

The Excessive Use of the Veto Power and its Impact on Threatening International Peace and Security

Zarzur bennouli

University of Chadli Bendjedid, El Tarf (Algeria), z.bennouli@univ-eltarf.dz

Received: 04/09/2025

Accepted: 18/12/2025

Published: 25/12/2025

Abstract:

The right to veto is considered one of the most prominent political tools used within the United Nations Security Council, as the UN Charter granted this exclusive privilege to the five permanent member states. This has enabled them to obstruct any draft resolution, even if it is supported by an overwhelming majority of member states. The right to veto was originally established to guarantee balance among the major powers and prevent the outbreak of widespread conflicts. However, with the passage of time, it has become an influential tool used according to the national and strategic interests of these states, which has made it a highly controversial topic in the international arena.

As a result, the veto power continues to be the most significant challenge confronting the Security Council. Its frequent use has hindered the Council's operations and blocked it from fulfilling its primary goal of preserving global peace and security since its establishment.

Keywords: Right to Veto, UN Security Council, UN Charter. egative effects.

Corresponding author: Zarzur bennouli, z.bennouli@univ-eltarf.dz

INTRODUCTION:

Since the establishment of the United Nations organization nearly eighty years ago, with its various organs, and at the forefront of which is the Security Council, The system and structure of which are shaped by the dominance of the nations that emerged victorious in World War II, This is evident in the permanent privilege granted to the five winning states in the Security Council, along with the authority they hold to adopt or veto resolutions, which has been termed the ‘veto right’, However, the Security Council, which comprises fifteen members in its composition, has granted permanent membership to five major states among its members. Above all, these states have been granted the right to veto resolutions issued by the Council, especially in substantive matters.

The frequent use of the veto over time has made it the most debated aspect of the United Nations, as permanent member states have misused it to pursue their own interests and agendas, This has often paralyzed the Security Council, preventing it from fulfilling its core mission of safeguarding global peace and security As a result, many countries, experts, and scholars have urgently called for reforms to the Security Council, particularly regarding the veto privilege.

This study seeks to explore the overuse of the veto power and track how permanent member states have misused it at various stages of the United Nations’ history to advance their own interests and those of their allies.

The excessive or improper use of the veto by permanent Security Council members has had a detrimental impact on efforts to maintain peace and security, creating complex challenges Thus, the central question of this study is:

“What is the effect of the excessive use of veto power on international peace and security?”

To tackle this question, the study primarily adopts a descriptive approach, thoroughly examining the topic and its key concepts and details. Additionally, an analytical approach is employed by studying and evaluating the legal frameworks, data, and statistics related to the use of the veto in the Security Council since its establishment.

To address this comprehensively, the topic is divided into three sections, as follows:

Section 1: The Meaning of the Veto Right.

Section 2: The Mechanism of Using the Veto Right.

Section 3: Excessive Use of the Veto Right.

2. Section One: The Meaning of the Veto Right

The phrase "veto right" does not appear directly in the United Nations Charter texts. Instead, it is derived from the provisions outlined in Article 27. This principle posed a great challenge to those gathered at the Yalta Conference in 1945. However, the matter was not settled until the San Francisco Conference later that same year. Nevertheless, the veto right remained a source of controversy due to the results it produced, which led to the Security Council's inability to perform its assigned tasks due to its misuse and excessive use by the major powers.

2.1. First Subsection: Definition of the Veto Right

Linguistically, 'veto' is a Latin word meaning 'I forbid' or 'I do not permit'. It is the right to prevent and abort the passage of any proposed resolution or law. Some constitutions, such as the English constitution, granted this right to the king, and likewise the American constitution granted the president the right to veto laws proposed by Congress. It is a quality attributed to power, or the ability to stop undesirable outcomes. It is a power held by one party, although actors may cooperate on a common practice of veto. The legal character of the veto can be conferred by textually stipulating it in international and domestic laws (Lulseged, 2013, p. 24).

From the perspective of international law, the veto is understood as the authority of a permanent Security Council member to block a draft resolution on substantive (significant) issues, without needing to provide justification, unlike procedural matters. This mechanism was established in the Security Council to incentivize major powers to engage in international relations following World War II (Al-Ala, 2005, p. 212). Recognizing that these powers might lose certain privileges in a democratic organization, the veto right was granted to the five permanent members of the Security Council: Russia, China, the United Kingdom, France, and the United States. In practice, this is not just an objection to a proposed resolution but effectively nullifies it. The term "veto" has been widely used since the United Nations was founded in 1945, particularly within the Security Council, and its five permanent members who possess this right in the face of any draft resolution submitted for voting in the Council. An objection from any of these states is sufficient to prevent the issuance or passage of any draft resolution, even if all other members agree to it, and even if it is acceptable to the other fourteen member states (Al-Azzawi, 2009, p. 82).

2.2. First Subsection : Forms of the Veto Right

To complete the concept of the veto right, it is necessary to clarify its forms, which can be classified as follows:

The Simple or Real Veto: This pertains to a negative vote cast by a permanent Security Council member on a substantive issue.

- This means that if any of the permanent member states votes negatively against any draft resolution related to substantive matters, the resolution cannot be issued under any circumstances. This type of veto is common and familiar in the corridors of the Security Council and is also called the initial or real veto (Al-Issawi, 2010, p. 68).
- **The Hidden Veto:** This refers to the abstention from voting or voting against a draft resolution presented. This refers to a veto initiated by one-third of the Security Council's members. Such a veto highlights the true nature of the Council's operations, particularly in relation to its voting system. To clarify this type, the United States was able to prevent the issuance of any resolution from the Council by controlling a sufficient number of votes in the Security Council, without any permanent member exercising their veto power. This fundamentally leads to a difference between the United States and the former Soviet Union. While Russia may have used the apparent (legal) veto, the United States used what can be called the hidden or de facto veto (Al-Hamdan, 2013, p. 42).
- **The Double Veto:** Neither procedural nor substantive matters were mentioned in the Charter. Therefore, for the purpose of classifying a specific issue presented to the Security Council for voting, the permanent member who wishes to prevent the issuance of a resolution performs the classification of that issue as substantive and not procedural, using the veto right. The double veto appeared based on considering the issue of legal classification as a substantive matter, as the permanent states can use the veto right whether when searching in the matter of classification or when studying the matter itself (Lamine, 2016, p. 154).
- **The Collective Veto:** Non-permanent members in the Security Council can have the right to veto any draft resolution presented to the Council. If more than six non-permanent members reject a draft resolution during voting, the required majority of nine votes cannot be achieved, even if all permanent members vote in favor of the draft.

resolution. This type of veto is rare, For this reason, it is often called the “veto power” or the principle of agreement among the major powers (Al-Mashhadani, 1999, p. 95).

- **The Veto by Proxy:** The veto power can be exercised directly or on behalf of another. When a permanent member state uses its veto to support another permanent member, the permanent member of the Security Council involved benefits, to a dispute presented can abstain from voting, and this member can deputize another member in the Security Council to use the veto right. This action is known as the veto by proxy, and the United States is the most frequent state to practice this type of veto (Muhanna, 2011, p. 56).

3. Section Two: The Mechanism of Using the Veto Right

The Security Council, like the General Assembly of the United Nations, operates under a set of rules governing procedures, the submission of topics, and the stages these topics undergo before reaching the final voting process, The voting system in the Security Council is a critical aspect of the United Nations, sparking concerns among states at the San Francisco Conference about the Council’s potential inability to fulfill its duties due to this system, These concerns have proven valid, as the voting mechanism has consistently reflected inequality and has been a key factor in the frequent paralysis that has hindered the Council’s effectiveness in numerous cases.

3.1. First Subsection: Use of the Veto Right

Undoubtedly, the issue of voting in the Security Council has been one of the most challenging matters for the United Nations since the drafting of its Charter. Disputes over voting procedures and decisions on actions against aggressors persisted until the Yalta Conference in 1945, attended by U.S. President Roosevelt, British Prime Minister Churchill, and Soviet leader Stalin. At this conference, Roosevelt proposed a solution that was endorsed by Stalin and Churchill, later incorporated into Article 27 of the Charter. Notably, the voting process in the Security Council holds critical importance, making it a central issue for the United Nations. These disagreements are not confined to major powers but also arise between major and smaller nations, (Al-Musfir, 1997, p. 263).

It is important to highlight that Article 27 of the United Nations Charter outlines the voting process in the Security Council as follows: Each member state in the Security Council, whether permanent or non-permanent holds one vote. Non-members may be invited to join discussions but do not

have voting rights, Resolutions on procedural matters require the approval of nine votes from the Council's members, These procedural matters include holding meetings outside the UN headquarters, creating subsidiary bodies, adopting rules of procedure, allowing a non-UN member to participate in discussions on an issue before the Council, and inviting a state involved in a dispute before the Council to join related discussions. Such resolutions are passed with a majority of nine votes out of the fifteen member states, without requiring the consent of the five permanent members, (Saifuddin, 2012., p. 73) .

Security Council resolutions on substantive issues require a majority of nine votes, including the votes of all permanent members. As stipulated in Article 27 of the Charter, such resolutions must have the unanimous agreement of the five permanent members Consequently, if a single permanent member is absent or abstains from voting, no resolution can be passed, even if it secures 14 votes.

Therefore, if the five states do not agree on the resolution, whatever the reason for non-agreement, the resolution cannot be issued, even if the reason is due to one or some of the five states, This is the traditional form of using the veto right (Sufan, 2008, p. 226).

It is evident from the above that substantive matters need the approval of nine Security Council members, including all permanent members Without their consent, no resolution on these issues can be passed.

In line with this, the absence of a major power, and its abstention from voting on a resolution, does not invalidate it. Likewise, it is not permissible for a major power to use the veto right if it is a party to a dispute. This requires that voting takes place in one stage, When the President of the Security Council initiates the voting process, the absence or abstention of even one permanent member prevents the resolution from being adopted. The principle of counting an absent or abstaining member as a vote in favor is not permitted, (Al-Fatlawi, 2004, p. 201).

Since the Korean issue in 1951, when the Soviet Union withdrew from the Security Council due to the recognition of Nationalist China as a permanent member instead of the People's Republic of China, the practice of treating abstention as permissible has emerged. During voting, the Council President requests member states to raise their hands in support of a resolution, If a permanent member's representative raises their hand to reject the resolution, they exercise the veto power, blocking the resolution's

adoption regardless of the number of approving votes. However, if they do not raise their hand, they are considered to have abstained, equivalent to being absent. In such cases, if the resolution secures nine votes, it will be passed, (Naji, 2007, p. 137).

In practice, this approach conflicts with Article 27 of the UN Charter which mandates the consent of all permanent member states for resolutions to gain legal validity under the Charter, If a party to a dispute is involved in the peaceful resolution of that dispute, this requirement remains critical, and if this dispute falls under the provisions of Chapter VII, the American proposal was for Britain to agree to this proposal, The Soviet Union opposed this proposal and defended its idea that resolutions related to the most important issues for maintaining peace and international relations must be taken with the approval of all (Soviet Union - United States - Britain), as well as China and France, which enjoy permanent membership rights. The American goal from this was the participation of whoever was a party to the dispute in the voting (Hamid & Mohammed Al, 2004, p. 137) .

This situation incentivizes states with a majority in the Security Council to resort to force rather than pursuing solutions acceptable to all parties, posing a direct threat to nations and raising the risk of a global catastrophe, The United States holds a de facto veto over most Council resolutions, as it can block their adoption without formally using its veto power. This stems from its influence over Security Council members, enabling it to secure seven votes to prevent any resolution's passage without invoking the veto, This dynamic has significantly impeded the United Nations' effectiveness Consequently, permanent member states were granted the veto privilege, (Al-Daqaq, 1978, p. 136).

3.2. Second Subsection: Restricting the Use of the Veto Right

The existence of the veto right granted to the five permanent member states in the Security Council has created a suitable means to express the lack of trust between the major powers among themselves, as well as between them and other states, We can imagine the possibility of the shrinking size of distrust if there was no easy way to express it, especially since we know the importance of the rule that for every action there is a reaction in the field of relations between blocs, There is no doubt that the veto right is not the only reason for the Council's inability to carry out its functions, but it is the strongest and most direct reason for that (Al-Muhaimid, 2007, p. 123).

The Excessive Use of the Veto Power and its Impact on Threatening International Peace and Security

Therefore, the majority of international law jurists demand maintaining this right, but with restricting its scope and effects so that it does not obstruct the work of the Council. Despite the veto right's indication of a national orientation, and despite it being a problematic manifestation that undermines the idea of equality between states, it is a resistance to the rule of voting by majority. Accordingly, recommendations and statements have emerged calling on the The five permanent members of the Security Council, endowed with veto power by the UN Charter, are urged to exercise restraint in using this right. Among the most significant appeals are the recommendations from the United Nations General Assembly, which encouraged states to minimize and limit the use of the veto, particularly to avoid obstructing the Council's work through its misuse, and identifying the issues for which this right should not be used, and exchanging views before voting on important issues (Al-Ayoun, 1985, p. 132).

For instance, the General Assembly's recommendations on December 13, 1946, and April 14, 1949, specifically Resolution No. 267 on voting in the Security Council, urged permanent members to refrain from excessive use of the veto on issues that are not substantive, discouraging its use as a justification in such cases. This has happened many times since then. It happened that the permanent states agreed on a British draft resolution on 1949-10-18, which stipulated exchanging views among them before voting on any substantive resolution. However, this did not prevent the multiple uses of the veto right (Shalabi, 1984, p. 122).

Proposals to limit the use of the veto right have varied, whether by expanding the definition of what is meant by procedural matters or by restricting its use to the provisions contained in Chapter VII regarding the threat to peace, its violation, and aggression. This is also done by excluding specific issues from the scope of this right, such as the issue of accepting new members. Many proposals have been submitted aimed at strengthening the Security Council and directing its efforts and concerns towards achieving the purpose for which the international organization was established. For example, restricting the use of the veto right by setting agreed-upon limits for the issues in which it is permissible to use it. Others advocate for amending the UN Charter to include a provision allowing a permanent member to cast a negative vote in the Security Council without it being considered a veto. This would align with the current practice of

treating a permanent member's absence or abstention from voting as not obstructing the resolution's adoption, (Hamouna, 2011, p. 147) .

Others call for increasing the number of members of the Security Council, and this is done by balancing and expanding its membership, so that it helps to reflect all important interests in the world, confirming that any controversial or conflicting proposal can carry global support with it, and the Security Council becomes an attractive place for international discussions and reaching a solution that satisfies everyone (N, 2017, p. 25) .

Despite all previous attempts and others, nothing has been achieved, and the veto right remained an easy means to implement ambitions and protect interests, even if it required violating its provisions and the Charter. Here lies the danger, This will persist as long as the conflict between the interests and ambitions of the five permanent Security Council member states continues.

4. Section Three: The Excessive Use of the Veto Right

It was easy for the veto right to turn into an abuse and unfair use. This is an empowerment for major colonial powers, and we see a kind of blackmail of international peace, which was previously non-angelic, At the founding of the United Nations, the veto power was granted to certain states to maintain a balance of power and promote peace However, this violation of the principle of equality among states within the world's foremost organization tasked with preserving peace and security has led to breaches of human rights and international law, constituting a serious flaw by design. Abuse of the veto occurs when a Security Council member employs it inappropriately, in ways that contradict the UN's core principles, prioritizing the political interests of the permanent member over the stability and peace of the international community.

4.1. First Subsection: Forms of Excessive Use of the Veto Right

There is no doubt that the permanent states in the Security Council bear a moral responsibility towards the international community as a whole and towards future generations, simply because of their ability to control the fate of humanity in many aspects, particularly those concerning international peace and security, and the commitment to human rights values and principles, which are central to sustainable development and the work of UN bodies, The overuse of the veto power has significantly impaired the Security Council's ability to fulfill its responsibilities, leading many to view it as a key factor in the failure of the collective security system, (Abbas, 2018, p. 108).

The Excessive Use of the Veto Power and its Impact on Threatening International Peace and Security

Since its establishment, the Security Council has witnessed, throughout its history, the use of the veto right 445 times, which has been used only by the five permanent member states that have the right to object to and annul any resolution they do not like or that conflicts with the interests of their allies. The five states become guardians over the world, and the primary controllers of its resolutions. Of the 15 Security Council member states, 5 hold veto power, which allows them to block decisions.

to any resolution presented to the Security Council without stating reasons. These are the United States, Russia, China, Britain, and France (Wolters & Tom, 2005, p. 14).

Perhaps one of the most important and earliest forms of abuse of the veto right is its use to protect a permanent state in the Security Council from condemnation or sanctions for itself. The state becomes both a judge and an adversary, and deterrence from aggression and illegal acts committed by a specific state is eliminated, which exacerbates the gap between the individuals of international law and detracts from respecting the principle of equality between states and clarifies the responsibility before The international community, embodied by the United Nations, is undermined by this. Such actions conflict with international law, its general principles, and Article 27, paragraph 3 of the United Nations Charter, which was adopted, which prevents states from voting if one of the parties to the dispute was involved, which Russia did not respect to protect itself from accountability and its use of the veto right against the resolution condemning it by the Security Council after its annexation of four Ukrainian regions in 2022 during the Russian-Ukrainian war (Nations, Report, 2025). Moreover, the permanent Certain Security Council states have continued to misuse their veto power to protect their allies from governments whose national and self-interests outweigh international peace and security. Perhaps the most prominent example is the American veto, which has been in service of the Zionist entity and its government (Ross-Nazzal, 2008, p. 14).

It has protected it from resolutions related to condemning the Zionist entity for annexing the Golan Heights in 1982, invading Lebanon in 1982, and condemning it for building settlements, and its recent war on Gaza, Denying the right to self-determination, a fundamental principle and right, violates international law On January 25, 1976, the United States used its veto power to block the Palestinian people's right to self-determination, as

outlined in the United Nations Charter, contributing to ongoing human rights violations, or semi-annual or annual violations against Palestinian civilians, especially in the Gaza Strip, The veto was also used to reject the resolution to burn the hands of Sheikh Ahmed Yassin, the founder of the Hamas movement, or his assassination In 2004, the United States vetoed a resolution condemning Israel's use of force against Palestinian civilians in 2018, (Agency, 2025).

During the Security Council session on Tuesday, February 20, 2024, Washington used the “veto” against an Algerian draft resolution calling for an immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza, which is facing a humanitarian catastrophe since October 7, 2023. The American “veto” caused the Security Council to fail to adopt the Algerian draft resolution, despite 13 states out of 15 members of the Council voting in favor of it, while Britain abstained from voting. Since October 7, 2023, the American veto has been used 5 times:

- On October 12, 2023, the Security Council failed to issue a resolution regarding an immediate ceasefire in Gaza due to the American “veto” (website, 2025).
- On December 16, 2023, the Security Council also failed to issue a resolution to send a fact-finding mission for investigation into allegations of Israel committing “war crimes” in Gaza.
- On February 20, 2024, the Security Council also failed to approve the Algerian resolution regarding an immediate humanitarian ceasefire in Gaza.
- In June 2024, Washington used the veto right against a draft resolution in the Security Council to cease fire in Gaza and lift all restrictions imposed on humanitarian aid immediately In June 2025, The United States sparked frustration among other Security Council members by exercising its "veto" power against.
- a draft resolution to cease fire in Gaza and allow humanitarian aid to enter the besieged sector without restrictions. It justified its actions by saying that the veto undermines diplomatic efforts aimed at resolving the conflict, The Pakistani ambassador, Asim Iftikhar Ahmed, strongly criticized the American veto, considering it “a green light for the genocide of Palestinians in Gaza, and a stain on the conscience of the Security Council,” His Algerian counterpart, Amar Jama, said in turn, “Silence does not defend the dead, nor does it hold the hands of the

perpetrators, nor does it confront the consequences of injustice” (Sayam, 2025).

- A report from the Global Affairs website on the United States' use of the "veto" in the UN Security Council up to last December shows that Washington has invoked this right 89 times, with almost half of those instances aimed at supporting Israel. The report notes that Washington alone has wielded the "veto" 45 times specifically to back Israel by that point, so the most recent one — against the Algerian draft resolution on Tuesday — marks the 47th such action. The site further highlights that, among these 47 American "vetoes," 35 were solely related to the Palestinian territories (Nations, rapport, 2025).

Russia holds the record for the most frequent use of the veto power since the Security Council was established. The Soviet Union and Russia have exercised the veto a total of reached 293 times until now, in defiance of the West. Among the most prominent situations in which Russia used the veto was to prevent a resolution criticizing Serbian forces in Bosnia for not allowing the High Commissioner for Refugees to visit Bihac in Bosnia. Another time, it obstructed a resolution regarding the financing of United Nations activities in Cyprus. And two other times to prevent the passage of a resolution related to condemning During the Syrian civil war, Russia and China jointly vetoed every resolution targeting the Syrian government. This marks the first instance in veto history where it was used in relation to an Arab country. It is worth noting that the last time Russia used the veto was on March 28, 2024, against a resolution related to renewing the mandate of the expert team concerned with preparing reports related to sanctions imposed on North Korea (Agency, rapport, 2025).

As for Britain, it has used the veto right 32 times, some of which were alongside the United States or France, or both, while it acted alone in the rest, defending Rhodesia, which later collapsed, and on its ruins, the state of Zimbabwe was established. China and France are considered the least frequent users of the veto, as each of them China has utilized its veto power 18 times since the Security Council was established. One of the most significant cases of China's veto use was on May 26, 2022, alongside Russia, to object to a draft resolution against North Korea regarding its nuclear weapons proliferation (Nations, rapport, 2025).

The forms of abuse of the veto right are not limited to undermining international peace and security in an indirect manner only, but rather reach

the extent of using the veto to prevent peace-keeping operations directly. China temporarily obstructed United Nations peacekeeping missions in Guatemala to punish member states that maintain close relations with Taiwan and considered the veto right a tool for arbitrary actions between irresponsible governments (Burnay, 2018, p. 24).

The veto power doesn't need to be overtly misused to be problematic as the mere threat by permanent members to use it acts as a veto, albeit a concealed one (Trahan, 2020, p. 32). This reaches the same results in the end. The most clear example In this context, a key example is the 1994 Rwandan genocide, When the Security Council explored intervening to halt the massacres, two permanent members, the United States and France, blocked the formation of a robust intervention force, In addition to that, these countries used the hidden veto right to weaken the crisis and avoid the term genocide according to international law, The prevention of peace operations was the result of France's alliance with the government of genocide (Wolters & Tom, 2005, p. 16) .

4.2. Second Subsection: Consequences of Excessive Use of the Veto Right

he excessive use of the veto power significantly undermines general international law. Such use often violates key principles, rules, or branches of international law. A clear example is the breach of general international law and the United Nations Charter, which established the veto. The veto itself contradicts the principle of equality among states, a core tenet of international law and the Charter, which rejects discrimination based on a state's size, culture, political system, or other factors.

The misuse of the veto power violates Article 1, paragraph 2 of the United Nations Charter, which promotes resolving disputes and upholding peoples' right to self-determination. The U.S. misuse of its veto in 1976 against a resolution by Pakistan, Tanzania, and Panama supporting Palestinian self-determination exemplifies this abuse, (Abbas, 2018, p. 85). Misuse of the veto power has blocked initiatives to make Myanmar accountable for oppressing the Rohingya, weakening the global community's capacity to tackle human rights abuses. The Rohingya crisis in Myanmar has displaced over one million Rohingya Muslims from their homes China, a permanent member of the Security Council, used the veto right in 2007 and followed a policy of non-participation in discussions in 2018, leading to the United Kingdom's reluctance to put the issue to a vote. This continued until a resolution was issued by the Security Council in

2021 regarding this crisis, which called for an immediate cessation of violence and the adoption of necessary measures to preserve peace in the region, The United Nations described this resolution as the first of its kind, and the United Nations celebrated its ability to finally fulfill its role in establishing international peace and security (Nations, rapport, 2025).

It can be said that the crisis of irregular migrants and refugees is a result of a chain reaction that began with a slight change, followed by a major deviation, leading to catastrophic consequences, The result is the presence of displaced people from areas of war and destruction, The existence of the veto power has been a source of contention, As a result extends to acts of terrorism, destruction, and chaos, and the emergence of a complete generation exposed to the recruitment of criminal organizations. This chain reaction comes in the form of successive violations that These instances together form an outcome of the misuse and overuse of the veto power.

Resolutions from the Security Council addressing climate change were not spared from this veto abuse either, as Russia exercised its veto in 2021 against a draft that aimed to recognize climate change as a threat to international peace and security to prevent a resolution submitted by Ireland related to climate change and security Therefore, a permanent member of the Security Council can exercise their veto power to block the adoption of a resolution into force of international agreements, which undermines international environmental cooperation and prevents progress in protecting the environment and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, It is strange to find that addressing climate change is subject to prevention due to The use of veto power by a state can, in theory, negatively impact the international community and the rights of future generations, The mere existence of this possibility of this hypothetical scenario makes the abuse and excessive use of the veto right a threat to sustainable development and environmental issues, for which efforts are being made to protect them (Nations, rapport, 2025).

The veto right has exceeded all legal boundaries, as the consequences of abusing the veto right include allowing genocide and making it an option available to corrupt governments to escape accountability for war crimes. Mexico and France, on September 30, 2015, through The Code of Conduct encourages voluntarily refraining from using veto power in specific cases, including resolutions preventing genocide. However, it did not exceed

being a proposal. It is worth noting that the United Nations itself realizes the magnitude of the disaster caused by the veto right, and this is clearly and explicitly stated on The official United Nations website under a clear title: “The Veto Against International Law” It can be said explicitly that the veto right has become a right to kill and assassinate democracy and humanity (Fassbender, 2020, p. 1168).

5. CONCLUSION:

In conclusion of this research, it can be said that the fundamental flaw in relation to the veto right does not lie in the right itself, as it is a mechanism devoid of whims, but rather in the abuse of its use and its deviation from its intended goals, which has undermined its credibility, as well as that of the Security Council and the United Nations as a whole, This has resulted in the obstruction of the Council’s work and its inability to carry out its tasks in maintaining international peace and security, The veto right has become a tool for the major powers to impose their will and protect their interests, even if it means violating international law and human rights Therefore, It is essential to reform the Security Council and limit the use of veto power to ensure.

that it serves its original purpose of maintaining international peace and security, and not as a tool for political manipulation and self-interest This reform should include clear guidelines for its use, and mechanisms to hold permanent members accountable for its abuse, Only then can the Security Council regain its credibility and effectively fulfill its mandate to promote peace and security worldwide.

Results:

Based on our study, we have arrived at several findings, which can be summarized as follows:

- The most significant risk posed by the veto power is the lack of consensus among the five states that hold this privilege, making it a point of contention when used in numerous issues, particularly those related to international peace and security, The veto power has stalled the Security Council’s work and decisions, undermining the United Nations’ effectiveness.
- Veto usage often serves to protect the interests of major powers in the Security Council, sidelining the desires of less powerful nations.
- The exclusive control of the veto by five states clashes with the principle of equality among all nations.

The Excessive Use of the Veto Power and its Impact on Threatening International Peace and Security

- The Security Council's authority is shaped by the discretion of its permanent members, who hold sway over decisions tied to the Council's roles, with all five veto-holding states needing to agree for any resolution to pass.
- The veto's impact on the Security Council's voting system persists, as permanent members with this privilege may use it solely to protect their interests, with each state effectively exercising oversight over other members to prevent decisions that conflict with their interests or those of their allies.
- The veto power continues to pose challenges in the actions of major powers. While these nations hold this privilege, they should place humanitarian principles above practical and legal considerations when wielding it. Consequently, the United States' use of the veto during the humanitarian crisis in Gaza, which has deeply moved global consciences, will leave a lasting stain on its international humanitarian and legal reputation.

Recommendations:

Based on the above, the following recommendations can be proposed:

- Work toward expanding Security Council membership based on the principle of equal sovereignty and appropriate representation of major civilizations and developing nations, to ensure fairer representation and a composition more aligned with the current international reality.
- Eliminate the designation of permanent members by name in the veto system and replace them with regional organizations, such as the European Union, African Union, Organization of American States, Arab League, Organization of Islamic Cooperation, and other regional organizations.
- Address the ambiguity in the veto system by establishing clear criteria to distinguish between substantive and procedural matters.
- Ensure that the Security Council's actions are subject to oversight by the United Nations General Assembly and the International Court of Justice to guarantee that its decisions align with the UN's objectives and principles.
- Require at least two votes for a veto to be valid during voting, rather than relying on a single vote as is currently practiced, to prevent its misuse or abuse by any single state.
- For the Security Council to effectively fulfill its mandated tasks, two conditions must be met: justice, which requires expanding the Council's

membership, and efficiency, which necessitates limiting the number of members to enable the Council to perform its duties effectively and promptly.

6. Bibliography List:

1.Books:

1. Ahmed Saifuddin, *The Security Council and Its Role in Protecting International Peace*, Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut, 2012.
2. Ahmed Abdullah Abu Al-Ala, *The Evolution of the Security Council's Role in Maintaining International Peace and Security*, Legal Books Publishing House, Egypt, 2005.
3. Akif Yusuf Sufan, *International Regional Organizations*, Al-Ahmadi Publishing House, Cairo, 2008.
4. Abdullah Mohammed Al-Ayoun, *The Collective Security System in Modern International Organization*, Al-Bashir for Publishing and Distribution, Amman, Jordan, 1985.
5. Al-Sayyid Al-Daqaq, *International and Regional Organizations*, University Culture Foundation, Cairo, 1978.
6. Bardo Fassbender, *Key Documents on the Reform of the UN Security Council 1991-2019*, Brill Nijhoff, 2020.
7. Fahri Rashid Muhanna, *International Organizations*, Doctoral dissertation, Dar Al-Kutub for Printing and Publishing, Mosul, Iraq, 2011.
8. Ibrahim Ahmed Shalabi, *International Organization: A Study in General Theory and International Organizations*, Dar Al-Jami'a for Printing and Publishing, Beirut, 1984.
9. Ibrahim Fouad Abbas, *Palestinian-American Relations*, Al-Dar for Publishing and Distribution, Egypt, 2018.
10. James Ross-Nazzal, *The U.S. Veto and the Polemics of the Question of Palestine in the United Nations Security Council*, the University of Michigan, 2008.
11. Jennifer Trahan *Existing Legal Limits to Security Council Veto Power in the Face of Atrocity Crimes* Cambridge University Press 2020.
12. Jan Wolters & Tom Ruys, *SECURITY COUNCIL REFORM*, Egmont Institute, 2005.

13. Kamal Abdul Aziz Naji, The Role of International Organizations in Implementing International Governance Decisions, Center for Arab Unity Studies, Lebanon, 2007.
14. Lama Abdul Baqi Mahmoud Al-Azzawi, The Legal Value of Security Council Decisions in the Field of Human Rights, Halabi Legal Publications, Beirut, 2009.
15. Lamrot Lulseged, vetoing the veto, Simon Fraser University, 2013.
16. Malcolm N. Shaw, International Law, Cambridge University Press, 2017.
17. Matthieu Burnay, Chinese Perspectives on the International Rule of Law, Edward Elgar Publishing, 2018.
18. Mohammed Habib Zuhair Al-Muhaimid, The United Nations and Federal Polarity, National Islamic Consensus Movement, Department of Political Studies, International Research Section, Safat, Kuwait, 2007.
19. Mohammed Sami Abdul Hamid & Mohammed Al-Sayyid Al-Daqaq, International Organization, Ma'aref Establishment, Alexandria, 2004
20. Mohammed Saleh Al-Musfir, The United Nations, Faculty of Management and Economics, University of Qatar, 1997.
21. Suhail Hussein Al-Fatlawi, International Organizations, Arab Thought House, Beirut, Lebanon, 2004.
22. Saifuddin Al-Mashhadani, The Discretionary Authority of the Security Council and Its Use in the Case of Iraq, General Cultural Publishing House, Baghdad, 1999.
23. Usmani Lamine, Political Reform: The UN Security Council, Political and Organizational Dimensions from 1991–2011, Ibn Battuta Publishing and Distribution House, Jordan, 2016.

2. Journal article:

1. Ali Abdul Muti Al-Hamdan, The Possibility of Reforming the Veto Power, Journal of Sharia and Legal Sciences, Al-Marqab University, Issue 2, Libya, 2013

2. . Mohammed Hussein Kazim Al-Issawi, The Veto Power in the Security Council: A Study from the Perspective of International Law, Ahl Al-Bayt Journal, Ahl Al-Bayt University, Iraq, Issue 11, 2010.
3. Ramzi Naseem Hamouna, The Legitimacy of Decisions Issued by the International Security Council and Their Oversight, Damascus University Journal for Economic and Legal Sciences, Vol. 27, Issue 1, Faculty of Law, University of Damascus, Syria, 2011.