It was decided at the UN's founding conference in 1944, that Britain, China, the soviet Union, the United states and in due course France should be the permanent members of any newly formed council France though defeated and occupied by Nazi Germany, but its role as a permanent member of the League of Nations, its status as a colonial power and the activities of the Free French Forces on the allied side allowed it a place with the other four (Charles 2007).

Thus, Britain, France, Russia, China and USA are the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These big five members are not literally representative of any geo-political region or continent, but there is in equality in geographical representation:

Country	Continent	Number
Britain	Europe	1
France	Europe	1
Russia	Europe	1
USA	A/America	1
China	Asia	1
	Total	5

The five permanent members are the most powerful countries in the world with unmatched capacity to ensure global peace and security .They share common characteristics. These include: possession of nuclear biological, chemical and lethal conventional weapons. In a relative term, each of the five permanent members is developed in Politics, economics, demography and social harmony. Above all, there ranking in military perspective is most outstanding. (Charles 2007). Additionally, with the idea of keeping membership limited to improve efficiency, the total United Nations

Security council member was increased from 11 in 1966 to 15, with 10 non permanent members chosen by UNGA for two years from Africa, Asia, Eastern Europe, Latin America and Western Europe among others. To ensure joint management of global affair, cooperation of values, and cooperation in search of solution to common problem, the veto system or principle was introduced and formalized at the Yalta Conference, February, 1945 to guide draft resolution on substantive matter before the council . The veto power clause is deliberately provided against the majority conspiracy capable of endangering world peace and security. It is hope that any authorized action by the consensus of the Big five members is for the general interest of the world community.

Voting activity in the United Nations Security Council determines action or in action of the organization against any nation for violating international principles, decisions and resolution. The voting activity is unique. Binding voting activity a.... is the exclusive prerogative of the Big give members. The voting behaviour in the UNSC is odd. This is because, the majority votes does not empower action. This is why, a Venezuela diplomat (described the veto as "an anti democratic practice... not in accordance with the principle of the sovereign equality of states) the pew research outer for people and the press veto power clause holds the balance.

Article 27 of the United Nations charter states inter alia:

1. Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote.
 2. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members.
 3. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members, provided that, in decisions under chapter vi, and under paragraph 3 of article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.
- The fact that "substantive decisions by the UNSC require

"the concurring votes of the permanent members", means that any of those permanent members can prevent the adoption by the council, of any draft resolutions on "substantive matters. For this reason, the power of veto is also referred to as the principle of great power unanimity. Each of the big Five has a veto power defined as the capacity to overrule any proposed action. On this note the Security Council is structured to vote unanimously and empower an international action. For instance, "In favour" or "yes" vote show the consensus of the big five members. Once there is a negative vote, the other Nations in favour of an action are under the veto power principle and obligation to soft pedal". For sure, two or more negative votes only define the strength of opposition to any action. However, one negative vote is ultimately more powerful and respected than the other four votes in favour. This is the exact stuff of the veto power.

ANALYSIS OF CHINA AND RUSSIA USED OF VETO ON SUBSTANTIVE DRAFT RESOLUTIONS OF THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL

In the UN system, the main responsibility for managing global peace and security is lodged with the fifteen-member Security Council. However, its effectiveness as an instrument of collective action has often been neutralized, because the support of all permanent members, required by article 27(3), for such a decision is not forthcoming. This is due to National Interests and ideological differences. In March 1999, China and Russia delegates refused to support a draft Security Council resolution authorizing NATO led forces to intervene in the Kosovo crisis, despite the support of twelve of the fifteen council members (Manfred 2007). China and Russia resistance to effective measures against Serbia, impelled the NATO deployment. The duo inaction weakened the acceptance of the peace keeping mission because it lacks universal legitimacy (Marfred, 2007).

Prior to intervention on 19 March, 2003, and the inception of operation IRAQ, Freedom, the regime of Saddam Hussein had repeatedly violated sixteen UN Security Council Resolutions (UNSCR) designed to place sharp controls on the regime's activities and to ensure that Iraq did not pose threat to international peace and security. (James 2004) These violations spanned a period of more than twelve years, and was gradually inflicting irreparable harm to the minimum world order system represented by article 2 (4) and chapter VII of the UN charter, peace and security of the region, and to the well being of the Iraqi people yet, the draft resolution 1441 (2002) of the council that was to determined or secure full compliance with its decisions, to restore international peace and security was opposed by Russia and France because of their economics interests in Iraq and ideological differences (James, 2004). They (Russia and France) refused to support the coalition led-international in Iraq despite the threat posed to global security by the Sudan Hussein's regime.

Again, the council did not agree to the draft resolution for targeted sanction against Sudan's principal's actors in the crime against humanity. China and Russia's vetoed weaken the final text of the resolution. Observers noted that the draft resolution infringes on China and Russia's economics interest in Sudan. Evidence proved that china is the single largest investor in Sudan's oil, while Russia is Khartourn's major arms supplier (Fulia, 2007) although China did not exercise its veto, as it had vowed to do early, on and vetoed for resolution 1764. It actions did significantly weaken the draft resolution, because she vetoed only when clause that affected her interest was removed.

The in action of China and Russia to the council's resolution on Iranian Nuclear crisis is another proven case of the frivolous employment of veto power to cover interests at stake. Although Russia voted to report Iran to the UN Security Council, nevertheless, her vote was informed by the desire to ensure the

application of measures that protect her interest in Iran. That Russia offer to enrich Uranium on its territory for Iranian nuclear power plants, suggests her desire to monitor the nuclear programme to avoid Iran development of weapon that could undermine her security interest in the region, and her citizens, since Iran is her close neighbour (Seth, 1998). In the same vein, china vowed to veto any measures that would prevent access to Iran's oil resources. Being one of the largest consumer of the Iranian oil resources, above all, her strong bilateral agreement with Iran, she vowed to block any attempt by US to get sanction imposed on Iran even when the later had repeatedly disregard UN nuclear regulations.

In Myanmar's problems, UN security council draft a resolution that would have urge the government to respond in a complete, concrete and timely manner, but china and Russia federation representative vetoed the draft resolution. China's position was informed by the fact that she is an immediate neighbour of Myanmar, that might in one way or the other, be affected by the council's punitive measures. Besides, she is a council member from the Asia-pacific region (Michael 2004). In this diplomatic approach to veto power, it is neither china nor Russia that are guilty US had also successfully pressured the UN to exempt US troops serving as UN peace keepers from the jurisdiction of the international criminal court, by threatening to veto all UN peace keeping operations (Rourke, 2007).

With the above plethora of facts, it is reasonably to argue that common users of veto prefer to abstain rather than veto on resolutions not directly related to their interests, and veto draft resolution that might jeopardize one's interest

IMPLICATIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY

Article 39 to 51 of the charter establish a framework for collective security based on the use of force and provide the security

council with authority for enforcement. Despite these powers, the reluctance of certain council members as analysis in the proceeding page of this work, left the organization on the sidelines at a time when according to the charter, its possibilities should have been used to the maximum. Under chapter vii it is the council that must decide whether in any particular instance a threat to peace exist; whether aggression has been committed and if so, by whom, and finally, what, if any, collective steps by UN. With the exception of UN sanctioned action in the defense of Kuwait in 1990, it has never been possible to invoke these collective enforcement provisions. In Korea, the potential veto of the soviet ambassador obliged the organization to turn to the General Assembly for the necessary authority under articles II, 14, 18 and 24 of the charter (James, 2004).

The scarcity of actions brought under the collective action provided in chapter Vii of the UN charter suggests lack of visibility and total commitment to the charter's obligation. UN has no standing army, and does not have equipment stock piles for peace keeping mission but relies on its member states for contribution, paradoxically, most of the major donors, with preponderance powers, now excuse its veto power self-interest with pre-charter references to principles of non intervention and sovereign immunity to neutralize collective will to manage global peace and security. Today, United Nations has a battered image, and is often blamed for almost every disaster on the planet because UN Security Council's positive achievements-preventing potentials wars, conflicts, restoring peace after conflicts and building democracy are often eclipsed by more spectacular failures (Michael, 2004).

Through their refusal to act all, they prevented any form of effective action against the genocide in Rwanda; through their unwillingness to equip the Peacekeeping forces with sufficient diplomatic will and appropriate from of authority to take action, due to partisanship and division among them, they make possible the appalling consequences in Liberia, Kosovo, Somalia, Sudan,

Cambodia, Angola, Korea, Kashmir, and Middle East (Marfred, 2004). In a broader sense, the failed response to the above cases did not only indicates a shameful negligence on the part of UN Security Council, when it comes to saving succeeding generations from the much emphasis scourge of war" but has also exposed the glaring weakness in the capacity of United Nation Security Council to executes values, which United Nations stands in the contemporary complicated New World Order; thus, the values basis of joint management of global peace and security is at the sorting threshold. This is so, because, veto bearing members have deviated from the charter's obligation to the pursuit of individual national interests.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The ability to make a difference in the management of global security will be determined by UN veto member's ability to put aside differences. If the UN Security Council members cannot rise above ideology, hostility, suspicion and individual national interest to an unusual degree, they will find it different to set the tone which could launch far more powerful and effective mechanism for the management of global security in the years a head. On the basis of these findings, the paper suggests immediate implementation of "Uniting for Peace Resolution Mechanism". This will help UN General Assembly to overruled vetoes not related to international principles and values. Again, multiples states agreement on vital issues should be emphasis before exercising veto. This will help to reconcile charter values on one hand and required procedures on the other. Lastly, power of veto should be limited to only critical national security issues.

REFERENCES

- Adebayo, A.** (ed) (1993). *Africa within the World: Beyond Dispossession and dependence*. London: Zed Books African for Development and Strategies.
- Hassan, A. S.** (1995). The UN and its expanded Agenda: A problem analysis. A paper prepared for the Nigerian society of international affair conference, Lagos NIIA.
- Asobie, A. H.** (2002). *Nigeria Economic Diplomacy and National Interest*. In C. Joy Ogwu (ed). *The Economic Diplomacy of the Nigerian State*. Lagos: Frankad Publisher.
- Charles, W.** (2007). *World politics, Trends and Transformation* (11th edition). U.S.A: Thomson Learning Academic Center.
- Dennis, C. J.** (2000). *Why peacekeeping fails*. London: Macmillan.
- Hans, M.** (1978). *Politics among Nations: The struggle for power and peace*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.
- James, T. P.** (2004). A legal appraisal of Military Action in Iraq. www.enoughproject.org.
- Julia, S.** (2007). UN Crisis Management and peacekeeping. www.enoughproject.org.
- John, P.** (2007). UN: Europe slow to contribute to Darfur peacekeeping force. www.enoughproject.org.
- Marfred, E.** (2000). UN Complex problem. www.enoughproject.org.
- Michael, G. M.** (2000). *The evolution of US peacekeeping policy under Clinton. A fair-weather friend?* London: Frank Cass
- Rowke, J. T.** (2008). *International politics on the World stage*. (12th edition) London: McGraw Hill.
- Seth, C.** (1998). Nuclear, Biological and Chemical Weapons: Implications and Responses, Vol. 2 No. 1 culled from internet. www.enoughproject.org.