T.R.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT SECURITY MEMBERS: A CASE FOR REPLACEMENT OR EXPANSION

M.A THESIS

Chijioke Emmanuel NWANI

Department of Political Science and International Relations
Political Science and International Relations Program

THESIS SUPERVISOR: Prof. Dr. Ragıp Kutay KARACA

JANUARY 2019

T.R.

ISTANBUL AYDIN UNIVERSITY

INSTITUTE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

THE UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT SECURITY MEMBERS: A CASE FOR REPLACEMENT OR EXPANSION

M.A THESIS

Chijioke Emmanuel NWANI

(Y1216.110011)

**Department of Political Science and International Relations
Political Science and International Relations Program**

THESIS SUPERVISOR: Prof. Dr. Ragıp Kutay KARACA

JANUARY 2019

YÜKSEK LİSANS TEZ ONAY FORMU

Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler Anabilim Dalı, Siyaset Bilimi ve Uluslararası İlişkiler İngilizce Tezli Yüksek Lisans Programı **Y1612.110011** numaralı öğrencisi **Chijioke Emmanuel NWANI**'nın **"THE UNITED NATION PERMANENT SECURITY MEMBERS: A CASE FOR REPLACEMENT OR EXPANSION"** adlı tez çalışması Enstitümüz Yönetim Kurulunun 08.11.2018 tarih ve 2018/29 sayılı kararıyla oluşturulan jüri tarafından oybirliği/oyçokluğu ile Tezli Yüksek Lisans tezi 04.02.2019 tarihinde kabul edilmiştir.

	Unvan	**Adı Soyadı**	**Üniversite**	**İmza**
Danışman	Prof. Dr.	Ragıp Kutay KARACA	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
Asıl Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Özüm SEZİN UZUN	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
Asıl Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Emine AKÇADAĞ ALAGÖZ	İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi	
Yedek Üye	Prof. Dr.	Hatice Deniz YÜKSEKER	İstanbul Aydın Üniversitesi	
Yedek Üye	Dr. Öğr. Üyesi	Fatma Zeynep ÖZKURT	Nişantaşı Üniversitesi	

ONAY

Prof. Dr. Ragıp Kutay KARACA
Enstitü Müdürü

DECLARATION

I hereby declare that the information in this thesis was obtained and published in accordance with the academic rules and ethical conduct of Istanbul Aydin University. All information was fully cited and referenced accordingly. (04/02/2019).

Chijioke Emmanuel NWANI

FOREWORD

All thanks and honour goes to Almighty God, for His protection and giving me the strength and wisdom to complete my Master's program. I thank the lecturers that have been of great help towards this amazing career of mine.

In respect to the supervision of my thesis, I appreciate the effort of Prof. Ragip Kuntay Karaca and Prof. Ozum Sezin UZUN, i thank you both for your support, endurance and time towards making this thesis a success.

I acknowledge the efforts of my siblings, for their support and motivation towards my education. They have been of great help to me in difficult times.

I am using this means to thank my friends and colleagues who have been of great help towards my academic accomplishment. I am so blessed to have them around me.

January 2019   Chijioke Emmanuel NWANI

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABBREVIATIONS

AU	: African Union
ADIZ	: Air Defense Identification Zone
BRICS	: Britain Russia India China South Africa
ESS	: European Security Strategy
EU	: European Union
CASD	: Continuous at Sea Deterrence
CHS	: Commission on Human Security
CJEF	: Combined Joint Expeditionary Forces
GWoT	: Global War on Terrorism
ICJ	: International Court of Justice
IMF	: International Monetary Fund
KFOR	: Kosovo Force
NATO	: North Atlantic Treaty Organization
NGOs	: Non-Governmental Organizations
P5	: Permanent Five
SCO	: Shanghai Cooperation Organization
USDD	: United States Department of Defense
UN	: United Nations
UNSC	: United Nations Security Council
USSR	: Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
WTO	: World Trade Organization

LIST OF TABLES

**THE UNITED NATIONS PERMANENT SECURITY COUNCIL: A CASE
FOR REPLACEMENT OR EXPANSION**

ABSTRACT

The most powerful organ of the United Nations (UN), the United Nations Security
Council (UNSC) has been under various criticisms over the last decade and one of
the major areas that is being criticized worldwide was its membership. Both
members and non-members of the UNSC have questioned the nature or state of the
current five membership members namely United States, Russia, United Kingdom,
China and France. These five permanent members also have their own sentiments
regarding expansion or replacement appeals from different countries. Obviously, the
concerns of the five permanent members are related with economic, military and
political interests which overlap each other. This study therefore assesses both the
advantage and disadvantages of each of the appeals by matching them against the
future and effectiveness of the Council. After the assessment of the appeals from
different angles, the study also makes specific recommendations as to whether
expansion or replacement would be the best option, judging from the current state of
global affairs.

Keywords: *Expansion, Replacement, Political, Economic, United Nations, United
Nations Security Council*

BİRLEŞMİŞ MİLLETLER DAİMİ GÜVENLİK KONSEYİ: DEĞİŞİM VEYA GENİŞLEME İÇİN DURUM İNCELEMESİ

ÖZET

Birleşmiş Milletler'in (BM) en güçlü organı olan Birleşmiş Milletler Güvenlik Konseyi (BMGK) son on yılda çeşitli eleştirilere maruz kalmış ve dünya genelinde eleştirilen başlıca konulardan birisi de üyelik konusu olmuştur. Hem BMGK üyesi hem de üye olmayan ülkeler, ABD, Rusya, İngiltere, Çin ve Fransa şeklinde beş üyeden oluşan mevcut üyeliğin niteliğini veya durumunu sorguladılar. Bu beş daimi üyenin aynı zamanda farklı ülkelerden gelen genişleme veya ikame başvurularına karşı kendi düşünce ve hassasiyetleri bulunmaktadır. Açıkçası, beş daimi üyenin kaygıları birbiriyle örtüşen ekonomik, askeri ve politik çıkarlarla ilgilidir. Bu nedenle, bu incelemede çağrıların her birinin avantajları ve dezavantajları, Konseyin geleceği ve etkinliği ile karşılaştırılarak değerlendirilmektedir. Başvuruların farklı açılardan değerlendirilmesinin ardından, bu çalışmada aynı zamanda global konuların mevcut durumundan yola çıkarak, genişlemenin veya değişimin en iyi seçenek olup olmadığına dair spesifik tavşiyelerde bulunulmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: *Genişleme, Değişim, Politik, Ekonomik, Birleşmiş Milletler, Birleşmiş Milletler Güvenlik Konseyi.*

1. INTRODUCTION

The United Nations Security Council (UNSC), as an organ of the United Nations has come a long way in maintaining international peace and security. Over the years, it has been criticized on issues such as its legitimacy and efficiency. Some critics believe that there are some structures which have become ineffective because of the evolving trends of global security and the emergence of newer and stronger threats to deal with. Other critics believe that the supposed ineffectiveness of the United Nations Security Council comes from the reluctance of the permanent five members to compromise on certain key decisions relating to security.

The United Nations Security Council has been a legitimate and effective organ over the years. However, the contemporary dynamics of security keeps questioning its legitimacy and effectiveness. Therefore, there is the need for certain adjustments to be made in the structure, regulation, representations and operations of the whole organ. Such adjustments could only be done when the five permanent members could come to a compromise on the security challenges posed by emerging security threats. The question of representations revolves around either increasing (expansion) the scope of membership or replacing old members with new ones (replacement).

The thesis however examines the cases of expansion because most of the proposals for reforms were in line with the need for expansions rather than replacement. This examination was done by accessing the positions of each of the permanent members on expansion of the UNSC permanent membership. The implications of expansion of the P5 were also examined in this thesis. The discussions of this thesis confirmed that the position of Russia on expansion is quite clear and positive. Russia supports expansion but it is only willing to work with members who would respect the global ambitions of Russia which includes their national interest but Russia has failed to show support for any candidate yet. Finally, the thesis also reviews the positions of the five permanent members on both expansion and replacement.

1.1 Literature Review

This section of the thesis examines thepast opinions of different authors in relation to why and how expansion or replacement would be significant or beneficial for the United Nations Security Council as an international organ.

1.1.1 National interest, associated consequences and collective authority

In their publication, *UN Security Enlargement and US National Interest*, McDonald and Stewart (2010) explained that expansion could only take place if it well in line with the interest of the United States. However, they also highlighted the fact that any new members that would be accepted into the permanent five members must reflect that current realities of this twenty first century. Even though Stewart and McDonald agreed that it was very difficult to select the best candidate (s) for the expansion process, economic and security capabilities were the two most important indicators that needed to be examined during the process.

Referring to the promise made by President Obama to renovate certain outdated institutions in the US National Security Strategy (The White House, 2010). UNSC was also one of the institutions that were mentioned in the former President's agenda and the first candidate that was specified was India. The support for India was not only based on the recent rapid rising economy of India but also because many states have called for equal representation of all parts of the world in the UNSC. According to them, South East Asia does not have any representative at all so the security around that region has always been below expectations.

McDonald and Stewart did not really support that UN was renovating the council because of the above reasons. Rather they believed that US had special interests in bringing on board India. That was the reason it was not a coincidence when India was mentioned as the first candidate and even supported by the former President of the United States himself.

Brian Cox also valued the act of expansion of the UNSC permanent membership but, in as much as he supported the idea of expansion, he also highlighted the various consequences associated with the action. In his publication *United Nations Security Council Reform: Collected Proposals and Possible Consequences*. He cited the case of genocide as an example of a situation where more members would be needed to take strong decisions on such security problems. In his explanation he weighed on

the different calls by nations for reforms of the UNSC but he urged the UN to consider the consequential effects of the each of the proposals before choosing the best alternative proposal (Cox, 2009 p.98).

In 1992, the UN resolution 48/26 was passed due to the increasing number of countries in the UNSC. The resolution called for the establishment of a working group that would generate proposals based on two motives; equality and efficiency. The first reform he described was based on expanding the permanent seats on the basis of geographical representation. Other proposals were based on the scope of the veto and how it was used. An expansion in permanent membership would have increased the number of veto holders which means that security decisions would be more accurate than before. Some of the proposals he evaluated included the Razali Plan, the G4 Plan, the Uniting for Consensus Plan, Ezulwini Consensus and the S5 Plan. Proposals came from different European, Asian and African states.

David Caron's position was not really concerned about expansion or replacement. By this I mean that he did not have a problem with an expansion but he never really showed any support for it. His arguments were neutral because he rather concentrated on the collective use of authority by the UNSC (Caron, 1993 p559). That was the most important point he emphasized. He was not fascinated about the number of permanent members so all he wished for was that the veto powers must be used legitimately.In his journal, *The Legitimacy of the Collective Authority of the Security Council*, he stressed on the importance of tolerance and judgment. In this contemporary multipolar world, judgments on security issues are taken by the UNSC at the international and global level. But the question is 'how long would the UNSC be able to perform this role?' The question of legitimacy then comes in. Any challenge that confronts any security issue must be dealt with through the process of institutionalization and that is why the USNSC is important.

1.1.2 Permanent Membership and the changing nature or wars

Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, Jennifer Welsh and Dominik Zaum (2008) reiterated the need for reforms in the UNSC but their argument was not based on any other reason than the changing nature of war. In their publication, *United Nations Security Council and War; The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945,* the authors shared their ideas based on the need for expansion rather than replacement by

analysis the different kinds of wars which have occurred before and after the establishment of the UNSC (Lowe et al, 2008). Their analysis was geared towards the future in case any kind of war would erupt around the globe again. Some of the wars they analyzedin relation to the UNSC were the Korean War, the Arab-Israeli wars, the India-Pakistan Wars, the Iran-Iraq war and many more. In their opinion, the circumstances that led to these wars must be reviewed know the type of candidates to accept in the permanent membership seat. The acceptance of any wrong candidate might jeopardize the security views of other countries and might result in major conflicts, which might result in a war an extreme case. In her book *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*, Mary Kaldor also explained the role of non-state actors in contemporary security decision making. She made this explanation by differentiating between old wars and new wars and according to her, old wars were wars fought between two or more states where, opposing forces from each state represent the entirety of the state. In such wars, civilians were clearly differentiated from soldiers by way of uniform. In actual sense, the war was between the security forces and not the whole state (Kaldor, 2006). The security forces just represented the whole state. With new wars, the fight is not only between the security forces of the state but it also involves some non-state actors.

The purpose of new wars is to defend identities and not to defend the state therefore most of the actions are directed towards civilians. Example of such new wars is the Rwandan civil war. Old wars represented the struggle of two equal security forces of two different states. The reason why Kaldor used the word 'equal' here was that all participants of old wars are usually armed. However, new wars are, more or less, armed participants against unarmed participants in some cases (Kaldor, 2007).

One advantage of old wars is that it strengthens the winning state by increasing taxation and developing a national ideology. An example of long term result of old wars is the emergence of strong states after World War Two such as United States, Russia (Former Soviet), Britain and Germany. New wars on the other hand result in the disintegration of states, open markets, transnational crime and low taxation and a weaker state. Organizations such as the United Nations and the European Union were established after new wars and right now many states are experiencing the effect of new wars.

The experiences of different forms of wars in the past has helped with the evolution of the UNSC's thoughts towards the maintenance of international peace and security. However, some of these concepts of evolutions are rarely discussed during security issues while some have abjectly been abandoned. These concepts also include humanitarian law.

The concept of humanitarian law from the angle of the UNSC involved two processes which are its execution and implementation. Execution and implementation of humanitarian laws are guided by resolutions which place three requirements on the parties involved in an armed conflict. The resolutions enable the UNSC to exert necessary pressure on the parties involved in the war. The resolutions are categorized into three different sets and each set has its own requirements.

The first set of resolutions require that the parties in the conflict must comply with all humanitarian laws in general. The second set of resolutions require that the parties involved in an armed conflict must implement certain specific rules of humanitarian law while the third set requires that the Security Council implements the humanitarian laws to institutional measures.

One of the few security authors who advocated for a replacement reform of the UNSC was Helen Leigh-Phippard. She is considered an outstanding author because a replacement proposal or position is not easy to embark on, especially when the author is a female. This kind of position attracts many critics but Helen was able to publish her ideas of replacement in her publication, *Remarking the Security Council: The Options*. Helen targeted the two European representatives as the UNSC; France and Britain. According to Helen, the only way in which the UNSC could gain more authority without adding to the total number of members is to replace some of them because in that way, Veto powers would also not be increased and so further problems with Veto could be avoided (Leigh Phippard, 2004 p.67). In her advocacy, her choice of candidates was a replacement of Britain and France with Japan and a single European seat.

In my opinion, I believe there is a case for expansion of the UNSC permanent membership because even though global security trends have changed and new conceptions have emerged, countries such as Russia, United States, China, Britain

and France are still relevant due to the long historical setups of each of them. Therefore, there is no cause for replacement.

Another reason why I believe expansion would be the best option is that, it would give the new members the opportunity to work with old and experienced states so that in the future if the old states would have dents in the security details, the new states could cover up gaps that have been created. I also agree with authors who advocate for expansion to improve upon the fairness or representation.

Representation is quite important because in many ways, it would also affect the level of contributions expected from each geographical region in terms of maintaining stability. Eastern Europe and part of the Middle East (allies) are greatly represented by Russia while United States represents North America and parts of the Middle East as well (allies). However, China represents only Asia and does not have any allies. Africa is not represented at all. South East Asia is not also represented but Europe has two giant representatives. To an extent, the level of fairness in representation looks and smells fraudulent from afar.

One reason why replacement cannot be possible or at most, would be difficult is that the relegated members would not be prepared to let go their position very easily because it is always not easy to let go a position that one has occupied for a very long time.

1.2 Theoretical Framework

1.2.1 Securitization theory

Securitization theory basically revolves around the questions that are asked about the state of global security. The theory seeks to broaden the discussions on how to promote global security without jeopardizing its current state. Security challenges have expanded from military to include other contemporary challenges and so the state of security cannot remain as it is. To consider something as a threat towards security, a political choice must be made. Such choices naturally create the process through which securitization would be developed. In other words, the labelling of something as a threat is the function of the securitization process that could be applied to it (Weaver, 2000:1). Another principle of the securitization theory is that the creation of the process of securitization for a particular threat cannot be done by a

single entity or actor. This is because the interpretation of a threat by an actor could be different from the interpretation of another actor. However, the application of securitization cannot take place without an agreement between all participating actors (audience).

The first attempt to define securitization theory came from the Copenhagen School, which described the theory as 'a more extreme version of politicization' (Buzan et al, 1998 p.23). In an extensive explanation, the theory could be described as the identification and treatment of the threat with extreme measures related to security. Ole Waever explained that when top officials of a particular security institution come together to discuss threat issues, they are engaging in a process of securitization (Waever, 1995 p.57). In such as case, the securitization process would involve speeches and discussions.

However, two author friends of Waever; Buzan and De Wilde point out that there could be cases where the securitization process would not have any kind of indicators therefore the actors involved in securitization at any point must be observed closely and evaluated through the extent to which the targeted audience would accept it (Buzan, Waever, De Wilde, 1998 p.25). In an attempt to relate this concept to the practices of the UNSC, the threat in this context would be the fact that the UNSC has not adjusted towards the current political and economic trend.

The securitization process would be when the five permanent members agree to admit another member (expansion). For example, if the permanent members should decide to admit Brazil or India, it is possible that most of the non-permanent members (audience) would accept such decision or not. According to Flyod (2010), if the audience accepts it, the issue is no more considered a normal issue and could be dealt with outside the parameters of normal rules and regulations.

1.2.2 The process of securitization

The stages of the securitization process as presented originally by the Copenhagen School included five steps. The first step is involves the development of the securitizing speech which is to be discussed by all actors together. For example, if the security issue in question occurred in Russia, then obviously Russia would be responsible for developing all speeches surrounding the threat. During the

development of speeches or discussions, the actor, in this case, Russia could be represented by a military, political or security agencies and individuals.

The second step involved in the process of securitization is the discussion of the referent subject. The referent subject in this context refers to the region, organization, entity or actor from which the threat is emanating.

The third step involved in the process of securitization is the discussions of the referent object. The referent object simply refers to the region, organization, entity or actor that is seriously threatened by the referent subject. The threat towards the referent subject could be an attack on the freedom, justice system or national security of the referent subject in question (Balzacq, 2005:172).

The fourth step involved in the process of securitization is the proposal of extraordinary measures by the securitizing actor. These measures would present different alternatives to deal with the threat in question but only one can be chosen after careful review of the situation in relation to the alternatives developed.

The last but not the least step involved in the process of securitization is the translation and relation of the chosen measure to the audience. The audience is simply a term that is used to describe all security actors and agencies who need to agree on the threat before it is implemented. However, the type of audience depends on the political power structure or environment in which the audience find themselves. In the United States, the audience could refer to the entire population or the Cabinet depending on the threat issue being examined. In the case of the UNSC, the audience would be both permanent and non-permanent members.

1.2.3 The application of Securitization

The environment of security is always engulfed in a situation where power is concentrated in the hands of the elite actors. Therefore, there is a strong need for this power to be deconstructed or balanced in security. For example, the security of the world is entrusted in the hands of the Permanent Five Membership (P5) but in recent times, countries such as the Brazil-Russia-India-China-South Africa and the Great Four which are Brazil, Germany, India and Japan have emerged strongly so a balance of power is needed because such new actors can also contribute towards international security. There are many necessary security actors present in today's world.

A security actor is a person, institution, state or group that puts forward a serious claim on an ongoing securitization issues. When there are more than one securitizing actors, there is bound to be a consensus among them before an effective securitization could be performed. It must however be noted that any claim by a securitizing actor must be legitimate because the legitimacy of the claim serves as another basis on which the feasibility of that claim is evaluated. Every securitizing actor has a chance to make and gain a claim in the security environment but some actors would always have a greater advantage and position in relation to the definition of security threats (Buzan et. al 1998 p.31). Therefore, the only way an issue would constitute a security issue is when it is recognized by those in advantaged positions (Waever, 1995 p.54).

The statist nature of the security environment is the reason why securitization processes have developed adverse effects on the global community (Krause and Williams, 1997 p.41). An example of such a situation where the statist nature of the power environment breeds serious negative consequences is the Global War on Terror (GWoT). The GWoT is spearheaded and dominated by the United States government and because of this there has been a very huge revival of political realism and the development of military security policies. In his publication *Security and the War on Terror,* Williams explained that the securitization of international terrorism by the United States has caused very important virtues such as human rights and human governance to be ignored from international security agenda (Williams, 2008:2 p.3).

1.2.4 Human security theory

Since the UNSC has the major task to maintain international security, one of the fundamental principles on which the peace is maintained. Human security ideas have become prominent in contemporary security development because the world is become more interdependent from time to time. Due to this interdependency feature, all states around the world need to have a representative at the UNSC. The individuals in every state is represented by the state itself but in the UNSC states in Africa and Middle East are not represented. This is a direct trample on the individual rights of citizens in those regions.

Human security is a pre-requisite for a strong human development. Contemporary international and global security revolves around the theory of human security. Traditionally, security was all about decisions made by the state and most of such decisions revolved around the wishes and benefits of the state as well. States' benefits at that time did not consider the interest of the masses that much. The state believed that they understood the interest of the citizens better, but it appears that they really do not understand it that better because the security interests of the citizens are not static. This has been confirmed by the modern security strategies used by many top countries especially in Europe and Asia.

The object of human security does not revolve around the state or society but rather the individual. This feature distinguishes it from the traditional concept of security which is centered on the activities of the state. The traditional concept of security seeks to protect only the state from all sorts of external threats that could endanger its sovereignty, territory or existence.

In her material, *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention*, Mary Kaldor highlighted the fact that people tend to believe so much in any international law which is formulated after a war. A similar situation happened after the two World Wars (Kaldor, 2007). The problem is not that the laws are not necessary or effective but the fact those laws change the thoughts of people who have been glued to them either through studying them, obeying them or both. The effect is that the more the ideas of people continue to be glued towards a particular set of laws, their thought about security becomes more problematic as time goes on.

According to the Bilgin (2003) human security is diverse but the most important aspects include economic security, food security, health security, environmental security, personal security, health security, community security, political security, food security and many more. Health, environmental, personal and community security are the most commonly known and practiced ones. However, political security.

The Commission on Human Security (CHS) tried to describe human security in a similar way as the UNDP but with a more expanded meaning. In a 2003 report by the CHS, the commission's description did not consider the threat towards the livelihood of mankind but rather examined human security as a kind of secured freedoms and

rights enjoyed by individuals. The definition also emphasizes that the management of human security involved integrated contributions from different actors such as the civil society, NGOs and regional institutions.

Most of our contemporary thoughts about security stem from the laws at the end of World War Two. These thoughts have long existed during the cold wars and they still exists in this modern era. In the 1990s, there was a slight shift in the direction of thoughts towards real conceptions such as humanitarianism, civil society and many more. The cold war thoughts had always perceived US as the supreme power over any other state.

Therefore, when the war on terrorism began, the world was faced with two competing paradigms of thoughts; the one which supported the US and its actions (good) and the one which respected the rule of law, human rights and global governance. Even though contemporary Europe is established based on the latter paradigm, there is still part of it (Europe) that is hooked on to the former paradigm stemming from the cold war.

1.3 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study was to examine the UNSC as a structure and the kind of reforms that are needed to maintain its dwindling legitimacy and efficiency. For the purpose of this study, this aim was translated into the three objectives which are stated below:

- Examining the cases on which expansion reforms are necessary for the UNSC permanent membership
- Reviewing the different positions of the P5 members on expansion reforms
- Examining the effect of Veto powers of the P5 on the effectiveness of the UNSC

1.4 Significance and Limitations of the Study

Most literature related to UNSC only describe the members of the UNSC and their roles in the responsibilities of the UNSC. However, an important concept, which is reforms, are rarely discussed into details. The farthest some discussions go is to examine the different proposals submitted to the UNSC for reforms. Very few of

them describe the reasons why reforms are needed and the type of reform that would be necessary. This study would contribute to the literature relating to UNSC by focusing on how expansion reforms could be implemented and its implications for both permanent and non-permanent members of the UNSC.

All the assessments made were limited to the timeframe of 2016 or earlier. Therefore, any changes beyond 2016 did not reflect in our discussion.

1.5 Research Questions

The aim and objectives of the thesis are achieved by answering some research questions in relation to the literature of the thesis:

- What are the approaches of the permanent members to the UNSC expansion?
- How would the UNSC expansion be effective to solve current world challenges?

1.6 Methodology

The thesis is an explorative study, which uses only secondary data to explain the various concepts in the literature review. Most of the data came from publications, articles, reports and working papers.

2. THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL AND ITS REFORMS

2.1 Historical Background of the UNSC

The UN Charter specifies in Article 24 section 1 that the primary responsibility of the UNSC, which is to maintain international peace and security, is conferred by its members and so all the members understand that every action taken by the UNSC in relation to security is on behalf of the members themselves. The UNSC has a tremendous array of powers and responsibilities, all confined under its umbrella but the primary objective of the Council is to maintain international peace and security. The UNSC also has the power to take decisions that bind all the members of the UN because, issues relating to security affects all the members of the UN. Article 23 of the United Nations Charter stipulates that the Security Council would consist of fifteen non-permanent and five permanent members.

International institutions mostly reflect the opposite of what great powers want to achieve, so great powers would forever have the perception that international institutions exist to prevent them from achieving their interests. This is why, most of the times some greater powers end up lobbying with these international organizations and end up controlling the affairs and operations of the institution at the expense of other powers. A clear example is the UNSC, Russia, China and the United States (USDD, 2005).

Examining this from an international relations perspective, idealists and constructivists do not support the thoughts of the great powers. Idealists especially believe that international organizations are necessary for the prevalence and projection of justice, fairness and transparency (Chimni, 2004). It must however be noted that the perceptions about international organizations and great powers contain some level of truth but the fact still remains that cooperation among the two would always be effective than them working individually.

The UNSC is one of the major organs of the United Nations and it is conferred with the main responsibility of maintaining international peace and security and also accepting new members into the United Nations. It also has the power to establish

peacekeeping operations, sanctions and military actions through Security Council Resolutions.

Before the United Nations was established, conflicts between nations were solved by using international treaties and there were also international treaties organizations that were in charge of these treaties. An example of such organizations was the International Committee of the Red Cross (Kennedy, 2006). Due to the excessive number of casualties resulting from the First World War, another international organization known as the League of Nations was established out of yet another treaty known as the Treaty of Versailles to calm the tensions that had risen among the nations in the war. The League of Nations recorded a lot of failures in performing its responsibilities. Most of the world powers were not significantly involved in its operations. The League of Nations also failed to act the 1931 Japanese invasion of Munchiara, the second Italo-Ethiopian War in 1935, the 1937 Japanese occupation of China and Nazi expansions under Adolf Hitler

Due to these and more failures, there was the need for the establishment of another international organization and that was where the idea of the United Nations was first formulated. The conception of the United Nations was used by Roosevelt when he described allied countries in the past. In 1942 Roosevelt of the US, Litinov of the USSR and Soong of China came together to sign a document which later attracted twenty-two other signatories from different nations. The document was known as the United Nations Declaration.

In 1944, the three countries were joined by the United Kingdom in a conference which was organized in Dumbarton Oaks in Washington to plan the establishment of a structure for the United Nations. During the conference, the major issue that was discussed was the establishment of the United Nations Security Council. As of 1945, there was a total of 47 signatories to the document. Among these 47 states, the United States, United Kingdom, USSR and China had formed an alliance which later came to be known as 'Four Policemen' (Urquhart, 1995 p.23). This term or name served as the basis for the formation of an executive branch of the United Nations called the Security Council.

At the Dumbarton Oaks Conference, France was selected as a result of a consensus among the big four to occupy the fifth permanent seat in the UNSC. United States

advocated for the selection of a sixth member, Brazil but USSR and United Kingdom vehemently opposed this selection (Meisler, 1995 p.6). The beginning of 1945 was used to deliberate on the issue of Veto power. Russia was the first to support such an idea followed by the United States and Britain.

Irrespective of the level of expectation that the countries demand from the UNSC, the Council sometimes fails to enforce certain decisions especially when the P5 do not come into agreement on the issue. Most of the time, it is Russia or China that becomes the party which disagrees with the other three. The Iran issue has created an anti-compromise line which finds the United States, United Kingdom and France on one side while Russia and China remain on the other. In other words, these five countries have never come to a compromise on a solution to stop Iran's nuclear attitudes.

Another case which presents ineffectiveness of the UNSC is when member states use sovereignty to prevent the Council from intervening especially when the issue directly concerns human rights violations. In the past, such cases have included that of Zimbabwe and Sudan. States prevent the UNSC from intervening in these cases by opposing the use of coercive or military force, which are strengths of the Council.

The third case in which the UNSC is seen as ineffective is that there are only few punishments for states who fail to perform their obligations. These punishments, which usually include resolutions for sanctions are even far from being strong even though they are effective most of the time.

In the nutshell, the UNSC is still an indispensable institution as far as the security of the globe is concerned. Despite being confronted with the dilemma of having to strike a balance between satisfying US national interest and maintaining international security with the support of other members, the Council still emerges as effective from the perception of the world. The fact remains that the UNSC needs the contributions of all the participants of all the members to attain the most stable international security possible.

The importance of the UNSC in most of the policies of the United States is inevitable therefore the United States cannot rule the Council out when it comes to policy making. United States can only play the role of leadership by integrating the rest of

the members with the UNSC to make sure that compromises are made in dicey situations that could go a long way to disrupt international peace.

Irrespective of the efforts of the United States towards expansion, France and the United Kingdom are considered as the most enthusiastic members in favor of expansion ideas concerning the UNSC. In many respects, this might be due to the constant 'threats' to the permanent seats of these two European countries or at least one of them. Somehow, many states believe that the representation of Europe with two countries is rather unfair to the world because other regions of the world do not even have representations at all. In other words, the UK and France feel vulnerable because the continuous calls for expansion are all about representation of other regions. Furthermore, the Lisbon Treaty has constantly increased the pressure on these two members by calling for the merging of the two seats to create a single seat for Europe. As an indirect response towards this seemingly 'treat', the UK and France in turn, proposed the creation of renewable seats on the terms of five to fifteen years.

The position of Russia is already known to be an opposing one. Russia opposes two major aspects of reforms pertaining to expansion. First, they oppose the admission of additional members into the permanent five memberships and secondly they oppose any attempts to review the concept of Veto of the P5. China, on the other hand, has stated that it is open to any expansion actions but they vehemently stressed that there was the need to include an African representative as well. For China, a true expansion must consider Africa because of recent growing security concerns on issues such as migration and refugee problems. However, China's support or expansion comes with preferences because they do not really support the idea of Japan and India being added to the permanent members. China believes that the addition of two or more members from the same region would not only create new problems but would also compound the existing ones.

The fact that there was a very destructive war preceding the creation of the UNSC is enough to make the Council a strong counter threat institution, sometimes with force and sometimes with diplomacy. The five permanent members United States, China, France, United Kingdom and Russia control the affairs of the Council and it seems they would be doing so for quite a long time. Even though the UN Charter did not specify that geographical location was some criteria for granting permanent

membership, many regions in the world feel that their regions are not represented fairly in the permanent seats therefore there must be an amendment that would take care of such unfairness. Another reason why enlargement is necessary is that the members of the United Nations has increased from 51 to 192 and so the idea of five countries representing 192 states does not really sound ideal. In other words, five states cannot take decisions on behalf of 192 members of an institution. It would have been better off if it were only one country with a few states reporting to it than five states being on behalf of the huge number of states involved.

These two reasons above present a strong case for amendment of the structure of the Council. However, the preferred amendment could be enlargement because the five members have established a historically strong bond that would breed devastating consequences when broken. That is to say, it would be better to welcome new members on board than to discard old members for new ones. The global security trend has changed over the years and new states are emerging from regions, which are not represented fairly.

Apart from this fact, there are other states, which fund the United Nations as an institution such as Japan and Germany, but they also do not have permanent memberships. Africa does not have any representatives at all but in terms of security, there are countries such as Nigeria and South Africa that can match any standards set by the great powers. At least if the African states would not be in the same standard with the great states, they would not have a lot to learn or improve on.

Proponents of enlargement for the UNSC have warned of future failures of the Council if an expansion is not undertaken because the security dimensions would not reverse and they are getting complex with time. However, a successfully orchestration expansion process could enhance power management in the future by engaging regional powers in occasional power transitions. The inevitability of expansion must be a motivating factor for the United States to lead the process earlier and stop wasting time.

Most of the developing countries have doubts concerning the legitimacy and effectiveness of the UNSC. These doubts were because of the unequal geographic composition of the permanent five, Declining relevance of the Council's operation to

today's threat dimensions, Failure to comply with binding resolutions and Exclusion of countries with equal military powers as the P5.

If the claims of the developing states are also true, then the UNSC is really in a very critical state that needs urgent reforms.

From the point of view of the permanent members, the UNSC is in perfect state discharging its legitimate duties and responsibilities according to the UN Charter so there is no need for reform, at least not for now.

Critics also believe that the UNSC is no position to issue binding international decisions in certain regions such as Africa because the whole continent is not even represented in the permanent five membership but ironically, that is where most of the UN peacekeeping operations take place.

The calls for expansion, of course, come with various oppositions. Critics painted a very positive picture of the UNSC and its operations by comparing it with other previous international organizations such as the League of Nations. According to these critics, the UNSC has been far more effective than the League of Nations and so there is no need for any expansion or replacement whatsoever.

Most policy makers and scholars who argue against expansion are Americans who believe that any expansion process, whether expansion or replacement would reduce the influence or control of the United States, empower antagonistic leaders and increase gridlock. In other words, most critics believe that American hegemony would be seriously threatened by any amendments in the Council structure. Therefore, critics believe that US must not lead a reform that would threaten its own influence or jeopardize its interest.

Would the expansion end the demands for regional representation? Those who are not in support of expansion also argued that any expansion procedure would open the way for other regions to ask for representation but virtually, not every region in the world could be represented. As stated earlier on in the previous chapter, candidates from unrepresented regions do not even receive support from the fellow regional states and examples of China not supporting Japan's permanent candidacy, Pakistan not supporting India's candidacy has been explained in the previous chapter. According to critics of expansion, the regional representation problem cannot be solved permanently with the admission of regional representatives but rather it would

create ill feelings among two or more powers in a particular region and it would be too late for any kind of replacement to be done. For example, if Latin America does not support Brazil enough to be granted permanent membership, does that mean the UNSC should accept Venezuela in place of Brazil?

The last but not the least argument of the critics of expansion was that, candidates must be assessed or supported based on their ability to combat international threats to stabilize the peaceful and secured atmosphere rather than them bring regional leaders.

During the period when the UNSC was established, international and global security were only threatened by wars which usually begin with internal conflicts. Therefore, the capabilities of the permanent members were evaluated by their military capacities.

In recent times, many publications have confirmed the fact that great powers derived major benefits from international institutions as compared to some years ago (Ikenberry, 2001). In this contemporary era, the UNSC does not even have any major restrictions on the actions of the great powers. The fact that these great nations have Veto powers is enough to confirm that the only restriction they have is to come to a compromise with the other members on a particular issue. Apart from this, nothing else really matters. In fact, other issues such concerning allies, national interests and so on, all revolve around the level of compromise among the permanent members powers.

In the history of international organizations, none of them institutionalized privileges for great than the UN Charter does. The great and powerful nations in the world, especially United States believe that when organizations do not operate with institutionalized privileges, the become mediocre institutions. That is why institutions such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) are seen as very important economic and financial institution (Byers and Nolte, 2003 p.149)

Surprisingly, all attempts to formalize the dominance of institutions have failed in the past because the UN Charter never really encouraged or made provisions for anything opposite to equality. After the First World War, some states began doubting the effectiveness of their operations because they were operating based on the

principle of sovereign equality but there was the need for stronger institutions to be established.

One of the conditions with which stronger institutions could be established at that time was to provide privileges for the great powers. The Veto was one of the greatest privileges ever provided for the permanent members of the UNSC. Referring back to the San Francisco Conference, the great powers confirmed that they would never compromise on issues concerning Veto irrespective of the different proposals from smaller states for a transformation. The only option the smaller states had was to accept an organization with privileges for the few because any other option meant that there wouldn't have been any stronger organization at all.

The contemporary reality is that different states are emerging with strong security and economic details such as India and Brazil so this situation might exert a bit pressure on the kind of privileges provided for the greater powers but at the end of the day, the Veto privilege would still remain the same because permanent membership status comes along with the Veto and they are absolutely inseparable (Berween, 2002 p.45).

As explained in earlier on, the concept of Veto has a very unusual way of promoting unity among the permanent members particularly Russia and United States. This has been displayed on many occasions where the two had to compromise among themselves before carrying the other three members along. An example of such a case was during the Iran-Iraq War in 1986, where the US and Soviet Union had to conduct information meetings to discuss salient issues even before actual Council meetings (Bailey and Daws, 1998).

The unity among the permanent members is also a keen way of preventing smaller states from intervening in high decisions because they only chance the smaller states would have is when the issue comes into the public domain after closed door meetings have been held and it is time to vote. However, the permanent members also have the duty to defend the kind of decisions they make behind closed doors when they come into the public domain. The permanent states have actually reduced their use of Veto over the decade but they always find ways to remind other countries that they still have the power to veto any decision is they want (Mahbubani, 2004 p. 259).

There are also informal cell groups within the Council which mostly consist of few states with a common interest irrespective of whether they have permanent or non-permanent membership. These groups are known as 'Groups of Friends'. Due to their informal status, the farthest they could go with their operations and decisions is to draft Council resolutions. 'Group of Friends' presents a win-lose situation for the UNSC because, in as much as it enhances the effectiveness of the Council, it also presents an opportunity for the permanent members to extend their influence over the Council the more.

Non-member states and non-permanent member states had managed to sustain their complaints about veto for a very long period of time. It was not as if the Council had ignored such complaints but rather, the Council had failed to respond satisfactorily to those complaints. Efforts aimed at improving the transparency of the Council had not been excellent even though they had still managed to achieve some progress. Quite frankly, certain measures had been implemented to limit the influence of the great powers and some of these measures included:

- The reduction of information meetings
- The provision of accessibility to draft resolutions for non-members
- The introduction of public meetings involving non-member states
- The widening of public audience to include NGOs

The measures stated above did not absolutely solve the problem of representation and participation of non-members but at least they went long way to remedy some hitches and some imbalances in the UNSC in the mid- 1990s(Mahbubani, 2004 p.201).These measures were also directly in line with the objectives of placing a limit on the privileges given to greater powers or states in the Council but so far, these measures have proved futile as far as limitations of privileges for the great powers are concerned.

The only tool that had been successful in placing limitations on the how great powers use the Council was the invocation of norms. When it comes to normative tools, the unity of the permanent members become insignificant and so do their Veto powers. Non-member states usually invoked the norms to challenge certain decisions by the great powers and it had been effective in many occasions but most of the time, it worked only against cases that involved sanctions such as Libya and Iraq. Therefore,

the Council was quick to realize that sanctions had become less effective because of normative reasons.

The UNSC could not abandon sanctions completely but was able to channel them towards individuals instead of nations but after a while, the new form of sanctions were also abandoned because they usually targeted innocent individuals. This was a total violation of the rule of law and so the Council had to review its sanctions policies after complaints were lodged in by countries such as Sweden. The whole idea of these normative claims was that the permanent members needed to consult a broader range of states before taking certain decisions. At least when seven or more non-permanent states were consulted during decision making, it was highly probable that the decision could be accepted.

In some extreme cases, the support for decisions was sought regionally. This meant that when a decision revolved around a state in a particular region, countries from other regions could be deliberately involved in the decision making process as well. In that case, the scope of engagement of states becomes wide and the decision would be accepted by the Council quickly. To make this explanation clear, the case of Haiti was an obvious example. During the intervention in Haiti, the United States sought support by involving countries in both Latin America and the Caribbean in their decisions and operations. The US was commended for such a gesture because Brazil would have resisted the decision of US to intervene but since Latin America and Caribbean consents were sought, Brazil reversed its decisions to challenge the resolution of the Council that allowed US to make decisions concerning intervention (Malone, 2004b p.631).

The first set of resolutions are the ones that exert the most general or softest form of pressure on the parties involved in the conflict. A resolution such as the SC Resolution 1674 might have a relatively limited effect but it vehemently expresses the basic priorities of the UNSC. The main function of the SC Resolution 1674 is to outline the law which protects journalists and citizens during an armed conflict or war (UNSC, 2006).

The second set of resolutions enables the UNSC to exert pressure on parties in an armed conflict to comply with specific elements concerning humanitarian law. In this case the UNSC would only be concerned about those areas or elements that have

been violated by those parties. The UNSC might focus on groups of violators, regions of violations, international conventions or individual violators.The first way through which the UNSC focuses on certain elements of humanitarian law is when it calls out selected humanitarian law violators such as Taliban, ISIS or Al Shabab.

The secondway through which the UNSC focuses on certain elements of humanitarian law is when it addresses specific regions such as Kivus and Kisangani.The third way through which the UNSC exercises pressure for compliance of specific elements of humanitarian law is the invocation of international conventions. Such conventions confer obligations on all the parties involved in the conflict to protect human rights. Example of such convention is the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide in 1948. The fourth way through which the UNSC uses resolutions to exert pressure on parties in an armed conflict is by focusing on specific acts violation or individual violators.

The third set of resolutions are used by the UNSC to exert pressure on the parties involved in armed conflicts by providing for institutional measures. In this case the UNSC makes sure that investigations are conducted into various violations. The mandate for such investigations are normally charged towards the Secretary General and peacekeeping officers. The Secretary General must submit reports to the Counciland make recommendations to certain organs of the UN on better ways to protect civilians during an armed conflict.

2.1.1 Non- authorized military operations

The five permanent members of the UNSC are authorized to use force in certain extreme cases but only under specific mandates from the General Assembly. Such cases may involve more than self-defense. When such authorization is put to use, the country or countries exhibiting the force must do so under national control or command. Some of the actions which can be performed with UN –authorized force includes.

Supporting sanctions with coercion such as the support of sanctions in Iraq and Yugoslavia by naval forces in 1990 and 1992 respectively.

- Retaliation actions against an adversary such as the case of North Korea
- Forceful state interventions such as Operation Turquoise by France in 1994
- A necessary peace settlement case such as that of the Kosovo Force (KFOR)

The use of the UN authorized military force can be problematic if any permanent or non-permanent members of the UNSC do not agree for one of them to use the force. An example of such a situation occurred in 2003 when United States claimed that the UN resolutions allowed it to use force to implement a cease fire against Iraqi forces but the other countries did not agree. They wanted the UN to reiterate the authority that would allow them to use force in invading Iraq and also ensuring a regime change. Till today, the UN cannot reconcile the tensions between states that demand to use force and states that do not agree. Only the United States has managed to use force in extreme cases since 1960. United Kingdom is always caught between the idea of using force and the quest of maintaining peace.

2.2 Reform Proposals for Expansion of UNSC

The Security Council has seen a lot of calls by members for different reforms in different areas of the Council and its operations. Those calling for reforms also believe that it is one of the most prominent ways of enhancing the legitimacy of the Council. United States has always supported the idea that Japan and India must be added to the permanent membership of the UNSC. United Kingdom and France on the other hand, supported the accession of Germany and Brazil into permanent membership but unfortunately it has not materialized. As stated earlier on, China has always defended the idea of introducing developing countries into the permanent membership but since China is the only supporter of developing or third world countries, the four members always find a way to block such suggestions with their veto powers.

Russia is also in supported of India being admitted as a permanent member but this kind of support is based on the fact that Russia and India are allies. It has been two decades since reforms have been requested by both permanent and non-permanent members. The reason why expansion is so needed is that the global political scene is changing rapidly and constantly. India's position reforms in UNSC is directly in line with the ideas of both Russia and the United States.

India believed that the UNSC has expanded over the years and if the UNSC must succeed for a longer period, the reforms must be able to attract political support from the international community. Despite the support India is getting from some Great powers or allies in the UNSC, India in turn advocates for other developing countries

to be included. Note that there is a difference between developing countries and third world countries. Third world countries simply mean non-Western countries but they could also be developing countries in some circumstances. Third world and developing countries feel that the UNSC is not considering their own grievances and contributions when making decisions. Currently, the UNSC has failed to yield to its representation function (Okumu, 2005).

Despite the radical nature of Russia, it still recognizes the need for reforms but Russia would only veto when it finds out that the reforms would not favor them or any other ally country of theirs. Because of the radical ideas of Russia, they strongly advocate that any reform in the UNSC must be done rationally. Simultaneously, the UNSC must uphold the principles of multilateralism and integrity upon which the UN Charter was established. Expansion of the UNSC would increase the efficiency of its operations.

Portugal did not only call for an enlargement in the permanent membership of the council but also the non-permanent membership. In a speech made by the Portuguese Prime Minister, Jose Socrates in 2010, he explained that it is very necessary for the 15-member Security Council to be enlarged so that more members would be included. He believed that when more members are added it would enhance the transparency and efficiency of the UNSC (UNDP, 1994). Portugal also believes that Brazil and India are both economically sound and deserve to be added as new permanent members

Nkoana-Mashabane (2011) also agreed to the fact that the UNSC urgently needs many reforms to correct the inequitable power distribution in the council. It has been 15 years since the since the issue of UNSC reforms were introduced in the agenda of the United Nations. In his opinion, the United Nations is far behind in time about six decades or so. Due to this redundancy, the council is not updated in line with the current political happenings around the globe.

Most of the reform calls are related towards the reviewing of both permanent and non-permanent memberships while other reform calls are related to the scope of the Veto power. In 2005, there was a major attempt at reforms in these two areas as against the two previous attempts in 1963 and 1993 but all these three reforms failed

woefully. Despite their failure, they highlighted some weaknesses in the Council and that was why there was a need for another reform to take place.

The 1963 attempt resulted in a change in the number of non-permanent members while the 1993 attempt changed the negotiation process of the Council but the overall objectives were not achieved. This was because the major objective was not to change the number of non-permanent members but rather to include more developing country representatives (Zacker, 2004 pp 214,215). Negotiation processes changed dramatically in 1993 and this was greatly influenced by the end of the Cold War. The changes that occurred in negotiation processes included the fact that NGOs and non-state members are now allowed to participate in Council meeting and there are more major consultations between the current P5 and other major powers such as Germany and Japan.

Apart from these two positive changes, the UNSC also allows the international media access to the minutes of any Council meeting. After reviewing most of the reform proposals from different countries, the UN Secretary General at that time Kofi Annan presented two major options for UNSC member states in 2005. The two options all had the objective of increasing the UNSC membership from fifteen to twenty-four but none of the options stipulated a changed in the number of Veto exercising states

The first option proposed that there should be six permanent members where one would be chosen from Europe, one from the Americas, two from Africa and two from Asia. In addition, there would be three new Non-permanent Members on a non-renewable two-year term. The second proposal presented by the UN Secretary General was that there would be no permanent seats at all but rather eight Semi-permanent Members elected on a regional basis for a renewable four-year term; and one new Non-permanent Member on a nonrenewable two-year term.

The second proposal option was not welcomed by many states at all, and most of these states had been lobbying the UNSC for permanents seats for a long time. Therefore, that option was practically not acceptable in their own perspective. Two states that presented strong opposition against the second option were Germany and Japan. Due to the numerous oppositions against the second option, the first option was also affected and in the end, the UN could not enforce both options.

2.2.1 Causes of reform failures

The three reforms that failed to materialize at the UNSC have been attributed to the refusal of the P5 members who do not want to share their power with other states but there are also some regional dynamics that contributed to such failures over the years. The first major reason why the reform proposals failed was that they all considered the problems of the Council from the wrong angle. The mistake was that the proposals blamed the structure of the UNSC for the existing problems but arguably, the problems of the UNSC persisted because they were so complex to tackle and the capacity of the members should have the major concern rather than the structure of the UNSC.

According to Edward Luck, the reform proposals failed because they revolved more around the size of the UNSC rather than concentrating on real issues such as transparency, accountability and equality because many states have improved both in economic and military terms and he believed that cooperation with such rising states would be the greatest thing that could have ever happened to the UNSC (Luck, 2006). To support this fact, the history of the UNSC has been consistent and effective since the end of the Cold War so the claims of the proposal were false.

The second major reason why the proposals could not work was that they could not make representatives a proxy for legitimacy. The Security Council always tried to balance state representatives with its core objectives because it was afraid to repeat the same mistakes, which occurred during the era of the League of Nations (Luck, 2006). However, expansion of members could have been another way through which its legitimacy could have been confirmed because the principle of equality would have come into display.

The third reason for the failure of the reform proposals was the fact that the mechanism of Regional Groupings undermined the idea of expansion instead of enhancing it. This was because Regional Groupings or Divisions created oppositions between two states in cases where one was already a permanent member and the other was an aspiring candidate. For example, in 2005, China strongly opposed the admission of Japan into permanent membership while Pakistan opposed the admission of India into permanent membership as well. Therefore, different kinds of

questions were asked about the expansion process and some of the questions included:

- Would new members actually represent their regions?
- Would they simply be from those regions?

These two questions were unable to be answered by the two proposals and coincidentally, many countries really wanted the questions to these answers and since they could not find them in the two reform proposals, the UN considered the proposal as handicapped.

The fourth reason for the failure of the proposals was that there was no clearly defined consultation process with other member states and NGOs therefore the transparency of the Council was questioned by actors. This undermined the expansion reforms as well.

2.2.2 Oligarchy and Veto power

The Security Council is just a security institution but the reality is that the key behind the success of this institution is actually the unity between the United States, United Kingdom and the Soviet Union (Russia). Many decisions that could have resulted in wars have been taken peacefully over the years because of the unanimity between these three countries. Critics who complain about the scope of Veto power for the P5 often forget that such power also comes with a huge security responsibility which many countries are not capable of assuming.

Furthermore, the P5 countries have many things in common when it comes to the history of international and global security. Even though there are certain limitations and restrictions among the P5 members, their unity is required when it comes to matters concerning global or international security. In other words, security solutions rest with the great powers which have the capacity to manage the military situation of the globe and his reality was declared by President Roosevelt in 1943 when he described the concept of Four Policemen which were China, United States, United Kingdom and Russia.

Amidst the debate concerning the governance of the P5 over military decisions, many scholars have doubted the prospects of any cooperation involving Russia. Such doubt has existed since the end of the Cold War even though Russia has given the

world less reason to underestimate its integrity. According to Wells, the Soviet was seen as the enemy of the world before the end of the Cold War so the true intentions and operations of Russia in relation to the security stability of the world depends on the relations it would build with other great powers.

Before the Cold War, the Soviet Union was seen as a destructive force but after the cold war, the relationship between Russia and major powers have transformed them into a constructive force. In other words, Russia is a very crucial force in relation to the future security stability of the globe. At the end of the cold war, the United States and United Kingdom knew that it was better for them to approach Russia jointly with any idea of post war organization rather than appearing as individual states.

In July 1945, the United Kingdom claimed that the idea of Four Policemen began in their country and the original idea was to enforce cooperation among the four great powers in aspects of security. Such a claim was supported by Gladwyn Jebb but there were many other authors that did not agree with Jebb. There were even British public officials who commended the concept of the Four Policemen but most of them were not concerned about its origins. In their own opinion, the United Kingdom should rather prefer to be associated to the Four Policemen concept by their global contributions rather than as pacesetters. One of the public officials that disagreed with Jebb was Lord Halifax.

2.2.3 Use of Veto for allies of great powers

The purpose of the UN Security Council Reform in 2000 was to enhance three qualities of the council which were representation, effectiveness and legitimate so that the world would increase their confidence in the institution. All these three qualities represented expansion or enlargement of the council. However, the enlargement process was highly influenced by the 'veto' of the great powers.

As long as the 'veto' power exists, it would be very difficult for one of those permanent UNSC members to be replaced whatever the case might be except the replacing state is an ally of two or more top members. This kind of special status enjoyed by the 5 permanent members makes it very difficult for certain decisions to be taken because if those decisions do not favor them, it would never be a successful decision. The United Nations cannot undertake any decision that is opposed by the

United States. On a normal day, if the US offers its support to any UN proposal, such support should be highly considered, with or without veto.

The permanent membership of the UNSC is continentally inappropriate because two out of five of the members are European countries while Asia is represented by only China. A US-Europe tie is tighter and stronger than a US-China tie to an extent. Inevitably, third world countries are also represented by China, which means that there is a limit to which third world countries could look up to the United Nations, especially when it comes to security issues.

The hope of third world countries in the UNSC depends on China and this was confirmed when Robert Mugabe, the Zimbabwean President implored China to step in and prevent Harare from being discussed on the UNSC agenda by Britain. Mugabe believed that bringing Harare to the UNSC agenda was an unnecessary move and he did not want that. John Sigler highlighted on the great connection between the US and its allies. According to him, the United States would use its veto power to prevent any sanction of the UNSC against its allies especially Israel, even if it is just a resolution.

The case between Syria and Israel in 2003 was a perfect example. US vetoed a resolution proposed by Syria aimed at denouncing Israel's threat to remove then Palestinian Leader Yasser Arafat. A report from Washington declared the resolution as 'flawed' because it failed to address the terrorism acts going on Palestine at the time. Another instance where the United States stood in for Israel was when US blocked a resolution which criticized the killings by Israeli Forces and the destruction of a World Food Programmed warehouse in West bank (Toameh, 2018).

The fact has been established that Veto power undermines many positive activities within the UNSC. However, one positive thing about the UNSC permanent members is the multilateralism factor displayed (The Southern Times, 2005). Whenever the five permanent members reach consensus, it becomes an effective and sharp tool which facilitates international peace and security. From an institutional perspective, the insertion of veto into the Charter made the United Nations persist longer than the League of Nations.

Without the concept of veto power, some of the Great Powers would not have been members of the UNSC as of this time because they would have deserted along with

the League of Nations. The concept of Veto in the UNSC could be compared to a fuse. When it is burning, it would be wise to have the fuse blown rather than have the whole house burn down in flames.

The world has seen a very reasonable period of power balance between the states with the highest security details but not much has changed about the UN Security Council. The United Nations almost came to a point of failure because most of its sections could not adjust toward the current trends of politics over the years. There have been many calls to amend the structures in the UNSC because many countries are of the opinion that the level of fairness involved is far less. At least there should be a member in the permanent 5 who would represent other countries except the ones in the permanent group.

The President of Sri Lanka, Chandrika Kumaratunga believes that the UNSC needs to take more responsibility concerning its membership acceptance criteria. His speech was supported by the Zambian President Levy Mwanawasa, who believed that it was not right for the 'holly' members of the council to undertake all strategic actions and decisions among themselves (Mboka, 2005).

There should be some form decentralization that would make the views and ideas of other countries count too. Even the Secretary General knew that it was time for some changes to be made in the UNSC but the problem was that those changes could not be made without all the veto-wielding members coming to a compromise because that is the requirement of Article 108 of the U.N. Charter.

Can there be any situation where Article 108 of the Charter could be amended? The chances of this action are actually very slim because the so-called Great powers are very contented with the way power is shared among them.

Many states are satisfied with power sharing rather than striving to maximize it. Other members have downplayed their unilateral powers in the name of friendly relations with other countries. Reduction of or contention with power is a strategy used by the Great powers to obtain national interests without making the less superior countries feel inferior. With such strategy, it has been proven that less becomes more in the end. Such strategy does not use military force but rather a set of diplomatic tactics, which have been branded to look like cooperation.

The best veto-power could do is to foster cooperation but prevent the actual implementation or action from taking place. In most cases, the veto-wielding countries use their power for their own national interest, if the decision would favor their country. When the decision would favor one country in the veto and become a detriment to the other, there would surely not be any consensus at all. Most of the issues where consensus is not achieved revolved around serious global political discussions such as security, conflicts, climate, hunger, elections, war and many more.

In the past, the United States and Britain could not agree with the other seven veto members concerning the imposing of economic sanctions on South Africa in the 1980s. France and Britain have also been recorded to have prevented certain actions concerning the Suez Canal in 1956(Verbeek, 2003 p.255) while the United States alone also refused action on Vietnam in 1960 (Summers, 1999).

The consideration of the interests of the permanent members has now increased over time, therefore any country that comes up against the five permanent members knows that there is a very slim chance of winning against them in any world issue. Currently, Russia and China are ready to veto any decision to punish Iran because of the drive to take charge of their nuclear cycle.

2.2.4 Neglecting the core proposition of the UNSC

The events surrounding expansion or enlargement of the UNSC have been very complex and cumbersome just like the events leading towards its establishment. As of 1945, there were serious debates surrounding its formation and reforms but very few debates surrounded the core proposition of the Council. The question is 'What was the core proposition of the Council?' The core proposition was to identify and deal with major threats to international peace and security but sadly, the attention that has been given to this proposition could not be compared with the attention directed towards the formation and reformation of the Council.

The problem was that members states were so divided on the issue of membership and Veto to the extent that the major objective of the Council was overlooked. The Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan, was fully aware that member state had the perception that the UNSC had an anachronistic structure so the idea of power being concentrated among few members was totally wrong. The perception of such

members were redefined in 1965 when the Council expanded from eleven to fifteen even though it had nothing to do with the permanent five members (Weiss, 2005).

Member states also had divided perceptions about regional representatives in the permanent states. Countries in every region have their own sentiments as to why a particular country must not be granted permanent status. The current five permanent members of the UNSC have not really yielded to the expectations of the public therefore the world is still having doubts as to whether extension would even work because the existing members would still be there.

Ironically, many countries have opposed the admission of certain states as members or even candidates but not so many countries have shown their support for any idea of replacement of the permanent members. This speaks a lot about how nations appreciate the Security Council as an institution. No matter how bad some states wanted reforms and reviews of the scope of the Veto, they still acknowledged the efforts of the five permanent members so far. Since the end of the Cold War, many things have changed with respect to how the UNSC operated. There have been positive changes in the meetings, operations, missions and enforcement actions of the Council. As a result of this, cases of conflicts, refugees and other violence forms have reduced drastically.

Sometimes one is tempted to view reforms as unnecessary for the Council but looking at it from another angle, the reforms might be in a positive direction even though the actions of the Council so far have been progressive. Nevertheless, it must be noted that the Council still has a long way to go. The reforms may also be capable to transform the activities of the Council to reflect the contemporary dimensions of international security because the security direction of the globe keeps changing day in day out.

Critics have over the years, concluded that the calls for expansion in the UNSC were simply aimed at improving the relevance, credibility and legitimacy of the Council but over the years, the Council has proven that these qualities are still intact. Discussions concerning any expansion activities must revolve also around the thorough revision of the UN Charter, or at least that must be a starting point. Amending the UN Charter is not an ordinary process because the approval of two thirds of the UN member states is needed. Since the Charter was established, there

have been only three major revisions but it was only the 1965 revision which made provisions for an expansion of the UN Security Council. Since then, there has not been any expansion whatsoever of the UNSC and subsequently no expansion of the UNSC P5 as well. As of 2008, the US public exhibited their support for expansion after a poll exercise was conducted, and the favorite candidates that emerged included Germany, Japan, Brazil and India.

2.3 International Laws

International laws describe a judicial structure which explains a single form of international restriction to various states. In this setting, there are a set of specified and accepted rules which states could apply to solve or minimize the problems they have with other states. The international laws exist to minimize or diffuse the tensions that could rise between two or more countries due to their different views of world affairs.

Every state pursues its national interest and sometimes, the national interest of one country might lead them to encroach another state's territory or properties. To avoid wars, laws have to be formulated to control such tensions. For the laws to be easy for states to obey, each state would have to tune their domestic laws in line with the standards of international laws. International laws do not only deal with security issues but also trade and economic issues as well. However, priority is given to security issues because if security issues are not solved effectively, other problems cannot be dealt with. International laws rarely support the use of military intervention except in extreme cases where the laws cannot be effective due to extreme violations.

One problem with international laws is that there is no global institution that implements its laws. Most of its provisions are implemented by either regional or international organizations such as the AU, EU, NATO and many more. Another institutional problem associated with international laws is that there is no global institution that punishes violators of international laws. Some scholars often make the mistake of thinking that the International Court of Justice (ICJ) is that kind of institution. However, the ICJ also has a limitation because every decision it takes must be consented by the states in conflict. Therefore, when decisions are taken at the international level by the ICJ, the option to implement or not to implement is left to the states in the question.

There have been many lapses in the activities of the UNSC and most of these lapses come from the inability of the UNSC to perform its responsibilities in terms of security. Examples of cases in which the full ability of the UNSC has not been fulfilled are the Crimea and Syria cases. The responsibility for international peace has not been fulfilled in these two cases and any argument against such a fact would need to examine the two sides of the debate; realist or liberalist view.

The effectiveness of the UNSC depends on the nature of global politics during the period of review. In the times of a multipolar world, there was a huge equality and balance in global power and therefore major powers would want to use their veto to the full. That is to say, as the world becomes more multipolar oriented, there is bound to be more disagreements between the members of the Security Council. The liberal conception of security encompasses the combination of international laws, international organizations, political integration and democratization (Badalan, 2009 p.73).

Regional laws on the other hand, are decided by regional authorities such as African Union and the European Union. These institutions also apply the standards of international laws and furthermore, they synchronize the various domestic laws of their members into regional laws. Therefore, in the nutshell, all the laws become similar and easy to obey (Jutersonke, 2008 p.189). Laws also regulate the economic relationship between states. Laws are a way of solving issues between states without using military interventions.

The only problem with international laws is that there is no global organization which oversees activities between all states around the globe. It is either between two or more states and not all states.

When it comes to issues concerning security, the five permanent members of the UNSC are governed by both international laws and bilateral laws between them. France and United Kingdom have bilateral security arrangements such as the Combined Joint Expeditionary Forces (CJEF) and the Continuous at Sea Deterrence (CASD) because they are the only countries in Europe who have nuclear weapons and the only EU countries in the UNSC. Therefore, their cooperation on security would be on both domestic levels, regional levels as well as international levels. France and United Kingdom have common interests and are facing common threats

such as terrorism, nuclear proliferation and cyberattack. The two countries also have similar budgetary requirements for security.

Security arrangements of the UNSC do not correlate with the concept of collective security because the UN Charter does not allow for such a system. This is why the five permanent members (P5) of the UNSC cannot have any action taken against them by non-permanent members of the UNSC. Even among the P5, actions cannot be taken against each other. The UNSC cannot also mandate any action against the ally of its members without the compromise of the member (s).

All these are made possible because of the Veto power held by the P5. Most member countries have criticized the Veto power concept but the UN benefits from it because it saves time and resources which could have otherwise been wasted in planning outrageous actions against the p5 and their allies.

The concept of collective security simply refers to a global or regional system in which every state in that system considers security as a prime concern for all other states, therefore any action to be taken would be considered by all the member states so far as the action breaches security or is considered as a threat to the peace of all or any member.

The basic assumption of collective security is that the threat might come from one or more of the member states in the system so other states need to be concerned if a situation like that arises. Collective security is quite different from alliance systems in the sense that, an alliance system considers few countries which might have the same threat or opposition to deal with. However, the threats of members in a collective security system might be different but since it breaches security, other members must also raise concern. An alliance system also stands against threats in other sectors such as economic, social, energy and political but a collective security system is only there to tackle security threats to maintain peace.

2.4 International Organizations and Political Integration

The international laws would be useless if there are no organizations to implement and evaluate it at all and that is the reason why there are international organizations as well. As mentioned earlier on, organizations such as the African Union and the European Union are examples of international organizations. Other examples include

United Nations, NATO, OSCIE and IFM. United Nations operates in a more global front than all the other organizations. These organizations only function because of the consensus of states to participate in activities stipulated by the organizations.

There are also treaties governing many relations and activities between member states of each organization. Some states also have common objectives and therefore cooperation at the highest level is very necessary for the achievement of such objectives most of which are political in nature. This is where states begin to create institutions, which have greater authorities than them to supervise or manage the activities of member states. Such a process is known as the political integration. It could be security, economic, political or social oriented. The European Union, for example, was formed based on the Maastricht Act.

However, the friendly relations between any two or more states must not be used as a tool or yardstick during decision making especially when it involves security issues. According to Magisterium, such variables such as race, sex, language, religion and friendly relations between states must be set aside when dealing with security matters because these variables are capable of influencing accurate security decisions (Miga-Besteliu, 2006:10).

The last component of the liberalist perspective is democratization. Liberalists believe that the only way states could avoid war is when every government becomes effective to the brim. Effectiveness of a government is determined by the level of democracy in that state. Democracy facilitates peace and then peace in turn facilitates economic prosperity.

IOs play a central role when it comes to a wide range of issues including security. The variations in IOs stem from the different scopes for which they are established. Some are meant from global purposes, others are meant for regional and international. When it comes to membership, some international organizations weigh some of their members while others consider equality.

The different purposes of international organizations can affect the activities of the institutions themselves. States also manipulate institutions to achieve their own interests. Constructivists argue that international institutions play a vital role in spreading global norms. Realists on the other hand, have an opposing view to that of

the constructivists. In their opinion, they believe that international institutions are secret organizations used by the state for selfish purposes.

It is very hard to see an international institution with full autonomous power from the state. Some states spend their time and resources construction international institutions to aid their national interests on the international front. States contemplate on the particular design for international organizations because they know that the design can affect the results of their activities. It is very difficult for international organizations to adapt to the growing power of states.

Centralization has its advantages and disadvantages but it is different from the concept of centralized enforcement. Centralization encompasses a range of activities performed by groups of leaders or a particular leader with other members being limited from having the same opportunity in decision making. An example is the UNSC. The organization is part of the UN but it has only five permanent members who support or repel decisions by way of veto.

2.5 Significance of Regional Organizations in UNSC Reform

As far as EU is concerned, the legitimacy of the UNSC and its role in peacekeeping has not been up to standards or expectations over the last two decades after failed instances in Kosovo, Iraq and Syria. As nations have failed to perform their mandates in relation to international peace and security, it has become increasingly important for regional organizations to assume such responsibilities. This is why the EU and African Union have increased their effort to sustain their international peace and security.

In many ways, scholars often question the legitimacy of the UNSC on intervention decisions (Buchanan and Keohane, 2011). According to some scholars, the UNSC has totally been ineffective when it comes to interventions because it has failed to use multilateralism to address conflict issues. Some authors also explained that it is important for the UNSC to share the responsibility among regional and global security agencies.

The idea of shared responsibility could be one of the best solutions for maintaining the legitimacy of the UNSC. This means that one of the UNSC can have a more concise image in terms of effectiveness can be better represented at the UNSC with

less disagreements and more recognition is to embark on a UNSC reform, which would provide seats for delegates from all over the globe.

Surprisingly, this solution has not been easy to implement at all due to legal and operational constraints because Article 4 of the UN Charter does not really make provisions for delegates or states from all over the world but rather for delegates or states who are 'peace loving'. Therefore, providing for delegations from all over the world would mean that the UN Charter must be amended to create such a resounding solution. Amending the UN Charter is not a simple task because according to the rules of the Charter itself, any changes in previous provisions must be adopted by two thirds of the majority of members of the GA and ratified by two thirds including the P5. These are the major constraints that are holding back this kind of solution.

Nevertheless, there are other options for regional representations to be implemented without amending the UN Charter but their effectiveness might not be strong as the solution discussed above. These options include:

- The enhancement of regional representation through the increase of non-permanent seats
- The increase in regional organizational representation in UNSC debates and meetings

The first option actually represents the idea of regional representation better than the second but the second one has less legal constraints that the first. For the first option, seats would be assigned to regions which do not have any representatives at all. When this is done, the security views and contributions of every state would be taken into account. Currently, EU representatives are only divided into only three regions; Eastern, Western and Asian but there could actually be more (Drieskens, 2010 p.158).

The second option deals with increasing the regional organizations, which represent their regions at UNSC deliberations. There are two major ways to implement this option. The first way is to widen the scope of Article 39 of the Provisional Rules of Procedure of the Security Council. Article 39 provides for the invitation of any individual or groups who can be very instrumental for a particular purpose when they are equipped with the necessary information.

The other way to implement the second option is by granting observer status to regional organizations which have attained a higher level of integration with the UNSC. Integration in this context is defined according to the region's involvement in UN activities over the past years. On such basis, EU would be granted an observer status because it is, by far, the regional institution with the highest of integration with the UNSC. The advantage of integration with the UNSC is that EU could partake in the deliberations of UNSC concerning certain key decisions covering security such as terrorism, nuclear proliferation, human rights, peacekeeping missions and many more.

EU must also endeavor to use the privileges offered to them by the UNSC to advocate for a better representation for the AU. All the AU states are members of the UNSC therefore apart from the EU, the AU is the other regional organization with the highest level of integration. Therefore, EU must play a role in advocating for similar privileges for the African Union, after all, the two regional organizations have had a cordial relationship in the past, considering the joint Africa-EU Strategy in 2007 and the EU's involvement in African Peace Facility (Helly, 2013 p.140).

3. THE PERMANENT FIVE AND THEIR POSITION ON UNSC REFORMS

3.1 Permanent Members' Position on Expansion or Replacement

United States also supports the idea of expansion but it changes its support from one candidate to the other depending on the administration in power. Bush advocated for Japan during his administration while Obama advocated for India during his administration as well. However, it must be noted that the candidates that are supported by US always fall within the scope of their allies or economic beneficiaries. This is because United States considers its national interest above any other interest in the world.

China, which is described as the most loyal permanent member of the UNSC also supports the idea of expansion because it believes that there is no geographical balance in the current permanent membership of the UNSC. In as much as China makes the case of a balance in the geographical representation of permanent members, it maintains a special interest in the security of Africa because China has the largest economic benefit in Africa than all the members. Part of its national interest is to protect its businesses and citizens from criminal activities that endanger their lives. China also debunks the idea of choosing two representatives from the same region so it never supported the candidacy of Japan (Shambourg, 2007 p.29).

3.2 Russia and European Security

Russia and the United States have set security parameters which the other permanent members such as United Kingdom and France still seek to attain. The parameters or standards do not have implications for only United Kingdom and France but the European Union at large. Therefore, the level of this implication could be accessed from to angles; from the European Union point of view or from the point of view of each of these two European UNSC permanent representatives. In this study, I choose to access it from European Union point of view but references would also be made towards the significance of Brexit for these security parameters.

The relationship between Russia and the European Union is more of a strategic one when it comes to security. European Union knows that Russia has a history of violating international commitments and that is why they have a huge presence of military on the European continent (Silina and Kravchenko, 2015). The vision of Russia to become a dominant force in this multipolar atmosphere is obvious to the world but what is worse is that they are building this vision with very weak economic, demographic and societal institutions and that is where the danger comes in. The only force competing with Russia is the Western world which includes European Union, NATO members and the United States.

Russia's domination has been doubted by the Western world since the collapse of the Soviet Union and that is why Russia has resorted to rely strongly on its military capabilities to fight for world power in a diplomatic way. This has caused a sharp decline in the relevance of the EU over the last six years or so (Dermirjian and Birnbaum, 2014). Europe has become relatively irrelevant in terms of security, trade and world affairs in general. This must not be misunderstood mean that Europe is not an integral force in world security anymore but rather they have not performed up to expectation with the recent operations of Russia in Crimea.

The European Union confirmed that their core security order was challenged when Russia wanted to annex Crimea illegally but the question is 'What has Europe done so far to stop Russia?' Russia knew that is was putting its relationship with EU at risk but the simple fact is that a country such as Russia does not care that much. Russia clearly rated its national interest above the security stability of the European Union with the Crimea issue.

If the international community would recall, there have been several cases where Russia had made its intentions clear about the security situation by updating most of its security and foreign policies. In dealing with Russia on security, Europe must consider a few issues, which include how Russia perceives the West. Russia believes that the loopholes created by the West caused most of the causes of security instability around the globe. In Russia's opinion, the West has misconducted themselves by using force in the wrong ways and wrong places. Therefore, the only solution from Russia's perspective is that the West should make way for power sharing with other rising powers because that is the only way a global security balance could be created and possibly lead to a long term world peace.

The relationship between Moscow and European Union in terms of security has deteriorated to an extent that the role of EU has been reduced in Russia's foreign policy. The direction of Russia's security and military policy changed after 2014 with the adoption of the new Security strategy. The document was responsible for defining the national interest and national strategic priorities of the Russian federation. The major vision of the document was to strengthen Russian national security in the end. Further updates of Russia's security came in 2009, 2010, 2013 and 2016 leading a very significant change in the security environment in Russia.

The Security strategy document of Russia also exposes certain domestic weaknesses including corruption, organized crime, terrorist risks, embezzlement of public funds and many other malpractices. To an extent, most of the international exploits made by Russia cannot be valued in terms of the strengths of the country itself because the indicators would not reflect the actual capacity of Russia (Borger, 2014). This is because Russia has downplayed certain comparative advantages that it has including a well-educated populace and a dynamic IT sector. Instead, Russia sees its capability of arms dealing as an advantage.

From Russia's point of view, almost all the policies of the West tend to jeopardize its security decisions especially Europe. Complaints from the Russian Federation are mostly centered on Europeans trying to encroach Russian territories through the enlargement programs. The Security strategy document of Russia also outlines the tools, which Russia uses to address its security policies, and these tools include the reliance on military and diplomatic activism.

3.2.1 Reliance on military

Russia has been able to attain the level of development required internationally. Russia connects to the world through its military exploits because their military power is one the key components of their foreign policy. Russia faces an environment full of dense and dicey threats that are capable of resulting in wars therefore the Kremlin has a huge responsibility to protect the security of Russia. In 2008, the Kremlin resorted to using force in calming down tensions in Georgia. This was not the normal or traditional approach of the Kremlin but because of the rising tensions around the Russian territory, there was a need for a change in strategy. Due

to the huge security responsibility, Russia dedicates a huge part of the national budget towards the modernization of their military.

Part of the Russian military modernization came as reforms after the Georgia War. During the reform, Russia was able to identify many weaknesses in its military organization. However, these weaknesses were corrected and confirmed during the Syria conflict (Walker, 2015). Many scholars believe that most of the weaknesses in the Russian military stem from some of the traditional Soviet ideas which they were still operating by. The aims of the 2008 reform were to;

- Strengthen the combat capacity of the Russian Army,
- To refurbish the army's control and command,
- To enhance army equipment and officer training.

These aims were developed as a result of the identified problem of demotivation, low quality training, obsolete equipment, old Soviet strategies and a disorganized chain of command. Earlier on in this chapter, it was stated that Russia faces many threats in its security environment and these threats are weighing on the efforts of the Kremlin. Some of these threats include conflicts in the post-Soviet spaces, the central Asia problem, unrests in the North Caucaus, the Kuril Island claim of Japan and the growing economy of China. At first sight, the threats might look like they have nothing to do with Europe but ironically; Russia believes that European policies are responsible for causing all these threats. In latter parts of this study, the various reasons why Russia has developed such an ideology about Europe would be explained further.

3.2.2 How the military fits into Russia's international ambitions

Vladmir Putin distinguished the military element of Russia's international visions because Russia knew that a strong militarized country was the only thing missing on the international front. Even though United States also had a heavy presence of military internationally, there was nothing wrong if two or more countries were equipped too. Most of the powerful countries in the world now understand that military enforcement is the highest component of international dominance in this twenty first century (Renz, 2016 pp24,25).

 According to Putin, the President of Russia, any country that does not have a strong and credible military force, that country is exposed to pressure from other states. The

Ukraine conflict confirmed how committed Russia is when it comes to national interests.

3.2.3 Diplomatic activism

European Union does not underestimate Russia when it comes to issues relating to security. Therefore, it would be wrong for any state to reason that the only capability of Russia is their military even though it is the most powerful tool. Russia also has the ability to work its strategies around diplomacy but the difference is that they believe in their military power more than their diplomatic power. This does not imply that Russia's diplomatic activism is not effective because Russia would not hesitate to take advantage of any window or opportunity that would emerge from the weaknesses of Europe. Within a period of two decades, EU has experienced Brexit, Greece migrants and many other problems and all these are part of the reason why Russia still believes it has a chance to use diplomacy to achieve some positive for itself.

Russia does not also agree to the fact that United States perceives it as a regional power instead of a world power. In 2004, President Obama made directly referred to Russia as a 'regional power', which is posing as a threat to its neighbors, not out of strength but rather out of weakness (Borger, 2014). In the two conflicts that Russia has taken center stage, Russia has combined both military and diplomatic techniques because the West got more involved in the issue.

One of the weaknesses of Russia is that it has not been able to create an alliance as powerful as the West and so when it comes to diplomatic issues; it is almost as if it is 'a Russia versus Western allies' affair' because the inequality balance swings towards Russia. Russia's diplomatic antics also include their ability to confront other powers, which are emerging to challenge the hegemonic position of the United States. This is where China, one of the permanent members of the UNSC comes in. Over the last decade, China has become an economic superpower currently challenging the existing powers US, Russia and Europe but in terms of military capabilities, China still has a lot to learn around US and Russia but at least one positive platform for China is that it is a member of the UNSC.

In actual sense, what this means is that Russia maintains a very good foreign policy. Russia supports countries, which threaten the hegemony position of US, and since

Russia itself is a military threat to the US, it believes in partnership with China and India who are threats to United States economically. In 1998, Moscow initiated the idea for a triangular economic establishment known as the Russia – India and China (RIC) partnership. Therefore, in as much as Russia is concerned about Syria, its ally, it is equally concerned about the rise of India and China.

The RIC is not the only alliance, which Russia has plated its faith in but the Kremlin is also pleased with the progress of the Shanghai Cooperation Organization (SCO) and the British-Russia-India-China-South Africa (BRICS) connection. These two emerging groups have the tendency to threaten the hegemonic position of the United States and so Russia would do anything for such groups to succeed. Some of the agendas, which these associations are pushing, include multilateralism and multidimensional influences of international organizations such as World Bank and IMF because Russia believes that the control of the Bretton Wood System has been monopolized by the West while other territories including Russia itself have limitations in their influences.

Russia has also supported the idea of a G20 rather than a G7 but its intentions are quite clearly related to an increase in representation and has less to do with its rivalry with the West. So far, there have been progressive actions by the SCO and the BRICS towards the aim of challenging Western policies. First of all, the SCO has added India and Pakistan as new members while the BRICS is trying to establish its own financial system, which would be independent of the Bretton Wood System.

Russia's diplomatic approach is not only motivated by the rivalry between the West and them but also by the realistic ideas of the threatened international position, which the country finds itself in. Russia sees its international position as very vulnerable and exposed to many threats especially on its security. If Russia's international position should be reviewed carefully, it would be discovered that they are actually recognized internationally and globally not because of any outstanding territorial achievements but rather because of their Soviet history and their participation in international organizations.

This, to an extent, is not fair in Russia's perception. For example, the presence and activities of Russia on the Asian continent can never be compared the prolonged historical presence of the West in terms of trade, security, foreign relations and world

politics in general. Moscow believes that this kind of imbalance needs to be corrected especially when it comes to security and defense issues; therefore, Russia has moved to increase its dealings in Asia since the early 2000s. Even though it has not made much progress until now, the decisions to increase its activities was at least a first step towards progress to come in later years. At this point, it would be fair to say that Russia, although not there yet, has made a huge statement with its military force and must be given the due attention despite its international weaknesses.

As stated earlier on, Russia evaluated the effectiveness of the United Kingdom and France through the operations of the European Union until the Brexit happened. Even after the Brexit, Russia still has its pre-established conceptions about the operations of the British in terms of security. Let me just say naturally, Russia does not approve of any action the European Union takes. This is because Russia believes that EU is a deliberate and strategic extension of the operations of the US to destabilize global security. Russia even extends its disapproval towards NATO (NATO Summit, 2016) and at a point in time, Russia complained about Europe's antimissile defense system stating that it was not directed towards Russia.

In the nutshell, the long term wish of Russia is for EU to take security and defense issues more seriously and work towards a stronger cooperation with Russia itself because till today, Russia does not approve of any ideas or actions of the European Union and this has led to a deterioration in Russian-French, Russian-German and Russian-British relationships.

As a result of the radical approaches of Russia, which was subsequently caused by its perception of Western wiles, Russia still remains a very central component of security for Europe. Even though some members of EU such as Poland and Ukraine see Russia as an adversary and a military threat, other countries such as Italy and France still stand by Russia just because it does not want to complicate the tensions associated with the Eastern Europe giant.

3.2.4 Recent declination of Russia's security efforts

In the opinions of many European countries, the efforts of Russia in terms of global security have slightly declined and that has affected the credibility of the country. One issue that has exposed the declination in Russia's efforts is their position on non- proliferation. European heads have concluded that Russia's role on North Korea

and Iran has rather been passive and constructive which is quite contrary to the terms of the 1994 Budapest Memorandum on Security Assurances. Secondly, Russia is the one who determines the terms and conditions under which the Plutonium Management and Disposition Agreement was resumed after being suspended for a while. The lack of cooperation between Russia and the West (especially the US) has resulted in many damages including that in Syria. The Syria conflict has given terrorists an upper hand because they have recognized that the two countries are opposing instead of cooperating to fight them.

3.2.5 Russia's national interest

Russia also supports the expansion reform programmes of the UNSC and moreover, Russia does not really care about any candidate that comes up. However, Russia does not want the expansion to jeopardise or cause a limitation in its Veto rights. Russia does not also want any new member who has conflicts with any of its allies in the past. In other words, Russia does not directly support expansion but it is not against it at the same time. Russia is more concerned about its authority as a permanent UNSC member so any reform that would affect its authority would not work because Russia would Veto.

3.2.6 Application of securitization to the Crimea Crisis

One of the cases in which securitization came into play in relation to Russia was the Ukraine Crisis which occurred in 2014. During the height of the issue, it was noted that the United States did not support the antics of Russia concerning the dispute. The negative opinions formed by the United States public was that Russia was seen as a threat to Ukraine and the United States. The Obama administration actually described Russia as an ideological threat to the international order. Actors involved in the securitization process during the Crimea crisis claimed that Putin had totally ignored the principles of international liberalism by violating treaties and ignoring international institutions. The Obama Administration considered Russia as a disgrace to the legitimacy of the permanent five because of the Crimea crisis. The annexation of Crimea was a security threat to Ukraine but also a political one to the United States.

As stated earlier one, Russia was perceived as a threat by United States because Putin's administration creates certain uncertainties in the international order.

Therefore, the Obama administration chose to respond in a rather vacillating way. The interest of the United States was the stability of the international order, and the peace of Ukraine was part of this interest. Both the interest of Russia, Ukraine and Europe were jeopardized during the Crimea crisis (The Ukraine Timeline, 2014). In further response, the Obama administration released executive orders in line with sanctioning Russia. The sanctions issued by US were agreed upon by the United States and its allies.

3.3 US National Interest

United States supports the idea of expansion on the UNSC permanent membership but the choice of candidate presented by the US has varied over the years. During the Obama administration, India was the preferred candidate of the United States if any expansion was to take place. United States has specific national interests in India when it comes to security because of technological reasons. In 2015, Obama endorsed reiterated that the US support for India seeking permanent UNSC membership was a priority for US foreign policy. Obama also considered the progressive nature of India's democracy and rising economic power.

United States had been showing greater interest the establishment of a post war organization since the era of Winston Churchill but they never wanted the organization to have only three members therefore they were pushing for China to become a member of any post war organization that would be formed. In other words, the United States had been playing the role of leadership right from the end of the war until the day the United Nations was formed.

If United States had shirked this role, there would have been no post war organization such as the United Nations. During his State of the Union address in January 1945, President Roosevelt reiterated that states only realize the difference between them only when they near to conquering their common enemies or oppositions (Roosevelt, 2001). Roosevelt even wanted the United Nations or any other organization to be established when the war was going on but unfortunately, since it was a cooperative activity between different nations, it had to go through some few steps including the ones stated below:

- Series of bilateral consultations between US and Great Britain particularly between 1943 and 1944,

- President Roosevelt's approach to Stalin at the Teheran summit conference in November 1943,

- Agreeing to a draft charter by Dumbarton Oaks,

- The review of Soviet's position and the settlement of issues from Dumbarton Oaks,

- The definition of the scope of Veto,

- Ratification by capitals.

The national interest of the United States remains prominent even in the midst of increased and new global threats. These threats have made it very difficult for dominant institutions to operate smoothly in recent times and therefore a great deal of multilateral action is needed to orchestrate solutions for the problems created by the new global threats. The institutions would eventually have to adapt to the security environment but the adaptation process must be made easier for them.

In as much as Russia had drafted its new Security Strategy (The White House, 2010) to solve these problems, United States had also drafted its own with the aim of renovating outdated institutions and enhancing cooperation with new and emerging powers (Rice, 2009). Yet again, the renovation of the UNSC revolved around its membership.

3.3.1 Obama's perception on UNSC reform

Obama began this campaign by strongly advocating for a permanent seat for India. One would be wondering why he chose India among all emerging countries but the point is, United States have economic interests in India and they believe that economic security is also a major component of national security and subsequently national interest. However, the quest of US to seek for a permanent seat for India does not necessarily reflect any replacement ideas but rather expansion.

US policy makers currently harbor to major doubts in relation to the UNSC. First of all, they doubt whether the UNSC actually needs and reforms in its membership and secondly they doubt whether the reforms or changes in membership would help US in achieving its national interests. If there should be any prospects that the changes could be beneficial to the United States, would they even be able to reach these benefits amidst this complex global diplomatic landscape?

The Obama Administration showed its commitment to amending international issues but did not really show any support for UNSC reforms. Scholars must therefore be careful not to interpret Obama's support for India's permanent membership as a support for major reforms of the UNSC. In other words, this means that the Obama administration was not against any reforms but they did not just show support for it. During the whole period of the Obama administration, there was nothing like a proposal whatsoever made by the US concerning UNSC reforms but in many instances, statements and speeches of US officials were in line with idea of expansion. Most of such statements reiterated the following facts:

- There would be reduction in the effectiveness of the UNSC if successful expansion exercises are conducted (Rice, 2009).
- Proposals concerning expansion of the P5 must have more than one country in mind
- The evaluation of candidates must be based on their international security and peace contributions or prospects
- The current structure of the Veto must be maintained
- Proposals concerning expansion must tally with the ratification requirements of the UN Charter (Wolf, 2009)

The only difference between the attitude of the Obama administration and other administrations towards expansion is the particular country they supported. For example, the Bush administration exhibited its great support for Japan during its time while the Obama administration showed its support for India during its time. During the time of each administration, only one member is emerging on the radar of discussion while other members are left open for future discussions. Is this a strategy of showing support for expansion or does it go beyond expansion? The common preamble that runs through most of the US administrations, or at least the two discussed above, is the importance of US national interest.

Irrespective of the political party in the US leadership, there is always a similarity in the policies adopted on UNSC reforms. The United States only adopts policies after assessing the risks and rewards associated with that policy. In fact, US is not the only country that assesses risks and rewards when drafting a policy. Other European governments also do the same but the difference is that United States would always consider its interest ahead of any other factor when drafting policies. The summary

of US policy on enlargement is that the G4 members should simply be added to the P5 but the G4 would not have access to Veto power. If this idea were to be successful, it would be very beneficial for United States because two of the members would be their strong allies.

United States uses many multilateral bodies to obtain its national interests or objectives. The organizations surely include the UN, NATO and G20. Among all the bodies that work with the US, UN is the one considered most effective because of its universality, convening power, technical capacity, and perceived legitimacy. As a country, the UNSC serves as a lender of last resort to the United States when it wants to embark on multilateral initiatives, which are directly in line with the country's objectives.

Over the past decade, US has looked to the UNSC for sanctions that could salvage the two situations which are posing a number of threats towards global security and international peace; the violations of Nuclear Proliferation activities by Iran and the infringement of human rights by Kim Jong II of North Korea. Other instances in which the United States relied on the UNSC included the authorization or renewal of the Afghan and Iraqi missions, all in the aim of reducing the misuse of nuclear weapons in the Middle East, weapons that were dubbed 'weapons of mass destruction' by the United States.

An enlargement is exactly what the UNSC needs because an enlargement has, at least, the prospects of confronting today's security realities. The current state of the UNSC does not really present any hope of lasting solutions towards security issues. An enlargement or expansion of the UNSC might not make it perfect but it would surely enhance the status quo. The process of enlargement or expansion, as discussed in this context, must be led by the United States because arguably, it is the most influential state in the Council and the Council represents the national interest of the United States.

The United States must continuously make its support for expansion clear and publicly known because that would set the pace for other states to begin showing support for the process, which might yield positive results in the end. The US must also divert the same level of attention to the aspirants by supporting different countries which fit the criteria. So far, only support for India has been made public

but if other countries are fit to be candidates, the United States must not hesitate to throw its support behind those countries even if they are not allies. After all, candidacy does not mean membership in anyway.

In supporting the expansion or enlargement process, the United States must also make sure that any state that is granted permanent membership is briefed on the privileges as well as the responsibilities involved in being a candidate. In that way, the United States could introduce future reforms that would be in line with their interests because other countries would want to renovate their security profiles with hope of being a permanent member someday.

3.4 EU's National Interest (Britain and France)

As stated in earlier chapters, the position of these two countries also represents that position of the European Union. Britain and France support expansion reform of the UNSC but their interest is regional domination therefore they do not want any candidate from Europe at all because this would reduce their own representative powers. For example, Britain and France do not support the candidacy of Germany at all. Rather, they support any candidate from the other three members in the G4 which include Brazil, Japan and India. Italy and Spain do not also support Germany as well. Germany on the other hand does not support any state from the UfC which is spearheaded by Italy and Spain. Rather, Germany has put itself as candidate in most of the proposals that submits to the UNSC. Some other countries in the EU have different positions which oppose that of France and United Kingdom. That is to say, Britain and France perceive Germany or any other European candidate as a threat if they should join the permanent members.

3.5 China's National Interest and Africa

China's approach towards expansion is quite a fair one. Even though China also considers its national interest, it actually advocates for a candidate from Africa because of two major reasons. First of all, Africa represents over 40% of China's global labour market. Therefore economically, China benefits from Africa while Africa also benefits from China. The second reason is that China supports regional fairness therefore they believe that it is high time a candidate was chosen to represent

the region of Africa since there is representative for the Americas, Europe and Asia already.

China is considered as the most pragmatic member among the permanent five. The level of respect for China is because of the level of consistency in its policies especially foreign ones. Since China became a permanent member, it has abided by the principles of the Council, making sure that certain major virtues such as national sovereignty and non-interference are highly respected. Another quality China has exhibited over the years is the attitude of flexibility in its decisions towards international peace and security. Recently, China has doubled up its efforts towards UN peacekeeping operations even though it also considers its national interest foremost, as in the case of the United States. China also considers itself a global power in terms of security and this fact has been accepted globally. This kind of popularity also comes with a huge responsibility especially towards its ally countries. China uses its recognition to advocate a thorough consultation or stability in any form of enlargement process or reform that would take place in the UNSC.

Even though China was granted permanent membership later than the other members were, it never affected its support for the activities of the Council towards international peace and security. For example, in 2012, China contributed approximately 3.1 percent towards the peacekeeping activities of the United Nations (CIC, 2013).

The global power of China has also enabled it to play a very significant role in regional security activities. This regional role of China has been manifested in many cases such as that of Sudan, Myanmar and the recently security concerns in North Korea. China's flexibility has become a very crucial tool in contemporary security because of the dynamism in recent international threats to security. The UNSC has also been one of the successful multilateral platforms through which China's global aspirations have been attained over the past decade.

The argument no more considers whether China is a global power or not because they are already one of the global powers. However, the existing argument is whether they could maintain their position and continue to contribute towards the stability of international peace and security. Many scholars argue that in many respects, China's status as a global power is limited towards its economic power. That might be true to

an extent but it does not necessarily mean that China cannot play a significant role in future international security issues. In other words, Beijing is fully aware that it has the responsibility to search for its identity in the world of security, if it wants to maintain its global power status. China's search for its overall global identity began with the country's ability to clearly define its national interests in over a decade ago. In 2009, President Hu Jintao reiterated that China had always protected the principles of sovereignty, security and development but it had shown more attention to development in the past. Therefore, this is the time for China to focus on the other two virtues; sovereignty and security. The components of China's national interest include political stability, sovereignty and security and a sustainable economic and social development (Wang 2011 p.71). These three components have also served as the basis on which China has built most of its global strategies. Over the years, China's global activities have been guided by two major visions, which are deeply connected, to the ancient beliefs of China as a country. First of all, China believes that the world could only be a safer (security) and better (economy and society) place only through a multipolar approach. The second belief China stands on to build towards its global ambition is that major powers have the greatest responsibility to build relations among them because that is the surest way of correcting past mistakes and facing future challenges together (Guo and Hua, 2008).

China realizes that there is a gradual shift in global power from the West to the East bloc, which is causing many other powers to even have the chance to compete globally for a global status. Therefore, as a country, China feels the need to work towards being a global power and at the same time maintaining close and integral relations with other great powers (Womack, 2001 p.129). As stated earlier on, the evolving nature of international security threats has caused global security challenges to be interconnected, which means that countries would have to work together before they could salvage the security situation of the globe. This is the reason why China would need to work with countries such as the United States and Russia (Qimao, 1993 p.238).

The case of China was quite ironic in relation to the cooperation among dominant powers at the end of the Cold War. This was because China's role in the Dumbarton Oaks proposals was not very significant but the opinion of China on the formation of a post war organization was clearly defined. China strongly believed that the security

of the world must be controlled by a few dominant powers, which would be capable of compromising on very dicey security situations (Areddy, 2015).

China and Russia shared a common view when it comes to the principle of unanimity because they both believe it is an essential virtue for the effectiveness of any post war organization. China acknowledges that the voting system is also a prominent alternative to unanimity but the reason why China supports the use of unanimity is that they believe the voting system would rather weaken the effectiveness of the Security Council.

To an extent, such cordial relationships between these three superpowers is inevitable as far as the security of the world is concerned. The bilateral relationship between China and Russia concerning security would always be different with the one between Russia and the United States because obviously, a relationship between China and United States on security would involve a lot of consultations due to the fact that China is relatively new while United States is more experienced in global security discussions. On the other hand, Russia and the United States are almost on the same pedal when it comes to security issues because the two have a long history garnished with many differences.

With this preamble, China and the United States have established their plans to improve the bilateral relationship between them. One of such existing plans is the establishment of The Strategic and Economic Dialogue (S&D). This strategy does not just focus on improving on the bilateral relations between these two powers but also seeks to address the current international security situation. An example of the contribution of the S&D towards an international peace situation are the recent activities surround the East China Sea situation when China declared the new Air Defense Identification Zone (ADIZ). United States showed maximum support for China but also made sure that Japan would not hold any ill feelings about the project. With the help of the US Vice President Biden, China and US were able to reach a compromise over the each other's concerns in the case to avoid any misperceptions that could aggravate into something else.

China has vowed never to lend its support to any proposal, which excludes the admission of an African representative into permanent membership because Africa contains the highest number of developing countries which have been and would be

of greater benefit for China. China does not even believe that two representations from Africa is enough, and that is the reason why they could not support the 2005 Ezulwini Consensus. The fact that China could not support this consensus does not mean that it has relented its support for an increase in African representation but rather shows how committed China is when it comes to the African region.

China has a particular interest in Africa when it comes to the ideas of UNSC expansion and it has always advocated for the inclusion of an African representative in the UNSC, stating that it was unfair that Europe had two representatives while Africa had none. This, however, must not be misinterpreted to mean that China supports a replacement of the European members but rather as that China seeks a geographical balance with a special interest in the African region. In fact, China's interest in Africa expands to include security, political, economic and ideological interests. However, for the scope of this study, the discussions would revolve mostly around the security interests.

Africa has been blessed with a very vast geographical dispensation and is also geographically far from China and so that means the continent and its countries do not constitute any form of threats towards the national security of China. However, China is economically active on the continent and that means it would have businesses and expatriates that need protection from threats in that region. This is where the interest of the Beijing government comes in. The number of Chinese citizens present in Africa as of 2012 was estimated to be approximately 1 million.

The dynamics of politics in Africa presents a very dangerous environment for Chinese citizens or any other country's citizens to live or survive in because of the security risks involved at the top and bottom level. Some of the obvious security threats that Chinese nationals confront on the African continent include criminal attacks such as robbery and kidnapping which constitutes the most damaging form of threat on the continent of recent (Fang, 2008). Another form of attack that is common in relation to Chinese nationals being present on the African continent is political attacks. This form of attack generally occurred when Chinese nationals decided to cooperate with the local government on certain projects pertaining to economic or social exploits.

The third form of security threat to Chinese nationals on the African continent is the attacks which arise due to labor disputes and illegal businesses by certain Chinese companies. The last form of attacks take place when Chinese vessels are attacks at sea. Below are summaries of the various security threats which confront Chinese Nationals in Africa.

Table 3.1: Examples of Political Security Threats faced by Chinese Nationals in Africa

Year	Country	Casualty	Type	Purpose	Source
2007	Nigeria	None	Kidnap	As protest against crude oil exploitation	Fang Wei
2007	Ethiopia	Nine	Murder	As protest against investments that benefit the Ethiopian government	China News Agency
2007	Niger	None	Kidnap	As protest against negligence of the region by the Niger government	Zhang Zhe
2012	Sudan	None	Kidnap	As protest against the ruling government	China News Agency

Table 3.1 above explains scenarios in which the national security of China has been threatened in Africa when their workers were attacked. In 2007, gunmen attacked the Niger Delta in which five Chinese workers were kidnapped in the early hours. The second scenario in 2007 also involved an attack on an oil field run by Chinese people in Eastern Ethiopia. The attack resulted in the killings of over 70 Chinese workers. The third scenario above also happened in the same year of 2007 where 9 people were abducted or kidnapped. All these attacks were politically motivated. In 2012, an incident of kidnapping also happened in Sudan where 15 Chinese workers were abducted and ransoms were demanded from their company before their release

Table 3.2: Examples of Attacks on Chinese Projects in Africa

Year	Country	Casualties	Project	Source
2010	Zambia	None	Mining	Lusaka Times
2012	Zambia	One	Mining	Caixin
2012	Ghana	One	Mining	China Daily
2013	Ghana	None	Mining	The New York Times

Table 3.2 on the other hand depicts the particular sector in which kidnapping and other forms of attacks are rampant in Zambia and Ghana. This sector is the mining sector because most of the projects of projects that are undertaken by Chinese companies in Africa are in the mining and transportation sector.

Table 3.3: Examples of Criminal Security Threats faced by Chinese Nationals in Africa

Year	Casualties	Country	Type	Source
2007	None	Nigeria	Kidnap	Xinhua News Agency
2007	None	Togo	Robbery	Sina.com.cn, June 4 2007
2007	One	Nigeria	Robbery and Murder	Xinhua News Agency
2008	Five	Sudan	Kidnap and Murder	Xinhua News Agency
2009	One	South Africa	Robber and Murder	Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs
2012	One	Nigeria	Murder	Xinhua News Agency

According to Table 3.3, between 2007 and 2012, the total number of Chinese workers who were kidnapped, robbed and murdered in Nigeria, Togo and South Africa were recorded to be 8. This number actually reflects the cases that were formally recorded but there are some cases that have gone unnoticed.

3.5.1 How the UNSC facilitates China's Global Strategy

In many sections of this study, there have been different references to how critical or crucial the UNSC has been in terms of the implementation of policies by the P5. Even though the engagement of the UNSC is higher with the United States, China

also needs the UNSC to implement certain global policies if any success would be achieved at all. In the past, the UNSC has reciprocated the loyalty and respect China has shown with the Council and the consistency in its national policies as well. China has always wished that the Council would improve in its ways of implementing or developing policies that would directly address the current realities and challenges facing the world.

The complexity of human lifestyle continues to create new threats towards international security, which means that one problem that confronts the UNSC constantly is the struggle to cope with the complexity and interconnectedness of these new threats. Since the UNSC was established, Western countries have always tried to shape the structures of the Council to correspond with their own interests. However, the emergence of new powers has brought a huge constraint on the interest of Western hegemony to the extent that the United States has to battle with other powers in terms of policies.

The views of China concerning sovereignty has been clearly defined as part of their global ambitions. China believes that the contemporary world is controlled by sovereign states and so the only way to achieve an effective global governance status is to strengthen the national institutions in member states. Sovereignty has become a very important concept recently because of the many disagreements that exist among nations when it comes to security. In other words, nations have failed to live up to expectations when it comes to the implementation of effective security policies. China supports interventions in the cases of possible nations which have failed to maintain their sovereignty. As a plus, China is prepared to work closely with Russia on such terms.

3.5.2 Roles of China in UN Peacekeeping Operations

China has a track record of support when it comes to peacekeeping operations of the United Nations but their support has undergone a lot of changes since their first involvement in peacekeeping. When the United Nations was established initially, China did not really understand the concept of peacekeeping because they actually thought it was one of the strategies that the Western nations were planning to use to protect their hegemonic nature and also interfere in the affairs of weaker nations.

This position China had on peacekeeping was also facilitated by the ongoing bipolar struggle between the Soviet and the United States for global power at that time.

When China finally consented to the importance of peacekeeping activities, it gradually agreed with the three major principles guarding peacekeeping operations which are stated below:

That any peacekeeping operation must have the consent of all the parties involved. That there should not be any form of partiality on behalf of any of the parties involved. That the intervening country or institution must refrain from using force except on the basis of self-defense (Ayenagbo et al, 2012 p24)

China does not only adhere to the above principles of peacekeeping but also advocates that other great powers must do same. As part of China's advocacy of these peacekeeping principles, it only lends it support towards UN operation that uphold such principles (Fravel, 1996 p.1106). Since 1990, China has increased its contributions towards peacekeeping operations of the UN by improving on its training capabilities and contribution of military and troop units (He, 2007 p.10). China is now the highest contributor of troops among the permanent five members of the UNSC.

3.5.3 China's perception on UNSC Expansion

The UN has always been confronted with constant calls for reforms in its structures and operations especially in the permanent membership and Veto concepts. Many of these calls are connected to the recent decline in its effectiveness according to non-permanent members. As stated repeatedly throughout this study, United States is the only nation that sees nothing wrong with the legitimacy, efficiency and effectiveness of the UNSC.

China fully supports any reform that would enhance the efficiency of the Council in any way but they surely believe that expansion would be the right idea. Increasing representation is the first priority of China. China advocates that developing and small countries are not truly involved in the Council's deliberations. China does not support the replacement of any country even though there are three representatives from Europe but it only claims that there should be a balance in the geographic representations in the UNSC, which means there must be representations from the

Latin countries and Africa as well. For China, admitting representations from these regions also represents that the representation of different civilization and cultures.

China is the only country that comes clear with reasons why it supports or does not support certain resolutions or policies. To an extent, China can be described as the most loyal country among the permanent five to the UNSC. China is fully aware of the limitations and constraints that confronts the Council because securitization issues have gotten complex with the passage of time (Carlson, 2005). Issues that were not considered as threats in the past have now become threats towards the stability of security and therefore the USNC has been forced to include them in its agenda. Some of these threats include climate change, organized crime, human trafficking and many more. China is also concerned about these thematic creeps and they maintain that the UNSC needs to embark of reforms to be able to concentrate on pressing issues and delegate thematic issues to other departments (Wang, 2012 p.109). In conclusion, China maintains a balanced view concerning the role of the UNSC in maintaining international peace and security. Even though it has its own interests and sentiments towards the past operations of the Council, China still respects the approaches of the council and the efforts it has made so far to achieve maximum efficiency through its reforms (Stahle, 2008 p.633).

3.6 European Union and UNSC Reform

For the purposes of the study, the views of France and Britain would be described from the angle of the European Union because both countries represent the EU and as such their position on UNSC reform is bound to be uniform. Even with its exit of Britain from the EU, it still maintained some of its prepositions in relation to the UNSC. When it comes to security, France and Britain have a lot in common. They are faced with the same form of 21st century threats to security such as terrorism, serial killings, radicalism and many more. They also mostly apply the same global and regional approaches towards solving the security issues befalling them.

The EU maintains an integrative feature when dealing with the UNSC. On the other hand, the UNSC evaluates the EU's contributions based on how effective the national institutions of its members are. Reform of the UNSC has been an issue causing different reactions in the European Union. First of all, there is need to explain how committed the European Union is towards multilateralism.

EU's commitment towards multilateralism dates back to the 2003 Iraq crisis because that event weakened both the EU and the UNSC and caused them to re-strategize. Re-strategizing saw the EU increasing its support for the activities of the UNSC because it wanted to revitalize the concept of multilateralism and also revive its position as a global actor (Langenhove, Torta, Felicio, 2006 p.21). The EU's approach towards global or international security changed totally with the adoption of two major documents which shaped the EU-UN relations. These documents were the European Commission Communication and the European Security Strategy (ESS). The EU recognizes only the UNSC as the institution that can guarantee peace but EU is also willing to share in the responsibility therefore the EU is directly advocating for cooperation.

The specifications Lisbon treaty is responsible for providing EU members with a more coherent and unitary appearance at the UNSC. However, prior to the establishment of the Lisbon treaty, the scope of EU responsibilities and obligations were clearly defined in Article 19 of the Treaty on the European Union (TEU). The TEU made provisions that there should be a full concession among all EU members, both permanent and non-permanent and also each member must have full information concerning any action or policy taken by the Union in relation to security.

France and the United Kingdom were then charged with the responsibility to defend the interest of the Union. The activities guided by the provisions in the TEU were formalized in 2001 with the aim of enhancing coordination among EU members. The difference between the TEU and Lisbon treaty is that the latter was established to replace the former but the latter never came with any innovations in terms of coordination in the EU. It only charges members with the responsibility of defending the interest of the Union as a whole. However, the Lisbon treaty always defended the interest of EU members in the UNSC over their interest in their own identities.

The European Union has struggled to maintain a consensus on certain policies of the UNSC. Since 1990, there has always been division of thoughts among the members of EU in which France and UK were found to be on one side while Germany and Spain were on the other. An example was the 2008 suggestion by Italy for a permanent association between an EU Council and its UNSC representatives which was met with a cold response from France and UK. Irrespective of these divisions,

when the EU members finally achieve a consensus on key issues, they were translated to the UNSC by France and United Kingdom.

European Union itself does not see anything wrong with increasing the number of representations it has at the UNSC. However, some members oppose other members' views on many security issues as discussed above. The Lisbon Treaty is yet to be described as a successful tool for coordination because ever since its introduction, the members of the EU have only been engulfed in one division or the other. Since the EU replaced the European Community at the UN and assumed all its responsibilities, all EU members had submitted a draft resolution seeking for a reinforced observer status at the UNSC. A unification of EU's representation at the UNSC would take time to settle but for now, the in- fighting and disagreements between some members has presented France and UK from concentrating fully on supporting reforms in the UNSC. This means that France and UK have to deal with opposition from some EU members on one hand and deal with how to support reforms in the UNSC on the other hand.

3.6.1 Profile of internal disagreements in the EU concerning UNSC reform

In 1945, things took a turn in San Francisco because the Conference no more about just four powers but rather five. France was supposedly going to be on board very soon. Many countries doubted whether France would get along with the previous four powers because there was already a somewhat strong and established relationship among the four powers prior to the San Francisco meeting. As long as the four dominant powers stayed united over all those years prior to San Francisco, their decision to bring France along had to be accepted by smaller powers. In fact, there was no way the disagreement of the smaller powers could overshadow the agreement of the dominant four.

The smaller powers had no choice than to accept the decision because they really needed an international organization to be established and the only way such an objective could be achieved was to compromise with the decision of the great powers (Churruca, 2005:9). One of such decisions was to admit France into permanent membership. Now, many of the small powers including New Zealand, Denmark and Egypt had agreed that the authority for making security decisions would be better off if it rested with the great powers.

The opposition Luxembourg exhibited against Germany was because of the two successful invasions Germany had conducted on Luxembourg. Technically, these were diverse ways in which the smaller powers pledged allegiance to the great powers and sought for their protection against global threats. The support for the cooperation among great powers was also confirmed by a widely criticized gesture by US Senator Tom Connally, who teamed the draft Charter submitted by those who opposed the idea of cooperation among the greater powers at the San Francisco Conference.

The importance of unanimity was not because it could enable the great powers to compromise easily on security issues but rather, it was introduced because future security challenges could not be easily compromised by all the powers. In other words, unanimity makes it easier for powers to agree on taking certain actions against global security threats.

There might be internal disagreements in the European Union but ironically, the EU supports reforms of the UNSC only that its support has not really been firm because it has a lot to deal with internally. EU's support for reforms are also guided by the thought of enhancing the legitimacy of the Council in relation to international peace and security.

Like China, European Union welcomes the idea of admitting new members unto the permanent five but the point is that EU itself has not been able to formulate a common position on UNSC reform. This means that the EU has nothing against expansion with geographical balance but it has clearly not shown its support for it. This does not mean EU supports replacement but it simply means that they have not been able to provide a concrete proposal on the implications of UNSC reforms for the EU.

Since the end of the Cold War, the only debate Europe had ever supported in relation to UNSC membership was when it advocated for extra permanent seats for both Germany and Japan to constitute the P7. However, Italy firmly opposed the candidacy of Germany (Hill, 2005). Germany was part of the G4 countries, which included other members such as Japan, Brazil and India. On the other hand, Italy and Spain were the spearheads of the UfC group.

In 2005, the G4 submitted a proposal for UNSC reforms which was totally different from that of the UfC but the opposition was not surprising because Germany could not get along well with Italy (UN General Assembly, 2006). In the proposal of G4, the four countries put themselves forward as potential candidates for permanent seats. On the other hand, the UfC advocated for the doubling of the number of non-permanent seats only with a two-year electable term. These kinds of tensions are the ones undermining a common stand from the EU in relation to the UNSC.

Since the Maastricht Treaty was established, there has always been support for the enhancement of EU representation at the Security Council by creating a permanent seat for EU at the UNSC and both the European Parliament and European Commission were in great support of this idea. The members of the UfC fully support this idea but France and United Kingdom who are the two representatives of EU have failed to agree with a single seat for EU because they do not want their status at the UNSC to be downgraded in anyway.

While France and United Kingdom have been resisting any form of replacement with a single seat, Germany has been advocating for a single permanent national seat for itself. Germany's position is actually ambiguous because it wants a permanent national seat at the UNSC but simultaneously, its membership in EU also demands that it offers support for the single EU seat. As of 2015, Germany's position to advocate for a permanent seat for itself had reduced as compared to the other G4 members such as India, Japan and Brazil because the country has been torn between performing its huge European responsibilities and competing with the other G4 countries.

The internal disagreements among EU members have also undermined the recognition of sensitive issues concerning member states, and the long-term consequence is the absence of a common ideology on representation. Of recent, the UfC has taken a different dimension to their proposal for reforms in the UNSC. The new approach is regional oriented where regional groups would be assigned non-permanent seats for two years. One of seats would be rotated between the Eastern and Western Europe after every two years (Security Council, 2010). This new proposal by the UfC drew new support from Portugal, Sweden and Poland.

As stated earlier on in this chapter, France and United Kingdom had always harbored different UNSC reform ideas as compared to that of the UfC and the G4. In the Anglo-Franco proposal, they advocated for expansions in both the permanent and non-permanent members. For the non –permanent membership expansion, France and UK supports any candidate from the G4 but they also support the fact that a candidate has to come from Africa as well. In the nutshell, the two representatives of the EU support expansion of permanent membership by two more members, one from G4 and one from Africa.

3.6.2 Effect of Brexit of UNSC reforms

According to scholars, the exit of Britain from the European Union presents positive implications that negative implication for United Kingdom's permanent seat in the UNSC. For the purpose of this study, the focus would be on three different possible implications Brexit has had on UNSC reforms. The first implication was that Brexit has strengthened the position of the United Kingdom in the UNSC.

If the United Kingdom had stayed in the EU, Brussels would have merged the seats of the two countries to produce a single seat and it would have been difficult for Britain to maintain its influence over the UNSC as much as it would have been difficult for France too. Therefore, Brexit was a positive move in this context. Some scholars such as Karen E Smith also argued that Brexit has not had any effect on the permanent seat of Britain because the UNSC is far larger than EU therefore an exit of an EU member would affect the Union rather than the UNSC.

Other group of scholars argue the Brexit has reduced the legitimacy of the UN. In the explanation of Catherine Gegoutpointed out that since the UNSC could not restrict Britain from Veto privileges after its exit from the EU, both the UN and UK have less legitimacies than before. According to Catherine, it does not make sense for the UK to maintain the same say as the other members when it failed to maintain its membership in the European Union. I argue against this point and the reason is that China and Russia do not belong to any regional organization and they still perform their responsibilities in relation to the UNSC therefore being a part of a regional institution or not must not be the basis on which a permanent member must be evaluated with.

Richard Whitman also argued that Britain would forever be haunted with the thoughts of fighting to keep their seat at the UNSC because Brexit has changed the perception of the world about the UK. The world now harbors the perception that Brexit is a confirmation of the diminishing of UK's international relevance (Woollard, 2016). Since the world has begun doubting the relevance of UK, very soon they would begin doubting the relevance of some other permanent members.

3.7 How The UNSC Expansion Would Be Effective to Solve Current World Challenges

Current security challenges around the world include climate change, terrorism, radicalism, cyber-crime and many others. These challenges affect every nation on the globe and so it is very important for every country to be represented at the UNSC. Currently, the legitimacy of the UNSC is being threatened by the emergence of these security challenges. To maintain its effectiveness and legitimacy, expansion would provide a means through which more countries would actually be represented well in the UNSC depending on where the candidate is chosen from. A fair representation of regions would contribute immensely towards the effectiveness of the UNSC because the views of every region including Africa, Americas, Europe and Asia would be equally considered. Another way through which expansion can promote the effectiveness of the UNSC is when a representative from the Middle East is chosen for permanent membership. In my own opinion, it would increase the chances of maintaining international security because the stability in the Middle East would improve since they have a representative. In critical examination, most of the security challenges occur or emerge from the Middle East region so to have a representative from that region could be very important for the UNSC.

4. CONCLUSION

Table 4.1:

Statement	USA	Russia	China	France	Britain	Total
Membership Decision	Replacement	Expansion	Expansion	Replacement	Replacement	3 R 2 E
Regional Membership Expansion	Support	Disapprove	Disapprove	Disapprove	Disapprove	4 D 1 S
Recommendation of non-regional candidates	India	None	Africa	None	None	1 IND 3 NONE 1 AFR
Basis for evaluation of candidacy	Security Economic	Security Economic	Economic	Security	Security Economic	2 S/E 2 S 1 E
Views on Unfair regional presentation	Positive	Irrelevant	Negative	Positive	Positive	3 P 1 N 1 Ir

The fact has been established that the UNSC needs serious reforms to maintain or improve its legitimacy and efficiency. The most probable and preferable reform ideas would be expansion of both the permanent and non-permanent membership. From the above discussions, many states wish to be given preferential treatment in relation to membership at the UNSC. Some members even go to the extent of proposing themselves as candidates such as Germany. Others have recommended some other countries such as India, Brazil and Japan as potential candidates. Every particular candidate is associated with different forms of criticisms and implications for the permanent and non-permanent members. The evaluation of a member must purely be based on its security capabilities. If such an idea could be implemented, then the most ideal candidate that could be chosen would be either Brazil or Japan.

Accepting Germany would only compound the problem of regional representation because France and Britain would always oppose such a decision. EU is engulfed in too much internal inconsistencies to the extent that the whole Union does not have a

common stand when it comes to membership at the UNSC. Until today, the membership of EU at UN is highly fragmented with different activities and cliques. Germany is opposed by Italy and Spain while France and Britain also take different sides on EU representation.

Russia does not have a problem with any type of reforms because it has declared its intentions to work with any state on condition that the state would respect its global ambitions. One of the global ambitions of Russia is to be supreme in military and economic aspects. That is to say, Russia is poised to taking over the position of the United States and it would do anything to achieve that feet. Therefore, any country or state that tries to prevent Russia from this achievement would get personal problems with Russia. Some scholars see Russia as a threat to the international community because Russia has a history of violating international laws at will.

China's idea of expansion also looks very effective to an extent because bringing on board an African country would be a very good advantage for China and Africa because China has economic interest in Africa and African also contains most of the issues that the UNSC discusses from time to time. In the nutshell, the best form of UNSC reform is expansion because it holds more advantages than a replacement. An expansion is also simple than a replacement and involves less risks.

The discussion above has explained how the establishment of the United Nations Security Council came about according to Article 21 section 1 of the United Nations Charter. The responsibilities conferred on the UNSC include a major assignment of maintaining international peace and security. There are other minor responsibilities that come along with this major responsibility but at the end of the day, global peace and security remains the ultimate goals of the UNSC. However, this responsibility of maintaining international peace has not been easy because most of the great powers involved have had major difficulties of compromising with each other's security decisions.

That is to say, national security objectives often do not correspond with the ideas of global security. Most theories do not support the decisions of some great powers while other theories do render full support of the others. Some of the theories that often challenge the decisions of great powers include idealists and constructivists theories. However, the realist theories support the decisions of great powers because

of one basic ideology such as national interest. According to realism, every nation seeks the maximum benefit for its citizens and therefore any decision that compromises such maximum benefit (national interest) would lead to disagreements between the countries in question. This whole perspective of national interest could be related to a particular dimension of international relations.

In as much as great powers try to protect or fight for their national interests, they might as well disagree with international institutions or organizations according to the laws by which these institutions or organizations operate by. The responsibility of maintaining international peace and security gives the UNSC the power to choose the particular nations that could be part of the decision making process of the organ. This task of choosing the right nations has become a major dilemma over the past years. This thesis reviewed the criteria under which a nation could be chosen to represent the particular region in which it dwells. Once a nation is classified as member of the UNSC, all security operations and sanctions connected with that country are guided by the United Nations Security Council Resolutions.

Conflict has always existed between different states, societies or territories. Therefore, it is necessary for the relationship between countries to be regulated. After the Second World War, these conflicts were only regulated by international treaties but some treated were often breached by certain countries. This subsequently led to the establishment of international organizations such as the UN and World Trade Organization (WTO) to regulate the actions of different states. United Nations was restricted to security while WTO focused on trade relations.

The United Nations represented a continuation and improvement of many failures of the League of Nations but the UN began with four countries namely United States, United Kingdom, China and the USSR. After a while, France gained permanent membership thereby increasing the representation of Europe to two nations.

Members such as China have complained about the unfair representation of Asia and also the non-representation of Africa. However, China also disagrees with the idea of bringing Japan on board because they consider themselves as the economic giants of Asia so Japan would be a threat to China's representation. China has also continually advocated or suggested a representation for Africa because of the huge economic interests China has on the African continent. The two European representatives,

France and Britain are also in keen support of bring another member on board but they have arguably disagreed for a membership slot for Germany.

Russia on the other hand strictly opposes the idea of expansion and they also oppose any review of the Veto power concept. The reason for this is best known to Russia alone. Some scholars speculate that Russia simply wants to oppose anything the United States supports and therefore there is no apparent reason.

The structure of the UNSC is not a worry for just the permanent members but also the non-permanent ones, especially developing countries. However, developing countries rather worry about the legitimacy and effectiveness of the organization as a whole. In other words, non-permanent members worry about other issues apart from the issue of representation. Even though they worry about the unequal geographic distribution of permanent membership, they also worry about the fact that UNSC policies and operations do not correspond with the contemporary security challenges.

Expansion has a lot of critics and one major reason given by these critics was that, the assessment of a candidate must not be based on any other reason that military capability. If that should be the case, then countries such as China and the United Kingdom would have to be replaced. Replacing China almost seems impossible because of their huge economic status but replacing United Kingdom could be possible because the military capability of United Kingdom has declined over the past three years or so.

The issue of reviewing the Veto power has also come under criticisms. One of the major arguments against Veto review is that the concept of Veto acts as a unification factor among the permanent members. This is because Veto is the only authority that is available in equality for all the permanent members.

Many states have also submitted reports on different kinds of reforms which they deem fit for the UNSC. All the proposals that have been submitted in the past were practically achievable but most of them were turned down by the UNSC. Among some of the key areas in these submitted reforms were the ideas of expansion. China, United States and Russia have strongly supported the idea that India deserves to be a permanent member. All these three countries supporting India have clear interests in both India as a country and as an economy. Out of the numerous reform proposals, only three came close to being applied but all the three ultimately failed for two

reasons. First, the permanent five members do not want a sixth member to share the Veto privilege with them. Secondly, regional dynamics also contributed towards these failures.

The role of international laws cannot be underestimated when it comes to maintaining international peace and security. International laws define the boundaries which national interest must not cross because the national interest of one country might be the security problem of the other. However, there is one weakness when it comes to the application of international laws. The weakness is that there is no one global institution that oversees the implementation of these laws. Nevertheless, national laws have been synchronized with regional laws which have subsequently been synchronized with international laws so it is very easy to abide by international laws. The European Union and African Union have played major roles in regional laws over the years. In as much as it is easy to abide by international laws, it is easier to breach them. This is the dilemma that states or nations confront every day.

As explained throughout this thesis, each of the permanent members uses their powers to fight for national interests and that includes China. China is ready to Veto any decision to include an African country in the permanent membership because of its enormous interest in the continent. The interest of China is not only economic but also includes security. The number of Chinese citizens present in Africa as of 2012 was estimated to be approximately 1 million. The dynamics of politics in Africa presents a very dangerous environment for Chinese citizens or any other country's citizens to live or survive in because of the security risks involved at the top and bottom level.

In the nutshell, expansion seems very realistic and quite a fair decision to be taken by the UNSC. At least it would ease the operations of the UNSC by encouraging regional fairness. However, as long as members such as Russia exist, that decision would take a long time to be taken because Russia does not support the idea of expansion in anyway.

REFERENCES

Areddy James T, (2013) "China Aims to Rewrite Rules of Global Web," Wall Street Journal, July 29, 2015, A1, A10, quote on A10;

Ayenagbo, K., Njobvu, T., Sossou, J. V., & Tozoun, B. K. (2012). *China's peacekeeping operations in Africa: From unwilling participation to responsible contribution.* African Journal of Political Science and International Relations, 6(2), 22-32

Bădălan, E, (2009), *Sisteme globale de securitate. Bucuresti:* Editura Centrului Tehnic-Editorial al Armatei.

Ball, D. & Hazel, L (2001)*, Factionalism and the Ethnic Insurgent Organizations,* Canberra*:* ANU Strategic and Defence Studies Centre.

Bailey, S, & Daws, S (1998), *The Procedure of the UN Security Council. Oxford*: Oxford University Press

Balzacq, T. (1995). The Three Faces of Securitization: Political Agency, Audience and Context, SAGE Publications and ECPR-European Consortium for Political Research, Vol. 11(2): 171–201. *European Journal of International Relations* 11(2). 172

Berween, M. (2002) "*Democratization of the UN: Isn't it Time for Structural Reform at the United Nations?*" The Review of International Affairs 2(2): 40-62.

Bilgin, P., (2003). *Individual and Societal Dimensions of Security.* International Studies Review, 5, 203- 222.

Borger, J (2014) 'Barack Obama: Russia Is a Regional Power Showing Weakness over Ukraine', *The Guardian*, March 25,

Buchanan, A, & Keohane, R (2011), Precommitment regimes for intervention: Supplementing the Security Council. *Ethics and International Affairs*

Buzan, B, (1996), 'The timeless wisdom of realism?' in Steve Smith, Ken Booth and MarysiaZaleweski (eds) *International Theory: Positivism and Beyond*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press pp47-66.

Buzan, B, Weaver, O & de Wilde, J (1998), *Security – A New Framework for Analysis*, Colorado: Lynne Rinner Publishers, Inc., Boulder.

Byers, M, & Nolte, G (eds.) (2003), *United States Hegemony and the Foundations of International Law*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Carlson, A. (2005). *Unifying China, Integrating with the World. Stanford:* Stanford University Press,

Campbell, BB, and Arthur, DB (2000), *Death Squads in Global Perspective: Murder with Deniability*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Caron, DD (1993), 'The Legitimacy of the Collective Authority of the Security Council' *The American Journal of International Law87,* vol no. 4, pp 552–588.

Chinese Ministry of Foreign Affairs, (2009), December 14, *http://www.fmprc.gov. cn/chn//gxh/cgb/zcgmzysx/fz/1206_39/xgxw/t633258.htm*

Chimni B. S., (2004) "*International Institutions Today: An Imperial Global State in the Making*", European Journal of International Law, Vol. 15, No. 1,

Chimni, B.S. (2007) "*A Just World Under Law: A View from the South*," American University International Law Review.

Churruca, C (2005), *Criticizing the EU Security Strategy: the EU as a regional cooperative security provider, in Revista Electrónica de Estudios Internacionales*, n. 10, diciembre, pp. 9, <thttp://www.reei.org/index. php/revista/num10/articulos/criticizing-the-eu-security-strategy-the-eu-as-regionalcooperative-security-provider>.

Cockayne, J, & Malone DM (2008), 'The Security Council and the 1991 and 2003 Wars in Iraq' In *United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice Since 1945*, edited by Vaughan Lowe, Adam Roberts, and Jennifer Welsh. Oxford, GBR: Oxford University Press.

Cox, B (2009), 'United Nations Security Council Reform: Collected Proposals and Possible Consequences' *South Carolina Journal of International Law and Business 6*, vol no. 1, pp 89–128.

Council on Foreign Relations, *Council Special Report No. 59*, http://www.cfr.org/international-organizations-and-alliances/unsecurity-council-enlargement-us-interests/p23363.

Demirjian, K, and Birnbaum, M. (2014) "Ukraine Accuses Russia of an Incursion," *Washington Post,* November 8

Drieskens, E (2010) '*Beyond Chapter VIII: Limits and Opportunities for Regional Representation at the UN Security Council*', in International Organizations Law Review, vol 7, pp. 158.

Floyd, R (2010), S*ecurity and the Environment: Securitisation theory and US environmental security policy,* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Frankel, B (1996), '*Restating the Realist Case: an Introduction' in Benjamin Frankel (ed.*) Realism: Restatements and Renewal London: Frank Cass and Company Limited:

Gegout, C (2016) 'Brexit would be death knell for British influence in the world', *The Conversation,* 18 May 2016

Guo, S. and Shiping H., (2008) eds. *New Dimensions of China's Foreign Policy.* Lanham, Md.: Lexington Books,

Helly, D., (2013), The EU and Africa since the Lisbon summit of 2007: Continental drift or widening cracks? South African Journal of International Affairs, 20:1, 137-157

Herz, J. (2006), *Idealist Internationalism and the Security Dilemma*. In Ungureanu, M.S., Manualul de securitate. Bucuresti: Polirom.

Hill, C (2005), '*The European Dimension of the Debate on UN Security Council Membership', in The International Spectator*, vol. 40, No. 4, pp. 31

Hightower P (1999), *The Concept of Peace Theory,* Singapore, Darmouth

Hurd, I (1999), '*Legitimacy and Authority in International Politics*', International Organization vol 53(2), pp 379–408.

Human Security Report (2005): War and Peace in the 21st Century (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005).

Ikenberry, GJ (2001). *After Victory: Institutions, Strategic Restraint, and the Rebuilding of Order after Major War*. Princeton: Princeton University Press

Kaldor, M (2006), *New and Old Wars: Organized Violence in a Global Era*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press

Kaldor, M (2007), *Human Security: Reflections on Globalization and Intervention.* Cambridge, Polity Press, U.K

Kaldor, M (2012) *New and old wars: Organised violence in a global era*. 3rd ed. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Karen E Smith and Katie Laatikainen, (2016) '*Without EU clout, how would the UK fare at the United Nations*?', LSE blog, 8 March 2016

Kennedy, D. (2006), *Of War and Law,* Princeton University Press: Princeton (2006) pp., 18.95

Kennedy, P (2006), *The Parliament of Man: The Past, Present, and Future of the United Nations.* New York: Random House.

Krause, K, & Williams M. (1997), *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases.* London: UCL Press

Krause, K, (1998), *Critical Theory and Security Studies: The Research Programme of "Critical Security Studies".* Cooperation and Conflict vol33:3, pp 298-333.

Kravchenko, S (2015) '*Putin Tells Defense Chiefs to Strengthen Russian Nuclear Forces',* Bloomberg, <http://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2015-12-11/putin-tells-defense-chiefs-to-strengthen-russian-nuclear-forces>

Langenhove, VL, Torta, I, Felicio, T (2006), The EU's Preferences for Multilateralism; a SWOT Analysis of EU/UN Relations, UNU-CRIS Occasional Papers No. 0-2006/21, Brugge, United Nations University Comparative Regional Integration Studies, pp. 9, <http://www.cris.unu.edu/fileadmin/workingpapers/20060919114318.O-2006-21.pdf>

Leigh-Phippard, H (1994) 'Remaking the Security Council: The Options'. *World Today.* 50.8-9. pp 167-172

Lowe, V., Roberts A, Welsh J, and Zaum J (2008), eds. *The United Nations Security Council and War: The Evolution of Thought and Practice since 1945*. Oxford University Press

Luck, EC (2006), *The UN Security Council: Practice and Promise*. New York: Routledge.

Lusaka Times, (2010), October 15 http://www.lusakatimes.com/2010/10/15/chineseshoot-injure-11-collum-coal/.

Macknara, B (1986), *Resolutions of the United Nations Security Council,* Toronto, University of Toronto Press

Malone, D (1998), *Decision-Making in the UN Security Council: The Case of Haiti, 1990–1997*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. — (ed.) (2004): The UN Security Council: From the Cold War to the 21st Century. Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Malone, D (2006), *The International Struggle over Iraq: Politics in the United Nations Security Council, 1980–2005*. Oxford University Press, Oxford:

Mboka, J (2005) «Africans rejects G-4 UNSC Reform Proposal, » Africa in a Power game, 20 September 2005, <http// www.un.org/largerfr.un.refor/um.org.un//->[27 September 2018].

McDonald, KC & Stewart MP (2010), *Security Council Enlargement and U.S. Interests*. New York, NY: Council on Foreign Relations

Medvedev, (2009) '*News Conference following G20 Summit*', 26 September 2009, President of Russia website, President of Russia website, <www.president.kremlin.ru>,

Meisler, S (1995). *United Nations: The First Fifty Years.* New York: Atlantic Monthly Press.

Miga-Beșteliu, R (2006). *Organizaţion internaţionale interguvernamentale.* Bucuresti: C.H. Beck.

Mahbubani, K (2004) "*The Permanent and Elected Council Members," in Malone, David (ed): The UN Security Council from the Cold War to the 21st Century*. London: Lynne Rienner Publishers.

Nkoana-Mashabane, M (2011). Notes following media briefing by the Minister of International Relations and Cooperation. South African Government Information, <www.info.gov.za>

Nye, JS (2009). *Understanding International Conflicts: An Introduction to Theory and History*, 7th Edition London: Pearson Longman.

Okumu, Wafula (2005) «Africa and the UN Security Council Permanent Seats', 15 April2005, http://: www.globalpolicy.org/security/reform/cluster1/2005/0428afriseats.htm, (26 September 2005)

Pirozzi, N (2011), Towards a more effective UN Security Council? The EU's role in the post-Lisbon era. <http://euce.org/eusa/2011/papers/3j_pirozzi.pdf>

NATO Summit, (2016) Press conference by the President of the French Republic, July 10, 2016 (http://www.elysee.fr/conferences-depresse/article/conference-de-presse-du-president-de-la-republique-lors-du-sommet-de-l-otan/).

Renz, B (2016) 'Why Russia is Reviving Its Conventional Military Power', Parameters, vol. 46, no. 2, Summer 2016, p. 24, p. 25

Roskin M (1993), *International Relations: The New World Order,* New Jersey, Prentice Hall.

Roosevelt, F. D. (1945) 'State of the Union Address', 6 Jan. 1945, www.presidency.ucsb.edu/ws/ index.php?pid¼416595 (retrieved 10 Feb 2001)

Rourke J (2002), *World Politics: International Politics on the World stage,* New York, McGraw-Hill

The Ukraine Crisis Timeline. (2014) "Russian Forces Occupy Strategic Facilities in Crimea." 28 February 2014. http://ukraine.csis.org/crimea.htm#4.

Rusong, W (1993), '*Country Case Study on Social Integration in China: Its Past, Present and Prospect*." Background paper for Human Development Report 1994. UNDP, New York

SC Res. 1674 of 28 Apr. (2006), on civilians in armed conflict.

SC Res. 1291 of 24 Feb. (2000), on the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

Silina T and Kravchenko V (2015). An Abduction of Europe. ZerkaloTyzhnia, 28 December.

Sina.com.cn, (2007), June 4 2007, http://news.sina.com.cn/c/2007-06-04/224311 956303s.shtml.

Shambaugh, David L. (2007). "*China's Propaganda System: Institutions, Processes and Efficacy.*" The China Journal (57): 25-58.

Sheever, D (1999), *Collective security in a Changing World,* New York, Shengold Publishers,

Statement by Ambassador Susan E. Rice, (2009) U.S. permanent representative to the United Nations, at an informal meeting of the General Assembly on Security Council Reform, February 19, 2009, http://www.usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/february/127091.htm

Statement by Ambassador Alejandro Wolff, (2009) U.S. deputy permanent representative, in the General Assembly, on the Security Council Report and Security Council Reform, November 13, 2009, http://usun.state.gov/briefing/statements/2009/131936.htm

Stolberg, A (2012) 'Crafting interests in the Twenty-First Century', viewed 15 February, 2018 <http://www.strategicstudiesinstitute.army.mil/pubs/display.cfm?pubID=1110>

Summers, H. G. Jr (1999). The Vietnam War Almanac. Novato, CA: Presidio Press,

The New York Times, (2013) June 6, http://www.nytimes.com/2013/06/07/world/africa/ghana-arrests-chinese-in-gold-mining-regions.html?_r=0.

The White House, (2010) National Security Strategy, May 2010, p. 1, http://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/rss_viewer/national_security_strategy.pdf.

UfC platform on Security Council reform, (2010) A/64/CRP.1, 21 January 2010, available at http://www.italyun.esteri.it/NR/rdonlyres/3661BCE2-6BFC-49A2-81E8-F8FFBFB58FE8/0/20100210125245277.pdf

U.N. GA, (1997) Report of the Open-ended Working Group on the Question of Equitable Representation on and Increase in the Membership of the Sec. Council & Other Matters related to the Sec. Council, 14, 21, Doc A /61/47 (Aug. 7, 1997).

U.N. GA, (2004) High Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, A More Secured World: Our Shared Responsibility, 256, U.N. Doc. A/59/565 (Dec. 2, 2004), available at http://www.un.org/secureworld/report.pdf [hereinafter High Level Panel Report]

UNDP, (1994), *Human Development Report 1994*. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press

US Department of Defense, (2005) National Defense Strategy 2005, available at www.defenselink.mil/news/Mar2005/d20050318nds1.pdf p. 5

Urquhart, B. (1995) "*Selecting the World's CEO: Remembering the Secretaries General*." Foreign Affairs: 21-26

Urquhart, B (1998), *Looking for the Sheriff*. New York Review of Books

Wæver, O (1995), '*Securitization and Desecuritization*', in Ronnie D. Lipschutz (ed) On Security, pp.46-86. New York: Columbia UP.

Walker, S. (2015) '*Syrian Mission Restores Pride in Russian Military after Years of Decay*', The Guardian, 15 March 2015.

Wang, J (2011). *China's Search for a Grand Strategy: A Rising Great Power Finds Its Way*. Foreign Affairs. vol. 90, No. 2, pp.68-79.

Wang, Y. (2012). Creative *involvement: a new direction in Chinese diplomacy, in China* 3.0, edited by Mark Leonard, European Council on Foreign Relations, pp.106-111.

Womack, B. (2001) 'How size matters: the United States, China and asymmetry', The Journal of Strategic Studies 24(4), pp. 123–150

Williams, PD (2008) (eds). *Security studies, 9/11 and the long war In Security and the War on Terror*, Bellamy et al., 9-24. New York: Routledge: Taylor and Francis Group

Weiss, TG (2005), '*Overcoming the Security Council reform impasse*", Dialogue on 22 Globalization Occasional Paper No. 14.

Xinhua News Agency, (2007) August 19 2007, http://news.ifeng.com/mainland/200708/0818_17_193546.shtml

Zacher, MW (2004), '*The conundrums of international power sharing," in Richard M. Price and Mark W. Zacher (eds.), The United Nations and Global Security,* Palgrave Press New York: pp. 211-225

RESUME

Name Surname	**:** Chijioke Emmanuel Nwani
Place and Date of Birth	**:** Lagos, 30/11/1984
Email	**:** chi_boya@yahoo.com

Education:

Bachelors **:** 2016, Public Relations and Advertising (Eastern Mediterranean University)

Master's : 2019, Istanbul Aydin University, Social Sciences, Department of International Relations and Political Science Program

Language Skills:

English (Fluent)

Reference:

Available on your request