
UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL: THE POST-MILLENNIAL NARRATIVES AND IMPERATIVES FOR MANDATE REVIEW

Odeyemi Oluwole J.

Department of History and International Studies
Ajayi Crowther University, Oyo, Oyo State, Nigeria
Email: odeyemioluwole6@gmail.com

Abstract: A tinder-boxed world with constant clashes of interests makes laudable the ultimacy and mandate of the United Nations Security Council. Following the barbarity of the previous two World Wars, the preeminent body is basically mandated to actively preserve and manage international peace and security. In stark contrast to the other ten, five of the fifteen-nation Council are permanent and equipped with overriding veto diplomacy. However, the recent election of Saudi Arabia as one of the ordinary ten, and its subsequent rejection (in protest), represented a disgust for, and, lately, a height in the calls for sweeping reforms in the composition and modus operandi of the Council. Upon certain analytical research, two categories of states and four strands of queer motives have been identified by this paper to characterize states' aspiration to, and the conduct of, the Security Council. The first category and strands are the five permanent members, who exploit their veto powers to pursue vested, parochial, but disguised as global interests. The other category and strands are states qualified to vie for the ten rotating seats, but seeking subversively, either geopolitical prestige, financial gratification and or external validation, particularly, when internal opposition and rating are harsh. Cunning and criminal governments also gratify veto holders to escape international justice. These obviously are mandate caricatures. With the recent and current conduct of Security Council in Georgia, Ukraine and Syria, in that sequence, the paper strongly concludes, with well-articulated reasons, that the Council has not only lost its founding mandate, it is also fostering an international wild life of nations. A third, global scale catastrophe may be impendent unless urgent reforms – also quite well-posed by this work, are undertaken to overhaul its mandate.

Keywords: United Nations Security Council, Veto Power, Permanent 5 (P5), Rotating 10 (R10)

Reference to this paper should be made as follows: Odeyemi Oluwole J. (2016), United Nations Security Council: The Post-Millennial Narratives and Imperatives for Mandate Review. *J. of Social Sciences and Public Policy*, Vol. 8, Number 2, Pp. 61-86.

INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC) is both unique and historic in conception. It is indisputably the world's most exclusive international club; hence, membership is often coveted. Notwithstanding also, the status (permanent or impermanent) of membership, its prestige is unrivalled by any other political club – indeed, it akin to sitting a top the world, and the permanent members are quintessentially the political demigods

of the international order. David Bosco scholarly described the Council as 'the world's most elite and powerful diplomatic body... the guardians of international peace and security... accustomed to working together in the blue-and-gold chamber where (it) makes its formal decisions'¹. Richard Holbrook, once a top-most diplomat, also tagged it "the most important international body in the world... because it can authorize the use of force for peacemaking or even a war, as in Korea, Kuwait and Afghanistan."²The Council's immense powers, supreme preponderance and prestige are well captured below.

It is the UN's enforcer, charged with making the world a safer, more stable place by preventing or stopping armed conflict among and even within nations. The Council has the authority to examine any conflict or dispute that might have international repercussions. It can identify aggressive action by states and call on UN members to make an appropriate response, including application of economic sanctions and even military action... The SC is the only UN body whose resolutions are legally binding. It has the authority to decide matters that affect governments, establish peacekeeping missions, and create tribunals to try persons accused of war crimes and in extreme cases to ensure the enforcement of international law. (Thessismun, 2007).

Indeed, the five permanent members (P5) of the Council – USA, France, Britain, Russia and China, – are the doyens of the world. The Council's extreme effectiveness is such that hardly could any nation (no matter how recalcitrant) afford to despise all the five permanent members, despite that they often don't share similar world view. Again, nobody can rescue nations upon whom it pronounces judgments, not even the International Court of Justice. Through veto diplomacy, the Council can legitimize, rationalize and supervise clinical destruction and massacre. Thus, Political wisdom and strategy require that nations befriend at least one of them (the more, the better, even if the friendship had to be acquired by enticements) to avert the possibility of dangerous Council consensus on matters of concern, which in the past had proven regrettably fatal for careless regimes. Bosco further extolled the colossal capabilities of the P5 thus:

Its five permanent members... account for nearly 30 percent of the world's population and more than 40 percent of global economic output. In military affairs, their dominance is even more overwhelming. They control more than 26,000 nuclear warheads, 99 percent of all those in existence. They have a combined 5.5 million men and women in arms. When the Council is united, its members can wage war, impose blockades, unseat governments, and levy sanctions, all in the name of the international community. There are almost no limits to the body's authority.³

Even the *rogue* states (like the US-branded *axis of evil* nations) have often sought refuge with other P5 members. While nations under the protective care of any of the P5 (particularly US and Russia) are often not only security guaranteed, they may also dare, with impunity, some unsavory international maneuvers. The lessons of Kuwait in 1992,

which marked the rudimentary end for Iraqi Saddam Hussein, had taught nations never to be rude to friends and allies of P5 states. Similarly, Japan could stubbornly incense China through its occasional and symbolic state visits to the *Yasukuni Shrine* {to celebrate late war heroes, conversely deemed by China (and Korea) as war criminals}, or boastfully claim the *Senkakus* *lets* in dispute with China. These just because the US is not only aligned with to defend her by the terms of a 1960 Japan-US Security Treaty, but to also quash any attempt by China to commit the Security Council against Japan. Israel, in the *paternal* care of the US, had indulged in agonizing and ceaseless seizures of Palestinian lands while Security Council is stalled from helping Palestine. Bashir al Assad has presided over war-torn Syria for five years running, reportedly committing acts of war crimes, but protected in power by Russia, the traditional ally inherited from his late father and former president. The proofs are numerous that it is strategically rewarding for nations to buy into the veto diplomacy, and to align with P5 members of the Security Council.

Similarly, the Council is enormously prestigious that every cadre of nation, advanced or developing, and outside the Permanent Five has coveted a seat of the rotating or elected ten (R10 or the E10), often at huge expense, just to be for two years per tenure, in the corridors of the most esteemed global power. Successful election into the UN Security Council's part-time seats is conceived as a welcome to global prestige and influence, notwithstanding that political power remains the exclusive preserve of the five veto-wielding permanent members. Nevertheless, nations scramble to occupy the nominal seats even on the pretext to seek relevance in the comity of nations. Election into the rotating seats is neither frivolous nor random. It is usually a privileged opportunity that undoubtedly results from intensive processes of intra/inter-regional politicking, often involving mutual sacrifices/compromises, diplomatic horse-tradings and international inducements. However, the action by Saudi Arabia of 18th October 2013, which saw authorities in the kingdom reject its nomination as a rotating member of the Council, was unprecedented. Undoubtedly, Saudi Arabia was neither frivolously nor randomly nominated having, for a couple of the preceding years, consciously been training national diplomats (to manage its eventual tenural operations if successful), and signaling intention and candidacy with intensive and expensive lobbying to secure the approval of its regional caucus – the Asia-Pacific group of nations, to get listed for a subsequent two-thirds vote by the UN General Assembly (UNGA).

Saudi Arabia, the oil-super rich Kingdom, has hitherto held sway, preferably in the international politics of energy since the 1973 Middle East oil embargo against the West, and through the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) thus established. The OPEC had rather provided an alternative but formidable platform and enclave through which its national and international interests have been pursued. The criticality of global energy sourcing, and the OPEC's place in it, have provided Saudi Arabia with the necessary political clouts and leverage than a *non-veto* UNSC seat could ever have afforded the Kingdom. It could certainly be betted, anyway, that, as a founding member of the United Nation's Organisation (UNO), the Kingdoms UNSC's first-ever and successful bid would be highly celebrated as it signaled global recognition and call to

international trust. However, Saudi's rejection of its UNGA election undoubtedly jolted the world and had cast indelible aspersion on the prestigious powers, credibility and utility of the Security Council. The Saudi's action is aptly the demystification of the UNSC and the desecration of the global diplomatic mythology.

Saudi Arabia had seemingly taken the world for a ride, having taken the conscious and painstaking efforts to drive the entire world through a tortuous diplomatic and elective processes, beating other interested regional/group contestants whose hopes and aspirations were dashed at the preliminaries, and garnering a total of 176 of the available 194 UNGA votes to get elected into the Council, only to throw it back at the world's face. But Saudi Arabia has taken the world on the fool's journey only to prove a point, and had in demonstration of rare courage done what most nations would never do. In an insensitive remark to Saudi's historic action, the Guatemalan U.N. Ambassador, then also a Security Council member, Gert Rosenthal, said: "They should have thought of that before competing for the seat."⁴ But Rosenthal seemingly failed to see the symbolism and deliberateness of the act in the Saudi's rejection of their first-ever UNSC seat and hence his kind are contented with the UNSC at its present constitution and mode of operation, notwithstanding its failing ability to consensually and effectively tackle global insecurity.

Contrary to the predictable ambitions and projections of most nations, the Saudi authorities have demonstrated non-desperateness to be mere partakers at the corridors of global power, more so as a non-veto member with no critical capacity to determine or sway outcomes. After all, members of the E10 have often acted relatively, and at best as *errand voters* for any or all of the Big Five. Put differently, it signaled that Saudi Arabia is neither proud nor prepared to be one of the *errand ten*, answering mainly to the whims of the Big Five. However, the excesses of the Western or special three i.e. USA, France and Britain, at overriding other members of the SC is now appalling. Erskine Childers, at a 1994 symposium on the United Nations at Fifty observed that the vast majority of members "have made very clear...their distaste for the way three Western powers behave in the Council, like a private club of hereditary elite-members who secretly come to decisions and then emerge to tell the grubby elected members that they may now rubber-stamp those decisions."⁵ That reality had often pitched the other two veto powers – Russia and China, against the three. Consequent of the rivalry, decisive Council actions had often stalled to tackle burning global issues.

Moreover, the Saudis have symbolically rubbished the much coveted offer on the protest that the Security Council had lately demonstrated gross incapability at resolving conflicts and ending wars. The strong opinion of the Kingdom is that the *Modus operandi* and the international double standard of the Council, for instance, on the Middle East have significantly weakened or compromised the organization's responsibility towards maintaining world peace. Specific instances cited were the long-dragging conflict between the Palestinians and Israelis, the ongoing Syrian civil war, and the reluctance to rid the Middle East of the potentials for Weapons of Mass Destruction. The Kingdom sees the Council as that which rather perpetuated conflicts and grievances in quite contradiction of

its original mandate to stamp out violence, maintain global peace and security, and resolving conflicts among and within nations. The Kingdom thus called for critical Organisational reforms before it could accept the UNSC seat. Saudi's act is an unprecedented protest on global pedestal which must not be confused as diplomatic unthoughtfulness as Rosenthal believed. The Saudi's sacrifice must rather be understood as high grade diplomatic investment towards the UNSC reform which members of the P5 had tactically resisted for long. It ought to be conceived a reasonable investment to guarantee greater peace in a world currently and numerously dotted with flashpoints. This Saudi's call for UNSC's reform is not novel but rather a renewed effort and tactical change at international agitation which had been on for an upward of two decades.

THE OBJECTIVE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The objective of this paper is to revisit and review the decades-long call for far-reaching reforms in the *modus operandi* of the UNSC amidst the Saudi's unprecedented act. It's been three years into Saudi's action, and it does not appear that the Saudi's sacrifice had yielded any reform as desired. The study seeks to examine the challenges of international peace and security in the 21st century. It overhauls the UNSC and its operations in recent years as a means to ascertaining how much the body has kept faith with its founding mandates (objectives and principles). The Saudi action is undoubtedly a wake-up call to put the UNSC on the spotlight to establish if its recent operations are for the peace or other motives. It is obviously a dangerous situation if opportunism, wantonness and frivolity have taken over the world's highest organ for ultimate global stability. A major goal here, if need be, is its reassessment as a functional agency for engineering and anchoring global peace in the new millennial. As the case may be, the attempt here, is a redemption / revamping of the integrity, reputation and mandate of the United Nations (UN). The study is also significant as it seeks to safeguard the United Nations away from the erstwhile Israeli Foreign Minister, Tsipy Livny's pessimistic derogation of the body as a *United Nothing*. It is in this light that the working theme for the paper is the UN Security Council vis-à-vis the millennial challenges, the urgency for reforms, and the paramountcy of global security and unity. The paper may also go down the history lane as another literature in the examination of the call for reforms to the *modus operandi* of the UNSC.

INVENTING THE GLOBAL PEACE – A SHORT HISTORY

The United Nations and its Security Council were the products of a set of culminated, progressive and liberal ideas whose origins were traceable (in Europe) to the Enlightenment, a period in the eighteenth century when many writers and scientists believed that science and knowledge, (and) not religion, could improve people's quality of lives.⁶ The pre-Enlightenment and the Enlightenment eras had witnessed an absolutely chaotic world. It was a world without any discernibly good and effective order which provided political opportunism for powerful and ambitious individuals. A jungle of a world dotted with innumerable hot spots. An international, cold-blooded *state of nature*, where unchecked and unnecessary ambitions like Napoleon Bonaparte's made human lives most miserable with grossly poor life expectancy. Napoleon's mindset could be captured in one of his hard-hearted declarations saying "I grew up on the battle field, and

a man such as I am cares little for the life of a million men.”⁷ It was in the midst of these wantonness and uncertainties of life and diplomacy of massacre that certain intellectuals and peace activists like Charles-Irenee Castel de Saint-Pierre, William Randal Cremer, Frederic Passy and Immanuel Kant began to tout the concept of institutionalizing international peace. The move to engineer international peace indeed became imperative even as the reformative hands of civilization began to mould our world, particularly in the wake of industrial revolutions and of human population’s geometric rise as against increasingly scarce resources, both among others, which had brought about greater and intricate interrelations among nations, and which further had pitched one against another. It is thus not far-fetched, why the call to invent machineries for international peace became imperative.

In this wise, Immanuel Kant, a German philosopher is easily unforgettable for his 1795 masterpiece, an intellectual essay titled *Perpetual Peace: A Philosophical Sketch*. There he outlined his recipe to redeem the chaotic world and to attain a peaceful world order. He had called for a kind of union of nations to jointly manage conflicts and to deliberately seek and attain peace via certain Kantian recommendations. Although there were a couple of other certain international efforts that emanated afterwards such as the development of International Law, organisation of International Conventions, and notably the Inter-Parliamentary Union (IPU), all in the bid to encourage nations to peacefully resolve their disputes. Indeed, the outcomes of the Concert of Europe and the Congress of Vienna that followed the Napoleonic Wars in 1814 are widely reputed to have bestowed a century of peace, stability and order in Europe. It was not completely devoid of turbulence though, wars were however minor. The outcomes of the Vienna Congress provided an effective framework within which nations managed their inter-relations, contained crazy freaks like Napoleon and curtailed their differences to avoid major wars on the Napoleonic magnitude.

The relative peace of the century that followed the Vienna Congress enabled the European powers to effectively explore and integrate the rest of the world and to acquire colonies overseas. Within that century, however, the generations that were horrified by the Napoleonic Wars had expired. The subsequent and naïve custodians of state-powers had relapsed into recklessness and had chosen to back-track the world into the previous crazy state of nature. War had become strangely and suddenly an exciting statecraft to them. Rather than consolidate on the previous international gains of peace and stability, psychopathic politicians emerged victorious again with egotistic ambitions in nationalist ethos subterfuge. Nations became given to secret security alliances and diplomacies, international witch-hunting and arms racing and the Napoleonic kind of aggressive expansionism and subjugations. Leaders of nations were failing to give the necessary, progressive and conscious attention to Immanuel Kant and other later-peace activists like Bertha Von Suttner until they heated the European polity into tinderbox situation that exploded with the incendiary assassination, in Sarajevo, of Archduke Francis Ferdinand of Austria-Hungary on June 28, 1914. The war was however global in scale as European powers marshaled their overseas colonies into the fights in wild desperation.

The unprecedented horrors of the Great War (First World War) that raged for four hellish years from 1914 had shocked and awed the survivors to hurriedly yield to the idea of forming of a League of Nations as an international institution saddled with the responsibility of procuring and maintaining peace among nations through such principles as collective security, disarmament and dispute negotiations and arbitrations. Apart from being the first major compromise on the concept of national sovereignty that emerged at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, it became both a premier effort at institutionalizing peace maintenance in a crises-prone world and at evolving International Organisations, not necessarily as world government but as managers of the global commons. The League's implication is that nations had yielded their two hundred and seventy years old sovereign independence to be influenced by the body. It was meant to represent an international investment of partial sovereignties for the sake of world peace. Thus, rather than merely encouraging international peace via random choices, common sense and good/free will of states as outlined by the Concert of Europe, the League, with a guiding covenant, was to become a deliberate and proactive equipment through which nations could be checkmated or held accountable for their actions and inactions. However, as the League lacked a Central authority to enforce its decisions, much dependance and hope was pinned on the then great powers to organise for peace in the name of the League.

But despite the popularity of the League and its lofty goal of saving the world from the 'scourge of war', it was numerously fraught with foundational, membership/composition, internal, and operational contradictions. Hopes were high though on the League's motives, nevertheless, much confidence was not reposed in it. The League's (security) Council, which ideally was its highest decision-making organ, had itself bogged down by its unanimity rule. But then, the lack of jurisdictional delineation between the Assembly and the Council provided for overlapping of duties to further compound the League's problem of difficulty in direction. The League perhaps had its greatest challenge from the refusal of the US Senate to ratify the American membership of the body. The US, which happened to be the key state in the League's formation, was also perhaps the most neutral, influential and powerful state required as a necessity to prop the League. The League was thus practically weak to carry out its assignment and was doomed *ab initio* from inauguration. It is regrettably expected that an organisation that sought to pauperize and vanquish an aggressively warrior nation as Germany must be militarily strong to effect such tall dreams. But it is indubitable that the League had numerous successes initially at dousing tension and quashing potentially hot spots/issues around the globe. Even members and non-members worked through and with the body. But as the League, not too long after, began to flounder with inabilities to enforce peace conditions and settle disagreements among the major European powers, an important lesson for today is that rather than teaming up to pragmatically reform and reposition the League to continue functioning and coping with the dynamics and trends of global politics, stake-holding nations withdrew from the body, leading to its untimely collapse and a deliberate global relapse to the 'scourge of war' (World War II), once again.

UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL – TRADING PAROCHIALISM FOR OBJECTIVITY?

Regrettably, just as it costs the world the Great War to vacate the Concert of Europe/Congress of Vienna for a League of Nations, it similarly costs the world another devastating World War II to scrap and rework the weakening League into the United Nations Organisation (UNO). The UN was better evolved by its strategists, using the benefits of the notable ills of the Defunct League in mind. With no overlapping roles among its organs, and by the terms of its Charter, (Articles 24 and 25), the Security Council got the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, just also as member nations were mandated, by membership terms, to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council.⁸ The composition of UNSC is similar to the League's Council, except in *modus operandi*. Fifteen members in all, where only five had permanent membership, and the rest ten seats for rotation among other nations across the regions of the world. The five are USA, France, Britain, Russia and China, and all, perhaps with the exception of France and perhaps China, were victors of WWII and had taken their permanent seats as war trophies which came along with veto power each to authoritatively challenge or quash the adoption of any substantive draft Council resolution that may go against their interests. The five had simply become the movers and shakers of the world. The R10 were supposed to matter in decision making, but, the exclusive P5's veto powers have had significantly rubbishy impact on the values, utility, qualities and objectivity of R10's role. The arrogated exclusive powers had provided each of the P5 with the preponderance position in critical deliberations about global peace and security.

Having become a set of most influential and policing nations in matters of war and peace, and with the attendant spin-offs of preponderances in other multiple spheres, nations have had to seek diplomatic friendship or alliance with either or some of them. Indeed, with the credibility of the UNSC's capacity to authorize international military interventions or foreign invasions that could ultimately effect regime-change or tilt power-balance in troubled states, many nations and leaders (who were roguery, rascally or spiteful, for instance, in the eyes of international law, norms and practices) have outrightly purchased or sought refuge, security, and protection, or aligned with any of the P5 in order to scuttle any action by the Security Council. This practice in effect, had significantly compromised the mandate and undermined the credibility of the UNSC to be the unbiased manager and vanquisher of conflicts around the globe. Despite being the victors of WWII and the most powerful nations in the world, ethics of their mandate in global conflict management sensibly demands that the UNSC's authoritative P5 be neutral, blunt and objective, and perhaps consensual in carrying out their delicate duties, particularly on issues that have gross decimating consequences on human lives, infrastructures and development.

However, the mandate had itself developed deplorable opportunism for members of the Security Council. It is thus not strange that membership of the P5 had become a gold mine to trading in influence, securing mouth-watering contracts / concessions / gifts and

inducements, establishing (inconvenient) military bases in overseas territories, international patronage cum nepotism and cronyism disguised as alliances, parading influence and flexing political/military muscles, and devilish opportunities to showcase and test newly developed military might. The power echelons of the P5 were too lofty to stamp out the temptations for gold-digging, and while nations talk in terms of national interests, P5 members parade the narratives of global interests, tendentiously to circumvent the sovereignty of nations and international law. Global interest indeed, if only in terms of the objective pursuit of global peace and tranquility, and not some narrow self-interest.

The consequences of the Security Council's unethical practices have had grave impacts on millions of innocent citizens in trouble spots around the world. Saddam Hussein, the late dictator of Iraq, had in 2003 sought refuge with France, and to some extent with Russia and China to avert the American plan to invade Iraq with the ultimate goal of dislodging him from power. The aggression which though, was motivated on trumped up charges of possessing Weapons of Mass Destruction purported Saddam to be ready to place them at the disposal of Al Qaeda terrorists. France's veto-threat successfully prevented a UN authorization of the invasion. The US, in defiance, unilaterally led a '*coalition of the willing*' to forcefully effect a regime-change in Iraq. But, the adverse fall out depicted the US as a *super-rogue* and reckless warmonger who habitually holds international law in contempt. This is more so as evidence could not be established linking Saddam neither with Weapons of Mass Destruction nor ties with Al Qaeda. Secondly, the resultant power vacuum and chaos in the country backfired, providing thereby a base for deadly Al-Qaidalism, apart from heightening deep and deadly sectarianism, both which had precariously destabilized the country ever since. The current terror visited on the region by the Islamic State had originated and festered on the US-championed destabilization. However, the UNSCs restraint must not be mistaken for mandate's wisdom and objectivity in matters of war and peace. It is rather that France had no muscle to flex really against the US, just also as the potential reward accruable to Iraqi allies was not appreciable to warrant stepping-in in its military defence.

Moammar Gaddafi, shortly after, also sought refuge with France. Only after his murder at the Libyan Revolution, following the consequences of the *Arab Spring*, did information leak that he partly had funded Nicolas Sarkozy's successful Presidential bid in 2007.⁹Gaddafi's son, Saif al-Islam specifically told euronews, "He was given assistance so that he could help them. But he's disappointed us: give us back our money".¹⁰ The Gaddafi's security-purchase required the assistance of Sarkozy to wield France's veto to deter any UNSC's resolution against Libya and his regime. It was further sensationally insinuated that a French secret serviceman acting on the express orders of Nicolas Sarkozy is suspected of murdering Colonel Gaddafi, and the motive was to stop Gaddafi being interrogated about his highly suspicious links with Sarkozy, who was President of France at the time.¹¹However, Gaddafi was too internationally rascally and locally disgusting to be helped in the face of the popular Arab Spring. Although Sarkozy denied the funding, many had conjectured that France, being the first country to recognise the interim

government in Benghazi, led the international campaign, by choice, to rid and silence Gaddafi in order to cover up the eventual revealing of such illegal campaign donation.

Notwithstanding Sarkozy's denial or the veracity of the illicit dealings, it is most suspicious and bizarre, how western powers, particularly France, Britain and Italy had warmed up to Gaddafi especially before the Arab Spring. The leaders of these western nations had all personally scrambled to trade their influence, first to bring Libya and Gaddafi out of international lockdown with pageantry, and secondly, to mediate same in business deals with the international conglomerates of their respective states. Tony Blair became the first British Prime Minister since Winston Churchill in 1943, to visit Libya in 2004. He had helped to facilitate premium business deals particularly in the oil and gas for Royal Dutch Shell and British Petroleum with Gaddafi and was known to have made regular visits to Tripoli. A couple of other Western leaders, including Sarkozy and Silvio Berlusconi of Italy secured similar business deals in billions of dollars' worth. These worthy rewards compelled the three most notable European leaders to commence image making for this pariah tyrant.

It is certain that Gaddafi made diplomatic/friendly cum business overtures to relevant and influential world powers, particularly the G8 club, NATO countries and the UNSC Permanent Five whom Gaddafi had previously dubbed the 'terror Council' whose veto power amounted to terrorism. He was for long a pariah, particularly since the Lockerbie terrorist bombing of 21st December 1988, for which he later accepted responsibility and paid hugely. Scholars of diplomacy watched in astonishment how a man once deeply loathed in the West suddenly became a darling of the West. Gaddafi had obviously crept into the corridors of global powers having bought their friendship with Libyan petrodollars. He instituted pro-Western liberal economic policies which saw Western exports to Libya reaching new heights.

He actually paid a state visit to Paris where Sarkozy warmly welcomed and called him a *brother leader*, and got invited to the G8 summit in L'Aquila, Italy where he conspicuously, in his usual flamboyancy, mingled warmly and took memorable propaganda pictures with World leaders. Both France and Italy were gracious to oblige his trademark and propagandist Bedouin-styled tent to be pitched in the open. For the first time in 39 years, he used the opportunity of the G8 summit to meet and shake hands with a US president (Barack Obama). Also, for the first time since he seized power in 1969, Gaddafi, whom Ronald Reagan had labeled the *mad dog* of the Middle East, traveled to the US in 2009 to address the sixty-fourth session of the UN General Assembly.

The trio of Silvio Berlusconi, Nicholas Sarkozy and Tony Blair/Gordon Brown had used their good offices to broker Gaddafi to the relevant sections of the West. It is rather bizarre, astonishing and disappointing how France and Britain suddenly turned to champion Western Intervention, putting their military advisors and military technology on the ground in aid for the rebels seeking Gaddafi's overthrow. Even Silvio Berlusconi teamed up with the interventionists as Italian fighter jets take off from *Birgi* Trapani Air

Force base in Sicily and from the aircraft carrier *Garibaldi* to drop bombs over the former Italian colony.¹²Of course, Italy's participation in the war openly was predicated on the fear that it could lose its influence in Libya to France, Britain and the United States, fearing also that a Paris-Benghazi nexus will freeze out its substantial interests in Libyan oil and gas".¹³Whereas NATO got the Security Council's mandate to enforce the imposition of a no-fly zone over conflict areas, Gaddafi had his vehicular convoy and escape route blocked by NATO aircrafts. He was then tracked and hounded down, captured and later killed (despite being already in custody and incapacitated by bullet wounds) in collaborative efforts between NATO and rebels in most suspicious circumstances.

NATO had utterly contravened the authorizing UN resolution which was to protect civilian population and forbade any Western interference in Libyan internal politics. It was equally suspicious that NATO operations swiftly drifted to the deliberate haunting to death of Gaddafi. The basket of surprises is only suggestive of a conspiracy to possibly cover up some past dirty deals that may be too embarrassing were he to be arrested and interrogated. Gaddafi had definitely drowned in the murky waters of international politics. Although Sarkozy denied both the funding allegation and conspiracy in Gaddafi's murder, it is most unlikely that anyone would own up to them. It is a conspiratorial real politik, and ethics and principles must give way for tracks to be covered, even with lives as forfeits. The circumstances had to do with some of the most critical stakes in the highest echelons of international politics. Besides, he is still very ambitious to preside over France in 2016 after he lost his previous reelection bid in May 2012. Owning up to the allegations will not only effectively terminate his political career, he might as well have a date to keep with French jailers.

But besides Sarkozy's alleged connection, it is also known that Western governments and their companies were very hopeful of securing fat contracts with the Libyan National Transition Council, not only in the juicy oil sector for which Libya is very rich, but also in the reconstruction of the country if only they could help in the sack of Gaddafi. Whatever business opportunities may have accrued to Italian, British and French companies under Gaddafi would be considered mere *beak wetting* by the time a regime change was effected which will definitely afford these countries a really deeper and long term bite into the Libyan economy. Now the despotic Muammar Gaddafi has definitely been removed from power, and Western companies are already smiling to the banks. But the power vacuum which the violent regime-change generated had given rise to anarchy as hundreds of armed militia groups, with opposing aims; roam the country to endanger public peace and to steal the resources of that country. The country is now awash with waves of assassinations, terror nurseries, black-marketing of light weapons and political destabilization that ricocheted the Middle-East and Sub-Saharan Africa. It is very doubtful if this generation of Libyans will ever know peace again in their life time.

As we write, scholars, world leaders, human right activists and others have been perplexed at the joint Sino-Russian blind and staunch support for President Bashar al-Assad of Syria

despite the damning criminality and desperation of his sit tight regime to hold on to power regardless, also, of a people's revolution. In 2011 and 2012, China and Russia altogether vetoed three resolutions in the UNSC that called upon the Syrian regime of Bashar al-Assad to desist from military actions against its own people and, later, for President Assad to step down in favour of his deputy.¹⁴ Even when in September 2013, the US claimed to have evidence that Assad forces had used nerve gas to murder hundreds of innocent Syrian citizens in cold blood; Russia and China were unwavering in preventing the UNSC from sanctioning any intervention, purportedly to safeguard the lives of citizens. Russia went further in high diplomatic maneuvering to prevent a unilateral military action by the US against Assad regime, although the US is also aware that Al Qaeda-inspired Islamists were lurking behind, just like in Iraq, to take advantage of any regime change and power vacuum that may inadvertently result.

History accounts that Hafez al-Assad, the father, had sought refuge with the defunct USSR just as his son now do with Russia, and since China has seemingly shared Russian sentiments; thousands of Syrian citizens had died, while millions were displaced under the watch of the UNSC which had failed to provide for peace and security in the war-devastated Syria. But both China and Russia may have had reasons for their reluctance. Both were perhaps disappointed at the revelation above of French/British conspiracy, and of the business intrigues of Western companies. Peter Ferdinand has observed brilliantly, that "Russia and China believed they now have more reason to be suspicious again of attempts by other governments to exploit the situation to promote regime change."¹⁵ Obviously, much of the country is already damaged in the over four years of civil war, and, Western companies are already mouthwatering over reconstruction and service contracts, in the worth of tens of billions of dollars, should the Special Three of the P5 succeed in achieving regime-change with the rebels of Syria. And should Assad prevail ultimately, the economic rewards, including defence and armament contracts, shall be savored by Russia.

The Libyan experience has unfortunately made the UNSC to vacillate over Syria, while hundreds of thousands of innocent citizens have paid dearly by death or cruel displacement, in direct consequence of the standoff. If the UNSC must be retained with its mandate, the turn of events in the Syrian civil war had proved otherwise. The two preponderant powers in the Council – US and Russia – are now actual and opposing combatants in a war they should have helped to quell. While Fighter Jets from the two countries have further helped in the decimation process of Syria, they have either aided or encouraged the regime to commit War Crimes, or organised dissidents and terror-users to make the country ungovernable. John Kerry had admitted that the humanitarian disaster in Syria was the worst since World War Two. This is most illogical and unbecoming of the Council.

The UNSC in the Twenty First Century is obviously a caricature of the original lofty intentions. Decay, corruption, parochialism and self-centeredness have crept into the Council. Of course, the phenomenon may not be recent, it perhaps predated the Cold

War, but it's rather more pronounced in the post-Cold War. There is decay and corruption in the sense that world leaders, particularly among the P5 could exploit the UNSC for personal ends or possibly be bribed by despots to sway the UNSC. Put differently, a UNSC veto power is also a potential credit card or a blank cheque for corrupt enrichment. There is also parochialism and self-centeredness, since members of the P5 are increasingly using their veto powers to merely protect their core national, allies, or geopolitical interests. The watch word is no longer about global interests regarding peace and security or the defence of human rights in the face of mass crimes. It is even now wont of members of the R10 to see their election into the Council merely as an opportunity for felicity and the pursuit of sectional interests. The enormity of brokering peace and procuring security in our world is grave, hence, election into the UNSC, if well understood, is a bothersome call to selfless service for which elation is absolutely out of place. The ugly development, however, is that most dimmed their election, not only as popular international endorsement, but a trump card that is flaunted to intimidate the opposition and to score cheap domestic political point. Australia and Nigeria perfectly typified this deplorable scenario.

At Australia's election into the UNSC in October 2012, Prime Minister Julia Gillard's government described it as "a big, juicy, decisive win that is very, very sweet, one that shall afford Australia to have its own voice, in the main decision-making bodies of the world. It's the world saying 'we see Australia as a good country, a fine global citizen.'" She went further to pique Tony Abbot, the main opposition leader who had criticised the \$24 million cost of the bid as an expensive win (but which the government considered modest to promote the country), as a politician who hasn't got the breadth of vision to be Prime Minister of Australia.¹⁶ It is not an understatement to submit that the \$24 million had been squandered to purchase global prestige and vanity, and to intimidate the opposition party. Similarly at the election of Nigeria into the UNSC in October 2013, the ruling party in Nigeria had taken this to be a much needed external endorsement against the rising popularity of the local opposition party, and completely domesticated its importance, trivializing rather thereby, the beholding external responsibility. The ruling People's Democratic Party (PDP) described the UNSC election as an 'unprecedented feat (as if Nigeria was becoming a member for the very first time) and a testament to the achievements of President Jonathan-led PDP administration.' The party in a statement by its National Publicity Secretary, Chief Olisa Metuh, said:

The development had clearly shown that the world recognised the efforts of the present administration in repositioning our country through the President's Transformation agenda. He said, the securing of the UN seat is a clear evidence that the world acknowledges President Jonathan's efforts towards security, economic wellbeing and political stability of our dear country. Nigerians world over can now hold their heads up high. We are indeed very proud of our dear President who has remained focused on delivering on his mandate; a commitment that has today resulted in the restoration of the dignity of our country ...¹⁷

Considering the contextual gravity within which the Security Council had emerged, by which is meant the prevention of any war as the World Wars which had potentials to decimate multitudes of peoples around the world, and setback industrial economies resulting from colossal damages to industries and infrastructures, its membership in any form warrants nothing near glorification. The Nigerian/Australian examples, which clearly typified other member states of the Council, constitute some of the wrongest motives for which nations must aspire onto the Council. It is very disheartening for states and governments to seek election into the rotating membership for the mere promotion of self, or the test of global popularity and endorsement. If national governments seek election into the R10 for global endorsements or external validation to shovel up local popularity and legitimacy, such are highly irresponsible, and reprehensible. It is high insensitivity and most uncharitable for governments to celebrate election into the R10 considering that millions of lives of men, women and children, and as well, multi-billion dollar worth of human development are at stake, and dependent on the whim and disposition of the Security Council.

When nations aspire to the UNSC for the wrong motives, they care less about the humanitarian and *developmentarian* natures of their mandate, and about how they could make a difference to the challenges of world security. They only pursue opportunities accruable to membership and watched millions of lives and hard-earned development perish as the P5 are stalemated. They are usually unperturbed when they have been unable to add any value for their two years tenure, but merely running errands or rubber stamping, willy-nilly, for the Big Five. If indeed the world is serious about the Millennium Development Goals and sustainable development, then the SC must not dither at preventing wars or bringing wars to quick end, since wars are the most ruinous phenomenon that wastes economic gains and development, and sets the world back. Thus, a call to the UNSC is a call to emergency. It is most humanitarian in outlook and needs no celebration. It is also enormously burdensome in responsibility, and hence, sobriety, modesty and sacrifice ought to be the essential attributes that members must adopt at their election to Security Council. Far-reaching reforms are needed thus to salvage the Council from that of the parochially-minded motives. The Security Council ought to be the engine room for fostering global security and development, not some Vanity Fair.

Sahar Okhovat,¹⁸ an Australian scholar had asked these important questions. Why does Australia need to be in the Security Council? What would be the benefits of our presence in an organ that many believe is flawed and in many cases has been unable in containing crises? Why should we lobby and sometimes change our priorities (if we do) in order to be able to serve for just two years in a Council that many believed is strongly influenced by interests and policies of powerful veto holding countries who are there on a permanent basis? A number of reasons were listed. Their membership is hoped, according to Kevin Rudd, to enable them have a say in the direction of policies on Afghanistan and East Timor where Australian personnel are currently serving. Moreover, considering the geographical distance of Australia from main centers of power in the world, we

(Australia) have to “engage comprehensively across the Councils of the world” in this age of globalisation.¹⁹ The other is simply just that its being quite an age (27 years) since Australia last served on the Council. Overall, according to Okhovat, many politicians including Kevin Rudd believed Australia, as a Security Council non-permanent member, can be an effective voice for small and medium countries of the world.²⁰

However in a critique, with respect to Afghanistan, it is factual that Australia, out of own volition, had merely accompanied America, their big brother, to forcefully possess that country and dislodge the Taliban and Al Qaeda elements from power after 9/11. The peace mission to East Timor is rather in the strategic regional interest of Australia and as an aspiring and responsible regional power she may not wait for the UNSC seat before wishing to exert influence and preserve the stability of her northern neighborhood. To other motives, it amounts only to self-deceit for any of the R10 to boast the possession of an effective voice against the interests of veto powers. They may be heard, but an effective voice, no matter the reasonableness, is only by the rare grace of the P5 and there is no majority against a single blocking veto. Weighing the options without discountenancing the gallant contributions of Australia to UN peace keeping operations/budgets the world over, it may be valid to conjecture that the ruling party had only frivolously bidden the seat for mere international prestige and to shore up their rapidly declining domestic rating as against the rising profile of Tony Abbot leading the opposition party.

Ultimately and midway into their two-year tenure in the SC, Julia Gillard and the ruling party had failed to hoodwink Australians with bogus external popularity and hence lost government to Tony Abbot and the opposition party in the following Election. The ruling People’s Democratic party of Nigeria met a similar fate midway into their SC tenure as it also lost to the opposition in the 2015 General Election. Often, it is misstrategy for governments to seek external endorsement for local selfish purposes. Often also, they aspire to the UNSC for the wrong reasons. Hence, the theocratic Saudi Arabia is commendable for articulating security challenges and the difference they could make, rather than prestige-making. Confronted with the self-deceit and futility of taking on the veto powers, Saudi authorities had shown their disgust for the veto paralysis of the SC, and the rejection of the seat is in protest. But on the whole, ambitions and appointment to the Council are usually very elitist, consequently, the masses are often unconcerned by this extraneous politics. However, this elitist enterprise are usually at a huge domestic cost in cash and kind, and usually to the chagrin of the masses, it may cost politicians dearly, particularly in democracies. The cash is lost to buying influence and nomination in the course of bidding, and the kind represents actual sacrificial activities (often risky but undertaken as elite stunts which could endanger internal stability, but may occasionally and personally be rewarding, if successful, to the performing politicians) to demonstrate national contribution to global peace and security.

A recent instance is Chancellor Merkel’s *open door policy* granting German asylum to hundreds of thousands of displaced Syrians and other Asians that undertook desperate

journeys to flee war and terror at home. Against formidable internal opposition from PEGIDA and other groups, on credible infiltratory fears of Islamists, extremists and terrorists, and as well, counter-cultural and criminal elements, she strongly opined that Germany must not shut doors on peoples in danger. This *stunt diplomacy* comes against Merkel's earlier conviction about *multikulti*, a term used to describe the acculturative failure and problematic of German-born offspring of Arab émigrés to imbibe German cultures and civility. Local elections that directly followed Merkel's policy stunt showed the ruling Christian Democratic Union to lose grounds to opposition party. Most Germans found it hard to reason with government but conceived government's action as a compromise of German security, identity and values. The opposition had shortly later vindicated their stance by the series of allegations of women's groping and terror attacks leveled against the refugees in Germany. This scholarly essay, however, sees nothing that is honestly sincere in Merkel's generosity. It is all about elitist diplomatic overtures to put Germany in good stead for permanent seat in the esteemed Security Council whenever the occasion arises for reforms. It also puts Merkel in good stead for prestigious personal rewards and nominations, particularly, the Nobel Peace prize. The extreme diplomacy already won for her the 2015 TIME Magazine award as 'Person of the Year' for displaying rare morality through her liberal refugee policy. However, we can't be naïve to the *real politiker* nature of international politics that is often devoid of ethics and morality, but ultimately undertaken for potential rewards and political advantages.

But a further dishonor has come to the Security Council. Interests in R10 membership are also now-driven by economic opportunism. Numerous scholars have established a linkage between tenural membership and economic favouritism. Wang (1999), investigating the pattern of US foreign Aid on UN voting and using data collected for sixty-five developing countries between 1984 and 1993, found that the US government has successfully utilized foreign aid programs to induce foreign policy compliance in the UN on issues that are vital to America's national interests.²¹ Similarly, Carter and Stone (2010) examined the strategic relationship between U.S. foreign aid disbursements and voting in the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) against the background of U.S. law that stipulated, since 1985, that the State Department identify important votes and that USAID take the voting behavior of recipients in the UNGA into account in its disbursement decisions.²² They found, quite interestingly, that the strategic use of aid disbursements indeed induces strategic voting. Dreher et.al (2008), using panel data for 197 countries over the period 1951 to 2004, observed a robust positive relationship between temporary Security Council membership and participation in IMF programs even after accounting for economic, political, and country-specific factors. They also established the evidence that Security Council membership reduces the number of conditions included in IMF programs.²³

Further still, findings by Kuziemko and Werker (2006) indicate that a country's U.S. aid increases by 59 percent and its U.N. aid by 8 percent when it rotates onto the Council. This effect increases during years in which key diplomatic events take place (when members' votes should be especially valuable) and the timing of the effect closely tracks a country's election to, and exit from, the Council. They also observed that the U.N. results

appear to be driven by UNICEF, an organization over which the United States has historically exerted great control.²⁴ In confirmation of these financial favouritism, Dreher and Vreeland, (2007) observed that in 1992, Zimbabwe (then a rotating member of the Security Council) entered into its first International Monetary Fund (IMF) arrangement in a decade. The IMF granted the government a loan of over 300 million dollars and that at soft landing conditionality on the government and its peoples. At the time, the UNSC, at the prompting of the US wishing to dislodge Saddam Hussein was deciding the fate of the aggressor nation Iraq for invading Kuwait. During its time as a UN Security Council member, Zimbabwe voted on several resolutions regarding Iraq that the US cared a great deal about, including some resolutions that did not receive support from other developing countries. But when Zimbabwe failed to support just one resolution against Iraq, she was threatened by the IMF with new, stringent policy conditions to receive continued installments of the loan. Zimbabwe, in order to avoid harsh IMF conditionality, subsequently supported eleven Security Council resolutions opposing Iraq.²⁵

The case with Yemen was more pathetic as illustrated thus by Doug Bandow.²⁶ Based on domestic and regional considerations, Yemen had refused to vote in support of Resolution authorizing military intervention against Iraq in 1990. Consequently in annoyance, the serving US Secretary of State had purportedly passed a note to the Yemeni ambassador, saying "That is the most expensive vote you have ever cast". The punishment was gruesome to deter Yemen from standing in the way of the US in many years to come. The US had cut all of its 70 million dollars in aid, and despite her obvious dire need, she was not granted any IMF bailout for six years. Yemen must have deeply regretted her membership of the Council in that year, and, like many other nations in existential struggle, would have learnt never to defy the Big States in global power politics. These revelations speak of a travesty of justice to global peace and security. While it is not strange, though uncharitable and unethical, for donor nations to give aids in return for recipient favours, the US has always used its substantial powers in some global institutions to buy, induce or coerce votes at the UN.

The Council has become a tool for self-help, not only for the US, but for everyone who can. Nation-states, statesmen, and as well, international civil servants are known to be fond of taking advantage of their involvement to profit from the Council's activities. As members of the Big Five, especially the Western Three, utilise their powers and resources to pressure, reward or buy votes towards their interests, powerful national leaders in the Council also use the opportunity to line their pockets with ill-gotten funds from tyrannical leaders seeking to buy their influence to sway Council's decisions. The duo of Russia and China have despairingly harmonised interests and strengthened bilateral ties to avoid sidelining while mutually resisting, even when unnecessary, the threesome in the latter's excessive drive to use the Council for narrow interests. But Russia and China are not left out in the profiteering game either. The scandalized oil-for-food program established by the UN in 1995 readily comes to mind here. The program was complexly designed and managed by the UN to permit Iraq to barter oil on the world market in

return for food, drugs and humanitarian goods. The simple goal was to help impoverished ordinary Iraqi citizens consequent upon a regime of comprehensive international sanctions deployed to weaken Saddam Hussein. The Iraqi government however, with the collusion of certain UN officials, and some members of the P5, significantly abused the program for corrupt enrichment.

Sympathetic nations, individuals and organisations to Saddam's regime were given contract privileges to sell or procure for Iraq in the program. These contractors in return paid bribes and kickbacks mostly realized from surcharges to the Iraqi government. An enquiry reported that Iraq made well over \$1.5 dollars from such kickbacks.²⁷ The Duelfer Report revealed that Russia, followed respectively by France and China and their national companies benefited tremendously from the program.²⁸ The three nations and their companies were favoured solely because they all are permanent members of the UNSC, and their empathy, complicity and indulgence successfully enabled Saddam's government to circumvent the crippling sanctions. Similarly, Saddam's regime tried in desperation to buy or bribe anyone and everyone that could help sway, manipulate or sabotage the UN, and that ridiculously included UN staffers, the spouses, children, friends and in-laws of both UN Secretaries-General – Boutros Ghali and Kofi Annan, that served at the time. The discovery of the scandal involving fellow permanent members of the UNSC, to the chagrin of the US and Britain, and whose companies profited far less, could partly theoretically explain why the two powers defiantly teamed up to unilaterally dislodge Saddam Hussein and to occupy Iraq in 2003.

But then, as the threesome were colluding with Iraqi government, both the US and Britain had equally and massively profited through their military defence of Kuwait and Saudi Arabia, the two countries whose sovereign independence had been threatened with annexation by Saddam Hussein. While this essay does not absolve Saudi Arabia from any past benefit in the corrupt practices of the UNSC, the Saudi Authorities may also not be unaware of the manipulation and sleaze in the UNSC and the propensities of the permanent members for opportunism in place of sacrifice and objectivism, and chaos-invention as against engendering genuine peace and security. Saudi's rejection of the R10 membership may also be conjectured a cheap geopolitical stunt and a backdoor attempt to earn the leadership of the Middle East through the blackmail of a previously beneficial Council. Certainly, the UN Oil-For-Food program in Iraqi had been enmeshed in a complex web of multifaceted corruption, but all the permanent members of the UNSC had created opportunities for themselves in the ensuing international milieu. It is thus very correct to assert that the UNSC activities have often been motivated by economic self-interests, but have only been subtly presented as sincere efforts geared towards global peace and security.

It is a further bastardization of the SC as many nations of the world now strive to become one the Rotating Ten, either because they stand to make substantial financial gains for their wobbling economy as they run errands for any of the Big Five, or when the government is facing domestic crisis of legitimacy and thereby turning to the

international community for external validation. This is fraud and a corrupt diversion of international trust for cheap domestic gains, a distortion of purpose, a fallacy of legitimacy and a further short-changing of citizens of good governance at home. The UNSC, in less than a hundred years of existence has been grossly abused and stinking, riddled with corruption in all kinds, and habitual in opportunism and profiteering. Aspiration into the Security Council should be a call to ambulance service, and thus, members ought not to behave as ambulance chasers. This is why the Saudi's rejection of election into the R10 should be hailed, first as a sacrifice in condemnation of the decay and lack of objectivity in the Council, and second, as a global wakeup call for far-reaching reforms to redeem its lofty goals and image.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The Security Council is tremendously powerful and legendarily mythical in global perception simply for its sheer mode of evolution which came via a complex and unique political midwifery. The Council is a rare product of extreme and delicate political engineering. In David Bosco's veridical assertion, "the Council is a creature of great-power politics, not international bureaucracy. It is built on the assumption that five of the strongest nations have the right and duty to safeguard the globe".²⁹ This has given each of them the supranational status of guardian of international peace and security. It is also this extraordinariness of its evolution that accrued the SC such special rights, privileges and responsibilities. However, the Council in recent years is increasingly getting involved in grossly demeaning acts, self-demystification and disrespect. A critical analysis – as above – of events, decisions and pursuits of the Council in recent years show that it needs to reform, and the entire international community ought to be on the verge of revolt against the current regime of international order. The post-Cold War activities of the Council have been far less objective of its core duties to maintain international peace and security. Rather than function as guardians of international peace and security, the body had become a sleazebag, and is increasingly daring to operate as a Council of conflict inventors and profiteers.

Apart that the activities of the P5 members, and likewise the R10 have ultimately been driven by potential financial gains, their actions or inactions have also either backfired or become counterproductive for global peace and security. In the new millennium for instance, the Council had necessitated two regime changes in the Arab world, Iraq in 2003, and Libya in 2011. The two countries, which hitherto had been, though delicately, stable and prosperous have since failed and sunk deeper into anarchy and instability. Notwithstanding that the deposed and killed leaders (Hussein and Gaddafi) were deplorable, the motives surrounding the regime changes and the management of the post regime change have been queer and corrupted, and partly explained the difficulty in restoring law and order. And notwithstanding the attendant destabilizations currently in the two countries, the same Council, under the machination of its P5 is currently in a logjam over issues that could potentially bring about another regime change in Syria, an unfolding scenario that has already demonstrated the necessary ingredients of a failed and chaotic state for many years to come.

There is no iota of objectivity in the UNSC's Syrian struggle. The ultimate goal of the P5 is to feast on Syria's carcass, and the struggle essentially is about who shall possess more of the carcass. Should there be a regime change, the Western Three – USA, France and Britain, supporting the move, stands to gain immensely from post-war reconstruction contracts and the veritable mineral exploration rights with the rebel's new government. On the other hand, a victorious Bashar al Assad will similarly and bountifully reward the Eastern Duo of Russia and China, who had staunchly stood by to prophis regime. Their desire to help him keep power is not innocent and Assad is not naïve to the interests of his supporting allies. Assad's loss of power may also result in catastrophe for thousands of Russian and Chinese citizen-expatriates sojourning and working in Syria, aside massive losses of investments and opportunities for national companies of the allies.

For instance, at the downfall of Gaddafi and the destruction of Libya in 2011, China reportedly found itself exposed to considerable danger, firstly for the safety of its citizens working in Libya and secondly, financial losses from all the economic chaos. Chinese construction companies lost \$16.6 billion, as well as a further \$3-4 billion on lost exports of equipment, etc., even as China had hastily to evacuate 35,000 of its citizens.³⁰ For China that places its sovereign wealth fund at the disposal of its National construction companies as they bid for contracts around the world, bearing such losses are not limited to the victim companies. The case with China is quite interesting. Its industrial ingenuity, magic and cheap exportability have provided opportunities for segments of its most mammoth population to spill all over the world. Hence, China will definitely be the last country to sanction interventions that could backlash at its interests and peoples. But, must this also be at the expense of good governance in the host states, or the global peace and stability? There is thus no objectivity in the UNSC's concern over Syria after all. As Syria convulses with humanitarian tragedies and tens of thousands of Syrians die, with millions displaced in camps, members of the P5 and some of the errand R10 are merely scheming, gaming and waiting for time *to butcher the ailing cow for the meat*. Then, the winning side of the SC shall settle down to savor the post-war Syria, and others would scavenge.

The recommendations are clear. The UNSC must be reformed in line with the political and economic developments and sophistication of the Twenty-First Century. Membership of Council must be reviewed and the questions answered per the need to retain some nations permanently with veto power and others impermanent and impotent. The use of veto must be reviewed regarding its relevance and continuity, and as well, the modus operandi of use. The election and role of the rotating Council members must be reconsidered, such that they don't serve as tools-in-hand for the P5, but rather empowered and protected to make them more independent, assertive, and effective in Council activities. The Twenty-First Century context of global governance have changed and considerably broadened since the body was formed, and new issues have ever-since emerged to contend the global space with primary stake-holders. Consequently, membership of the Council needs to be broadened to accommodate emergent stake holders to world peace and security in the global village than it was the case during the

two World Wars. Similarly, a host of other issues, doctrines and concepts must be re-examined holistically in view of relevance to current drive for global peace and stability. Such include the aging concepts of state sovereignty justification for war and armament, globalisation and opportunities, wealth and poverty, sustainable development and good governance. Above all, checks and balances must be infused into UNSC to stamp out non-accountability, irresponsibility, international scavengery and recklessness, opportunism and profiteering.

The choice is ultimately between archaistic rigidity and pragmatistic flexibility. The world is a dynamic organism. It is constantly evolutionary and paradigmatic, and so are the inter-relational issues of states. New issues have since surfaced that had significantly altered the contexts within which the septuagenarian Council was borne when it held its first session on January 17, 1946 at Church House, London. Pragmatic reforms are urgently inevitable, first, to make it appropriately responsive to the dynamism of the ever-changing world, and second, to salvage it from the cankerous quagmire into which its post-Cold War operators have driven it. A good case is the criminal solidarity that members of the P5 are fond of having towards their allies, and as well the criminal complicity of members of the errand 10. The international civil servants operators also seized the opportunity, as demonstrated in the Iraqi 'oil for food' programme. Members of the P5 have used the Council selfishly to protect criminal allies from global prosecution and punishment when necessary.

As UNSC is grounded to a halt by ally solidarity, gross crimes against humanity and acts of human right abuses are being perpetrated by many states against their own citizens. Philippine government ignored 'due process' and 'rule of law' when in 2016 President Rodrigo Duterte, against UNSC's advice, encouraged citizens' vigilantes to rise and summarily execute fellow citizens suspected of drug dealing. Duterte scorned and accused the Council of perpetrating far greater crimes around the globe. The authoritarian populist also threatened to pull Philippines out of the UN. By approving extrajudicial murders to tackle endemic drug crimes, and emulatively likening it to Hitler's Nazi holocaust, abuse is inevitable and innocent Filipinos may be doomed. At that time, unfortunately, the two most preponderant members of the Council –US and Russia– who ought to deter the rash Duterte, were truly busy committing acts of war crimes in Syria, and leaving in their trail, good conditions for banditry and terrorism to thrive.

The Council's activities have often also been bogged down by ideological and other divisions among the P5, and hence, is increasingly becoming a house of indecision. Similarly, gross or perceived abuses of veto-use, particularly by the US and Russia have derailed the UNSC from objectivity of decision. UNSC's indecision and frivolities of veto-wielding have heightened global insecurity lately in the post-cold war era. The Council is increasingly a post-cold war arena for any of the Big Five to flex political muscle, particularly when international prestige and aggrandizement were at stake. Hence, as veto powers are being wielded, critical decisions to restore global peace and security were often unmade, even as the blood of innocents unabatedly stained the earth. With no imminent

action, the SC is gradually transforming into an instrument of bloc formation which could take the world back to the Cold War deadlocks.

As the world navigates between idealism and realism in the twenty-first century, the gains in human advancements since the first industrial revolution ought to have infused sanity into humanity, and that peaceful development is realistic and profitable than militarised development. As we gravitate towards UNSC reforms, some questions ought to be asked and issues needed be raised. These bother on:

1. Sanctity and sacredness of human lives: should there not be a way of infusing greater humaneness into the Council to ensure this objective and eliminate wanton massacre?
2. International roguery and despotism: shouldn't there be increasing reliance on, and the strengthening of International law and non-military sanctions to deter these, and to promote good governance and humanitarianism. Henry Kissinger once acknowledged in this wise that "Countries that proclaim that they are unaffected by pressure are either bluffing or have had the good fortune never to be exposed to it."
3. The international legal order: should there not be a periodic review, through this, about who and what constitutes the Security Council?
4. General Assembly: can this not wrestle the determination of criteria for membership and modus operandi of Security Council, other than allowing national power quanta and international *real politic* to have its way? Can nations not employ concerted contempt to rebuff irresponsible P5 states? Contempt, is perhaps the only counter-weapon against the mammoth military might of P5 states. And, since P5 states care so much about prestige and influence, the strategic employment of snub-campaigns is very likely to humiliate and deter their mounting international thuggery and abuse of Council mandate.
5. Insularity: can partiality be not prevented from the Council? Can non-alignment principles be not incorporated into membership of UNSC? To enhance objectivity, shouldn't the P5 and the E10 be barred from security alliances and membership entanglements? After all, the Big Five often boast to have global commitments/ interests, it would be illogical again for them to have other narrow alliances and commitments.
6. Veto parochialism: Can't the big powers be limited to permanent seats without veto, so to infuse greater efficiency into the Council and remove the veto-bog down that often stalled decision-making? After all, the ability to take unilateral action in Council's disregard (as done by US in aggression against Iraq) technically negates the integrity of veto utility. Originally, veto power was bestowed to appease these powers and to sooth their warring nerves in the peaceful defence of their interests. The veto has since become national assets that are traded, negotiated, exploited and invested. This is miasmal and draconian.
7. Global peace/security: Must nations be Council members to effectively impact on these?

8. Responsible sovereignty: isn't it cheaper for nations to possibly exercise greater influence by being alive to this rather than abdicate it to the advantage of preponderant powers?

A turn around reformation of the Council shall impact greatly on global peace, security, prosperity and development when the above questions/issues are put into cognizance. We live in chaos-prone world since clash of interests among nations are constant in their deep competition for limited resource opportunities. Consequently, the UNSC is splendid in kind, crucial and inevitable for overseeing international peace and security. Though it must be awesome in power quantum to effect its mandate, reforms are however constantly crucial to ensure that it continually aligns with global dynamics. Council activities must be transparent and strengthened against manipulation, exploitation and profiteering. As interstate activities are increasingly getting subjected to the international legal order, the Council cannot continue as the arbitrary leviathan whose enthronement and continuation is not subject to conditional review. It took the butchery of the Great War to abandon the failing Concert of Europe for the League of Nations, and as the League ailed barely two decades later, it sadly again took world leaders a greater carnage of World War Two to reform the failing league. Now the UNSC is also evidently decaying and becoming enmeshed in corruption and anti-mandate activities. Rather than being swiftly responsive to global security needs, the on-going Syrian Civil War and the now-simmering down civil crisis in Ukraine are proves that the Council is increasingly fomenting and escalating conflicts around the world. The roles of Big Five members in the dismemberment of both nations, and Georgia, earlier in 2008 would be unforgettable.

Rather also than being humanitarian per excellence, powerful Council members now compound human suffering around the world. The July 2014 fatal downing of the Malaysian Airline MH17 over Ukraine, and the October 2016 deluge of fire on civilian interests in Aleppo would also not be forgotten. The scenario under set is an international wild life of nations, and no one knows who's next to be victim for decimation, all, in the name of the Council. For two decades now, mounting agitations for its reform have come from the nooks and crannies of the globe, but so far resisted. Despite the abundance of strong historical lessons, teaching humans not to risk but avert destruction, shall it then take a third major war to rework the progressively abused and decaying Security Council, in a world acutely advanced in mass-massacre technology? As nations stood-by nonchalantly for five years running, watching the US and Russia – in the name of the Council – helping in the Syrian decimation process, what then is the role of civilization and fine diplomatic art if this highly developed homo sapiens could not cooperate against barbarity and fashion a peaceful, sophisticated future? World leaders must be wiser than the cunning and destruction that greed, avarice and selfish ambitions could bring to the human race. Nations must also be aware and unite against the surreptitious resurgence of the Cold War rivalry through the backdoor, as indicative of the current tide of international politics. The septuagenarian Council is obviously too old, failing and outmoded to continue scaling the commanding heights of global security, and, the time

is now overripe for its complete revamping to save the world from the impending doom emanative of its decay.

REFERENCES

¹ Bosco D., 2009. Five to Rule Them All: The UN Security Council and the Making of the Modern World. New York: Oxford University Press, 321 Pages.

Cited in Thessismun, 2007. United Nations Security Council: The Current Situation in Darfur. University of Macedonia, Thessaloniki, Greece, for Thessaloniki International Student Model United Nations. P3.

³Bosco D., 2009, Op Cit.

⁴McDowall A., Saudis Reject Security Council Seat, Angry over Mideast Inaction. Fri Oct 18, 2013 1:50pm. Retrieved on 11/6/2013. www.reuters.com/us-saudi-security-idUSBRE99HOFL20131018.htm

⁵Erskine Childers, 1994. Empowering the Peoples in their United Nations. Symposium on the United Nations at Fifty: Creating a more Democratic and Effective UN, Hesburgh Centre for International Studies, University of Notre Dame. GLOBAL POLICY FORUM. <http://www.globalpolicy.org/component/content/article/228-topics/32395-empowering-the-peoples-in-their-united-nations.html>

⁶ Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English

⁷ Ellis E. G. & Esler A., (2003). World History: Connections to Today. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

⁸Functions and Powers of the Security Council, Repertoire of the Practice of the Security Council. www.un.org/en/sc/repertoire/index.shtml. Retrieved 11/19/2013.

⁹Davidson K. A., Gaddafi Financed Sarkozy Campaign in 2007, Claims Arms Dealer Ziad Takieddine, The Huffington Post. Posted: 01/03/2013 4:26 pm EST. Updated: 01/09/2013 11:45 am EST. Viewed on 07 Jan. 2014. Retrieved from <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/news/gaddafi-financed-sarkozy>

¹⁰EXCLUSIVE – Gaddafi to Sarkozy: 'Give us Back Our money', 16/03/11. Viewed on 07 Jan. 2014. <http://www.euronews.com/2011/03/16/gaddafi-s-son-calls-the-libyan-rebels-traitors/>

¹¹Allen P., Gaddafi was Killed by French Secret Serviceman on Orders of Nicolas Sarkozy, Sources Claim

PUBLISHED: 11:43 GMT, 30 September 2012 | UPDATED: 06:56 GMT, 1 October 2012.
Viewed on 07 Jan. 2014.
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2210759/Gaddafi-killed-French-secret-serviceman-orders-Nicolas-Sarkozy-sources-claim.html#ixzz2pomxOwAK>

¹²Marianne Arens, 2011. Italy's Role in the War on Libya. World Socialist Web Site, wsws.org. Retrieved on 21st Jan, 2014.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴Ferdinand P, 2013. The Positions of Russia and China at the UN Security Council in the Light of Recent Crises. Policy Department DG External Policies, European Parliament.

¹⁵Ferdinand P., Op. Cit.

¹⁶Paul Toohey, Australia Wins Seat on UN Security Council. October 19, 2012. Herald Sun News. Retrieved 4th Dec. 2013.
<http://resources.news.com.au/files/2012/09/24/1226480/426771-un-security-council.jpg>

¹⁷'Nigeria Elected to UN Security Council'. October 18, 2013 by Olusola Fabiyi, Olalekan Adetayo and Kamarudeen Ogundele. Retrieved on 6th Nov. 2013. <http://www.punchng.com/news/nigeria-elected-to-un-security-council/>

¹⁸Okhovat S., 2012. The United Nations Security Council: Its Veto Power and Its Reform. CPACS Working Paper No. 15/1. The University of Sydney.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹Wang, T. Y., U. S. Foreign Aid AND U.N. Voting: An Analysis of Important Issues. *International Studies Quarterly* (1999) 43, 199-210.

²²Carter, D. B., & Stone R. W. 2010. "U.S. Aid Disbursement and Voting in the United Nations General Assembly." Working Paper. Accessed online on 2/2/2011 at http://www.rochester.edu/College/PSC/stone/working_papers/unvote7.pdf

²³Dreher, A., et al., Global Horse Trading: IMF Loans for Votes in the United Nations Security Council. *European Economic Review* (2009), doi:10.1016/j.eurocorev.2009.03.002

²⁴Kuziemko I. & Werker E., 2006. How Much is a Seat on the Security Council Worth? Foreign Aid and Bribery at the United Nations. *Journal of Political Economy* 114 (5), 905-930.

-
- ²⁵Dreher A. & Vreeland J. R. (2007). The Political Economy of the United Nations Security Council. Book Proposal. Accessed online on 2/2/2011 at http://147.142.190.246/joomla/peio/files/Dreher.Vreeland_UNSC.pdf
- ²⁶Bandow is cited in Dreher, A., et al. Op.cit.
- ²⁷Summary of Report on Program Manipulation. Independent Inquiry into the United Nations Oil-for-Food Programme. <http://www.iic-offp.org>
- ²⁸[Duelfer, Charles; Iraq Survey Group](#) (30 September 2004). *Comprehensive Report of the Special Advisor to the DCI on Iraq's WMD*. Washington, D. C.: Central Intelligence Agency. ISBN 0-16-072492-9. Retrieved 2 November 2011.
- ²⁹Bosco D., 2009. Five to Rule Them All: The UN Security Council and the Making of the Modern World. New York: Oxford University Press.
- ³⁰Ferdinand P, 2013. The Positions of Russia and China at the UN Security Council in the Light of Recent Crises. Policy Department DG External Policies, European Parliament.