

Palestinian Issue and the Security Council of UN: Use of Veto Prevents the Establishment of International Peace

Majid Bozorgmehri* - Associate Professor of Political Sciences, Imam Khomeini International University, Qazvin, Iran

Alireza Mohammad Khani- Assistant Professor of Political Sciences, Islamic Azad University, Zanjan, Iran

Received: 29/08/2011

Accepted: 20/01/2012

Abstract

The Occupied Palestinian Territories have been a source of conflict for much of the twentieth century. The Palestinian Issue for the UN and especially for the Security Council (SC) is a main challenge which menaces continuously the international peace and security in the World. As our major question, we desire to elaborate the role and the policies of the SC concerning the Palestinian Issue. Through this paper, we seek firstly to explain the issue and then to evaluate the Security Council's activities. We try to observe if the SC has been accomplished, based on the Charter of UN, its main duty, i.e. the peace keeping?

We have chosen the Critical Theory of International Relations as our theoretical framework. As our conclusion,, we try to prove that the SC has failed to accomplish its main duty. The right of Veto and the US pressure are considered as the major factors which prevent the SC to play its expected role. The Palestinian Issue demonstrates more and more the fact of need for the essential reforms in UN structure, especially in the Security Council.

Keywords: Palestine, Security Council, Veto, UN, Israel.

* E-mail: bozorg_majid@yahoo.com

Introduction & Problematic

The Occupied Palestinian Territories have been a source of conflict for much of the twentieth century. The factors and underlying issues giving rise to this conflict are many and varied, but the reality is that there can be no peace without justice. While the Israelis have a deep-seated desire to create a Home land on land that has deep spiritual significance for them as well as for three other faiths, the Palestinians are people dispossessed of faiths their lands and without self-autonomy, forced to endure an occupation not of their making.

The Palestinian Issue for the UN and especially for the Security Council (SC) is a main challenge which menaces continuously the international peace and security in the World. As our major question, we desire to elaborate the role and the policies of the SC concerning the Palestinian Issue. Through this paper, we seek firstly to explain the issue and then to evaluate the Security Council's activities. We try to observe if the SC has been accomplished, based on the Charter of UN, its main duty, i.e. the peace keeping or not? And if the SC has sought through this Issue, to consider the right of self determination (Chapter 1, Article 1, part 2 of Charter) for all nations without discrimination or not? What is the nature of vetoes declared by the U.S.?

As methodological approach, we have tried, through a historical review and based on the UN documents, to develop our argument by analyzing the content of the documents. We have reviewed a great number of UN Docs to build the framework of our argument.

A nearly same argument has been discussed by Mohammad Hassan Khani. In his article, "Double Standards in International Organizations: A Comparative Study of the UN Response to Iraqi Invasions of Iran and Kuwait" .the author proclaims that in the past six decades the UN has failed to accomplish its mission in maintaining international peace and security. From his point of view, by analyzing the most important factors in the UN Security Council's response to the Iraqi Invasions of Iran and Kuwait, it seems that the political will and national interests of the permanent members of the Council were the essence of the actions and decisions made by the Council (Hassan Khani, 2010: 224).

1.1. Peace Keeping is one of the Main Duties of the SC

The SC is one of the principal organs of the UN and is charged with the maintenance of international peace and security. Its powers, outlined in the UN Charter, include the establishment of peacekeeping operations, the establishment of international sanctions, and the authorization of military

action. Its powers are exercised through resolutions (Encyclopedia of the Nations Online, 2011).

Under Article 27 of the UN Charter, Security Council decisions on all substantive matters require the affirmative votes of nine members. A negative vote, or veto, also known as the rule of "great power unanimity", by a permanent member prevents adoption of a proposal, even if it has received the required number of affirmative votes. Abstention is not regarded as a veto despite the wording of the Charter (United Nations Security Council, Wikipedia, 2011).

Between 1946 and 2007, vetoes were issued on 384 occasions. United States has used the veto on 82 occasions, often in support of Israel, between 1946 and 2007 (Global Policy Forum, 2007).

The most recent US veto on the issue of Israel came in 2011 (BBC News, 2011).

Under Chapter Six of the Charter, "Pacific Settlement of Disputes", the Security Council "may investigate any dispute or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute". The Council may "recommend appropriate procedures or methods of adjustment" if it determines that the situation might endanger international peace and security. These recommendations are not binding on UN members.

Under Chapter Seven, the Council has broader power to decide what measures are to be taken in situations involving "threats to the peace, breaches of the peace, or acts of aggression". In such situations, the Council is not limited to recommendations but may take action, including the use of armed force "to maintain or restore international peace and security".

1.2. The Palestinian Issue is a focal point for the International Peace & Security

The Palestinian Question remains one of the most discussed topics in the Security Council since Israel declared its independence in 1948. The problem of Palestinian refugees has existed since 1948, following Israel's defeat of neighboring states Egypt, Jordan and Lebanon. The resulting Palestinian Refugee crisis caused the General Assembly, in Resolution 194, to lay out a course for those driven from their homes and wishing to live in peace to return. In the 1949 Armistice, what remains of the state of Palestine was occupied by Egypt (the Gaza Strip), and Transjordan (the West Bank), These territories were seized by Israel in a 1967 preemptive attack against Egypt, Jordan and Syria. Within six days Israel had seized the Sinai Peninsula, the

Gaza Strip, the west bank, and the Golan Heights. This prompted the Security Council to pass Resolution 242, calling for Israel withdrawal from the territories it occupied. Israel maintained control of all occupied territories, and Syria and Egypt attacked jointly in 1973 in what became known as the Yom Kippur War, prompting Resolution 338, which affirmed Resolution 242 and called for peace talks (The Security Council, 2010: 5).

Israel withdrew from the Sinai after a 1979 peace treaty with Egypt. However, in 1982 Israel invaded Lebanon in order to destroy Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) forces there. While this drove the PLO from Lebanon, it also caused the formation of Hezbollah. In 1987 Jordan ceded its rights to the West Bank to the PLO, which recognized Israel and began negotiations for peace. The Palestinian Authority replaced the PLO in 1994 in governing the West Bank and Gaza Strip after the signing of the Oslo Accords. After the breakdown of the peace process and the beginning of the Second Intifada in 2000, work towards peace in the Middle East has been a difficult process. The most recent progress occurred in 2003 with the Quartet, composed of the United States, Russia, the European Union and the UN, backing what is known as the Road Map. The Road Map suggested a permanent two-state solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and the Palestinian refugee problem. Israel rejected some portions.

The situation in Gaza has been tense since the administration of a blockade started in 2007 as Hamas gained control of the Gaza strip. The blockade has cut food, medicine and fuel supplies to critical levels.

Efforts at restarting the peace and moving towards a two state solution, originally envisaged in General Assembly Resolution 181 of 1947, have reached a stumbling block due to the expansion of Israeli settlements in the West Bank. Secretary-General Ban Ki-Moon has stated that expansion of Israeli settlements is illegal and acts against international law. He has also called for a lift of the blockade on Gaza (UN News Centre, 2009).

Israeli settlement-building, and its construction of massive border-wall that annexed large swaths of Palestinian territory, has made resolution of the conflict far more difficult.

Key issues that have plagued the stalled "Peace Process" include: Israeli settlement and settlement-building, the Israeli wall, shared sovereignty over al-Quds [al-Sharif] (Jerusalem), and the right of return of 3.7 million stateless Palestinian refugees.

Figure 1: Conflict Points on Gaza & West Bank



2.Theoretical Framework: Critical International Relations Theory

Through the Critical International Relations Theory, we could demonstrate more and better the need of change for the USA Foreign Policy regarding the Palestinian Issue in the Security Council of UN.

2.1.General Review on Theory

Critical international relations theory is a diverse set of schools of thought in International Relations (IR) that have criticized the theoretical, meta-theoretical and/or political status quo, both in IR theory and in international politics more broadly - from positivist as well as post positivist positions.

Study of critical theory in the science of international relations is essentially not a new idea. The value of critical theory first appeared in the century of enlightenment through the writings of Kant and Hegel. Kant and Hegel took out papers that contain a critical review of reflection about social and community and country development at the time (Devetak, 2004: 146).

The 1980s was the beginning of a new era in international relations theory. During these years, a new theoretical perspective, which is called “Critical Theory”, has appeared and become a serious alternative to the “traditional

theories”, especially to realist theory and its positivist methodology. Critical theory basically appeared as a reaction to the dominance of neorealism and neoliberalism which are named as the “traditional theories” by Horkheimer. In addition to that Habermas claimed that even though neorealism and neoliberalism are both opposing each other both are based on the ‘enlightenment project’, by which these theories aim to apply scientific knowledge in the liberation of humanity (Evans,1998:106-108).

After the fall of the Berlin Wall, during the 1990s, Critical Theory has been recognized as a legitimate alternative theory in international relations discipline. During these years, scholars, like Andrew Linklater, Robert W. Cox and Richard Ashley tried to apply the thoughts, ideas or theories of the Frankfurt School and other critical theorists to the international relations theory(Baaz, 2011).

2.2.Basic Concepts of Critical Theory

2.2.1. Democracy

Democracy is an unfinished project of modernity according to the critical theorists. Firstly, critical theorists criticize the liberal democratic capitalist form of democracy, and they believe that a more democratic form, which they call “Radical Democracy”, should be established. The task of radical democracy, Mouffe claims, is to deepen the democratic project of modernity (Mouffe,1990).

Radical democracy, on the other hand, demands the recognition of difference and maximum pluralism without destroying the community. Critical theorists basically aim to transform the contemporary capitalist democracy into a more consensual form of democracy which they call radical democracy.

Critical international theorists basically try to apply the ideas of critical social theorists to the international level. Deriving their thoughts from Habermas’ communicative rationality, and other critical theorists, they aim to transform the current international system to a more democratic one. The relationship between individuals, non-governmental organizations and other groups must be improved by communicative rationality by bringing their ideas, problems and thoughts to the international organizations more often. Habermas believes that this will make the international political system more democratic. Critical theorists aim to build an international system which is open to any difference, such as identity, religion, ethnicity, gender, nationality, and hence more democratic. For example, the current structure of

the United Nations is actually the domination of five privileged states of the Security Council over the others.

They support maximum pluralism in the international system without destroying it. It is here we could discuss that the use of veto by USA in the Security Council in favor of Israel is a serious violation of pluralism in the International system.

2.2.2. Emancipation

According to Horkheimer's well-known distinction, critical theory may be distinguished from a traditional theory according to a specific practical purpose: "a theory is critical to the extent that it seeks human emancipation to liberate human beings from the circumstances that enslave them" (Horkheimer, 1982: 244).

Deriving from Marx's thoughts, emancipation has a very central role in the writings of critical theorists. In Habermas' epistemology, critical knowledge was conceptualized as knowledge that enabled human beings to emancipate themselves from forms of domination through self-reflection. Emancipation means, according to critical approach, freeing someone from the control of another or setting free from the power of another (Baaz, 2011).

In our case, ie, Palestinian issue, an abuse of veto power could be observed in the International system.

2.2.3. Justice and Equality

Critical theory makes pressure on the unequal and unjust structure of the current international order. Critical theorists seek to analyze critically the sources of inequality, injustice and domination that shape global power relations, and they find the answer to their search in the realist assumption that state is the basic unit in international system. Critical theorists think that peoples, individuals, international organizations, non-governmental organizations must also be represented in the international system as well as the states to provide global justice and equality.

Andrew Linklater argues that "justice considerations have moved to the centre of the discipline as questions about transnational justice (justice between individuals within world society) have become as important as international justice (justice between the societies within the system of states)" (Linklater, 1999: 473).

It is very clear that the use of veto power as an unequal and unfair right by USA prevents the Security Council to exercise their duties concerning the

Palestinian question. Based on three major concepts of Critical Theory, “Radical Democracy”, “Emancipation” and “Justice and Equality”, we could open our debate about the use of veto in the Security Council in the Palestine-Israel Issue.

3. Data and Analysis of Question

The UN has not been yet able to resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict. We observe that the SC’s positions has been oriented by US pressure and vetoes. There is no doubt that one of the major policies of USA in the Middle East is to preserve the Israel’ Security (Akhbari, 2007: 48).

The SC has passed 225 resolutions concerning Palestinian question from 5 March 1948 to 9 January 2009 ,but the news of quarrel are constantly appearing as the top topics on the mass media in the world.

3.1.Important Cases of the SC involvement

With the question of Palestine unresolved, an insecure peace, punctuated by violence and acts of force, was maintained in the region from 1950 until 1967, when Israel came to occupy the entire area of the former British Mandate of Palestine. The Israel has been continuously a threat for its neighbor and bordering countries (Soltaninejad, 2006: 123).

3.1.1. Establishment of UNEF I

Armed conflict erupted anew in the Middle East on 29 October 1956, when Israel began military operations against Egypt – to be joined later by France and the United Kingdom. Amidst sharply rising tensions, Egypt had nationalized the Suez Canal in July of that year. At an emergency special session, the General Assembly called for a ceasefire, and the crisis ended with the eventual withdrawal of the invading forces and the deployment of the United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF I)—the first United Nations peacekeeping force (United Nations, Middle East-UNEF I).

UNEF I was withdrawn in May 1967 at the request of Egypt, which had informed the Secretary-General that it would no longer consent to the stationing of the force on Egyptian territory and in the Gaza Strip. On 5 June 1967, hostilities broke out between Israel and Egypt, Jordan and Syria. By the time a ceasefire called for by the Security Council was accepted by the parties, Israeli military forces had occupied the Egyptian Sinai, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank including East Jerusalem, and part of the Syrian Golan

Heights(United Nations, 1990, Chapter 3).

After the ceasefire was secured, the Security Council adopted resolution 237 (1967), in which it called upon Israel to ensure the safety, welfare and security of the inhabitants of the areas where military operations had taken place and to facilitate the return of displaced persons. The Governments concerned were asked to respect scrupulously the humanitarian principles governing the protection of civilian persons in time of war contained in the Fourth Geneva Convention of 1949. At its fifth emergency special session, convened after the fighting began, the General Assembly called upon Governments and international organizations to extend emergency humanitarian assistance to those affected by the war. The Assembly asked Israel to rescind all measures already taken and to desist from taking further action which would alter the status of Jerusalem (UN Department of Public Information, 2008).

3.1.2. The SC Resolution 242

On 22 November 1967, the Security Council, after much negotiation, unanimously adopted resolution 242 (1967), laying down principles for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East. The resolution stipulated that the establishment of a just and lasting peace should include the application of two principles:

- Withdrawal of Israeli armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict, and
- Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgement of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every State in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force.

The resolution also affirmed the territorial inviolability of every State in the region and called for “achieving a just settlement of the refugee problem” (S/PV.1382 (OR), 1967).

Figure 2: Territories Occupied By Israel since June 1967 .(United Nations, 1990.Chapter 3.)



Egypt and Jordan accepted resolution 242 (1967) and considered Israeli withdrawal from all territories occupied in the 1967 war as a precondition to negotiations. Israel, which also accepted the resolution, stated that the questions of withdrawal and refugees could be settled only through direct

negotiations with the Arab States and the conclusion of a comprehensive peace treaty. Syria rejected the Council action, maintaining that the resolution had linked the central issue of Israeli withdrawal to concessions demanded from Arab countries. The Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), which had been formed in 1964 to further Palestinian interests and aspirations, strongly criticized the resolution, which it said reduced the question of Palestine to a refugee problem. (UN Department of Public Information.2008),

3.1.3. War of 1973 and the SC resolution 338

In October 1973, war broke out again between Egypt and Israel in the Suez Canal area and the Sinai, and between Israel and the Syrian Arab Republic on the Golan Heights. As fighting reached a critical stage, the Soviet Union and the United States jointly requested an urgent meeting of the Security Council. On 22 October, the Security Council adopted resolution 338 (1973), which reaffirmed the principles of resolution 242 and called for negotiations aimed at “a just and durable peace in the Middle East”. the ceasefire call was later confirmed in resolution 339 (1973) of 23 October, and the Secretary-General was requested to dispatch United Nations observers immediately.

However, as fighting continued in the region, President Anwar el Sadat of Egypt appealed directly to the Soviet Union and the United States to intervene with troops and enforce the ceasefire. While the Soviet Union agreed, the United States opposed the request, putting the two super Powers on a collision course. At the request of Egypt, the Security Council reconvened on 24 October, and a resolution calling for the creation of a new peacekeeping force, which became the second United Nations Emergency Force (UNEF II), was worked out.

In the wake of the 1973 war, the United Nations greatly intensified its efforts to secure a lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Under United Nations auspices and the joint chairmanship of the Soviet Union and the United States, an international peace conference was convened in December 1973 in Geneva. Egypt, Israel and Jordan were represented in the conference, but Syria refused to take part.(http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Security_Council_Resolution_338).

After three meetings, the conference adjourned indefinitely, but it was agreed that contacts would continue through a military working group. The working group played an important role in reaching agreements on the disengagement of forces between Egypt and Israel, in January 1974 and

October 1975, and was involved in the conclusion of a disengagement agreement between Israel and Syria in May 1974. These agreements were carried out with the assistance of two United Nations peacekeeping forces. After Egypt and Israel agreed to disengage their forces, UNEF II supervised their redeployment. Under a separate agreement reached in May 1974, Israel and Syria signed a disengagement agreement. This led to the establishment of the United Nations Disengagement Observer Force (UNDOF), which was assigned to monitor the agreements between Israel and Syria. The Council renewed UNEF's mandate periodically until July 1979, when it was allowed to lapse following the conclusion of a peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. UNDOF continues to function on the Golan Heights to the present day.

From 1974 to 1977, efforts were made at various levels to promote a resumption of the negotiating process. Early in 1977, after a visit to the Middle East, Secretary-General Kurt Waldheim reported to the Security Council that fundamental differences between the parties had prevented agreement on the resumption of the Geneva peace conference (UN Department of Public Information.2008).

3.2. Resolutions Vetoed by USA

In addition to a long list of UN General Assembly resolutions that Israel has not complied with, there is also a long list of Security Council resolutions that the United States has vetoed to shield Israel from criticism by the Security Council over the Zionist state's barbaric actions against the Palestinian people and the Arab states. The presence of a strong Israel to balance the Islamic and Arab world was considered as a major strategic priorities of USA in the Middle East (Akhbari, 2007: 50).

Here is a partial list of US vetoes, in chronological order:

On September 10, 1972, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution condemning Israel's unprovoked attacks against Southern Lebanon and Syria. Thirteen Council members (including four of the five permanent members with veto powers and nine of the ten non-permanent members who are elected by the General Assembly for two-year terms starting on January 1 with five replaced each year) voted for the resolution. One non-permanent member abstained from voting. The United States was the only Council member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it.

On July 26, 1973, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution affirming the rights of the Palestinian people to self-determination, statehood and equal protections under international law. Thirteen Council members (including

three permanent members, with China absent, and all ten elected members) voted for the resolution.

The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/10974, 1973).

On December 8, 1975, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution condemning Israel's air strikes and attacks in Southern Lebanon and its murder of innocent civilians. Thirteen Council members (including four permanent members and nine elected members) voted for the resolution. One elected member abstained from voting. The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it. By vetoing the resolution, the US was, in effect, condoning Israel's murder of innocent civilians in Southern Lebanon.

On January 26, 1976, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution calling for the self-determination of the Palestinian people. Nine Council members (including four permanent members and five elected members) voted for the resolution. Three elected members abstained from voting. Two elected members were absent. The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/11940, 1976).

On March 25, 1976, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution deploring Israel's altering of the status of Jerusalem (occupied al-Quds), which is recognized as an international city by most world nations and the United Nations. The United States was the only Council member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/12022, 1976).

On June 29, 1976, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution affirming the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people. Ten Council members (permanent and elected) voted for the resolution, with four abstentions. The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/12119, 1976).

On April 30, 1980, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution endorsing self-determination for the Palestinian people. Ten Council members (permanent and elected) voted for the resolution, with four abstentions. The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/13911, 1980).

On January 20, 1982, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution demanding Israel's withdrawal from Syria's Golan Heights, which has been under illegal Israeli occupation since the Arab-Israeli war of 1967 (a war, it should be remembered, that was started by Israel). Nine council members (permanent and elected) voted for the resolution, with four abstentions. One

member was absent. The United States was the only member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it.

In addition to the Golan Heights Israel remained in illegal occupation of Egypt's Sinai Peninsula from 1967 until 1979, when the territory was returned to Egypt under the terms of the Camp David Accords. Israel also remained in illegal occupation of the Palestinian Gaza Strip and the West Bank for many years, and still makes periodic illegal military incursions into both territories. It has cut off the Gaza Strip's contacts with the outside world, shattered the Strip's economy by banning the export of its products, cut off electricity supplies and prevented Gaza's inhabitants from working in Israel.

The Zionist state has also built a massive barrier around the West Bank, turning it into a besieged ghetto, in blatant violation of a July 2004 ruling by the International Court of Justice at The Hague directing Israel to immediately cease construction of the wall and dismantle the sections that had already been built by then. Ignoring the ICJ ruling and widespread international condemnation of the wall, Israel has continued to press ahead with its construction. The wall, which now almost completely encircles the West Bank, has divided the Palestinian territory into a series of ghettos.

Israel has also built dozens of illegal Jewish settlements in the West Bank, ignoring repeated calls by the international community to dismantle the settlements. In violation of the West Bank's rights as a lower riparian territory, Israel has also illegally diverted water flows from rivers and underground water channels from the West Bank to Israeli territory, causing serious damage to the West Bank's agriculture and leaving many of its farmers virtually destitute.

All this has been done without a squeak of protest from the United States. Nor has the US ever put any pressure on Israel to mend its ways and stop its barbaric actions against the Palestinian people. On the contrary, the US continues to be Israel's staunchest ally and gives it over \$ 4 billion a year in economic and military aid – most of it in the form of grants that do not have to be re-paid. Since 1980, the US has given Israel a total of more than \$ 100 billion in economic and military aid.

On April 2, 1982, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution condemning Israel's mistreatment of Palestinians in the occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip and its refusal to abide by Geneva Convention protocols of civilized nations. The United States was the only Council member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/14985, 1982).

On April 20, 1982, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution

condemning an Israeli soldier who shot 11 Muslim worshippers on the Temple Mount of the Harm-al-Sharif near the Al-Aqsa Mosque in the Old City of Jerusalem (occupied Al-Quds), The United States was the only Council member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it. In doing so, what the US was, in effect, saying was that it was 'okay' for Israeli soldiers to shoot Muslim worshippers.

On June 18, 1982, the United States vetoed the SC's resolution that urged sanctions against Israel if it did not withdraw from its invasion of Lebanon. The United States was the only Council member that voted against the resolution, thereby vetoing it (S/15185, 1982).

On August 6, 1982, US casts the lone veto on a resolution that would have called on all UN member states to refrain from supplying Israel with any weapons and from providing it with any military aid UNTIL the full withdrawal of Israeli forces from Lebanon (S/15347/Rev.1, 1982).

On August 1, 1983, US casts the lone veto on a resolution declaring Israeli settlements illegal (S/15895, 1983).

On September 13, 1985, US casts the lone veto on a resolution calling on Israel to abide by the Geneva Convention and to immediately stop all repressive measures including curfews, administrative detentions and forceful deportation (S/17459, 1985).

On January 29, 1986, US casts the lone veto on a resolution deploring Israel for continuing to violate previous Security Council resolutions and declaring as illegal ALL actions taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, and institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem (S/17769/Rev.1, 1986).

On April 14, 1988, US casts the lone veto on a resolution urging Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention and condemning Israeli human rights violations (S/19780, 1988).

On February 17, 1989, US casts the lone veto on a resolution calling on Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention and condemning Israeli human rights violations (S/20463, 1989).

On June 8, 1989, US casts the lone veto blocking a resolution demanding that Israel desist from deporting Palestinian civilians from the occupied territory and calling for the immediate return of those already deported (S/20677, 1989).

On November 7, 1989, US casts the lone veto blocking a resolution to condemn Israeli human rights violations and to establish a UN monitoring

team in the occupied territories including Jerusalem. (S/20945/Rev.1,1989).

On May 31, 1990, US casts the lone veto to block a Security Council fact-finding mission to report on abuses of Palestinians in land Israel captured in war (S/21326, 1990).

On May 17, 1995, US casts the lone veto to block a resolution that declared invalid Israel's expropriation of Arab-owned land in east Jerusalem (S/1995/394,1995).

On March 7, 1997, US casts the lone veto on a resolution calling on Israel to refrain from east Jerusalem settlement activity (S/1997/199, 1997).

On March 21, 1997, US casts the lone veto to block a resolution demanding Israel's immediate cessation of construction at an east Jerusalem settlement (S/1997/241, 1997).

On January 29, 1998, US casts the lone veto on a resolution calling on Israel to accept the de jure applicability of the Convention to the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967,including Jerusalem, and to fully comply with its obligations under that convention.

On March 27, 2001, US is the lone veto on a resolution backing a UN observer force to protect Palestinian civilians (S/2001/270, 2001).

On December 14, 2001, in the resolution, the Security Council condemned all acts of terror, extra judiciary executions, excessive use of force and destruction of properties, and demanded an end of all acts of violence, destruction and provocation. The resolution called on the parties to resume negotiations, and to implement the recommendations of the Mitchell Report. It also encouraged the establishment of a monitoring apparatus for the above mentioned implementation (S/2001/1199, 2001).

On December 20, 2002,the resolution expressed grave concerns over the killing of UN employees, especially with regards to Iain Hook in the Jenin Refugee Camp, expressed deep concerns at the deliberate destruction by the Israeli occupying forces of a United Nations World Food Programme warehouse in Beit Lahiya, recalled the protection accorded to such facilities under international humanitarian law and demanded that Israel, the occupying Power, comply fully with its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, and refrain from the excessive and disproportionate use of force in the Occupied Palestinian Territory (S/2002/1385, 2002).

On September 2003,the resolution raised concerns over the possible deportation of Yasser Arafat - "Reaffirming the illegality of the deportation of any Palestinian by Israel, the occupying Power, and affirming its opposition

to any such deportation"(S/2003/891, 2003).

On October 14, 2003, the resolution raised concerns regarding the security barrier being built by Israel in the West Bank (S/2003/980, 2003).

On October 5, 2004, the resolution condemned Israel's military incursion in Gaza causing many civilian deaths and casualties as well as extensive structural damage (S/2004/240, 2004).

And finally the Palestinian Resolution was rejected by the United Nations Security Council after the U.S. vetoed the resolution on February 18, 2011. The resolution condemned all Israeli settlements in occupied Palestinian territory as illegal, called Israel and Palestine to follow the Road map for peace plan, and for both parties to continue negotiations to end the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Over 120 U.N. member states supported the resolution(UN News Centre, 2011).

4. Conclusion

Since resolutions 242 and 338, the SC has taken no significant steps to end the Israel-Palestine conflict. United States influence has generally kept the issue off the Council's agenda. When Council members have introduced resolutions, responding to periodic crises, the US has repeatedly used symbolic weight, i.e. veto. In early Security Council practice, resolutions did not directly invoke Chapter VII. They made an explicit determination of a threat, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and ordered an action in accordance with Article 39 or 40. The phrase "Acting under Chapter VII" was never mentioned as the basis for the action taken.

In fact the question of veto in the context of reform of the Security Council and modernization and democratization of the United Nations as a whole is one of extreme difficulty and controversy debate. Contrary to the argument of the permanent members of SC that the unanimity of the permanent members is necessary for the efficiency of the Council when it discharges its primary responsibility under the charter, the records of the Security Council clearly illustrate that the opponents of the veto in San Francisco Conference(1945) were right in their prediction, in the sense that the excessive use of veto was, in reality, a disservice for the efficiency of the Council and did render it rather weak and ineffective where the Security Council should have otherwise taken a strong stand. The veto has been used to prevent action upon which all other members of the Council have agreed. It represents nothing short of obstructing the will of international community where reason on the part of the user of the veto fails to be convincing.

As our conclusion, it is clear that the SC has failed to accomplish its main duty i.e. Peace Keeping. The right of Veto and the US pressure are considered as the major factors which prevent the SC to play its expected role. This Issue emphasizes more and more on the fact of need for the essential reforms in UN structure, especially in the Security Council.

Finally, we should thank the scientific board of “ Geopolitics Quarterly “ to provide us this opportunity for publishing our arguments.

5. Acknowledgement

We want to thank the Research Deputy of Imam Khomeini International University of Qazvin and all the people who cooperated with us in compiling and editing this research.

References

A: Books & Articles

- Akhbari. Mohammad and Sayeid Mohammad Hadi Ayazi (2007), "Situation of the Middle East in the Geopolitical Structure through the Third Millennium" in "Geopolitics Quarterly, (An International Journal)" No.3. Vol 3. Fall 2007. PP.35-54.
- Bazz. Mikael (2011), Critical Theory as an International Relations Theory « September 11 in International Relations Theory. The Discipline of International Relations: Still an American Social Science? » <http://asrudiancenter.wordpress.com/2008/06/25/critical-theory-as-an-international-relations-theory/>.
- Devetak Richard and Christofer W. Hughes (2008), *The Globalization of Political Violence. Globalization's shadow.* Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. New York. <http://zhimzone.com/economy-and-politics/international-political-economy/175-what-is-critical-theory-in-international-relations.html>.
- Evans, G. & J. Newnhamn (1998), "Dictionary of International Relations", Penguin Books Ltd.
- Hassan Khani. Mohammad (2010), "Double Standards in International Organizations: A Comparative Study of the UN Response to Iraqi Invasions of Iran and Kuwait" *Geopolitics Quarterly, (An International Journal) Volume: 6, No 4, Winter 2010.* PP 218-227.
- Horkheimer, Max (1982), "Critical Theory, Selected Essays. The Continuum Publishing Company. New York.. ISBN. 0-8264-0083-3.
- Soltaninejad, Ahmad (2006), "The Geopolitical Factors which have Affected the Shaping of Syrian Foreign Policy in the Lebanon Crisis (1975-1990)" "Geopolitics Quarterly, (An International Journal)" No.2. Vol.2. Summer 2006.
- Linklater, Andrew (1999), "The Evolving Spheres of International Justice", *International Affairs (Royal Institute of International Affairs, 1944 -)*, Vol. 75, No. 3, (Jul., 1999).
- Mouffe, Chantal (1990), "Radical Democracy or Liberal Democracy?", *Socialist Review* Vol. 20, No. 2.

B: Internet Docs

- BBC News (2011), "Israeli Settlements : US vetoes UNSC resolution" . 18 February 2011. <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/world-middle-east-12512732>
- Encyclopedia of the Nations Online (2011), " cessed July 29 2011. United Nations " The Security Council. The Security Council Functions & Powers. Copyright © 2011 Advameg, Inc Functions and powers - The Security Council - system <http://www.nationsencyclopedia.com/United-Nations/The-Security-Council-FUNCTIONS-AND-POWERS.html#ixzz1U2IV6V18>.
- Global Policy Forum and the Center for Democracy and Citizenship, University of Minnesota. Accessed July 05 2011. "Veto database and information at Global Policy Forum.2007". April 26, 2007. blog.lib.umn.edu/geno0015/global-policy.
http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_Nations_Security_Council_Resolution_338
- The Security Council (2010), *Issues at AMUN:5.* "21st Annual American Model United

- Nations International Conference Issues at AMUN Chicago, Illinois 20” . 23 November 2010
American Model United Nations 1212 N. Columbian Avenue Oak Park, IL
60302mail@amun.orgwww.amun. Copyright July 2010, by American Model United Nations,
Inc. www.amun.org/uploads/.../2010/Final_Issues_Book_and_Covers.pdf -
- (SC) Resolution 338. 23 October 1967. Adopted at the 1748th meeting of SC. “Question of Egypt”.
<http://daccess-ddsny.un.org/doc/RESOLUTION/GEN/NR0/288/66/IMG/NR028866.pdf?OpenElement>
 - United Nations (1990), “The Origins and Evolution of the Palestine Problem, 1917 - 1988”; 10. CHAPTER 3.” THE 1967 AND 1973 WARS. Security Council adopts resolution 242. (1967),
With the question of Palestine”<http://www.un.org/Depts/dpi/palestine/ch3.pdf>. Chapter 3
 - UN Department of Public Information(2008), ” The Question of Palestine and the United Nations” 07-44457-DPI/2499-April 2008-4000.Reprinted:08-67554-DPI/2499/rev.1-January-2009-3000).
 - United Nations Security Council (2011), Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia. 18 March 2011 at 21:41.
 - United Nations (2011), “Middle East-UNEF I .First UN Emergency Force”. Accessed on August 4. 2011<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/missions/past/unef1backgr2.html>
 - UN News Centre (2009), “Secretary-General calls again on Israel to cease Gaza blockade”. 19 June 2009. UN News Service.[www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=31214&Cr=gaza](http://www.un.org/newswww.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=31214&Cr=gaza).
 - UN News Centre (2011),“United States vetoes Security Council resolution on Israeli settlements”. 18 February 2011. UN News Service:
<http://www.un.org/apps/news/story.asp?NewsID=37572&Cr=palestin&Cr1=>.

C: UN Instruments (US Vetoes)

- S/10974 . 1973 .United Nations Security Council. (SC) U.S Veto. S/10974 of 24 July 1973 (13 in favor, U.S. veto, China did not participate) Question “ Palestine: Examination of Middle East Situation. U.S. Vetoes of UN Resolutions Critical of Israel (1972 - 2006)
www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
- S/11940. 1976 . SC. U.S Veto. S/11940 of 23 January 1976 (9 in favor, U.S. veto, 3 abstentions – Italy, Sweden, UK, China and Libya did not participate in vote) Question: Palestine: Middle East Problem, including Palestinian question.<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>.
- S/12022 . 1976 .SC. U.S Veto .S/12022 of 24 March 1976 (14 in favor, U.S. veto) Question: Palestine: Situation in Occupied Arab Territories.
www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
- S/12119 .1976 . SC. U.S Veto . S/12119 of 29 June 1976 (10 in favor, U.S. veto, 4 abstentions – France, Italy, Sweden, UK), Question: Report on Committee on Rights of Palestinian People. U.S. Vetoes of UN Resolutions Critical of Israel (1972 - 2006):
www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm
- S/13911. 1980 . SC. U.S Veto .S/13911 of 28 April 1980 (10 in favor, U.S. veto, 4 abstentions – France, Norway, Portugal, UK), Question: Palestinian Rights.
<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>.
- S/14985 .1982 . SC. U.S Veto .S/14985 of 2 April 1982 (14 in favor, U.S. veto) .Question:

- Palestine: Situation in Occupied Territories:
<http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>.
- S/15185 . 1982 . SC. U.S Veto. S/15185 of 8 June 1982 (14 in favor, U.S. veto) .Question: Palestine: Conflict in Lebanon. U.S. Vetoes of UN Resolutions Critical of Israel (1972 - 2006) www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/15347/Rev.1. 1982 . SC. U.S Veto S/15347/Rev.1 of 6 August 1982 (11 in favor, U.S. veto, 3 abstentions – Togo, UK, Zaire) .Question: Palestine: Conflict in Lebanon. U.S. Vetoes of UN Resolutions Critical of Israel (1972 - 2006) www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/15895 . 1983 . SC. U.S Veto S/15895 of 1 August 1983 (13 in favor, U.S. veto, 1 abstention – Zaire), Question: Palestine: Situation in Occupied Territories: www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm
 - S/17459 .1985 . SC. U.S Veto .S/19459 of 13 September 1985 (10 in favor, U.S. veto, 4 abstentions – Australia, Denmark, France, UK) .Question: Occupied Territories: Deplores "repressive measures" by Israel against Arab population: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>.
 - S/17769/Rev. 1 . 1986 . SC. U.S Veto .S/17769/Rev. 1 of 29 January 1986 (13 in favor, U.S. veto, 1 abstention - Thailand) .Question: Occupied Territories: Calls upon Israel to respect Muslim holy places: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>
 - S/19780 .1988 . SC. U.S Veto S/19780 of 14 April 1988 (14 in favor, U.S. veto), Question: Occupied territories: Draft urged Israel to abide by the Fourth Geneva Convention, rescind the order to deport Palestinian civilians, and condemned policies and practices of Israel that violate the human rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories;)www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/20463 . 1989 . SC. U.S Veto S/20463 of 17 February 1989 (14 in favor, U.S. veto), Question: Occupied territories: Strongly deplored Israeli policies and practices in the occupied territories, and strongly deplored also Israel's continued disregard of relevant Security Council decisions: www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/20945/Rev.1. 1989. SC. U.S Veto S/20945/Rev.1 of 7 November 1989 (14 in favor, U.S. veto), Question: Occupied territories: Deplored Israel's policies and practices in the occupied territories: www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/1995/394 . 1995 . SC. U.S Veto .S/1995/394 of 17 May 1995 (14 in favor, U.S. veto), Question: Middle East: Confirms that the expropriation of land by Israel in East Jerusalem is invalid and in violation of relevant Security Council resolutions and provisions of the Fourth Geneva convention; expresses support of peace process, including the Declaration of Principles of 9/13/1993: www.mycanaanland.com/.../s/securitycouncilresolutionsonpalestinevetoedbytheusa.htm.
 - S/21326 . 1990 .SC. U.S Veto .S/21326 of 31 May 1990 (14 in favor, U.S. veto), Question: Occupied territories: NAM draft resolution to create a commission and send three security council members to Rishon Lezion, where an Israeli gunmen shot down seven Palestinian workers: <http://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/jsourc/UN/usvetoes.html>.
 - S/1997/199 . 1997 . SC. U.S Veto .S/1997/199 of 7 March 1997 (14 in favor, U.S. veto) .Question: Middle East: Calls upon Israeli authorities to refrain from all actions or measures,