

327.7

” , , ( ,  
) , dadashova.ramila@rambler.ru

**Dadashova R.**, candidate of historical sciences, researcher, Institute of philosophy, of sociology, and of Law of NAS Azerbaijan (Azerbaijan,Baku), dadashova.ramila@rambler.ru

**Geopolitical confrontations between the members with veto right of the Security Council and the problems of regulation of the regional conflicts**

The constant members of the Security Council with veto right use their right for implementing the geopolitical interests. There are more contradictions than the cooperation between constant members of Security Council today. The national interests of the America collide with interests of the any country what making an effort to do domination in the region of Eurasia. The influence of the USA increases in the Europe when the bounds of the NATO expand. Russia does not accept the natosentrizm politics of the USA and prefers the OSCE for the security of the continent. Russia makes an effort put in order of conflicts in post-soviet place with the help of the Commonwealth of the Independent States or itself. The resolutions of the UN about the global security show that the UN is multilateral system what it secures modern security. Therefore reforms are necessary in the mechanism of the UN. The author prefers to opinion of the High-level group on dangers and changes about reform in Security Council. The veto right of the constant members prevents put in order of the regional conflicts.

**Keywords:** veto right, geopolitical confrontations, international relations, regional conflicts.

), dadashova.ramila@rambler.ru

The USA, Russia, Great Britain, France, China are constant members of the Security Council. They have much right for defend the international security because they have veto right. There are more contradictions than the cooperation between constant members of Security Council today. There is difference of opinion between these states about ethnic, regional conflicts or fighting with international terrorism. Position of the USA conforms with position of Great Britain, position of Russia conforms with of France, China position is neutral in the most case.

The purpose of give of the veto right was creation of the unity principle between hegemon states. Ruzvelt–President of the USA supported the veto right, but he announced that the veto right of the great states breaks the security of the small nations and American people and senate will not support this offer. In the letter to Ruzvelt Stalin was writing that he supports the unity principle of the four states. Cherchil – Prime Minister of the British announced that the unanimous activities of the great states assumes importance in UN. He was writing about it to Stalin in his secret letter. But today the superpower USA use the veto right for realize the natosentrizm politics. USA do not have wish only to be the economical hegemony and they make an effort to strengthen position in economical rich and strategical

important regions of the world. After decline of the bipolar system the attitudes between Russia and USA changed, Russia lost this superpower position. The attitudes between Russia and USA lost the character of ideological contradiction, the geopolitical discord became stronger, the difference of opinion arose between two states in solution of the international problems, in the trade, in the military areas, in the regional security, in the strategical stability, in UN and in the other problems.

The national interests of the America collide with interests of the any country what making an effort to do domination in the region of Eurasia. One of priorities of the Eurasia politics of the USA is to broaden to the east of the composition of the NATO. Joining to the NATO of the Central Europe states, Baltic states, Ukraine is in the circle of interests of the USA. A.D. Boqaturov writes that the purpose of the European politics of the USA is to defend their security and the purpose in the Near and Middle East, in the Caspian Sea, in the Central Asia is ecological security, the purpose in Russia, in Japan, in Korean, in China, in India is strategical interests. H.Kissinger considers that there are six strength centre as USA, Europe, China, Japan, Russia, India. The USA will play the role of integration in the international system of the XXI century [1,p.14s].

One of strategical purposes of the USA in the Eurasia is to control in the system of Eurasia central communication and to become stronger in the place of past of the Silk Way connecting the Pacific Ocean with Atlantic Ocean. A.F. Panarin writes that USA can not be long-term a hegemon without neutralizing China and India. Japan assumes more importance for the USA when China become stronger. The USA have need a strong ally in the creation of order of the new world and this state strengthens the cooperation with Japan in the security area in the eastern Asia. The USA support the pretension of electing of Japan to the row of the constant member of the Security Council. Japan does not use his economical leadership, his situation and it does not make an effort to be regional dominant state. It prefers to pursue the policy under subordination of the America. The role of security of the America in the Far East is dependent from the cooperation with Japan [4,p.61]. Yet in 70 of XX century the USA proposed entering of Germany and of Japan to the row of the constant member

of Security Council. It assumes importance from point of view the diminution of the expense of the USA in UN and these states are colleagues of the USA. Under pressure of the developing countries the USA agreed including one country from the each developing region to the Security Council in 90 years. Z. Bzezinski writes that the Japan can be the authoritative state in the world by cooperation with USA. American administration must help Japan in this direction. The American–Japan agreement about free trade can strengthen the attitudes between two states.

Germany being from the leaders of the European Union continues global influence by EU. It is the basic partner, it is the loyal colleague, it is necessary military base of the USA. Germany collaborates with USA in the activities of secret service. The USA support the pretension of the Germany being of constant member of the Security Council. Z. Bzezinski writes that it is necessary to support the leadership of Germany in the Europe by USA for achieve the Europe. Germany supports the formula of «forgiveness+security = Europe+America» [4,p.80]. So Germany is basic supporter of the America in the Europe.

The base of the foreign policy of the USA is as the following: strengthening of the military strength, to strengthen the alliance with states defend its foreign policy, to pursue the sharp policy against dangerous states considered, to determine its interests in the attitudes with others countries, to strengthen itself global position in the countries where there is not the system of durable authority; to continue of the production of nuclear and modernizing of this weapon.

Making an effort to control the world of the USA independently will be able to result with decline of the UN. Russian researcher T.N. Ne atayeva shows two causes of the being defeated of the Nations League: 1) Social– political condition in 1919–1939 years what that was demanding being of the new international political structure. This organization was not the character of integration, it was centrifugal. The process becoming stronger of national status of the member states of Nations League was going in the world. 2) The legal mechanism of the Nations League was not complete. V.L. Oleandrov shows the following causes of declining of the Nations League: not be the collective strength basis, being divided of the Europe countries to

defeated and conqueror states, not take part of the USA and USSR in this organization [7,p.190–191].

Russia supports the leading role of the UN in the security. In the 58th session of the General Assembly V.V. Putin– President of Russia announced that the UN does not have an alternative for the security of the mankind [15,p.9–20]. The resolutions of the UN about the global security show that the UN is multilateral system what it secures modern security. Russia does not accept the natosentrizm politics of the USA and prefers the OSCE for the security of the continent. Russia makes an effort put in order of conflicts in post–soviet place with the help of the Commonwealth of the Independent States or itself. South Caucasus stays are the limelightof Moscow from point of view to secure the national security of Russia. The USA had big influence in the Caucasian region after declining of the USSR. N.A. Nartov announces that the purpose of the help of the USA to Ukraine, Azerbaijan, George is to weaken the centralize politics of the Russia [8,p.268]. S.S. Jilchov and I.S. Zonn write that one of the methods of the foreign policy of the USA is to do pressure to regions under the pretext of defense of the human rights and of developing of the democracy [5]. The American researchers write that the USA have not strategical interests in the Central Asia and in Caucasus which these regions have not so much energy reserves. The purpose of the USA is to become stronger of the democratic institutes, to explore energy reserves, to put in order the conflicts in regions [6,p.241]. Z. Bjezinski writes that thr USA help to new independents states for prevent of getting stronger of the Russia in these countries [4,p.242].

China is in the 3rd place after the USA and Russia according to economical potential, it is the biggest potential competitor of the USA. China army according to number (2,5 million) is in the first place. Special corporations being in the USA go to the expense of learning of China. The USA try to keep under control of China as Russia by way of to become stronger in the Central Asia. Most of the countries of Central Asia is the participant of the program of Partnership for the Peace, and some of them makes an effort to be member of the NATO. Developing of the cooperation of China with members of Shanghai organization is explained from this point of

view. One of basic strategical purposes of the USA in the Asia is not making a way anti-American approaching of China and of Russia. The American researcher E. Rubinstayn writes that Russia occupies the Eurasia. China will enter to alliance with Russia and Iran against the USA, Europe and Japan [1,p.15]. Creating of the alliance of China and of Russia stimulates the USA to approach with Japan which has historical contradictions with China. Russian researcher N.A. Nartov writes the alliance between Japan and China can put an end geopolitical hegemony of the USA in the Asia and Pacific Ocean region [8,p.272]. The USA finance the separatists of Uyghur being in the Sintszyan-Uyghur autonomy circle for weakening of China. The USA do not know the problem joining of the Taiwan with China. So, the contradictions being between China and USA does not become clear only by gentleness of China.

The Great Britain is the state supporting of the foreign policy of the USA lately. It assumes importance for USA yet. The Great Britain is not geostrategical figure, it does not claim the leadership in the future Europe, it makes an effort to create balance in the Europe traditionally. The Great Britain does not accept the political unity and prefers to the economical integration on the basis of free trade, to coordinatethe foreign policy, to security and defense in outside the European Union. It seldom uses itself influence [4,p.59]. The Europe states dependent of the USA for to defend the security. The influence of the USA increases in the Europe when the bounds of the NATO expand.

France does not make an effort only to the political role in the Europe and it makes an effort to strengthen its influence in the Mediterranean countries, in the Northern Africa – Morocco, Tunisia, Algeria. The France contingent leads to being supported of the security in the same regions. In opinion of the France the basic purpose is to connect of the Europe under administration of France and at the same time the chief role of the America must be restricted approximately in the Europe. If France wants to create the future Europe, it must involve Germany in reducing the role of the America in the Europe. The USA have created the strategical centre for learning France after the disagreement related with Iraq.

It was clear from facts shown above that there are geopolitical contradictions between the constant members of the Security Council and the states with veto right will express their interests when the Security Council gives any political sanction. Weakening of the Security Council will be able to influence to other organs of the UN. L.Gross – the lawyer of the USA writes that the paralysis of the Security Council must not spread to the General Assembly. The veto right assumes importance for guarding the geopolitical interests of the leader states or of the five constant members traditionally. Liquidating of the veto right assumes urgent importance for preventing the geopolitical interests of the constant members of Security Council. All member states must fulfill the decisions of the Security Council according to the Charter of the UN. The recommendation character of the decisions of the General Assembly, taking part of the constant members in all basic organs and influencing to the decisions restrict the sovereignty rights of the General Assembly at the same time of the states. Veto right of the constant members prevents put in order of the regional conflicts.

The past secretaries general B.B. Qali, K.Annan, the international expert group under the leadership of the foreign affairs minister of Algeria Laxdar Braximi who has been the adviser of K.Annan, M.Gulding – the representative of the Secretary General, Brayan Urkxart – the representative in UN, Diego Arria – the representative of the Venezuela in UN had given some offers about reforms in UN. But these offers had not yield the positive results yet. In the 58th session of the General Assembly prime ministers and foreign affairs ministers of the 50 states proposed for to strengthen the central role of UN. In the Summit of 2005 General Secretary K.Annan created High-level group on dangers and changes which consisted of 15 well-known politicians for giving recommendations about function of the basic organs of UN. B.B. Qali, K.Annan note of prevention of the veto right for put in order of the regional conflicts and they propose broadening of the composition of the Security Council. In the both model of the High-level group on danger and changes offered liquidating of the veto right [2;3]. It is possible to consider correctly of opinion of this group about to elect 8 members to the time of 4 years.



## References

1. Geopolitika: Antologiya. – M.: Akadmicheskiy Proekt Cultura, 2006. – 1004 p.
2. Doklad Gruppi visokogo urovnya po ugrozam vizovam i peremenam( /59/565 + corr/ 1), Chast vtoraya – kollektivnaya bezopasnosti I zadacha predotvrasheniya, Rol sanksiy. [http:// www.un.org](http://www.un.org)
3. Doklad Gruppi visokogo urovnya po ugrozam vizovam i peremenam ( /59/565 + corr/ 1), Chast chetvertaya. Bolee effektivnaya OON dlya XXI veka. [http:// www.un.org](http://www.un.org)
4. Zbignev Bjezinskiy. Velikaya shaxmatnaya doska (Gospodstvo Ameriki I ego geostrategicheskie imperativi) Perevod .Y. Uralskoy. – .: Mejdunarodnie otnosheniya, 1998. – 255 p. <http://www.chat.ru/~scbooks>
5. Jilchov S.S., Zonn I.S., SSHA v pogone za Kaspiem. – M.: Mejdunarodnie otnosheniya, 2009. – 200 p.
6. Jilchov S.S., Zonn I.S., Ushkov A.M., Geopolitika Kaspiyskogo regiona. – M.: Mejdunarodnie otnosheniya, 2003. – 280 p.
7. Mirovaya politika v usloviyax krizisa: Uchebnoe posobie / Pod redakchiey S.V. Kortunova. – M.:Aspekt Press, 2010. – 464 p.
8. Nartov N.A. Geopolitika: Uchebnik dlya vuzov / Pod red. prof. V.I. Staroverova. – M.: Edinstvo, 2003. – 439 p.