

## ISRAEL FACTOR IN US VETO BEHAVIOR

*Professor Dr Mansoor Akbar Kundi*

### **Introduction**

*US and Israel have special relationship but they actually developed after 1967. Now since 1970 there have been very close relationship.*

*Jimmy Carter*

*Our relationship would never vary from its allegiance to the shared values, the shared religious heritage, the shared democratic politics which have made the relationship between the United States and Israel a special—even on occasion a wonderful—relationship."*

*Bill Clinton*

Foreign policy of a country is the patterns of relationship it establishes with the outside world for the promotion of its national interests, an eternal phenomenon in international politics. The outside world includes state or nation-state and non-state actors. The nation-state actor as Huntington claims "will remain the most important actors in world affairs"<sup>1</sup>. The non-state actors have importance in international system which has grown since 1945. The non-state actions include International Government Organizations (IGOs), Non-IGOs or NGOs, Multinational Corporations (MNCs), Movements and media. It is "the actions of a state toward the external environment and conditions under which (foreign) actions are formulated. Foreign Policy is also a syntheses of the ends (national interests) and means (power and capabilities) of nation states. The interaction between national goals and the resources for attaining them is the perennial subject of statecraft.<sup>2</sup> The interaction can be either bilateral or multilateral but is ultimately for the promotion of national interests. Karl W. Deutsch is right when he says that the "foreign policy of every country deals with the preservation of its independence and security, and second with the pursuit and protection of its economic interests."<sup>3</sup>

The interests however can be other than routine interests countries have in common. They include special status for a country and “enemy of my enemy is my friend” considerations. So is the case of Israel in American foreign policy behavior. In the American policy making the Israel factor has played an important role in the restructuring of American relationship with the outside world, particularly the Muslim world majority of whom have not recognized Israel. For the US foreign policy making the survival of the Israel as a regional power is of core importance. The US foreign policy which was historically based on the principles of Monroe Doctrine, recognizing the rights of the existence of free nation on the principles of mutual co-existence and non-interference in European affairs, made a rapid shift in the post-World War II.

The emergence of Israel on the political map of Middle East was the achievement of the Zionist designs actually received its support in the Belfour Declaration long before the Second World War. Israel soon became the leading aid as well as nuclear technology recipient country from the US. It is the largest US aid receiving country in the world since 1960. In Noam Chomsky’s words, Israel is the only country to which American citizens can give tax free contributions, thus imposing on others a subsidy to Israel, in addition to the direct official aid and loans.<sup>4</sup>

The major political and morale support for its nuclear device in 1966 came from the US when it emerged as the sixth nation in the world and the first in the Middle East to develop and acquire nuclear weapons. The main expression of support for Israel has been foreign, military, and UN diplomatic support as its strategic liability. The fact as supported in the recent book by Wesley Clark *Winning Modern Wars: Iraq, Terrorism and American Empire* that America had totally turned a blind eye to the development of either nuclear capabilities or arsenals by Israel.<sup>5</sup> The US supported the Israeli cause in the UN Security Council on important issues where the rights of Palestinians was injured in large. Warren Christopher, Secretary of State in said that in relation to US and Israel “special relationship for special reasons”.<sup>6</sup> He is absolutely right. They don’t fall even under traditional models of bilateralism or national interests driven model about which once John F. Dulles, the US

Secretary of State under D. D. Eisenhower (1953-59) and architect of SEATO and CENTO had said that there are several de facto regimes in the world that we do not recognize. We act, in this respect, as our national interests dictate. The US supports Israel no matter it is against their national interests; international law principles or democratic values. American support for Israel since 1948 in international affairs is largely accountable for a drift in the American foreign policy. So is the case of the US United Nations (UN) veto behavior since 1972. It has been reflective of the unilateral support for Israeli aggression in the Gaza and Palestinian area.

This paper is an attempt to highlight the Israel factor in the US UN veto behavior since 1972 in defiance of the principles of UN Charter, international law and comity. The article will focus upon the dichotomy of the theory and practice of the UN veto behavior by a superpower in its special relationship. The hypothesis of the paper is that soon after US started using veto in the Security Council, its use has aberrantly been exercised against the UN Charter, international peace, security and morality to defend Israel aggression and hegemonic policies. The method of research is largely qualitative and analytic under theoretical and historical contexts.

### **Veto Power of Permanent 5**

The veto power of the Permanent Five (P-5) constitutes the very essence of the United Nations mechanism which in large has reflected on the impartial and democratic nature of the institution. There is no equality of rights of the member states. The five countries which reaped the fruits of victory in World War II were accorded special privileges.<sup>7</sup> There has been no mention of the Veto in the UN Charter. The use of veto is the ultimate result of have and have-nots power division of the use of affirmative and concurring vote of the UNSC on procedural and non-procedural matters. Article 27 of the UN Charter says:

Each member of the Security Council shall have one vote. Decisions of the Security Council on procedural matters

shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members. Decisions of the Security Council on all other matters shall be made by an affirmative vote of nine members including the concurring votes of the permanent members; provided that, in decisions under Chapter VI, and under paragraph 3 of Article 52, a party to a dispute shall abstain from voting.”<sup>8</sup>

The use of power is a privilege and responsibility of P-5. Its use was discussed in detail and approved in the UN Conferences in San Francisco, Dumbarton Oaks, and Yalta during 1944-45. The use of veto power was allowed in the hands of major powers which founded the United Nations largely for the promotion of international peace and security. It was designed to prevent any move or resolution which could threaten the very principle of the United Nations. Nevertheless, its use has been negated in spirit due to uneven division of the use of powers on procedural and non-procedural matters. One can cite number of examples when the use of veto being in negation of the UN Charter and international law was exercised to support power politics and regional interference for national interests. For example, when two resolutions were tabled in Security Council reproving the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan and taking American diplomats as hostages by Iranians in 1980 the USSR immediately vetoed them one after another. As David Schweigman discusses in his book *The Authority of the UN Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter*, the voting in the Security Council on procedural and non-procedural patterns has marked the uneven division of powers between the permanent and non-permanent members.<sup>9</sup>

Matters included in the procedural list or discussed are very limited without being significance. For example, the putting on any country's request for UN membership by Security Council is procedural matter and does need concurring vote, but the approval of 9 members including concurring of P-5 is non-procedural (absentia is allowed). Thus in August 1972 Security Council

succeeded in tabling the resolution for membership of Bangladesh as it was procedural but China vetoed it on 25 August 1972 as non procedural matter. To Schweigman,

the internal procedure of the Council such as the inclusion of the items on the agenda; adjournment and suspension of meetings; and matters designed as procedural by the Charter. non procedural matters include i. matters relating to the Council's discharge of its responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security under Chapter VI and VII ii. Matters relating to the admissions and expulsions of members, and the expulsion of members and suspension of their admission rights, iii. Matters relating to the execution of judgments by the International Court of Justice and the request for an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice iv. Recommendations for the appointment of Secretary Generals.<sup>10</sup>

Also, in case of any dispute whether the item is procedural or non-procedural the matter is treated as non procedural where affirmative vote of the P-5 is applicable.

The role of non-permanent members is rather limited in procedural matters, because they don't have the right of concurring vote. Had they had been assigned the right of concurring vote in non-procedural matters, the Security Council might not have been heavily dominated by the permanent members as it is today. The use of veto has given an edge to the P-5 as a dominant role in the world politics.. Giulio Terzi, the Italy's UN Ambassador has rightly remarked that no matter the use or threat of the use of veto, the 'hidden veto' has prevented substantial discussions of questions that are crucial to international peace and security. The right of the veto is embedded in the article 27, paragraph 3 of the UN Charter, is

addressed by virtually all reforms proposals about SC (8). It is the dominant feature of the UN Charter. Richard Falk says that Veto gives unilaterally to prevent a decision from being taken” and establishes a hierarchy among the members of the organization by wrongfully giving the five states the trustee of the international community.<sup>11</sup> It was designed as the special right of maintaining the international security and peace, but unfortunately it failed in large.<sup>12</sup>

A total of 261 vetoes (1946-2009) have been used in the Security Council with the following frequency: USSR/Russia 123, US 82, UK 32, France 18, China 6 (including one by Republic of China or Taiwan against the application for admission of Mongolia in UN). The use of veto against the admissions of new states in the UN was very frequent in 1950s and 1960s. The absolute majority of them were exercised by the USSR which blocked the admission until next. Many countries with excellent democratic record such as Finland, Italy, and Japan were blocked by USSR. The Great Britain and France never used veto to block an admission to the UN. Since 1976 there has been no use of veto against the application of admission for UN membership. America did not use its veto power as the foreign policy options or state behavior until 1970. There had been occasions when it should have used the veto for the enhancement of world peace and security. In many strategists’ analysis US could use its right of veto on a number of sensitive and strategic issues such as Arab-Israel dispute in 1956, Jordan River dispute and Arab-Israel War 1967 either in support of Israel against Arabs or uphold the UN charter. Since then it has dominantly exercised it in favor of Israeli role in the Middle East in violation of UN Charter as its strategic liability with unyielding support. In 1970 the US exercised its first veto on November 1970 on the situation in South Rhodesia (Zimbabwe). On Sept. 10 1972 US exercised its second but first veto on Israel. It was the Republican era with Henry Kissinger in the heyday of his diplomatic career, served as the Secretary of State under Nixon.

Henry Kissinger, a German born Jew, was the supporter of “Rejectionist Position” in favour of “Greater Israel”. It was the realization of the policy that Israel should not accommodate any

settlement or facilitation to Palestinians and maintain its firm control over the occupied areas as “Strategic Asset” for US. It was during Nixon that “Special Relationship” between Israel and US began which culminated in its height after Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982. Kissinger is on record for saying that Israel since 1948 has played a valuable role in the Middle East and US is fortunate in having an ally in the Middle East. These events will be taken into account in all future developments.<sup>13</sup>

During Nixon Administration huge arms supply was made to Israel which included F-4s and A-4s, a part of the overall \$ 500 millions package, as well as M-60 tanks, 105mm gun tanks, M-109 self propelled 155m howitzers, M-107 self propelled 175 mm guns, M-113 armored personnel carriers, Ch-53 Sikorsky helicopters and Hawk surface to air missiles. It was the beginning of realization by the US that Israel, besides material and military, needs more diplomatic support inside and outside UN. The fact has been revealed by George H. W. Bush (Sr) who served as the US Ambassador to UN (1971-73) when the first veto on Israel was used. The resolution was tabled at the request of Syria to debate the Israeli air strike of September 8 on Arab guerrilla bases in Syria and Lebanon. It mobilized an “embittered debate” with a veto end which darted off diplomatic efforts.<sup>14</sup>

### **American Use of UN Veto since 1970**

Out of the total 82 UN vetoes America exercised, 41 are on the Middle East question with Palestinian question at flashpoint. They primarily revolved around the issues of situation in the occupied territories with Israeli atrocities committed against Palestinians; complaint of Lebanon or Syria against Lebanon; violation of UN Charter and international law; and expansion of Jewish settlement in Gaza and East Jerusalem. As Donald Neff and Robin Alden discusses the resolutions were to attract world opinion and international organizations to secure necessary justice against the atrocities Israel committed. In response, US cynically used veto to shield Israel from international criticism, censure and sanctions.<sup>15</sup>

The draft resolution was tabled to condemn Israel's air attacks against Lebanon and Syria on Sept. 6, the day after 11 Israeli athletes were killed at the 1972 Munich Olympic Games. They were killed by five Arab terrorists belonging to PLO wearing track suits who climbed the six and 1/2 foot fence surrounding the Olympic Village in Munich, Germany. The death toll of the attacks ranged between 200 and 500 Lebanese, Syrians and Palestinians, mostly innocent civilians. Ambassador Bush justified the action as a new policy to combat terrorism in Middle East: we are implementing a new policy that is much broader than that of the question of Israel and the Jews. What is involved is the problem of terrorism, a matter that goes right to the heart of our civilized life.<sup>16</sup> It is important to note that the attack on Israeli athletes and the relevant events by the PLO militants which included the hijacking of three airplanes with hundreds of passengers to Jordan, and killing of three American diplomats in Khartoum was widely condemned by Islamic countries and was regarded as terrorist act. The OIC had asked for international tribunals to conduct the inquiry. The Israeli bombardment supported by American diplomatic support, nevertheless, inflicted much heavier damage by killing hundreds of human lives and flagrant violation of international law and international conventions: i.e. the Hague Convention 1907 respecting the laws and customs of war; and 1949 Fourth Geneva Convention protecting civilian population in time of war.

On July 26, 1973 U.S. vetoed a resolution which had nothing to do with terrorism but oriented international law question by affirming the rights of the Palestinians and established provisions for Israeli withdrawal from occupied territories as embodied in the previous General Assembly resolutions. It was few months after the October Arab-Israel War 1973 where Egypt by crossing the canal and deeper penetration into Israeli area had tarnished the military image of Israel. America used UN diplomacy as an anti-Israel behavior by Egypt and asked for immediate ceasefire on which all P-5 agreed. The US's support for Israel was a writing on the wall. President Nixon requested the Congress for immediate \$ 2,200 million military aid to Israel to "offset Soviet supplies to the Arab States".<sup>17</sup>



Similarly, the US exercised four vetoes during 1975-76 on Israel to silence the resolutions on Situation in the Middle East (Israel/Lebanon). The Middle East Situation in large were concerned about the Palestinian question, Jerusalem status, and question of the exercise by the Palestinian people of their inalienable rights. It was the period during which Palestinian question had entered the international agenda and debates in General Assembly and Security Council reflected the US-Israeli hegemony against the prospects of Palestinian state. The US UN behavior during the period individually and collectively (particularly or generally) strangled the wording of the “UN Resolution 242 from 1967 which stood for peace and settlement. In Noam Chomsky’s words:

From then to the present the US has blocked the possibility of a diplomatic settlement in the terms acceptable to by virtually the entire world: a two-state settlement on the international border, with “minor and mutual adjustments; that was the principle of official, through not actual, US policy until the Clinton Administration formally abandoned the framework of international diplomacy, declaring UN resolutions “obsolete and anachronistic.”<sup>18</sup>

The vetoing of the resolutions thwarted initiatives from “UN, Europe, the Arab states, the USSR, and the Security Council and General Assembly.

The resolution on Palestinian rights question in April 1980 was supported by all except US while the one on Israel/Lebanon issue had only one abstaining. The resolution was tabled to condemn the violation of Palestinians human, socio-cultural and religious rights at the hands of Israeli government. It followed the frustration grown after the Israeli Knesset passed a law declaring East and West Jerusalem combined as the “eternal capital of Israel”. It led to the growing annexation of occupied territory under Israel control with

day to day settlement of Jews. The ruling of Knesset was the violation of democratic spirit designed to promote trust building amongst citizens. An important clause of the bill actually proposed by Geula Cohen that "the integrity and unity of Greater Jerusalem (Yerushalayim rabati) in its boundaries after the Six Day War shall not be violated" was dropped and omitted the word annexation and Sovereignty.<sup>19</sup> The year 1982 witnessed the highest number of US vetoes in the Security Council with six UNSC resolutions being tabled off from discussion. Noam Chomsky in his book *Fateful Triangle* shows despair on each of the resolution which if had been allowed for discussion would have opened new discourses on the world peace and security. Describing the one on 26 June he says, the US in flagrant violation of UN Charter simply rejected it because in American policy makers' analysis, a transparent attempt to preserve the PLO as the viable political force, evidently an intolerable prospect for the US government (due to Israel).<sup>20</sup> A total of 18 vetoes were used under the Reagan Administration (highest than any Administration). They all shielded Israel from the Security Council criticism one way or another. Half of the resolutions vetoed were tabled by the non-permanent members of the UN Security Council about Lebanon and its aftermath situation.

The Israeli invasion of Lebanon in 1982 left Middle East not only politically uncertain and instable but in security hazards of blood and miseries by leaving around 20,000 to 20,500 dead. The Israel invasion of Lebanon followed an ongoing peace process which Yasser Arafat was going to achieve by imposing discipline on the many PLO factions to maintain the cease-fire made under U.S. auspices. It was a failed assassination attempt by the PLO rival group by Abu Nidal (June 3) on Israeli Ambassador Shlomo Argov in London. Consequently, the Israel went to war. Had Israel, under the Prime Ministership of Manachem Begin, not gone to war, the things in many political scientists' analysis, such as Edward W. Said, the costs would have been much lesser. Begin was told by even own advisers not to go to war as Arafat was in no control of Abu Nidal, but the information could not stop the invasion. To Manachem Begin, all Palestinians were PLO and were to be punished.

The UN resolutions being all designed to halt Israeli aggression against civilians and innocents, were blocked by the US because they were meant to condemn Israeli aggression.<sup>21</sup> The UN Vetoes strengthened Israel Strategic Asset concept which actually began after the invasion of Lebanon. US and Israel relations had never been so close and cordial as they were after the invasion. The aftermath of invasion witnessed more hegemonic role of Israel at the hands of US. It was after that Israel's National Water Company took control of the whole (scarce and disputed water resources) in the region. Ibrahim Matar in his research says that by virtue of the usurpation of the water resources the Israeli administration of the occupied territories, largely in the hands of military commanders, facilitated newly settled Jews by displacement, impoverishment, (and) fragmentation of Palestinian communities, and limitation of economic growth of the indigenous Palestinians.<sup>22</sup> Quoting extensive sources on the Israeli water problem and usurpation management i.e. Judea and Samaria and others published in leading American newspapers, Noam Chomsky in his book *Fateful Triangle* writes that Israel was heavily dependent for water resources in West Bank which for Israel was a more significant commodity than oil in the Middle East. It fulfilled 1/3 of its water sources with more exploration.<sup>23</sup>

In 1988 were witnessed the highest number of US vetoes on Israel. Out of the total five, four resolutions were vetoed within four months. The nature of the resolutions tabled was Israeli aggression in Lebanon, Syria and occupied territories. Lebanon and Syria in the individual resolutions had complained about the Israeli aggression in their territories. Had the resolutions not been voted, there would have been a debate on the atrocities of Israel, but US did not want it and believed in veto by silencing the voice of the aggrieved. With the exception of one absentia on the first resolution which was the complaint of Lebanon against Israel, the other four were supported by all other members of the Security Council. The question of occupied territories and violation of human rights of innocent dominated the UNSC debates, then and onwards, as the systematic perpetration of racist crimes, including war crimes, genocide, and ethnic cleansing by being contrary the spirit of the International

Convention on the Elimination of All Form of Racial Discrimination 1969.<sup>24</sup>

Five resolutions between 1989-1995 were tabled to attract the attention of World Body on the precarious state of affairs in the occupied territories but they were out of arena due to the US veto. The miserable state of affairs of the occupied areas has been on UN Security Council and General Assembly agenda with clear statements that its occupants are bereaved of their human, political and socio-cultural rights. This was the ultimate result of 1967 Arab-Israel War which made Israel as the dominant power with US supporting it as its strategic asset. Sherbok describes in her valuable work on the Palestine-Israel Conflict:

The outcome of the war was that Israel became the dominant military power in the region. Israel's troops were stationed on the Suez Canal, the Red Sea and the River Jordan and held a lien on Syria only thirty miles from Damascus. They controlled the whole of Palestine, including the West Bank of the Jordan and Jerusalem, along with on million Palestinians in the West Bank and Gaza strip, and they occupied the Sinai Peninsula and a thousand sq. miles of Syrian territory on the Golan Heights. Furthermore, one million Arab were displaced. Some 350,000 Palestinians fled from the West Bank to the East Bank of the Jordan.<sup>25</sup>

Exclusive and alien rule of Israel is a source of perpetual violation of human rights and international law in occupied territories. As Emma Playfair describes "international law in general and particular regards belligerent occupation as an inherently temporary state, contained rules designed not only to enable the occupier to ensure the safety of the occupying forces, but to preserve the essential and distinct nature of the occupied territories."<sup>26</sup>

But as mentioned above, this rule neither applies to Israel which claims as the democratic country nor US Administrations which adhere to the principles established by its founding fathers: George Washington, John Adam, Alexander Hamilton, Thomas Jefferson etc. They adhered to the principles all providing a guideline for principles of democracy at home and abroad of which American role in today's world has totally total negation of. America is a country which grew out of popular armed resistance against colonial masters on the grounds of liberty, fraternity and independence. America was built on the teachings of John Locke (1632-1683) and Montesquieu (1689-1755) that people have a right to resist in arms (revolution from below) against an unrepresentative and repressive rule).

Under the Clinton Administration two UNSC resolutions were rejected in March 1997. They were calling upon Israel to refrain from East Jerusalem settlement activities and Demanding Israel's immediate cessation of construction at Jabal Abu Ghneim in East Jerusalem. The situation in East Jerusalem was deteriorated after "Prime Minister Nathanyahu opened the controversial Hashmonean Tunnel under the temple Mount in Jerusalem.<sup>27</sup> It led to violent clashes and closure of safe passages for Palestinians.

Under the Bush first term of Presidency in March and December 2001 two resolutions were vetoed. The first one was a demand for establishing a UN observer force to protect Palestinian civilians. The second resolution was the result of UNSC meeting on the presence of Israel forces in Palestinian controlled area. It demanded the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian-controlled territory and condemning acts of terror against civilians. The situation worsened after Ariel Sharon in September went to Haram al Sharif, the Temple Mount with huge contingency of troops. He had been warned by Yasser Arafat not to go there in the greater interest of peace. The protests and demonstrations the next day of the visit culminated into bloody scenes with Israeli troops ready to shoot with gunship helicopters in action from above.

The resolution of December 2002 was relevant in nature. It condemned the killing by Israeli forces of several United Nations employees and the destruction of the World Food Program (WFP)

warehouse which was meant to provide food and other necessities to internally displaced Palestinians. The use of US veto is said to have dimmed the possibility of “Saudi Plan” proposed in 2002 and accepted by Arab League, a plan with sizeable American population approval. The Plan was perceived as a positive peaceful situation as it offered full recognition and integration of Israel into the region in exchange for withdrawal to the 1967 borders. It was an outstanding international consensus the US blocked inside and outside the UN.<sup>28</sup>

In September 2003 on the issue of Security Wall another resolution was vetoed by US. The wall which was the ultimate result of the Israel Security Plan was not built on Israel’s border but rather well within occupied Palestinian territory, thereby de facto annexing Palestinian land and ensuring that Israel’s colonies remain. It is estimated that approximately 43% of the Occupied West Bank (containing approximately 94% of the illegal Israeli settlers) will be de facto annexed by Israel.<sup>29</sup> About the vetoing of the 16 September 2003 Resolution Tony Judt writes thus.

On September 16, 2003, the US vetoed a UN Security Council resolution asking Israel to desist from its threat to deport Yasser Arafat. Even American officials themselves recognize, off the record, that the resolution was reasonable and prudent, and that the increasingly wild pronouncements of Israel's present leadership, by restoring Arafat's standing in the Arab world, are a major impediment to peace. But the US blocked the resolution all the same, further undermining our credibility as an honest broker in the region. America's friends and allies around the world are no longer surprised at such actions, but they are saddened and disappointed all the same.<sup>30</sup>

Similarly in 2004 two UNSC resolutions were vetoed in favor of Israel. The first one in March 2004 was the condemnation of the killing of Ahmed Yassin, the leader of the Islamic Resistance

Movement Hamas, while the second in October 2004 was to demand Israel to halt all military operations in northern Gaza and withdraw from the area. The veto of the resolution condemning the murder of 66 year old Palestinian spiritual and political leader Sheikh Ahmed Yassin by the Israeli forces can be better understood under the context of its veto power behavior on the Arab-Palestinian rights and self-determination against Israel. It was due to the violation of human rights and international law that the International Court of Justice in October 2004 gave a bold and symbolic decision condemning Israel's anti-terrorism partition fence is a violation of international law. The ruling though was unilateral and not binding upon Israel, but it served as a mirror in which the harsh action is seen and judged. It strengthened the pivotal concept of the law of nations that the promotion of international comity depends on the principle that that the integrity and sovereignty of nation-states and nationalities be respected and protected. Similarly, the Court's ruling will support the Naturalist school of international law, one of the three schools, that the international law is a true law and needs to be effective and regularized for international peace and security. The Court ruled out that the Israel Defence Forces (IDF) commander should reduce the infringement upon the local inhabitants, even if it cannot be totally avoided, by altering the path of the fence in most areas complained of in the petition.<sup>31</sup> The judgment meant that modifications would have to be made to a 25-mile stretch of the barrier to the north and west of Jerusalem. The court asked for the turning down of the fence by immediate compensation by Israel to Arab residents for the damage inflicted. The Israel's West Bank separation barrier was declared illegal thus.

The erection of fence was originally designed to follow the Green Line 1948 Border which was the border of Israel established by 1949 Armistice Agreement. The spirit of the line dramatically changed after 1967 War where Israel occupied West Bank and Gaza. The Green Line was the soft or loose border which facilitated Palestinians in day to day life to cross illegally into Israel to make bread and butter. After the election of Ariel Sharon, the decision was taken to erect the path with a total direction.

The last two vetoes US used in support of Israel were in July and October 2006. The first one was on the ongoing Israeli military operations in Gaza and in return the Palestinian rocket fires into Israel. The resolution called for immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Gaza Strip and a cessation of violence from both parties in the conflict. The second resolution was a demand for the unconditional release of an Israeli soldier captured earlier as well as Israel's immediate withdrawal from Gaza and the release of the dozens of Palestinian officials detained by Israel. Since November 2006 there has been no veto, no matter whatever diplomatic support for the Israel outside UN is afforded by the US which in Chalmers Johnson's analysis is behaving like an Empire and not a nation-state. To him US has 926 internal (in US) and 725 non US military bases ranging from al-Udeid air base in the desert of Qatar, southeastern in Kosovo and Kandahar. It can well be described as the globe's "lone superpower," then as a "reluctant sheriff," next as the "indispensable nation," and now, in the wake of 9/11, as a "New Rome."<sup>32</sup>

## **Conclusion**

The US UN behavior on Israel since 1973 is reflective of the special relationship and unconditional support the US shows for Israel. The Veto behavior shows that the use of concurring vote by P-5 has not been used in large to support the UN Charter which primary aim was to maintain international peace and security, to safeguard human rights, to provide a mechanism for international law, and to promote social and economic progress, improve living standards, and fight diseases. The US UN veto behavior has been negation of the very principles the UN was founded for. It symbolizes the special relationship between US and Israel which are expressed diplomatically, material and ideological. Majority of the resolutions tabled on UNSC floor were in conformity of the Security Council Resolution 242 of 22 November 1967 which emphasized in black and white "the inadmissibility of the acquisition of the territory by war and the need to work for a just and lasting peace in which every state in the area can live in security".



## Author

*Dr. Mansoor Akbar Kundi is currently the Vice Chancellor of Gomal University. Being a Pakistani-American educated, he joined University of Balochistan as Lecturer in 1979. He studied in University of Arizona from 1984-88. He is an author of ten books and forty research articles. He had been a scholar on Pakistan Chair at Istanbul University from 1998 to 2001. He was three times Dean of different faculties in the University of Balochistan.*

## Notes

---

<sup>1</sup> Samuel P. Huntington, **The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order** London: Touchstone Books, 1997, p. 36.

<sup>2</sup> Theodore A. Coulombis. James H. Wolf, **Introduction to International Relations: Power and Justice**, Prentice Hall, New Jersey, 1994, p 115.

<sup>3</sup> Karl W. Deutsch, **The Analysis of International Relations**, New Jersey, Prentice-Hall, Inc, 1978, p. 100

<sup>4</sup> Chomsky, Noam **Middle East Illusions: Peace, security and Terror**, first published by Rowman and Littlefield, 2003, reprinted in India, New Delhi: Chaman Offset Press, 2003, p 266

<sup>5</sup> General Wesley Clark **Winning Modern Wars: Iraq, Terrorism and American Empire**, 2003, p 112

<sup>6</sup> The term special relationship was used by Jimmy Carter in 1977, Yitzhak Rabin in 1992, and Warren Christopher in 1993; all are quoted in Bernard Reich, "The United States and Israel: The Nature of a Special Relationship," in David W. Lesch, *The Middle East and the United States: A Historical and Political Assessment* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview, 1996), pp. 233, 248.

<sup>7</sup> <http://weekly.ahram.org.eg/1999/437/op3.htm>

<sup>8</sup> See introduction in Bruno Simma and Hermann Mosler, **The Charter of the United Nations: A Commentary**, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1995.

p 3

<sup>9</sup> David Schweigman, **The Authority of the UN Security Council under Chapter VII of the UN Charter**, New York: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2001, p 46.

<sup>10</sup> Ibid, p 47

<sup>11</sup> Richard Falks, "United Nations and the Rule of Law" in the **Preferred Future for the United Nations** p. 8

<sup>12</sup> Ibid p. 301.

<sup>13</sup> Yitzhak Rabin, **The Rabin Memoirs** Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1979, p. 189

<sup>14</sup> . **Keesing's Contemporary Archives**: Weekly Diary of World Events, Published by Keesing's Publications Limited, Bristol, London, 1971/72, p. 25501

<sup>15</sup> <file://localhost/H:/Vetoes%20until%202008.htm>

<sup>16</sup> Robert Alden, **New York Times**, Sept. 12, 1972

- <sup>17</sup> Kesing's Contemporary Archives 1973, p. 26177
- <sup>18</sup> Noam Chomsky, Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for global dominance Allen & Unwin (South Asian Ed), 2007, p. 168
- <sup>19</sup> Ian S. Lustick , "Has Israel Annexed East Jerusalem?" in Journal by Middle East Policy Council, 5:1, 1997
- <sup>20</sup> Noam Chomsky, The Fateful Triangle, Boston, MA: South End Press, 1983, p. 19
- <sup>21</sup> Op. cit. Hegemony or Survival: America's Quest for global dominance p 167
- <sup>22</sup> Emma Playfair, ed. International Law and the Administration of Occupied Territories 1992, p 20.
- <sup>23</sup> . Noam Chomsky, The Fateful Triangle, Boston, MA: South End Press Classic, 1983 (reprinted in 1999), p 47 and endnote 12 p 81.
- <sup>24</sup> . John T. Rourke, International Politics on the World Stage 11<sup>th</sup> ed. New York: McGraw-Hill 2007, p 466
- <sup>25</sup> Dan Cohn Sherbok and Dawoud el Alami, The Palestine-Israel Conflict: A Beginner's Guide Oxford: Oneworld Publications, 2001, pp. 145-46
- <sup>26</sup> . Emma Playfair, ed. International Law and the Administration of Occupied Territories Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 1
- <sup>27</sup> . Yehudit Kirstein Keshet , Checkpoint Watch: Testimonies from Occupied Palestine, MacMillan, 2006, p. 28
- <sup>28</sup> Ibid p. 169 (quoting Mark Sappenfield in Christian Science Monitor, 15 April 2002
- <sup>29</sup> . <http://www.bobmay.info/wall.htm>
- <sup>30</sup> Tony Judt, "Israel: The Alternative" in The New York Review of Books 50:16, October 23, 2003, <http://www.nybooks.com/articles/16671>
- <sup>31</sup> "Mansoor Akbar Kundi "A Bold and Symbolic Ruling" The Nation Lahore: Pakistan, July 12, 2004
- <sup>32</sup> . Book reviews on the Chalmers Johnson. Sorrows of the Empire: Militarism, Secrecy, and the End of the Republic, Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004 <http://www.amazon.com/Sorrows-Empire-Militarism-Republic-American/dp/0805070044>

**List of Resolutions US vetoed in favor of Israel**

Date	Yes, No/Veto Abstain	UNSC Official Record	Draft Text No	Subject
10 Sept 1972	13-1-1	S/PV. 1662 para 74	S/10784	Situation in the Middle East (Ceasefire 1967 Violation)
26 July 1973	13-1-0	S/PV. 1735 para 97	S/10974	Situation in the Middle East (Palestinian Question)
8 Dec 1975	13-1-1	S/PV. 1862 para 118	S/11898	Situation in the Middle East (Israel/Lebanon)

25 Jan 1976	9-1-3 China & Libya did not participate	S/PV. 1879 para 67	S/11940	Middle East Question including the Palestinian Question
25 Mar 1976	14-1-0	S/PV. 1899 para 106	S/12022	Jerusalem Status
29 Jun 1976	10-1-4	S/PV. 1938	S/12119	Question of the Exercise by the Palestinian People of their inalienable Right
30 Apr 1980	10-1-4	S/PV. 2220 para 151	S/13911	Situation in the Middle East (Palestinian Rights)
20 Jan 1982	9-1-5	S/PV. 2329 para	S/14832 /Rev.1	Situation in the Middle East (Golan Heights)
2 Apr 1982	13-1-1	S/PV. 2348 para 9	S/14943	Situation in the Middle East (Mayors of Nablus and Ramallah Dismissal)
20 Apr 1982	14-1-0	S/PV. 2357 para 101	S/14985	Situation in the Middle East (Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem Attack)
8 Jun 1982	14-1-0	S/PV. 2377 para 23	S/15185	Situation in the Middle East (Lebanon)
26 Jun 1982	14-1-0	S/PV. 2381 para 12	S/15255 /Rev.2	Situation in the Middle East (Lebanon)
6 Aug 1982	11-1-3	S/PV. 2391 para 38	S/15347 /Rev.1	Situation in the Middle East (Lebanon)
2 Aug 1983	13-1-1	S/PV. 2461 para 238	S/15895	Situation in the Middle East (Occupied Arab Territories)
6 Sept 1984	14-1-0	S/PV. 2556 para 49	S/16732	Situation in the Middle East (Lebanon)
12 Mar 1985	11-1-3	S/PV. 2573 para 208	S/17000	Situation in the Middle East (Lebanon)
13 Sept 1985	10-1-4	S/PV. 2605 para 170	S/17459	Situation in the Middle East (Occupied Territories)
17 Jan 1986	11-1-3	S/PV. 2650 p. 31	S/17769 /Rev.1	Violation of Haram Al-Sharif (Jerusalem)
30 Jan 1986	13-1-1	S/PV. 2642 p. 38	S/17730 /Rev.2	Complaint by Lebanon against Israeli Aggression
1 Feb 1986	10-1-4	S/PV. 2655 p. 114	S/17796 /Rev.1	Syrian Complaint against Israeli Interception of Libyan Civilian Aircraft

*Israel Factor in US Veto Behavior*

18 Jan 1988	11-1-1	S/PV. 2784 pp. 39-50	S/19434	Complaint of Lebanon against Israel
1 Feb 1988	14-1-0	S/PV. 2790 p. 42	S/19466	Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories
15 April 1988	14-1-0	S/PV. 2806 p. 53	S/19780	Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories
10 May 1988	14-1-0	S/PV. 2814 p. 58	S/19868	Complaint of Lebanon against Israel
14 Dec 1988	14-1-0	S/PV. 2832 p. 28	S/20322	Complaint of Lebanon against Israel
17 Feb 1989	14-1-0	S/PV. 2850 p. 34	S/20463	Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories
9 June 1989	14-1-0	S/PV. 2867 p. 31	S/20677	Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories
7 Nov 1989	14-1-0	S/PV. 2889 p.32	S/20945 /Rev.1	Situation in the Occupied Arab Territories
31 May 1990	14-1-0	S/PV.2926 p.36	<a href="#">S/21326</a>	on the Occupied Arab Territories
17 May 1995	14-1-0	S/PV.2926 p.36	<a href="#">S/21326</a>	on the Occupied Arab Territories
7 Mar 1997	14-1-0	S/PV.3747 p.4	<a href="#">S/1997/199</a>	Calling upon Israel to refrain from East Jerusalem settlement activities
21 Mar 1997	13-1-1	S/PV.3756 p.6	<a href="#">S/1997/241</a>	Demanding Israel's immediate cessation of construction at Jabal Abu Ghneim in East Jerusalem
27 Mar 2001	9-1-4	<a href="#">S/PV.4305</a> p.5	<a href="#">S/2001/270</a>	on establishing a UN observer force to protect Palestinian civilians (report of Council meeting <a href="#">SC/7040</a> )
14 Dec 2001	12-1-2	<a href="#">S/PV.4438</a> p.30	<a href="#">S/2001/1199</a>	on the withdrawal of Israeli forces from Palestinian-controlled territory and condemning acts of terror against civilians

20 Dec 2002	12-1-2	S/PV.4681	S/2002/1385	on the killing by Israeli forces of several United Nations employees and the destruction of the World Food Programme (WFP) warehouse
16 Sep 2003	13-1-3	S/PV.4842	<a href="#">S/2003/980</a>	on the security wall built by Israel in the West Bank.
14 Oct 2003	10-1-4	<a href="#">S/PV.4828</a>	<a href="#">S/2003/891</a>	on the Israeli decision to "remove" Palestinian Authority leader Yasser Arafat.
25 Mar 2004	11-1-3	<a href="#">S/PV.4934</a>	<a href="#">S/2004/240</a>	on the condemnation of the killing of Ahmed Yassin, the leader of the Islamic Resistance Movement <i>Hamas</i>
5 Oct 2004	11-1-3	<a href="#">S/PV.5051</a>	<a href="#">S/2004/783</a>	on the demand to Israel to halt all military operations in northern Gaza and withdraw from the area.
13 July 2006	10-1-4	S/PV.5565	<a href="#">S/2006/878</a>	on the Israeli military operations in Gaza, the Palestinian rocket fire into Israel, the call for immediate withdrawal of Israeli forces from the Gaza Strip and a cessation of violence from both parties in the conflict.
11 Nov 2006	10-1-4	<a href="#">S/PV.5488</a>	<a href="#">S/2006/508</a>	on the demand for the unconditional release of an Israeli soldier captured earlier as well as Israel's immediate withdrawal from Gaza and the release of dozens of Palestinian officials detained by Israel.