

The United Nations Voting Result of December 21, 2017: How the United Nations is not Toothless

Charles Chidi Eleonu, Phd¹, Sharon Ebikebina²

¹Port Harcourt Polytechnic, Rumuola, Rivers State, Nigeria

²Dept. of History and International Studies, Rivers State University, Port Harcourt Nigeria

Abstract: - This paper intends to analyze the historical voting of December 21, 2017 as it relates to the role and powers of the United Nations. The UN has been successful in resolving several world conflicts peacefully but in the face of these efforts the critics of the UN see her to be toothless. The Czech after the resolution of 2017 stated it abstained from the historic voting because, Czech Republic did not believe the United Nations draft resolution would contribute to the peace process. The formation of the United Nations was necessitated by the inability of the League of Nations to prevent the Second World War of 1939-1945. Thus the United Nations was primarily established in 1945 to promote world peace and to encourage cooperation among nations in the world. This paper in a historical perspective found that the United Nations has proved critics wrong through the resolution of December 21, 2017. This paper found that the declaration of December 21, 2017 is upheld with compliance despite the United States threat of withdrawal of funds to the United Nations and the threat of not any more giving aid to perceived enemies to the United States of America. The paper established that the UN in an emergency meeting of the General Assembly pronounced President Trump's December 6, 2017 declaration of Jerusalem as capital of Israel null and void. And that about 130 nations voted in support of the resolution of the United Nations. The theoretical framework used in this work is the system theory. This paper concludes that the assertion that the UN is a toothless cannot be factual especially because the result of the UN voting stands and many sovereign nations all over the world complied.

Keywords: Cooperation, Decisions, Compliance, Declaration, Peace.

I. BACKGROUND

The formation of the United Nations was prompted by the failure of the League of Nations to prevent the Second World War of 1939-1945. Thus the United Nations was established in 1945 to promote world peace and to encourage cooperation among nations in the world (Jacques and Mingst, 2018). The first war prevented by the United Nations was when armed troop were sent to help Israel due to her neighbors including Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Egypt attacked the new nation after it was created in 1948. In 1956 also the United Nations sent armed troops to resolve the conflict in Egypt when France, Britain and Israel attacked Egypt over control of the Suez Canal. Over the years, the UN has equally been involved in resolving conflict in the Middle East such as Iran- Iraq war, Afghanistan and Syria. Despite her efforts, the United Nations have been called a toothless bulldog, this is so because most times decisions are being

taken by rich member countries such as the United States, Britain and other highly industrialized nations of the 48. These countries are the major financers of the United Nations, hence the UN must have need to listen to them and cannot unilaterally take any decision without the support of these countries. The United States for example contributed up to 26% of the United Nations total budget.

The United Nation had similar structures like the League of Nations but it had the most powerful nations as members, unlike the League of Nations and it does not require the consensus of all members to act. It has 192 members and has the General Assembly, the Security Council, The Economic and Social Council, The International Court of Justice and Trusteeship Council in its structure. Despite her efforts, the United Nations have been called a toothless bulldog, this is so because most times actions are being taken by rich member countries such as the United States, Britain and other highly industrialized nations of the 48. According to Carr (1939), these countries are the major financers of the United Nations and hence the UN must have need of them and cannot unilaterally take any decision without the support of these advanced countries. The United States for example contributed up to 26% of the United Nations total budget. Of recent times the United Nations has tried to prove critics wrong. On December 21, 2017 she called an emergency meeting and the General Assembly declared President Trump's December 6, 2017 declaration of Jerusalem as Israel's capital as null and void. About 135 nations were in support of the United Nations. This declaration still held despite the United State threat of withdrawal of funds to the United Nations and other countries who voted against the United States in support of the United Nations. Thus the assertion where not being false cannot be said to factual that the United Nations is a toothless.

II. CONTENTION OVER STATUS OF JERUSALEM

According to Cleveland and Bunt (2010), the origin of the Arab- Israeli conflict is linked to a religious war between Judaism and Islam that can be traced back to the rivalry between Abraham's sons, Isaac and Ishmael. The Arabs believe that the land is not for the Jews, that they were only settlers there and they are second class citizens. On the other hand, the Jews on the strength of the bible some over 2,000 years ago believe that it was written that Palestine which they call the hand of Israel would be restored to them

some day and that the temple would be rebuilt in Jerusalem. Only in the land of Israel had the Jews flourished as a sovereign nation. Muslim Arabs believed that Palestine for so long, a part of the Umma should remain part of the Muslim world. Jerusalem a city holy to the Palestine as well as to the Jews and Christians could not be alienated from the land ruled by Islam. Christians believe that the restoration of the Jews to Palestine or the creation of Israel must precede the second coming of Christ.

The status of Jerusalem has been the heart of Israel's conflict with the Palestinians. Israel occupied the east of the city in 1967 during the Middle East war and regards the entire city as its indivisible capital. The contest over Jerusalem has shaped much of the Arab-Israel War since 1967. Israel has not only defeated invading Arab armies but has also seized control of the Gaza Strip and Sinai Peninsula from Egypt, the West Bank and East Jerusalem from Jordan and the Golan Heights from Syria (Carr, E. H., 1939). The victory of the right-leaning party Likud in 1977, under the leadership of Menachem Begin, helped solidify the new emphasis on Jerusalem as integral to Israel's identity. Religious settlers became more prominent in the political life in Israel, starting a long ascendance that has never really halted. Old line Socialist with roots in Russia and Eastern Europe gave way to a more diverse and also more religious population of Israelis with origins in the Middle East, North Africa and other regions. Jerusalem symbolic importance and role in Jewish history is emphasized in military parade and curriculums where students from across Israel were taken on school visits.

This process culminated in 1980, when lawmakers passed a bill declaring that Jerusalem is complete and united is the capital of Israel though yet to annexing East Jerusalem. The 1993 Oslo accords provided for the creation of a Palestinian Authority to govern West Bank and Gaza Strip whereas resolution on core issues such as borders, refugees and Jerusalem's status were deferred. In the nearly a quarter century the prospects of a lasting peace deal seemed more elusive than ever. A visit in year 2000, by the right wing politician Ariel Sharon to the sacred complex known to Jews as the Temple Mount and to Muslims as the Noble Sanctuary which contains Al Aqsa Mosque and the Dome of Rock, set off violent clashes and led to a second Palestinian uprising that claimed the lives of about 1,000 Israelis and 3,000 Palestinians over a period of five years. The Palestinians claimed that Jewish settlers have encroached on East Jerusalem and that Israel has further compounded the problem by revoking residency permits. Even so, the ethnic composition of Jerusalem's population has remained about thirty percent to forty percent Arab.

According to BBC News (2017), the 193 member United Nations General Assembly held the rare Emergency Special Session at the request of Arab and Muslim states, which condemned Mr. Trump's decision to reverse decades of United States policy on December 6, 2017. The result of the UN General Assembly vote was inevitable. The United States

knew that the majority of states would vote for the resolution. The votes for the Resolution from powerful US Allies such as Germany, United Kingdom and France would be seen as a slap in the face of President Trump, while it could be argued that they simply voted in line with the existing status quo at the UN and there was no pressing reason for them to switch from the stance.

III. MATTERS ARISING AND THE UNITED NATIONS RESOLUTION

During the 2016 United States Presidential election, Mr. Trump campaign promises included to move the United Nations embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This Mr. Trump described as the eternal capital of the Jewish people. On December 6, 2017, the United States President Donald Trump announced the United States recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, and ordered the planning of the relocation of the United States embassy in Israel from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. Benjamin Netanyahu, the Prime Minister of Israel, welcomed the decision and praised the announcement. On December 8, the Secretary of State Rex Tillerson clarified that the President Trump's statement did not indicate any final status for Jerusalem and was very clear that the final status including the borders would be left to the two parties to negotiate and make decision. Trump's decision to recognize Jerusalem as capital of Jerusalem was rejected by a majority of world leaders. The United Nations Security Council held an emergency meeting on December 7 where 14 of 15 United Nations members condemned Trump's decision. The 14 Security Council members declared the decision of the United States to recognize Jerusalem was in violation of United Nations resolutions and international law (BBC News, 2017). The countries which criticized and condemned President Trump's decision at the emergency meeting were Britain, France, Sweden, Italy and Japan. However, the Security Council was unable to issue a statement after the resolution without the endorsement of the United States.

According to CNN News (2017) the UN Resolution demanded that all states must comply with the Security Council resolutions regarding the Holy City of Jerusalem, and not recognize any actions or measures contrary to those resolutions. The General Assembly further affirmed that any decisions and actions which purport to have altered the character, status or demographic composition of the holy city of Jerusalem, have no legal effect, are null and void, and must be rescinded in compliance with relevant resolutions of the Security Council. In this regard, the Assembly also called upon states to refrain from the establishment of diplomatic missions in the Holy City of Jerusalem pursuant to the Security Council Resolution 478 adopted in 1980. Reiterating its call for the reversal of the negative trend that endanger the two-state solution, the Assembly urged greater international and regional efforts and supports aimed at achieving without delay a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

In summary the United Nations Jerusalem resolution explains that a total of one hundred and twenty eight (128) countries approved the nonbinding resolution, while nine (9) countries voted against it, thirty five (35) countries abstained and twenty one (21) countries did not turn up to vote, they were absent. Apart from the United States all the other four permanent Security Council members voted in support of the resolution. The vote came a day after President Donald Trump threatened that the United States could withdraw funding and aids from countries that would back the resolution. That threat did not however, deter countries like Nigeria, Egypt and several others who despite receiving millions of dollars of American aid every year choose to stand by majority of the world in condemning the United States decision. The solution adopted by the United Nations General Assembly states that any decision regarding the status of Jerusalem are null and void and must be cancelled. The resolution is non-binding and therefore largely symbolic but the voting pattern indicated the extent to which the Trump administration's decision to defy a fifty (50) years international consensus on Jerusalem's status has unsettled world politics and contributed to American's diplomatic isolation. A spokesman for Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas welcomed the result calling it a victory for Palestine. After the vote, the German Foreign office tweeted its reasoning writing that the status of Jerusalem should be negotiated between Israeli.

IV. THE HISTORIC VOTING PATTERN AND RESULT

The CNN News (2017) explained that a country by country breakdown of the General Assembly votes rejecting United States decision of recognizing Jerusalem as capital of Israel is explained. On December 21, 2017, 128 member states voted in favour of the resolution of the United Nations. The General Assembly voted by a huge majority to declare a unilateral recognition of Jerusalem by the United States as capital of Israel null and void. At an emergency session of the General Assembly on Thursday, 128 countries voted in favour of the resolution rejecting United States President Donald Trump's controversial decision of December 6, 2017. Nine countries voted against, while 35 abstained though Trump had earlier threatened to cut aid to United Nations members who would vote against his decision. Member states that voted in favour of the resolution are: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Angola, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belarus, Belgium, Belize, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cape Verde, Cambodia, Chad, Chile, China, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Cote d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus.

Others are Democratic People's Republic of Korea (North Korea), Denmark, Djibouti, Dominica, Ecuador, Egypt, Eritrea, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea, Guyana, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran, Iraq, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Laos, Lebanon, Liberia, Libya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Mauritania,

Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea (South Korea), Russia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Serbia, Seychelles, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Somalia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Syria, Tajikistan, Thailand, The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Tunisia, Turkey, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Vietnam, Yemen, Zimbabwe. The member states that voted against the resolution are Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Marshall Islands, Micronesian, Nauru, Palau, Togo and the United States. Those United Nations member states that abstained are Antigua-Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Bahamas, Benin, Bhutan, Bosnia-Herzegovina, Cameroon, Canada, Colombia, Croatia, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Equatorial Guinea, Fiji, Haiti, Hungary, Jamaica, Kiribati, Latvia, Lesotho, Malawi, Mexico, Panama, Paraguay, Philippines, Poland, Romania, Rwanda, Solomon Islands, South Sudan, Trinidad-Tobago, Tuvalu, Uganda, Vanuatu (BBC News, (2017).

In attempt to understand the historic United Nations voting of December 21, 2017, it is explained that the United Nations General Assembly resolution ES-10/L.22 was an emergency session resolution declaring the status of Jerusalem as Israel's capital null and void. It was adopted by the 37th plenary meeting of the United Nations General Assembly on 21 December, 2017. The draft resolution was drafted by Yemen and Turkey. Though it was strongly contested by the United States, it was passed by 128 votes for to 9 votes against with 21 absentees and 35 abstentions. After the United Nations Security Council resolution was vetoed by the U.S three days earlier, the Palestinian UN ambassador Riyadh Manasour said the General Assembly would vote on a draft resolution, calling for Trump declaration to be withdrawn thereby seeking to invoke Resolution 377 known as the "Uniting for Peace" resolution to circumvent a veto. The Resolution states that the General Assembly can call an Emergency Special Session to consider a matter "with a view to making appropriate recommendations to members for collective measures" if the Security Council fails to act. On December 21, 2017, the General Assembly voted overwhelmingly during a rare emergency meeting to as nations not to establish diplomatic missions in the historic city of Jerusalem, as delegates warned that the recent decision by the United States to do so risked igniting a religious war across the already turbulent and volatile Middle East and possibly beyond.

By a recorded vote of 128 in favour against 9 (Guatemala, Honduras, Israel, Marshalls Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Nauru, Palau, Togo and United States), with 35 abstentions, The Assembly adopted the resolution "Status of Jerusalem" by which it declared "null

and void” any actions intended to alter Jerusalem’s character, status or demographic composition. Calling on all states to refrain from establishing embassies in the Holy City. It also demanded that they comply with all relevant Security Council resolution and work to reverse the “negative trends” hampering a two state resolution of the Israeli - Palestinian Conflict.

V. THE UNITED NATIONS: A FORMIDABLE ORGANIZATION

The United Nations, by this singular action of standing up against the United States, have continued to be the only global international organization that serves multiple functions in international relations. It was an organization designed to ensure international peace and security and its founders realized that peace and security could not be achieved without attention to issues of rights - including political, legal, economic, social, environmental and individual. Yet the UN has faced difficulties in achieving its goals, because its organizational structure still reflects the power relationships of the immediate post 1945 world, despite the fact that the world has changed dramatically especially in respect to the post Cold War relationship between the United States and Russia and the dramatic increase in the number of independent states (Carr, 1939). The UN is a reflection of the realities of international politics, and the world’s political and economic divisions are shown in the voting arrangements of the Security Council, the blocs and cleavages of the General Assembly, the different viewpoints within the Secretariat, the divisions present at global conferences and the financial and budgetary processes (Jacques and Mingst, 2018).

Despite its intensively political nature, the UN has transformed itself and some aspects of international politics as seen in the December 21, 2017 resolution on the status of Jerusalem. Decolonization was another of its successful accomplishments and the many newly independent states joined the international community and have helped to shape a new international agenda. The UN has utilized Charter provisions to develop innovative methods to address peace and security issues. It has organized global conferences and emergency sessions on urgent international issues, as reflected on the 21 December, 2017 Emergency Session called for as a result of Trump’s December 6, 2017 declaration of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. Notwithstanding its accomplishments, The United Nations still operates under the basic provisions of respect for national sovereignty and non interference in the domestic affairs of states .The norm of national sovereignty however runs into persistent conflict with the constant demand by many in the international community that the UN take a more active role in combating aggression and alleviating international problems. Thus, it is likely that the UN will continue to be seen by its critics as either timid or too omnipotent as it is asked to resolve the most pressing problems faced by the world’s most vulnerable citizens

Analyzing the United Nations Security Council and world diplomacy, Christensen pointed out that the Security Council is the most powerful body in the United Nations. The 15 members of the Security Council determine how the United Nations should resolve world conflicts. The Security Council is the only United Nations body that can order enforcement of action in the event of aggression. The Security Council’s five permanent members made up of Britain, China, France, Russia, and the United States possess the most power because any one of them can veto a Council decision (Morgenthau, 1948). According to Christensen, in 1914 the countries of Europe were thrust into another violent confrontation. The carnage of World War I brought the European system of diplomacy into disrepute. In place of the old system Wilson offered a new diplomacy in his Fourteen Points. Many of Wilson’s ideas were incorporated into the 1919 Treaty of Versailles and the League of Nations. After the United States rejected the league and returned to a policy of isolationism however, the European states reverted to the balance of power system and the pursuit of national interests through professional diplomats. During World War II, the United States President Franklin Roosevelt again sought to establish a new type of diplomacy, but Roosevelt and Churchill built the postwar international order on the basis of agreements with the Soviet leader Stalin that conformed more to the old European system than to the new ideas embodied in the Atlantic Charter and the United Nations. Although the United Nations remains a symbol of what a new diplomatic system might be, international politics since the end of World War II has adhered closely to the European model (Jacques and Mingst, 2018).

VI. THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF ANALYSIS

The theoretical framework of analysis or paradigm adopted in this paper is the interstate system theory of analysis which examines a relationship that exists among interacting units according to established rules. The influence of actors and position of scholars of international relations have divided the various influences on international events into different levels of analysis. There are three widely used levels of analysis such as individual actors, domestic influences and interstate influences. Some scholars also study a fourth level of analysis, global influences. In the individual level of analysis, scholars study the concerns, perceptions and choices of the individual people involved such as great leaders, crazy leaders, activists, or individual citizens. For example, if the assassin of Archduke Francis Ferdinand in 1914 had bungled the job, World War I might not have broken out when it did. In the domestic level of analysis, scholars look at how international relations is influenced by domestic actors, including special interest groups, political organizations, and government agencies.

The structure of relationships between nations is in historical perspective. Throughout the history of the interstate system, the relationships between nations have been structured in various ways, depending on how power was

distributed among them. For example, power may be concentrated in one or two nations, which then set and enforce the rules for other countries. The predominance of one nation is called hegemony. Historical examples of hegemony include Great Britain after 1815 and the United States after 1945, periods when these nations were the most powerful in the world, dominating trade and military relationships. Power may also be distributed more equally among half-dozen great powers and other somewhat weaker nations. In this case, alliances between nations play a crucial role in structuring their interactions. Power can also be distributed relatively equally among nations or alliances of nations. This is called a balance of power. Some scholars and political leaders believe that peace is best preserved this way because no one nation can win a war easily. The evidence for this theory, however, is not strong. The opposite proposition, called power transition theory, has more support. This theory suggests that peace is most likely when one nation predominates or when two opposing but equally powerful nations do. In this theory, major wars are likely when a challenger starts to surpass a dominant nation in power.

The world system constitutes of nations that interact according to a set of properly defined and long established rules. The rules of the system govern how nations treat each other and the rules are based on common understanding of the rights of a nation. According to the traditions of the interstate system, one nation should not infringe upon another nation's rightful territory or interfere in another nation's internal affairs. These rules were codified in the Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) in Europe. The system evolved because nations realized it was in their best interest to develop basic ground rules for dealing with each other in the absence of a central authority that could set and enforce rules worldwide. It has meant that nations must look out for themselves first and has shaped the way they relate to each other. They cannot rely on any higher power to enforce the rules or make sure other nations play fairly. Instead, they must enforce the rules by themselves or form alliances with other nations and collectively enforce them.

One of the most important rules of the interstate system is that nations should respect each other's internationally recognized boundaries. Under the interstate system, no nation has the right to invade or take over another's territory or interfere with the actions of a government within its own territory. A nation is considered a member of the international system if other nations recognize the authority of its government and other nations can formally extend this recognition by establishing diplomatic relations with that nation. A nation can also become recognized by being admitted as a member of the United Nations. Recognition does not imply that a government has popular support but only that it controls the territory within its borders and has agreed to assume the nation's obligations in the international system. These obligations include respecting the internationally recognized borders of other nations, assuming

the international debts of the previous government, and not interfering in the internal affairs of other nations.

In 1997 there were 186 recognized nations in the world. There are a number of political entities thought of as nations which include territories that function independently, such as Taiwan, colonies such as Martinique and nations yet to be recognized such as Palestine and the Vatican City. The great powers today include the United States, Great Britain, Russia, France, China, Germany, and Japan. These powers are the most important actors in international relations. Before the development of the modern interstate system, people were organized into more mixed and overlapping political units, such as city-states, empires, and feudal fiefs. The modern interstate system arose in Europe, beginning after about AD 1500, when France and Austria emerged as powerful nations. The system grew to encompass the European continent over several centuries, although it long coexisted with other systems such as the Holy Roman Empire. With the colonization of much of the rest of the world by European nations, the European idea of nations was exported globally. After European colonies in Africa and Asia began to win their independence, they also aspired to become recognized as nations in the international system. Today, the legal basis for the universal application of these principles is the charter of the UN. The UN charter, adopted in 1945, explicitly recognizes the central principles of the interstate system.

The significance of the interstate system as the theoretical framework of analysis is in the explicit explanation of the United Nations Resolution of December 21, 20017 through assessing the reasons why majority of the sovereign member states of the United Nations did not support United States idea of recognizing Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. It can be observed that most of the reasons given for supporting the resolution tended towards the avoidance of war, any form of force or infringement on the rights of people. Thus Hanna Sahrawi, a member of Palestinian Liberation Organization (PLO) Executive Committee, condemned Trump's warning to countries receiving aid from the United States. He advised Trump to know that some things are not subject to blackmail, particularly issues of principle, legality and morality. The Permanent Observer for the Holy See, Tomasz Grays stated that the Holy See called for a peaceful resolution that would ensure respect for the sacred city of Jerusalem and its universal nature, reiterating that only international guarantee could preserve its unique character and status, and provide assurance of dialogue and reconciliation for peace in the region (BBC News, 2017), CNN News, 2017).

The entire international community has been in accord that Israeli annexation and settlement in East Jerusalem since 1967 is illegal and has refused to recognize Jerusalem as capital of Israel. Thus the United States and President Trump's change in position considering the importance of Jerusalem to Arabs and Muslims would create difficulty in having a sustainable Palestinian - Israeli agreement or a

lasting Arab - Israeli relationship (Gala, 2017, Cleveland and Bunt (2010). The Australian ambassador to the United Nations explained that her country's government did not support a unilateral action that undermined the peace process. The Nicaraguan government also explained that unilateral actions of the United States jeopardized peace and stability in the Middle East. Whereas the Mexico's Ambassador to the United Nations explained that the United States must become part of the solution, not a stumbling block that would hamper progress, Armenia said the situation should be resolved through negotiations, paving way for lasting peace and security.

The significance of the interstate system theory is also linked to the future of the international system. Many of the foundations of the interstate system today are being challenged by changes in technology and international norms. The idea of territorial integrity and a nation's sovereignty means its absolute authority over its own internal matters is being undermined. Neither ballistic missiles nor television signals respect borders. Television, the mass media, telephones, and the internet are erasing the boundaries between nations, blending once-distinct cultures together and expanding transnational connections. Mass communication is also drawing worldwide attention to domestic issues that in the past were of little concern to other nations, such as human rights, the status of women, environmental practices, and democracy. In addition, the territories of nations are changing as some nations are becoming integrated into larger entities such as the example of the European Union. Others are fragmenting into smaller units as in the Soviet Union example.

These changes have led to a debate among scholars about whether the interstate system will survive in its current form or evolve into another system that does not yet exist. Some scholars believe nations with their different cultural identities, boundaries, and governments are becoming obsolete. They believe economics is becoming the driving force in international relations thereby encouraging increased cooperation among nations. They believe that cooperation along with technological changes will continue to blur the distinction between nations and the importance of national borders. Other scholars think that the interstate system will endure because nations have military force, and military force still determines what happens in the world and always will. The interstate system of nations remains intact but it is not increasingly overlaid with new forces and realities that respect neither the idea of sovereignty nor borders.

VII. CONCLUSION

The United Nations General Assembly acceptance by a large majority of the non-binding resolution of the United States recognition of Jerusalem as capital of Israel "null and void" goes a long way to make a statement in the international system that the United Nations is not toothless because even after the threat of Donald Trump the world most powerful

President they did not bend to his threat and give into his controversial decision on December 6, 2017 of the recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. This actually confirms to the idealist perspective that as long as countries come together under organization outside the state, peace can be achieved without war in the international system (Eleonu, 2019). The organization is believed to be an important force for peace and human development while others have called the organization ineffective, corrupt or biased. Evaluations of the United Nations effectiveness have been mixed. The United Nations is an intergovernmental organization tasked to promote international cooperation and to create and maintain international order. The organization is financed by assessed and voluntary contributions from its member states. Its objectives include maintaining international peace and security, promoting human rights, fostering social and economic development, protecting the environment and providing humanitarian aid in cases of famine, natural disaster and armed conflict (Carr, 1939, Morgenthau, 1948). The United Nation is the largest, most familiar, most internationally represented and most powerful intergovernmental organization in the world.

It was boasted and announced that USA will move its embassy to Jerusalem and that no vote in the United Nations will make any difference on that and that the United States was by far the single largest contributor to the United Nations. Followed also was the warning that the United States might also cut funding to the United Nations itself. During the 2018 State of the Union Address, Trump said that the countries which voted for the resolution, opposed the United States sovereign right to make this recognition and said he would ask Congress to pass legislation which would ensure foreign aid would only go to America's friends, not enemies. Shortly after the Resolution was announced, Prime Minister of Israel, Netanyahu rejected the result out rightly calling it "preposterous" (BBC News, 2017), CNN News, 2017). He thanked the states that supported according to him the, truth by not participating in what he described as the theatre of the absurd. Prime Minister Netanyahu stated that Jerusalem has been the capital of Israel and expressed thanks to President Trump and Ambassador Nikki Haley for their stalwart defense of Israel and their stalwart defense of the truth. It is recalled that it took seventy (70) years for the United States to recognize Israel officially and that it will take more years for the United Nations to recognize it as well.

The December 21, 2017 resolution was reached because the international system evolved from the nations realization that it was in their best interest to develop basic ground rules for dealing with each other in the absence of a central authority that could set and enforce rules worldwide. Again the lack of a central authority is the most important characteristic of the interstate system and according to the traditions of the interstate system, one nation should not infringe upon another nation's rightful territory or interfere in another nation's internal affairs. These rules had been codified

in the Peace of Westphalia, which ended the Thirty Years' War (1618-1648) in Europe. The system theory which examines relationships existing among interacting units according to established rules also looks at the world as a system of nations that interact according to a set of properly defined and long established rules which govern how nations treat each other as the rules are based on common understandings of the rights of a nation.

In observance therefore of the comments by representatives of the various independent nations and also the final resolution of the United Nations General Assembly, majority of the nations wanted the peace option through the joint majority decisions of the United Nations members. Most of the states avoided options that would jeopardize world peace, stability and morality, promote inequality, violence, force, war and the infringement on the rights of people. In this decision therefore, the United Nation's Resolution of

December 21, 2017 can be seen as demonstration of formidable power by the United Nations.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Carr, E. H. (1939) The Twenty Years' Crisis, In (Snyder, 2004. p.52).
- [2]. Jacques, F. Cecelia, M. L. Mingst, Karen (2018) "United Nations: International Organization" Encyclopedia Britannica.
- [3]. Mona, B. Sewell, C. Iritic, P. G. Gala, T. (2017) "Conflict in Jerusalem is distinctly modern. Here's the History"
- [4]. Morgenthau, Hans (1948) Politics Among Nations Burchill and Linklater, 2005, p1.
- [5]. William L Cleveland and Martin Bunt (2010). "A History of the Middle East"
- [6]. BBC News (2017) "Jerusalem: UN Resolution rejects Trump's Declaration" December 22.
- [7]. CNN News (2017) "The UN Resolution of December 21 on Jerusalem's Status" December 22.
- [8]. New York Times. December 22.
- [9]. Premium Times Nigeria December 22, 2017.
- [10]. United Nations Meetings Coverage and Press Releases: *General Assembly/Plenary; Tenth Emergency Special Session, 37th Meeting*. 21 December 2017. www.un.org.