

PART THREE UN SECURITY COUNCIL RESOLUTIONS AGAINST ERITREA DO THEY HAVE EVIDENCE BEYOND ANY REASONABLE DOUBT?

Before discussing United Nations resolutions against Eritrea the writer will first explain from page 1-5 why it was set up and the way permanent members use their veto power to shape up world politics.

1. INTRODUCTION TO THE INNER WORKINGS OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

The United Nations was set up after the Second World War with the principal aim of encouraging reconciliation among countries by promoting regional peace and stability in the world. Its first session was held on 17th January 1946 at Church House in Westminster London and its headquarters are in New York. The decision making body of the UN is called the Security Council and consists of 15 representatives from member states. Five members have permanent seats maintaining veto wielding permanent seat at the Security Council. These countries are the United States of America (USA) Russia, China, France, United Kingdom. The Permanent members also represent the main victorious powers of World War Two, and belong to the elite club of nuclear nations.

The other ten non permanent members are selected for two year term in January by two thirds majority in the General Assembly. The ten seats are divided into five blocks (Arab, African, Asian, European and Latin American countries) each block is represented by two members. In the General Assembly, the big powers always use their prestige/status/money or food aid on their satellite states to make sure that favourable countries are selected to the Security Council. In other words the, Permanent Members can use their power, influence, using direct or indirect threats to make sure countries that do not fall in line with the wishes and desires of the big boys club are excluded. For example, countries like Cuba, Venezuela, Sudan, Iran, Eritrea may not be selected to the Security Council because the United States, supported by its Anchor States like Ethiopia, Nigeria, South Africa would make sure to block their entry into the exclusive club. In fact there is an informal agreement among permanent members that when it comes to their interest, they will node among one another to pass a resolution at their own time space taking advantage of the old saying “ if you scratch my back, I'll scratch yours”.

The permanent members, also use their veto power in order to protect their interest or the interest of their satellite members. Between 2011-2012 there were two important and decisive Resolutions tabled at the Security Council. One was UN Resolutions 1973 passed against Libya on 17th March 2011. The Second one was UN resolution 1973 against Syria proposed by western powers on 5th March 2012. The UN resolution against Libya was simply a declaration of no fly zone over Libya and to protect civilian lives only. Russia and China abstained while western permanent members voted in favour of the Resolution. The resolution was interpreted by the Western intervening powers (USA, Britain, France) as a green light to bring regime change against Gaddafi and pressed on until he was lynched by a mob to - death. After Gaddafi's demise the New Transitional Government was set up with the help of Britain France and the United States. Subsequently the Super powers who did not support the UN resolution against Gaddafi but abstained instead (Russia and China) had to pay a very high price for failing to support the resolution. As a result they are now completely

excluded from the lucrative oil deal in new Libya by the new Government, pressurized perhaps by Western Countries to keep them out. And then came the Resolution on Syria tabled by Western powers at the UN Security Council. Russia and China, realised that they were conned when they abstained on the Libyan resolution, but Western powers interpreted it as though they were given blank cheque and NATO took advantage of the abstention and bombed Gaddafi's rag tag army to extinction. Russia and China have also lost a massive lucrative oil deal that they had an agreement with Gaddafi. To lose the oil deal was a bit too much for the two super powers. Moreover the two countries are also very fearful not to have the kind of Arab revolutions to erupt in their countries. Plus Russia decided to veto the UN Resolution against Syria twice because the country is one of the main sphere of influence of Russia, it sells billions of arms to Syria. Last year alone it sold more than one \$ billion worth of armaments to Syria government or about \$ 300 million each year. Note Russia also has a military base in Syria as well.

What is even more interesting in Western eyes is that President Assad of Syria is seen as a bad boy in the region and most importantly as a friend of Iran, therefore the hidden agenda of the West was to smash Syria into peace's using UN resolution and bring down regime change. At the same time to soften public opinion via the mass media to destroy Iran militarily so that it does not pose any threat to Israel. *But no matter what happens in Syria, attacking Iran is not going to be a picnic because Iran has not invaded any country, she has not threatened any country, she has not developed weapons of mass destruction, like any sovereign countries she has every right to do what is good for the Iranian people.* Therefore the two UN resolutions against the two Arab States which had wider consequences internationally, provide us timely example how the permanent members can use their power for their ultimate advantage and at the same time to protect countries like Israel by weakening or destroying others- like Iraq and perhaps Iran in the future. That is why Russia and China are now continuously blocking tougher measures against Syria by the UN Security Council that might open the way to foreign military intervention.

In reacting to the veto of the UN Resolution on Syria, by China and Russia, the most powerful lady in the World - Hilary Clinton (Secretary of State) said it was travesty of justice, Suzann Rice UN Ambassador for the United States Government said she was disgusted. The statement of the Two ladies is a clear indication that the permanent members are always prepared to use their veto powers one way or the other to advance their political and economic goals. Even in future it will be business as usual, Russia may use its veto to protect its interest in Chechen, Iran, Syria against the wishes of the Western countries whose hidden agenda is regime change for countries they do not have any love affairs with. China, will do the same in her sphere of influence for example in Tibet, Hong Kong, Taiwan, North Korea. France would do the same with her Francophone countries like Gabon, Niger, Chad, Ivory Coast where the French intervened in the last civil war in 2011 to overthrow Bagbo who lost the election but refused to cede power.

The United Kingdom is always dragged into Americas wars (Iraq and Afghanistan) and need to vote in favour of, or against, anything the United States brings to the UN Security Council. She would also use her veto if British interests are at stake. The issue of the Falkland Islands is still unresolved because Argentina still claims sovereignty over the Islands which are located at the southern tip of Argentina. The UK which is 80,000 miles away from the Falkland Islands or Malvinas as they are called in Argentina, has occupied the Islands since 1833 and still maintains sovereignty over the Island. The Islanders themselves who are

numbered about 3,000 strong wanted self determination, want to fly their own Flag and do not want to be under Argentinian rule. The issue of the Islands sovereignty will obviously flare up again and may even lead to war between Great Britain and Argentina in the future.

There is no doubt on few occasions the UN Security Council have passes constructive resolutions to save lives, but on some occasions they have blocked genuine resolutions against Human right abuses using their veto power, or at times intervening in any country as a police man of the world. Let us have a look at some of the UN Security Council Resolutions passed in the 1990s. In 1993 when the Somalis were fighting their clan war the Americans intervened and to their shock when one of their Black Hawk Helicopter was shot down by Aidid's forces over the skies of Somalia, their pilots were dragged down in the streets of Mogadishu. The American reaction was quick and swift - they left the country as quickly as they came in. The situation in Somalia then and now is still dire. At the time, if the UN Security Council passes a resolution to protect the people of Somalia by declaring no-fly zone over the country as they did in Libya, surely Somalia would not have disintegrated.

Then came the, genocide in Rwanda that took place in 1994 when about 800,000 of the Tutsi minority were slaughtered by the Hutu majority. The United Nations Security Council did nothing to intervene in that nation, more could have been done by France (who helped train the Hutu militia) and the United States. Kofi Annan was head of the United Nations peace keeping department in Rwanda which meant he could have forcefully argued for the UN troops to stay in Rwanda and increase their numbers to defend the Tutsis, but he was impotent and was not able to do anything. He simply bowed to his superiors to withdraw UN troops from Rwanda and the genocide continued unabated. The Clinton administration with Madeleine Albright, the 20th United States Ambassador to the UN and one of the facilitators of the Algeris agreement that brought Eritrea Ethiopia together to sign peace agreement caused by the border dispute between the two countries between 1998-2000 in which Ethiopia has continuously refused to abide by the agreement that she has signed in black and white. Madeleine Albright was again partly responsible as she did nothing to prevent the genocide in Rwanda. One should ask why is it there was not such urge to rescue those innocent lives? The answer is simple Rwanda did not have any oil or resources so the permanent powers did not have interest to defend the country. Consequently Rwandan Tutsis were left to fend for themselves.

The issue of Palestinian right to self determination has also come to the attention of the UN Security Council even in 2011, but the United States with its supporters vetoed it. Almost 4 billion people were horrified when Suzan Rice instructed by her boss President Obama denied the right of Palestinians for a nation hood. The betrayal of Palestinian right to live side by side with the Israelis is not only ignored by UN Security Council especially the Us and its allies +Western politicians, the Palestinian leaders themselves, from Yassir Arafat to President Abbas (Abumazen) Fatah Leaders are also equally to blame, because they are, corrupted. To some Palestinians they are seen as collaborates of Israel, because they were not able to achieve Palestinian aspiration for Independent Palestine - and no wonder they are called "Moderates" These moderates failed for decades and dragged back the Palestinian cause backward. The Arab world could have equally argued on behalf of the Palestinians and use UN Security Institutions to advance the cause of the Palestinians. For example with a stroke of a pen they (the Arabs) could have liberated Palestine by withdrawing their petrodollars from London, New York, Paris, Tokyo to neutral countries, like Switzerland then the World market could have collapsed and Palestinian could have been free by now, but with a massive

influence of the United States over Gulf states the latter are indirectly prolonging Palestinian agony up to the present day. Of course the Americans will not allow this to happen but if the Arabs were determined to do it no one could have stooped them from achieving Palestinian independence in line with the 1967 UN resolution between Israel and the Palestinians. The tragedy for the Palestinians is that the Arabs cannot do anything as governments without the permission of the United States. Therefore the Americans, the UN Security Council, the Arabs are still denying the Right of Palestinians for nationhood.

What is even more puzzling is that instead of advancing the Palestinian cause for nationhood, the Arab world wrongly perceive Iran as a danger, when instead, Israel is the real danger on their doorstep. Equally the Arabs seems determined to destroy their neighbouring mountain Iran instead of fighting for the right of Palestinians through the United Nations Security Council or through other means. Their inaction by not doing anything for the Palestinian cause is providing a perfect diversion for the Israelis who are doing their level best to deny Palestinian rights to live side by side with them. As such they seem to be collaborating with the Israelis to deny Palestinian rights which maintains the Israeli occupation of Palestine. Can you imagine when Palestinian homes are demolished, phosphorus bombs thrown at Palestinian men, women, Children, including more than 1500 killed or injured during the last incursion of the Israeli Army into Gaza in December 2008 and the Arabs seem to be happy with the status co? Which is quite tragic.

The UN Security Council with the powerless Arab League failed the Palestinians and continue to fail them. The UN Security council and the Arab Leagues interest seems to protect the Israeli establishment not Palestinian right to self determination. This is indelible evidence that the United States and its allies in the UN Security Council simply want to protect Israel and not the Palestinians. That is why the Americans have vetoed the Palestinian issue at the Security Council more than 40 times since the creation of Israel in 1948. Note Israel has every right to live but she has no right to deny this right to others. Thus the Superpowers would in most cases use the Security Council for their own interest and the interest of their allies regardless of genuine human rights causes like that of Palestinian. In other words the UN was not able to stop the war on Iraq, when no weapons of mass destruction were found, and the UN Security Council may not be able to stop Israel and its allies attacking Iran dragging the whole world into unnecessary war resulting into economic collapse and oil price doubling from its current price of about \$125 a barrel to perhaps over \$ 200. If this happens the whole world would face an economic mass suicide beyond anyone's imagination.

On some occasions the UN Security Council seems to be following Newton's law of Physics, as it seems to apply to the geopolitics in modern politics. Newton's law states that "every action causes an equal opposite reaction". As in the case of Kosovo in 1999, the Western Powers reacted swiftly, when Radovan Karadzic and his friend Slovan Maladish now both in detention in the Hague for crimes commuted against humanity, when they intentionally killed thousands of Kosovan Muslims to clear them from their area of residence because they were Muslims. The UN Security Council intervened in the name of humanity and saved many lives as they ferociously bombed the Yugoslavian army into submission to end the war. Thus the UN Security Council can intervene or not intervene if they so wish. So one may ask why can't the Security Council be reformed to accommodate more countries into its elite club so that the voiceless countries can have some kind of a say? The answer is simple why should

they, when they can have their cake and eat it, the present system favours permanent members as they can manipulate/ interpret any resolutions in a way that suit their political interest and keep away others.

Hence any UN resolution against any country should be looked at from the sphere of influence of the Permanent members geopolitical interest. For example the two illegal and unjust resolutions passed against Eritrea, one in December 2009 and the second resolution in December in 2011, provide us another example how permanent members like the US and their satellite states can manoeuvre to pass resolutions or provide diplomatic cover to their subservient nations like Ethiopia regardless of the issue in question. This tactic has now become common practice that the big powers and their allies can diplomatically bully countries like Eritrea even though they have no evidence to prove against her. Presently the golden rules of law here in the West still remains, that any one is innocent until proven guilty, but when it comes to countries like Eritrea the UN may not be able to abide by such sacrosanct rules. More over the recent unprovoked attack carried out by the minority Government in Ethiopia against sovereign Eritrea territory on 15th and 17th March 2012 under the watch full eye of the international community should have been condemned outright. But the UN Security Council remained silent on Ethiopian aggression, this is perhaps another example that the Security Council is biased against countries like Eritrea yet soundless in order to provide diplomatic cover to countries like Ethiopia. It is very unfair world.

An article on UN Resolution 1907 on Eritrea to follow in few days.

Note the Writer is a regular reader of all the National Newspapers in London especially the Guardian.

Tesfahannes Beyene

London 23 March 2012

Also by the author

Part One:

Eritrea: Its hidden beauty & determination – can it succeed where others have failed?

http://www.dehai.org/archives/dehai_news_archive/jun-dec11/0150.html

Part Two:

Border dispute between Eritrea and Ethiopia - what does the future hold?

http://www.dehai.org/archives/dehai_news_archive/jun-dec11/0522.html