

The Impact of Major Powers on Security Council Decisions

Haidar Salem Abdul Husein¹, Osama Murtadha Baqir²

Abstract

The research examines the impact of major powers on the work of the Security Council and its impact on international politics. The research emphasizes that the five permanent members of the Council (the United States, Russia, China, France, and the United Kingdom) have veto power, which allows them to prevent any decision even if it has the support of the majority. Major Powers utilize this power strategically to direct international policies according to their interests, which leads to influencing decisions related to international peace and security. The research also identifies how geopolitical balances and strategic interests can sometimes explain the lack of consensus in the Council's decisions. In addition, the research discusses criticisms of the present structure of the Security Council. It shows reform calls aimed at improving international representation and reducing the influence of major powers to ensure greater effectiveness and justice in dealing with global crises.

Keywords: *Security Council, Major Powers, Veto Power, International Relations, Permanent Member States, United States of America.*

Introduction

Since the founding of the United Nations in 1945, five major countries have controlled UN resolutions through the right to veto, which obstructs any decision in the Security Council even if all countries are in favor. The five countries expanded this advantage because they emerged victorious in World War II and possessed the elements of power in all their military, economic, wealth and technological forms. They are the central player in the real international system, and at the forefront of these countries is the United States of America. Since the Security Council represents the executive instrument of the United Nations and has the power to act on behalf of the countries under the umbrella of the United Nations, the Security Council acts with international legitimacy and law that is beyond reproach. On this basis, these five countries will cling to the veto right decided to them until their last breath and will not allow the rules of this system to be changed. Rather, these will not replace except through effective action, and this will only happen through the factor of power that changed these rules in 1945. This study will shed light on the seriousness of the international circumstances that were damaged due to the use of the veto right in the wrong places and will examine the possible reforms to improve the performance of this important body on the global level so that it can carry out its basic tasks of maintaining international peace and security and achieving justice and balance in international political equations.

Importance of the Study

The research stems from the importance of Security Council assessments, knowledge of the dynamics of international interactions, and sources of decision-making in the international system to set future policies and form a comprehensive vision for building alliances. This research also clarifies how main powers have influenced Council decisions throughout history, which helps in understanding recurring patterns and benefiting from them in making and dealing with future decisions.

The Purpose of the Research

Study and examine the impact of major powers on Security Council decisions by evaluating how they use the veto, political pressures, and economic and military resources to influence decision-making, including strategic balances, international alliances, and national interests. Evaluate the effectiveness of the Security

¹ Director of Almanbar center for studies and sustainable development, Email: haidar.mip22@ced.nahrainuniv.edu.iq, (Corresponding Author)

² Supervisor, Email: dr.osama@nahrainuniv.edu.iq

Council in achieving its main purposes of maintaining international peace and security and performing its role independently and fairly in light of the dominance of the veto of specific countries.

Explore the mechanisms of influence used by main powers for various means, such as threats, rewards, or diplomatic pressure, to direct Security Council decisions according to their interests. Based on the investigation, recommendations are made on how to improve the performance of the Security Council, enhance its integrity and effectiveness, and suggest reforms to the decision-making mechanism to ensure justice and equality in international decisions.

Research Problem

How does the impact of major countries affect Security Council decisions and international balances?

Does this impact lead to the loss of the rights and interests of small countries?

Do the decisions reproduce the true balance of international interests?

Do the interests of major countries push the Security Council to demote global issues of greater importance?

Does the inequality in decision-making lead to instability and a feeling among weak countries that rights can only be restored by force?

Therefore, does the dominance of the veto adopt the legitimacy of decisions, and is there a need for reforms in the structure or working mechanism of the Security Council to confront the influence of major countries?

Research Assumption

Major Powers justify using the veto by preserving international stability and their legitimate national interests. The influence of major powers can also assume the Security Council's ability to implement its decisions effectively. It may weaken the legitimacy of the Council as an international body that works fairly and directly.

In order to test the credibility of these assumptions, the following stages will be followed:

Study and examine the Security Council's voting mechanisms, document cases of the use of the veto by major powers, and determine how they affect the decisions taken.

Review and investigate the decisions issued by the Council and compare them with similar cases to determine the extent of compatibility in dealing with the issues raised.

Review specific cases in which major powers affected the Council's decisions and analyze the consequences for international stability.

Compare the influence of major powers on Security Council decisions regarding matters related to one of the major powers with the right to veto.

Using these approaches, the hypothesis can be tested comprehensively, and a detailed analysis can be provided on how major powers influence Security Council decisions and their implications on its global role.

Procedural Framework

Given that the theme is related to Security Council resolutions, the legal approach will be used to follow the procedures, legal aspects and obligations that must be followed in this process.

The historical approach will be followed to recognize the historical background of the practices of major powers in the veto right. Regarding the political features and the means used by major powers to achieve their interests and how to employ resolutions in their favor, the analytical approach will be used as far as it is related to revealing the facts and stating the reality.

First: The role of the major powers that control the Security Council and have the right to veto.

The Palestinian Matter

The Palestinian matter is one of the most prominent political and humanitarian issues at the international level. Its origins go back to before the establishment of the United Nations, specifically to the Sykes-Picot Agreement in 1916, then the Balfour Declaration in 1917, and the Mandate issued by the League of Nations in 1921 in favor of Britain over Palestine. After the formation of the United Nations and the agreement of all countries on the right of peoples to self-determination, which became an essential part of the Charter, the demand remained out of reach for the Palestinian people due to the conspiracy of the major powers and their prior intention to give a homeland to the Jews on the land of Palestine, violating all international laws and charters. Although the violations devoted against innocent Palestinians were serious and shameful to humanity, including displacement, massacres, killing, and the seizure of land and money, in addition to the participation of Britain and France with their forces and weapons alongside Israel in 1956 in what was known as the tripartite aggression against Egypt, the dominance of the major powers over the international system did not give any room to the other countries present in the international organization, which were supposed to have a role in the modern collective security system. Nevertheless, all of this was just ink on paper. Then, it came to the UN resolutions, whether in the General Assembly, such as Resolution No. (181) in 1947, which led to dividing the Palestinian territories into two states or Security Council resolutions, such as Resolution No. (242) in 1967, which came after the loss suffered by the Arabs against Israel, supported by the West. Although this Resolution, i.e. (242), stressed that Israel should withdraw from the territories it occupied during the war, the latter circumvented the Resolution and manipulated the translation of the text of the Resolution, even after the 1973 war between the Arabs and Israel and the acceptance of Resolution No. (338), where the Egyptian Sinai was restored, Israel refused to withdraw from any Arab land under the pretext that the text of the Resolution included withdrawal from lands, which is an unknown phrase that was interpreted as not binding on Israel, and with the support of the West, it remained until now in the Syrian Golan Heights. Despite the Arab and Islamic countries standing by the Palestinian produce and submitting many proposals to the General Assembly and the Security Council, some proposals condemning Israel were approved, especially in the General Assembly, and demanding that it stop attacking civilians and stop settlements. However, the policy in the Security Council was completely different and was never with the Palestinians. The United States stood as an impregnable barrier against any resolution that would harm its ally Israel by using the veto power versus dozens of resolutions. On the contrary, it supported Israel, prepared legal tools, and increased the support of many countries, including Arab and Islamic countries, through intimidation and enticement in order to tighten Israel's control over the land of Palestine and to drop the rights of the Palestinians internationally and legally.

The First Gulf War (Iran-Iraq War 1980-1988):

The Iran-Iraq War broke out in 1980 following skirmishes between the two parties, after which the Iraqi president in the previous regime, by a unilateral decision, ignited a wide front in the southern Ahwaz region, which is inhabited by a majority of Arab origins. Then, the fighting lines increased along the Iraqi-Iranian border for a distance of approximately 1,500 km and continued for eight years, during which all types of weapons and ammunition were used, even internationally prohibited ones and approximately 2 million were killed between military and civilians on both sides. During this time, Saddam's regime obtained military, political and economic support from several parties, as most Arab countries, especially the Gulf countries, stood under the pretext of confronting the Iranian (Shiite) expansion, which is the accusation that former President Saddam Hussein relied on when the war began, that Iran had inflamed the internal situation in Iraq by exporting the Iranian revolution. As for the Western countries, most notably the United States of America, Britain, France and even Russia, they provided Saddam's regime with weapons, information and proficiency, not out of love for Iraq, but for other reasons, the most important of which are :

These countries were not in contract with Iran, especially the United States of America, which lost a major ally after the overthrow of the Shah of Iran one year before the war.

Weakening the two major and locally influential parties in this war and occupying the entire region in order to divert attention from the main issue in the Middle East, which is the Palestinian issue.

Adding fuel before the start of the war and then prolonging it by the main countries was driven by economic interests to revive the arms markets of the major countries, especially since the two countries, Iran and Iraq, are considered rich and consuming oil countries.

The Security Council and the international will stayed helpless in the face of the will of the major countries, which did not move a finger for eight years and the huge numbers of victims, destruction and losses estimated at half a trillion dollars at the time. The Security Council resolutions did not depart beyond demanding that both parties end the war and good offices here and there and did not enter the stage of using force or the stage of Chapter VII, and what happened was not a threat to international peace and security. The most well-known resolution was Resolution No. 598, issued on 20/07/1987, which resulted in a ceasefire after Iran's approval on 20/08/1988 .

The Second Gulf War (Occupation of Kuwait in 1991)

The Gulf region is distinguished by its geostrategic consequence in terms of energy resources, geographical location, and history, and it has a special status with the United States of America. Since the era of U.S. President Truman in 1947, the United States began growing its influence in the Middle East region in general within its geostrategic plans as an umbrella for colonial planning, as the region became the key to its vital interests, especially about the security of oil supplies, controlling its flow and prices, and preventing its use as a weapon against it.

In 1975, the Library of Congress organized a study that indicated the possibility of using U.S. military force to occupy foreign oil fields, considering it a serious issue for the United States. The study indicated that the United States could assure the success of such military operations, which shows the extent of the United States' dependence on energy sources in this vital region. In another report on April 27, 1979, entitled "Importing Oil from the Persian Gulf States: Using U.S. Forces to Ensure Supply," formulated by two employees of the Library of Congress's Research Division, the report raised a fundamental question about how the United States could maintain its control over the richest oil reserves in the region. The report determined that it was assumed that disturbances or chaos would occur, which would make the rulers of this region seek assistance from the United States, either to end internal unrest or an attack by another country on them. In 1982, a Pentagon spokesman announced the formation of the U.S. Central Command instead of the Rapid Deployment Forces and that its scope of activity would include 19 countries. Definite training for the Gulf War II scenario began in 1989 . The political system in Iraq at that time believed it was in control of the regional arena.

Moreover, it experienced international acceptance, especially from the Eastern Bloc represented by the Soviet Union, which was breathing its last breaths at the time. However, the silence of the international community during the Iran-Iraq war made the Iraqi regime believe that its actions and adventures would please them. That war was prompted by the United States and aimed at removing Israel from Iraq's calculations. Several circumstances and facts prompted the Iraqi regime to decide to occupy Kuwait, including the manifestations of the crisis on August 9, 1988, when Kuwait decided to increase its oil production despite the quotas set by OPEC, with a focus on the disputed Rumelia border wells with Iraq, which Iraq considered a provocation that would harm it. However, the issue associated to the meeting of the former Iraqi president with the U.S. ambassador to Baghdad on July 25, 1990 (April Glaspie), who confirmed that the United States of America does not have security agreements with Kuwait about the tension between Iraq and Kuwait, which was interpreted by the Iraqi leadership as a green light for Iraq to deal with Kuwait without taking into account the reaction of the international community .

After Iraq entered Kuwait on 02/08/1990, the Security Council met on the same day and released Resolution No. 660, which demanded that Iraq withdraw immediately. It is worth observing that none of the five countries thought of standing with Iraq, that the Iraqi leadership's calculations were delusional, and that Iraq had been lured into a dark tunnel, after which decisions were issued under Chapter VII, pulling the rug out from under any attempts to correct matters and conduct any mediation to make things go according to what the United States of America planned to manage and control the affairs of the region. The United States of America found in this matter an opportunity that could not be missed in any way, so it invested in it as if it had been waiting for it. The United States of America deliberately contributed to issuing an enormous number of resolutions in the Security Council, which burdened the Iraqi state and shackled it with sanctions and obligations that would be very difficult to get rid of .

The Crisis in the Former Yugoslavia

When human rights are wasted, but there is no notice from the major countries, this is not enough for international action, but once one of the major countries feels that there is an interest in a conflict, human rights and violations will be a very serious issue and threaten international peace and security . An example of this is what occurred in Haiti; no human rights violations threatened international peace and security. Rather, all that happened was that a group of coup plotters took power of the government. At the request of the legitimate authority in exile, the Security Council progressed based on Chapter VII. The Council adopted coercive measures and utilized military force to achieve that purpose . As for what happened in Bosnia and Herzegovina between 1992 and 1995, it was a humanitarian disaster experienced by the Orthodox Serbs and Catholic Croats supported by the Yugoslav government against the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Through this brutal violence, the Serbs and Croats imposed a complete siege on the capital of Bosnia (Sarajevo) and during three years of bombing, starvation and destruction of the heritage of Bosnian Muslims from mosques and libraries, these attacks left 200,000 dead and two million wounded. The most horrific incident was the Srebrenica genocide, where 12,000 Bosnian Muslims were killed in one day. After three years of devastation and wars, the Bosnians gathered their forces. After some foreign aid reached from Islamic and Arab countries, Bosnian fighting groups and factions were able to repel the attacks and regain some cities until they reached the city of Banja Luka, the capital of Bosnian Serbs. Here came the international intervention to stop this progress and then stop the war in November 1995 and force all parties to sign the Dayton Peace Treaty, which led to the division of Bosnia and Herzegovina . It is worth observing that Russia was an ally of Yugoslavia in this conflict and opposed any Security Council resolutions against its ally Serbia. About the issue of the Kosovo area, which also belonged to Yugoslavia, similar events took place there, and Serbia committed massacres against it that were no less heinous than those in Bosnia . However, what the Security Council did after the events in Bosnia was considered a key act, as it established a war crimes court and tried the perpetrators of war crimes in Bosnia and Kosovo, headed by the then President of Yugoslavia (Slobodan Milosevic) .

Away from the Security Council and the United Nations, the main powers, especially the two superpowers, the United States of America and the former Soviet Union, during the period known as the Cold War, practiced many interventions, conflicts and even direct wars in many countries around the world without being subjected to any legal or international accountability due to their dominance over the real international system. These two countries deliberately announced these practices to execute a reality that other countries seek and remain protected by one of the camps. Among these instances are:

The civil war in Korea between 1950 and 1953, where China and the Soviet Union stood with the northern part and the United States under the authority of the United Nations with the southern part .

The war on Vietnam in 1965, which continued for ten years, is a scenario similar to the Korean War, where the northern part of Vietnam received support from China and the Soviet Union, and the southern part received support from the United States of America and South Korea. It is considered one of the most prominent and largest proxy wars during the Cold War .

The Soviet intervention in Afghanistan in 1979, and on the other hand, the United States and Britain helped the so-called Mujahedeen and the Soviet army was expelled in 1988 .

France's interventions in the countries of the African continent from the War of Independence in 1962, in which Algeria struggled against French colonialism and claimed the lives of one million Algerian citizens. France's role in the genocide in Rwanda in 1994 appealed the lives of eight hundred thousand people .

Falklands War: These islands belong to the Argentine lands in the continent of South America, but Britain colonized them in 1841 and made most of their inhabitants British citizens. The armed conflict between units of the British and Argentine armies continued for 74 days after Argentina attempted to regain sovereignty over lands belonging to its territory. However, the war ended with Argentina's surrender and supporting British sovereignty over the islands .

Second: The United States of America's unique supermacy over the Security Council

The United States of America appeared victorious after World War II; where it was able to resolve the battle across the Atlantic Ocean within one week after the detonation of the two nuclear bombs on Japan, which led to the latter's surrender, and Europe as well, the United States played a fundamental role in helping Britain and restoring France from the Germans. During this period, the United States of America felt that it was the only superpower that controlled the most deadly weapon in history and, therefore, sought by all means to dominate the world. However, it preferred to be through the United Nations to gain international legitimacy and to be based on the approval of the majority, which would give it a longer duration in world leadership.

The efforts that America followed in retaining the United Nations to achieve its interests during the Cold War:

The Small Assembly

In 1947, it established a permanent board that includes members of the General Assembly and considers developments on international peace and security issues at different times with the convening of the Assembly. In this case, it would have a wider extent to influence countries, and the Assembly would be free of the veto system. However, the Soviet Union and its allies opposed this step on the cause that it conflicted with the powers of the Security Council, which is specialized in it according to the Charter, and thus, the mission did not succeed.

Uniting for Peace

In another attempt, the United States of America succeeded in distributing a resolution in the General Assembly to consider issues related to international peace and security if the Security Council failed to carry out its responsibilities due to the lack of consensus among the permanent member states and due to the use of the veto. The Soviet Union also opposed this step due to its absence of legal basis .

Indirect (Hidden) Veto

In addition to the lawful right that the United States of America has to reject Security Council decisions through the veto system, it pushes the non-permanent member states that are present in the Security Council for one year according to the voting system in the General Assembly, which are nine countries. These countries are often a tool for the major countries, especially the United States of America, which uses special methods with them that it does not show in communal, which prompts these countries to drop any decision that the United States does not want by not obtaining a majority. In this way, the United States of America achieves its target without directly using the veto and without being subject to criticism, and it maintains its international reputation as a country that supports the international organization .

The generous support America requires to the United Nations gives it a large area of control and dominance. The United States is the largest funder of the United Nations, providing \$611 million alone, constituting 22 per cent of the United Nations budget , and hosting the organization's headquarters on its territory. It does not hesitate to utilize this advantage as a pressure card that it threatens and sometimes

implements. For example, the United States of America stopped its support to UNESCO in 1974 because UNESCO made decisions against its ally Israel, only to remove it two years later and then the United States resumed its contribution to the support .

The United States of America's contacts with the Security Council under the unipolar system:

After the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the weakening of the Third World bloc, the United States of America became in a leadership position for the United Nations and the Security Council, exploiting this to impose its foreign policy on the world. The United States has used the regulations of international law and the principles of the United Nations Charter to give international legitimacy to its practices, allowing it to justify its interventions and influence, whether through direct military action as in Iraq and Afghanistan or through economic sanctions and air embargoes as in the case of Iran, North Korea, Libya and Iraq . Most countries may distinguish the United States' dominance over UN resolutions and see its role as weak and often subject to US policy. The United States relies on its exploitation of international legitimacy on its association in the Security Council, which suffers from the influence of major powers, especially the permanent members. The biggest problem is that the everlasting members have also become part of the American orbit, which affects the credibility of the international organization, and its fate will be similar to previous international experiences. This allows the United States to issue international resolutions that assist its interests and positions on international political issues . The United States has not hidden its orientation and position towards Security Council resolutions on different issues, as it views resolutions in terms of the benefit they bring to it, such that it is prepared to engage in conflicts and wars outside the framework of international legitimacy, alone or within side blocs such as NATO if it does not obtain approval from the Security Council. This is confirmed by what was specified in a speech by US President Bill Clinton before the United Nations General Assembly on 27/09/1997, where he said: "We will work in partnership with others, and through multilateral institutions such as the United Nations. It is in our national significance to do so, but we must not hesitate to act alone when there is a threat to our vital interests or the vital interests of our allies. "

The Occupation of Afghanistan in 2001

The roots of the Afghanistan subject go back to 1979 when the Soviets occupied it, and a government loyal to them was appointed. This issue forced the ire of the countries hostile to the Soviet Union in the opposing camp, so the United States began supporting the opposition, which was mobilized on a sectarian and jihadist basis, in which fighters from outside Afghanistan participated in what was later known as the Arab Afghan Mujahedeen. The fighting in Afghanistan lasted until the Soviet withdrawal in 1989. However, the abandonment did not lead to stability in Afghanistan. Rather, the chaos continued and turned into civil wars between warlords fabricated by foreign countries' interventions . The fighters who became expert in the profession of fighting with the support of the West turned into internationally wanted persons due to their embrace of Al-Qaeda led by Osama bin Laden and their involvement in operations and bombings that targeted American targets in Kenya and Tanzania .

In 1999, the Security Council issued Resolution 1267, challenging that the Taliban hand over Osama bin Laden to the United States for trial on charges of planning and executing the bombing of its two embassies. However, the Taliban association, which controlled Afghanistan at the time, rejected the request, which led to a significant deterioration in relations, and the United States began planning and working secretly to capture bin Laden.

On 11/09/2001, the United States was subjected to the worst incidents in its history in what became known as the September 11 events, where a group of hijackers used four civilian passenger planes that were hijacked in the air as tools to strike sites inside American territory, including the Pentagon headquarters. However, the worst of these was affecting the World Trade Center towers in New York, which were targeted by two planes, which led to their destruction and resulted in the deaths of approximately three thousand people and twice that number were injured. The material damages from these events were estimated at approximately 247 billion dollars .

This crime sparked anger and demands for the requirement of protecting the United States of America from similar terrorist attacks in the future. However, September 11 was not only an attack on lives and facilities but also an assault on the essential freedoms on which the United States of America was founded, as US President George W. Bush pointed out .

After the events of September 11, the United States of America started what it called the war on terror. However, this war was broader than this idea, as the US administration exploited this war as a pretext for measures that began from within America, through which it violated the principle of freedoms enjoyed by this vast area that was proud of democratic values. The war that the United States of America launched on terror after September 11 did not strongly stress these freedoms. The United States of America subsequently witnessed a permanent and deliberate, unjustified decline in the fundamental rights that protect individuals from the abuse of government powers guaranteed by the US Constitution and international human rights law. The most directly affected were non-US citizens who were exposed to arbitrary detention and violations of the principles of fairness in legal procedures, as the government ignored the principle of the presumption of innocence.

After September 11, the Department of Justice, through its agencies, the FBI and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, began questioning thousands of people who might have information about or links to terrorist actions. The decision to question who appeared to be random was sometimes based on unsystematic encounters between law enforcement officers and foreign Muslim men or on the suspicions of neighbors. These questionings produced the arrest and imprisonment of approximately 1,200 noncitizens, although the exact number remains uncertain. Of those arrested, 752 were charged with immigration violations.

In February 2002, the Department of Justice recognized that most of those detained in connection with the September 11 investigation and charged with immigration violations, which it referred to as “special interest” detainees, had nothing to do with counterterrorism efforts. By July 2002, none of the “special interest” detainees had been convicted of terrorist movement, and most had been deported for visa violations. However, the course of their arrest, interrogation, and detention reveals the Justice Department’s unnecessary presumption of guilt .

Legal Basis for the War on Afghanistan

On September 14, 2001, the U.S. Congress passed legislation entitled “Authorization for the Use of Military Force against Terrorists.” This legislation approved the use of U.S. armed forces against those responsible for the September 11 attacks and those who harbored them .

Article 2(4) of the United Nations Charter, which the United States has employed and made into state law, prohibits the use or threat of force against any state except in circumstances in which the Security Council or another organ of the United Nations has authorized it, or in self-defense under Article 51 of the Charter.

Although the Security Council did not specifically approve the U.S.-led military campaign against Afghanistan, there are arguments that it is a legitimate form of self-defenses under the United Nations Charter. The series of Security Council resolutions on Afghanistan stipulate that it is achievable to prove that the Taliban is responsible, even indirectly, for the attacks of the terrorist organization Al-Qaeda, based on Afghanistan providing them with haven. In contrast, some legal experts have understood the invasion as an illegal operation under Article 51 because the September 11 attacks were not “armed attacks” from another state, as defined in this article. The confrontations carried out by terrorists did not prove with conclusive evidence that was behind them, and Afghanistan did not claim responsibility .

The Occupation of Iraq in 2003

The invasion of Iraq and the preparations and extensive political and political debate that preceded it are among the most complex issues of the current century. Justifications were used that were not up to the required level and became a theme of ridicule when the US Secretary of State raised his hands in the Security

Council holding a bottle in his hand as evidence of Iraq's possession of weapons of mass destruction. The British Prime Minister was not more fortunate than his American partners as he was suspected of lying to his people regarding the Iraqi weapons of mass destruction. The invasion of Iraq in 2003 was a dangerous precedent for disturbing international legitimacy through which the United States disregarded international charters and laws and exposed international peace and security to real danger. It was the start of an approach to military action outside the framework of international legitimacy and the scope of the United Nations and a clear violation of the United Nations Charter .

In this context, many international administrators and jurists in international law confirmed that this war lacks legal and international cover and that UN Security Council Resolution No. 1441, on which the United States relied to launch this war, does not give it any authorization at all to use force against Iraq. It had to supply a new resolution in this regard. This was confirmed by the former Secretary-General of the United Nations, Kofi Annan, in clear terms when he stated: "The American invasion of Iraq is not by the United Nations Charter from our point of view and is illegitimate from the point of view of the Charter." In answer to whether the Secretary-General meant that the war was illegitimate, Annan said: "Yes, I wanted to say that. "

Although the war launched by the United States and the United Kingdom on Iraq in 2003 was not through the United Nations, the latter admitted the status quo and dealt with Iraq as an occupied state. In order to legitimize this occupation and avoid a conflict with the international community, the United States submitted a draft resolution to the Security Council granting the American occupation forces control over Iraq's national economic resources and lifting the international sanctions imposed on Iraq since its invasion of Kuwait. As a result, Security Council Resolution 1483 was distributed which recognized the United States and the United Kingdom as occupying powers and granted the Coalition Provisional Authority specific powers and responsibilities under international law. The identical resolution called for lifting the sanctions on Iraq .

Using sanctions or bullying them as a pressure card on countries, whether through the Security Council or unilaterally.

Since the end of the Cold War, the United States has increased the practice of economic tools to achieve its foreign policy goals. These tools range from straightforward economic sanctions to promoting free trade, giving America exceptional power to achieve its interests without resorting to military force.

However, the reckless use of economic control may lead to short-term and long-term disastrous results. The Trump administration's hardline strategies, such as imposing tariffs on allies and adversaries and re-imposing sanctions on Iran without considering the negative effects , have undermined the United States' global position and its ability to influence in the future.

American officials consider that their country has reached a stage of power that makes it above the laws of economic and political gravity. According to this thinking, they believe they can launch trade wars without confronting reactions, considering America "the largest profitable market in the world." They can threaten to force sanctions on their allies and continue to make bad economic decisions while the US dollar remains in the first place.

However, in reality, concession and swap are the basis of politics. This reckless and arrogant approach has undermined the United States' position and economic authority in the long term .

The threat of the former US President to Iraq is a clear sample of what the US administration practices in this type of threat, as he said in response to Iraq's demand for the withdrawal of US forces that the United States will not leave Iraq unless the Iraqi government pays the cost of the US air base (Al-Assad base), which was built by the previous Trump administration, and if they do not, Iraq will be imposed sanctions that no country has ever seen .

The international approvals campaign launched by countries against Russia following its invasion of Ukraine in 2022, where many countries of the world voluntarily ended business with Russia, which led to the severing of trade and financial relations with it, and these sanctions were a shock to the Kremlin by freezing many of its foreign assets, which is unexpected for one of the largest economies in the world, as the speed, scope and size of these punitive economic measures and the nature of their objectives are unprecedented. These countries' response to the requests of the United States comes because of the link between their economies and the dominance of the US currency in international transactions .

Conclusions and Recommendations

At the end of this research, the main outcomes can be summarized:

Major countries are important and influential in determining Security Council decisions. This influence is due to economic and military control, veto power, and political pressure. These influences can rise in bias in decisions, which unbalanced reflect the national interests of major countries at the expense of the public interest.

The research showed that the influence of major countries creates key challenges for the Security Council, including issues related to the imbalance of decisions and the difficulty of achieving the Council's basic objectives, such as maintaining international peace and security. This has occasionally led to the Council's ineffectiveness in dealing with major global crises and achieving lasting solutions.

Through the results, it is necessary to reflect structural reforms and the working mechanism of the Security Council to enhance its effectiveness and integrity.

This includes fundamental reforms at the level of altering the Charter, such as changing the mechanism for using the veto power and enhancing the representation of small and medium-sized countries to ensure greater balance in decision-making.

Improving transparency and strengthening the oversight character in the decision-making process to reduce the exaggerated influence of major countries.

Consider strategies to enhance the balance between the benefits of major powers and those of other countries, including giving greater powers to the General Assembly, in which the weights of countries are equal.

In conclusion, there is a need to follow the ongoing expansions in the policies of major countries and their impact on the Security Council. It is also necessary for academic research to continue exploring how to improve the functioning of the Council and develop new strategies to address the challenges resulting from the great influence of major countries. Moreover, to provide effective solutions that increase the ability of the Security Council to perform its role more justly and effectively and contribute in a real way to improving international stability and achieving world peace.

References

- Osama Mortada Al-Saeedi, *The United States of America and the United Nations, the Post-Cold War Period: A Reformist Vision*, 1st ed., Dar Al-Basaer, Beirut, 2011.
- Sabli Talhami, *Explaining American Decision-Making in the Gulf War - Between Theory and Reality: Explaining American Behavior in the Gulf War*, an article published in the *Journal of Palestine Studies*, Issue 15, Summer 1993, accessed 25/08/2024 at 10:00, (<https://www.palestine-studies.org/ar/node/34532>).
- Abdul Samad Naji Malayas, *The United Nations and Humanitarian Intervention in the Framework of International Reality and Its Impact on the Protection of Human Rights*, *Journal of the College of Baghdad for Economic Sciences*, University, Issue 23, 2010,
- Fakhriya Ali Amin, *The War in the Korean Peninsula 1950-1953*, *Diyala Journal of Humanities Research*, Issue 38, Iraq, 2009, p. 651 (<https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/87bcef43be5ee595>).

- Majid Abdul Zahra Imran, The Soviet Occupation of Afghanistan and the Position of Western Countries (1979-1989), Wasit Journal of Humanities, Volume 14, Issue 41, Iraq, 2018, p. 564, (<https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/1e800fd75f4bf89>).
- Muhammad Nour Al-Basrati, The Strategy of International Sanctions and Its Implications on the Policies of Countries (Iraq - Iran - Russia) as a Model, Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University, Volume 23, Issue 3, July 2022
- Hala Saudi, The United Nations: The Necessities of Reform After Half a Century - An Arab Perspective, Center for Arab Unity Studies, 1st ed., Beirut, 1996
- Nadia Fadel Abbas, US Foreign Policy Towards Afghanistan, International Studies Journal, Issue 45, Iraq, 1/7/2010, (<https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/c79250c4dde4bee5>).
- Ali Musa Al-Dada, Trump's Administration of US Foreign Policy in the Middle East, Al-Mustaqbal Al-Arabi Magazine, Issue 477, Lebanon, November 2018. Pp. 128-131 (<https://bit.ly/4d9Lhv5>).
- Muhammad Nour Al-Basrati, The Strategy of International Sanctions and Its Implications on the Policies of Countries (Iraq - Iran - Russia) as a Model, Journal of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science, Cairo University, Volume 23, Issue 3, July 2022.
- General Assembly Resolution 181, 1947, accessed 06/08/2024 at 15:00, (https://hlrn.org/img/documents/Partition_resolution_181_AR.pdf).
- Naji Al-Bashir Omar Al-Qahwash, The Impact of Veto on UN Security Council Resolutions (The Palestine Issue as a Model), Master's Thesis, Department of Political Science, Middle East University, January 2015
- Kazem Attia Kazem Al-Shammari, The Extent of the Security Council's Jurisdiction to Consider Human Rights Violations, Master's Thesis, College of Law, University of Nahrain 2013
- Marwa Abbas Fadhel, Iraqi-American Relations Since 2014, Master's Thesis, College of Political Science/Department of International Politics, University of Nahrain, Iraq, 2022
- Nazir Majli, 100 years since the Sykes-Picot Agreement.. and the "partition" continues, an article published on the Asharq Al-Awsat website on 14/05/2016, accessed on 28/08/2024 at 15:30, (<https://bit.ly/3XssTHQ>).
- Omar Yass Issa Al-Dulaimi, Balfour Declaration, November 2, 1917 (the first catastrophe), an article published on the website of the Center for Strategic Studies, Anbar University, Iraq, on 14/11/2023, accessed on 28/08/2024 at 16:30, (<https://bit.ly/3z5di9e>).
- Resolution 242, 22/11/1967, Ambiguous Terms for a Settlement in the Middle East, a report published on the Interactive Encyclopedia of the Palestinian Cause website, accessed 15/08/2024 at 17:00, (<https://bit.ly/3XrhNTq>).
- The Bloody Iran-Iraq War on its Fortieth Anniversary, a report published on the BBC Arabic website on 22/09/2020, accessed 28/06/2024 at 15:00, (<https://www.bbc.com/arabic/world-54239290>).
- Hamed Al-Kanani, Resolution 598 to End the Iran-Iraq War: Timing and Challenges, an article on the Independent Arabia website on 24/04/2023, accessed 05/05/2024 at 15:00, (<https://bit.ly/4cSQsQz>).
- Alaa Jumaa, Newspaper: Did Washington give Saddam the green light to invade Kuwait?, an article published on the German Deutsche Welle on 02/08/2020, accessed on 17/08/2024 at 17:30, (<https://p.dw.com/p/3g8Qo>).
- Aggression against Bosnian Muslims 1992-1995, a report published on the Bosnia website, accessed on 28/06/2024 at 17:00, (<https://www.elbosna.com/bosnian-war.html>).
- Former Yugoslav President Found Dead in His Cell, a report published on the German Deutsche Welle (DW) website on 11/03/2006, accessed on 28/06/2024 at 19:00, (<https://bit.ly/4cTepr1>).
- Vietnam War, article published on Al-Ma'rifa website, accessed 28/08/2024 at 22:00, (<https://bit.ly/3Xq1Exv>).
- France.. A record full of violations in Africa, report on Al-Jazeera website on 07/02/2018, accessed 29/06/2024 at 20:00, (<https://bit.ly/4bR6V6E>).
- Falklands War, the largest naval battle since World War II, article published on Al-Rai newspaper website in Jordan on 30/03/2007, accessed 20/08/2024 at 15:00, (<https://bit.ly/3B3bzSg>).
- Sufyan Latif Ali, America from the arbitrary use of the veto to the occupation of Iraq, Al-Ummah website for studies and development, 07/08/2021, accessed 24/08/2024 at 12:30, (<https://bit.ly/3RIZFCr>).
- Anthony Blinken, the twenty-fourth anniversary of the embassy bombings in 1998, the official website of the US Department of State, 07/08/2022, (<https://bit.ly/3SqqIcW>).
- In numbers.. September 11 attacks on the 21st anniversary, a report on the CNN Arabic website on 11/09/2022, accessed 25/08/2024 at 22:00, (<https://cnn.it/3zY3LRf>).
- USA: Violations mar investigations into 11/09, Human Rights Watch website, accessed 25/08/2024 at 12:00, (<https://bit.ly/3WHfDQD>).
- Matthias von Hein, The 2003 Iraq War.. Violating international law due to false pretexts! – DW – 20/03/2023, accessed 18/08/2024 at 15:00, (<https://bit.ly/3xnt9PB>).
- Trump threatens to impose "major sanctions" on Iraq.. Pay us to leave, a report published on Sky News Arabia website on 06/01/2020, Abu Dhabi, accessed 8/25/2024 at 10:00, (<https://www.skynewsarabia.com/middle-east/1310293>)
- Resolution 242 (1967) / [adopted by the Security Council at its 1382nd meeting], of 22/11/1967, time of visit 12/8/2024 at 12:30 o'clock, (<https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/90717?ln=ar&v=pdf>).
- Resolution 337 (1973) / [adopted by the Security Council at its 1743rd meeting], of 15/8/1973, time of visit 16/8/2024 at 22:00, (<https://bit.ly/3B2G2jq>).
- United Nation, Committee on Contributions, scale of assessment, time of visit 24/8/2024 at 14:00 o'clock, (<https://www.un.org/en/ga/contributions/scale.shtml>).
- "S. 1061 — 118th Congress: A bill to prospectively repeal the 2001 Authorization for Use of Military Force." July 28, 2024 (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/118/s1061>).
- Marjorie Cohn, Bombing of Afghanistan is illegal and must be stopped, time of visit 24/8/2024 at 17:00 o'clock, (<https://bit.ly/3Aa0MoM>).

Iraq war was illegal and breached UN charter, says Annan, The Guardian, Time visit on 18:00, 29/7/2024.
(<https://bit.ly/3WrIWVI>).

Jacob J. Lew and Richard Nephew, How Washington Is Abusing Its Financial Might, Foreign Policy, 15/10/2018,
(<https://fam.ag/3LHe275>).