

Davorin Rudolf (Republic of Croatia)

## IN SEARCH OF AN EFFECTIVE UNIVERSAL SYSTEM OF SECURITY

After significant world changes in the late 1990's, namely, the end of the cold war, the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the termination of the Warsaw Pact, and the disappearance of bipolarism which is the division of the world into two powerful military alliances, today in the world, there are only two important systems of security. One of them, the unilateral US system of security, is operative, and the other, the collective UN system of security, is inoperative.

Other important systems of security have fallen apart.

The *bipolar or block* system of security disappeared with the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact (1991). After US intervention in Iraq, the system, which in the European-American region relied on the North-Atlantic Pact, is now so rife with internal problems, dilemmas and indecision that its very existence is in question. *Permanent neutrality*, like that of Austria or Switzerland, was recently favoured by a group of experts as a model of security for my homeland, the Republic of Croatia. However, it is not an option, because it is actually egoistic and confined to only one country. In essence, the aim of this system is the avoidance of war on one's own territory and not having to suppress wars of aggression and punish any aggressors wherever they may appear in the world. The politics of neutrality or "freedom from the union", which is well-known here in Finland, is not a legal obligation for any country. Finally, the great confederation of *The United States of the World*, or the creation of *The World Government* are systems which will probably come into existence during future generations' lifetime.

Since the large majority of countries, especially small and medium-sized ones, are interested in a universal world system of security, the first question is how to make the UN system of security effective so that it functions against any attacks on state sovereignty and independence, be they in the form of armed aggression, international terrorism, organised international crime and so on. The second question is how to reshape it so that it is accepted by all major world powers, and especially by the US, the only real super-power.

Today, interest in a sole universal system of security has perhaps increased, because the volcano that erupts with wars is still very much alive, and there is also the constant threat of international terrorism. I do not wish to be the devil's advocate but, for example, in the southern European region, where I come from, some important socio-historical processes have not yet ended. I will list the most important ones: the trend of the Albanian population, now dispersed throughout Serbia, Montenegro, Greece and Macedonia, to congregate into one homogeneous state; a final solution to the problem of Bosnia and Herzegovina (the anchor to which both Croatia and Serbia are tied); the process of Monte Negro achieving complete independence; the stabilisation of Macedonia (for example, in the form of a federation or a confederation). To this list one could add processes whose outcomes are more or less unpredictable, such as those in the Serbian provinces of Vojvodina and Sandak, or in the Croatian province of Istria. These processes could cause various confrontations including, of course, those involving armed force.

Why does the collective UN system of security only exist on paper?

There are two obstacles: the inadequate composition of the UN Security Council and its antiquated decision making procedure.

For years now, there has been fruitless discussion about increasing the number of permanent Council members, but a final agreement is still not in view. Among those knocking on the Council's door are Germany, Italy, Brazil, Argentina, Egypt, India, Pakistan, Japan and Australia. Some believe that a new member should be chosen from every continent. The decision about increasing the number of permanent members and the election of new member states should take place as soon as possible.

Another, perhaps more important, question is how to regulate a new Council decision-making procedure so that it suits the changed situations in the international community.

As it is well known, just before the end of the Second World War, at the Jalta Conference in February 1945, the three leading countries of the antifascist coalition, the USA, the Soviet Union and Great Britain, agreed that the collective UN system of security (involving the use of armed force) must not be used against any of the permanent members of the Council, which at that time were considered to be the great powers, either real or potential, because this could seriously endanger and destroy world peace. This was the reason they were given the right of veto, that is the possibility to stop any valid Council decision by voting "against". This means that no decision harmful to the interests of any one permanent Council member can be made.

Given that the circumstances and relationships in the international community have fundamentally changed, this system of making Council decisions enforceable should be changed. For example, instead of the right of veto, the rule of a high majority of votes could be adopted, such as a four fifth voting majority of all the states present. Or, more votes could be given to the super powers or leading countries than to other Council members. Thus, a system similar to that in the EU Parliament could be introduced whereby the number of a country's votes (representatives) depends on its importance or size. In the UN there was such a precedent where the votes of the former Soviet Republics of Belorussia and Ukraine were separately recognised. The proposition of such a system would, I believe, be attractive to the US as well as to other leading world powers today.

A system which privileges the world powers is, I know, against the principle of equality amongst countries. This idea may even astonish as it is put forward by an expert from a small country. However, my argument is that it is only by privileging the super powers and the economically and militarily powerful countries that an acceptable modern system of security can be achieved. I would like to emphasise that a revision of the United Nations Charter can only be implemented if each of the Security Council's five permanent members agrees on the amendments. Otherwise, the amendments cannot come into force.

Is it possible to put these questions on the agenda for the next Amaldi Conference? If I have succeeded in making you reflect on this issue, then I am well satisfied.

.....  
Dr Davorin Rudolf (born in 1934), member of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences, President of its Council for Peace and Human Rights, Professor of International Law and Relations at the Faculty of Law, University of Split (Croatia). His published books: *Neutralnost i paksaktivnost (Neutrality and Paxactivity)*, *Enciklopedijski rje\_nik me\_unarodnog prava mora (Encyclopaedic Dictionary of the International Law of the Sea)*, *Gospodarski morski pojas (Exclusive Economic Zone)*, *Hrvatska 1991 (Croatia 1991)*. He is the former Croatian Minister of Foreign Affairs and former Minister of Maritime Affairs. He spent 7 years as Croatian Ambassador in Italy, Malta, Cyprus and San Marino.