



The Model Conference Global Security Issues

Faculty of International Relations, University of Economics in Bratislava



Modelová konferencia Bezpečnostná sekcia

Fakulta medzinárodných vzťahov, Ekonomická univerzita v Bratislave

The EU would like to thank the *Forum for the 21st Century* for the second draft issued for the purpose of the Conference held on November 29th, 2010, and uses this opportunity to present the following statement:

In the section **Notes**:

- The EU agrees with the Forum on the constant changing character of the international environment and world itself. Nevertheless, the EU suggests revision of the first paragraph. The EU proposes the following formulation: *Since the end of the WWII, the global security environment has changed profoundly. Events such as emancipation of former colonies, the end of the Cold War followed by the collapse of the Soviet Union, terrorist attacks, increasing importance of the international organizations and military alliances, changes in global economy and emergence of the non-governmental actors have weakened the institutional security framework based on the UN Security Council founded on principles from the period after the end of the two World Wars. Due to the above-mentioned constant changes in international environment, it is not possible to ignore the new character of the 21st century world anymore. The international community should, therefore, face these changes and respond to them in appropriate way.*
- In the second paragraph, the EU suggests these changes: *Forum for the 21st century does not marginalize the danger of armed conflict between the nation states, but it points out to the new security challenges....*

In the section **Proposes**:

- The EU agrees with the necessity for urgent reform, which is caused and increasingly justified by multiple factors. Over the recent period one of the pivotal contestations of the legitimacy of the UN Security Council originates from the lack of equitable representation. The UN Charter stipulates membership in the Security Council based on geographical balance as well as contribution of member-states to maintaining peace and security. The European Union strongly emphasises the necessity of its single voice regarding the UN Security Council reform. Each member state of the European Union realizes that collective actions are needed to provide effective reactions to proliferating challenges and threats facing the contemporary world, which now concern the entire international community. The single EU seat is in complete alignment with the efforts of the Union to establish the Common Foreign and Security Policy (CFSP). Germany would also accept a common European seat, but as long as there is little sign that France and the UK will give up their seats, Germany insists on having its own seat. There have also been suggestions that the French should pool their vote with Germany in the Franco-German EU integrationist tradition and the UK would represent the EU tradition of less integrationist views. The positions of Germany and Italy over the scope of the eventual expansion are at variance





(Germany today proposes to expand the Council to 22 members, whereas Italy backs the admission of 10 non-permanent seats). Legitimacy comes from efficiency and effectiveness but in its turn the expansion yet does not result in efficiency. The European Union thinks that when a body goes past the most efficient size it becomes dysfunctional and irrelevant. An enlarged Security Council might eventually reinforce the power of the Permanent members rendering the elected members more powerless. We think that the EU should be able to produce and champion the proposal concentrated on the proportionality of representation and efficiency. Giving the EU a single seat would give the Member States a clear incentive to harmonize their policies: a coordinated policy can then be expected to actually take effect, instead of it being a supplement to domestic foreign policy. It would also deepen Europe's commitment to international peace-keeping and peace-making missions, something which currently varies very widely between member states, and push them to spend sufficient on equipping their militaries for such missions.

- The EU respects aspirations of the Forum to revise the definition of aggression, nevertheless, the EU remains at the traditional version. The European Union highly appreciates that Forum points out to the new threads of the 21st century which are interlinked to the most dangerous one, namely *terrorism*. The EU suggests to the Forum to focus more on the issue of terrorist activities since it represents a common goal of the international community to be tackled. Terrorism and activities related to it can never be justified. The EU will pursue all ways to disrupt any terrorist planning, organisation or terrorist networks. It is also natural that the level of terrorist activities cannot be eliminated entirely, nevertheless to succeed to at least some extent, collaboration of international community is viewed as the key. Consequently, the EU proposes to the Forum to incorporate following formulation as a part of the final draft: *The Forum calls for a strengthened international cooperation among states, UN, key third countries and international organizations in cooperating, specifically in exchanging of information, transport security and non-proliferation of light weapons/small arms through dialogue and agreement in order to tackle terrorism*. The EU is convinced that protective security for third countries should be enhanced as a part of the technical assistance. Terrorists affect thousands of lives of people around the world. Therefore, the EU sees the priority in minimizing the thread of terrorism. The EU absolutely agrees with the Forum that terrorism must not be identified with any religion and in addition to this, *neither with any nationality*.
- Concerning the point of the constitution of an effective early warning system, the EU is convinced that the human lives, human rights and dignity are of the highest importance and priority. Therefore, the EU would welcome an establishment of a system of quick reaction that would prevent the escalation and would immediately freeze the conflict. The EU suggests that units from global crisis management could be used for the purposes of quick stabilization and avoidance of increasing casualties. This would particularly apply to situations in which the UN SC would not be agreeing unanimously and human lives would





be the cost of non-acting. However, such warning system should be under constant supervision of an independent organ and should follow the international law.

- The EU agrees with the Forum on creating an effective crisis management operations that are carried out under the banner of international governmental organisations, which have been taking an active part in crisis situations. They should become an integral part on the planning, decision making and operations of their governmental counterparts and nation states.
- The EU expresses its support in establishing international regulation that would in the end embrace the regulation of the PMC as well. The lack of minimum standards in the military and security sector presents risks to the protection of human rights of civilians as well as the involved actors. The increasing number of PMCs in the world contributes to the multiplicity of reasons for the necessary international regulation. The EU recognises the need to set up international framework for private military industry of which PMCs are a part too. The international legislation based on definition of military services proposed in the analysis by Elke Krahmman is one of the solutions for establishing regulation on wider variety of actors providing such services. Moreover, the private military actors should obtain service licences entitling them to provide and export military services; should be approved by and get registered within a legal authority. The EU agrees with the Forum that the role of the legal authority could be undertaken by the UN. The actors, particularly PMCs, should be accompanied by an observer team monitoring their activities in the field and thus preventing non-compliance of the international rules and prolongation of the conflict. The international community should also agree on what services may be legally offered by PMC and what clients may be their recipients.
- The EU welcomes the Forum's formulation on the WWD as proposed in the second draft. It suggests a change to the sentence: „Naturally, this process *should* be lead by the United States and Russian Federation-*the two* countries currently holding the biggest stockpiles of nuclear weapons. This leadership should be internationally recognized pursuing achievement of common goals of the international community. “

