

MULTILATERALISM AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
(75th Anniversary of the UN)

[ФБ]

УНИВЕРЗИТЕТ У БЕОГРАДУ
ФАКУЛТЕТ БЕЗБЕДНОСТИ
UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE
FACULTY OF SECURITY STUDIES

energypact
foundation

Belgrade 2021.

SPEECHES

MULTILATERALISM AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Conference on the occasion of the 75th Anniversary of the UN
Belgrade, Deputies Club

Contents

PREFACE	9
ALEXANDRE S. DIMITRIJEVIC THE MULTILATERALISM WE NEED.....	11
IVICA DAČIĆ ESSENCE OF MULTILATERALISM AND GLOBAL SECURITY IS EXPERIENCING INNOVATIONS.....	17
SIMONA-MIRELA MICXULESCU MULTILATERALISM MUST BE INCLUSIVE AND GLOBALLY CONNECTED	25
PROF. NENAD ZRNIĆ, PhD INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE.....	29
PROF. VLADIMIR N. CVETKOVIĆ, PhD NATIONAL STATE IN THE GLOBAL ORDER – REALITY AND HOPE	31
JEAN LUI FALCONI FRENCH COMMITMENTS TO IMPROVE THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM	41
ALEXANDER BOTSAN-KHARCHENKO THE UNITED NATIONS AS AN INDISPENSABLE MULTILATERAL PLATFORM	45

FRANCOISE JACOB MULTILATERALISM IS ABOUT THE PEOPLES	49
PROF. BORIS KRIVOKAPIĆ, PhD INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE UNITED NATIONS	55
PROF. BRANISLAV ĐORĐEVIĆ, PhD CHALLENGES FOR THE GLOBAL PEACE	67
THOMAS SCHIEB UNITED NATIONS ARE NEEDED MORE THAN EVER	73
AMR ALJOWAILY A PLATINUM JUBILEE FOR THE UNITED NATIONS, REFLECTIONS FOR A BRIGHTER FUTURE FOR MULTILATERALISM	77
TIAN YISHU BUILDING A “COMMUNITY OF THE COMMON DESTINY OF HUMANITY”	81
MARIJAN IVANUŠA THE ROLE OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE UN INSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM	87
MILORAD KONDIĆ MULTILATERALISM AS A NECESSARY COMPONENT OF INTERNATIONAL SECURITY	91

PROF. ŽARKO OBRADOVIĆ, PhD
THE INTERDEPENDENCE BETWEEN
THE STATES IS STRONGER THAN EVER
BEFORE95

PREFACE

Serbia, together with 120 foreign delegations coming from all over the world, has just celebrated the 60th anniversary of the creation of the Non Aligned Movement – NAM in Belgrade in 1961.

However, no one could consider that the NAM is dead because the world has deeply changed since the very far year of 1961.

Of course, the world has drastically changed, but the Belgrade's event of October 11–12, 2021 sent a strong message for more cooperation, more multilateralism, and more respect for all the diverse voices of the international community.

In this context, all the participants reaffirmed the leading role of the United Nations besides the calls for the necessity of a deep reform of the organization, to reflect more effectively the positions of all its member states.

The organizers of the conference “Multilateralism and International Security” held in Belgrade in the context of the UN 75th Anniversary in September 2020, were happy to offer a modest platform to eminent speakers from the Serbian Government, high ranking representatives of the international community in Belgrade, and distinguished members of the academic community to give their contributions to this call for a New Multilateralism.

Since his election at the prestigious position of UN Secretary General, Mr. António Guterres is tirelessly

advocating for a more inclusive multilateralism which reflects the more complex and more dangerous world we are living in.

The Covid-19 pandemic reminds us the necessity to re-imagine multilateralism for a post-Covid future, a multilateralism for everyone as it was said during the debates at the last Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in New York.

We hope that the collection of the speeches of the conference “Multilateralism and International Security” could represent an additional voice to this debate by reaffirming that with no cooperation and no respect of our diversities – there is no life and no future for anyone.

In Belgrade,
October 15, 2021

Dr. Vladimir Cvetković
University of Belgrade
Faculty of Security Studies
Dean

Alexandre Dimitrijević
Energy pact Foundation
President

ALEXANDRE S. DIMITRIJEVIC

President of Energypact Foundation

THE MULTILATERALISM WE NEED

Mr. Minister,
Excellencies,
Ladies & Gentlemen,

A warm welcome on behalf of the organisers to this diplomatico-academic event to commemorate in Belgrade the 75th anniversary of the United Nations.

In few hours, in New York, a special session of the General Assembly will take place and a declaration signed by the member states to reaffirm their support to the Organisation and call on the international community to boost multinational cooperation as the unique way to ensure peace between nations.

Today, in Belgrade, our objective was to initiate a dialogue between diplomacy and academia, an informal brainstorming, if I may say, to understand how our speakers, according to the countries they are coming from, their expertise, their practice and knowledge, how they evaluate the contribution of multilateralism to the international security in the context of the UN 75th anniversary.

For the EnergyPact foundation, working for more than 10 years with the UN and its agencies, UNCTAD, ITU, UNODC, it was a very natural approach to organise this event, jointly with the Faculty of Security Studies of The Belgrade University.

The COVID-19 pandemic, which has crippled the world with sanitary, economic and social devastations, is a cruel but much needed reminder of our interdependence!

In other words, without fully embracing the consequences of our structural interdependence, which implies a robust and deeply cooperative multilateral system, we will vulnerably depend on extraordinary circumstances for every aspect of our lives, instead of building the collective resilience that can protect us against global existential perils such as pandemics, climate change, cyberattacks, terrorism, systemic crises and emerging threats.

More than ever, the theme of the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the United Nations must resonate in every human conscience with a sense of urgency and of vital imperative:

***The Future We Want, the UN We Need:
Reaffirming Our Collective Commitment
to Multilateralism.***

Since its inception in Geneva in 2009, the EnergyPact Foundation has always advocated for strengthening dialogue and facilitating pragmatic convergences on key global governance issues between actors that have different and even antagonist views and goals but acknowledge that it is in their strategic interest to build mutually beneficial collective platforms for transformational action.

No one questions that multilateralism is in crisis today. But there is consensus that the speed of change in our world, the growing complexity of governance, the emergence of mega threats and the need to secure sustainable growth in a stabilised international agora rather than arena requires a rethinking and a re-energisation of our global institutional architecture.

The first two decades of the XXI century bear extraordinary potentials for the revitalisation of the international order, and by “order” I don’t mean domination and power strategies, by “order” I mean direction, the organising principles that can maintain the global compass firmly oriented towards the Common Good.

First and foremost, we have witnessed the rise of Non-State-Actors, NGO’s, philanthropy, networks but also the global business actors that complement the role of the traditional state, are engines of mobilisation, and put multilateral diplomacy under a positive pressure.

A great example of this new reality was the negotiation of the Paris Climate Agreement, where Non-State-Actors played a major role, and the subsequent institutionalisation of the civil society-based Climate Action track in the UN climate negotiations and conferences.

The new multilateralism fit for the XXI century will be a hybrid multilateralism with State and Non-State-Actors working hand in hand to advance our global agenda and make our globalised society a more humane world, and our planet a dignified habitat instead of a devastated ecosystem.

The very concept of sovereignty is evolving, with, for example, French President Emmanuel Macron promoting an agenda for a “European sovereignty”. The narrow definition of sovereignty in our classical political thinking is very much challenged by our ever expanding interdependence and by the growing intensity of global issues such as climate-related disasters or systemic financial crises and transnational security risks.

The regionalisation of international relations gives a lot of perspectives for the spread of experiences of shared sovereignty, following the successful example of the European Union, and that may lead to the recognition that in world affairs today even sovereignty must be addressed with a collective dimension, because in front of global challenges, a narrowly-defined and defended sovereignty is more a weakness than a force.

This erosion of the traditional sovereignty is even more evident in the cyberspace now that all human activities are immersed in the digital sphere. A major field of expansion and of progress for the XXIst century diplomacy would be the creation of a digital multilateralism, as we succeeded in fostering the well-established climate multilateralism.

Ultimately, we need to take fully into account the realities of our multipolar world. Interconnected, interdependent and multiple, without hegemonic dominations as in the past. This is to say that multilateralism is not the continuation as such of the post World War II order, but, building on the values that supported it, it is a reinvention of international cooperation and co-development with a sense of universal empowerment, shared responsibility and tangible solidarity.

Our increasingly diverse world needs a multipolar multilateralism and to paraphrase Georges Clemenceau who said that the war is a too serious thing to be conducted only by militaries, I would say that peace and prosperity of nations are too essential to be left only to the governments.

Our perils are opportunities of innovation and progress. Let's transform our challenges into creative energy. Each of us must be somewhere in his community, a trigger, to move things and to transform the world.

We must and we can reinvent the multilateralism we need.

IVICA DAČIĆ

*First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign
Affairs*

ESSENCE OF
MULTILATERALISM
AND GLOBAL SECURITY
IS EXPERIENCING
INNOVATIONS

Your esteemed Excellencies,
Distinguished participants of the meeting,

I would like to thank the Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade, the Institute for International Politics and Economics, and the NGO Energy Pact for organizing this gathering and for inviting me to address you. At a time when there is more and more talk about a new phase in international relations, characterized by the weakening of multilateralism, the erosion of the influence of institutions such as the United Nations, and the return to the principles of realpolitik, the topic which we are dealing with today is more than actual.

It is certain that the fight against a new pandemic in the future will be seen as a security challenge, and the protection of public health will become one of the issues of national security.

We cannot help but notice that the crisis of multilateralism is visible in the dimension of international security, where international organizations and institutions have difficulties in coping effectively with both traditional challenges and new, asymmetric threats. The world is facing significant changes in communication and technological development – new challenges such as terrorism, driven by non-traditional actors and informal groups, are certainly affecting international security. In addition, the current crisis caused by the covid-19 pandemic only confirms the necessity to redefine the concept of national and collective security. It is certain that the fight against a new pandemic in the future will be seen as a security challenge, and the protection of public health will become one of the issues of national security. The spread of the coronavirus initially made visible the weaknesses and shortcomings of international organizations to adequately manage global crises.

Together, as actors in international relations, we must be careful, because something like that can result in a crisis of legitimacy, lack of predictability, but also confidence that international organizations and collective actions can lead to more stability in the international system, which is a common goal for all of us.

We are witnessing that the COVID-19 pandemics has changed not only international relations but also our everyday life. Many rules have been redefined, and special restrictive measures regarding movement and travel have been introduced in a large number of countries in order to create an infection control system, and this also has led to a reduction of bilateral and multilateral activities. Many international organizations have suspended their work or reduced its scope. Although the COVID-19 pandemics is not causing radical changes in the structure of the

international system of collective security embodied in the United Nations, the essence of multilateralism in the context of global security is experiencing innovations. Particular national interests come to the fore, while joint multilateral activities are receding. The so-called “virtual multilateralism” in the form of remote video conferencing and multilateral meetings via the Internet is more and more frequent.

All of the above shows that multilateralism is not terminated, but has been transformed and adapted to the current circumstances, still retaining its original essence. In the time of the global crisis caused by the pandemics, it is necessary for key international organizations to be adjusted to the needs of today and ready to deal with all the challenges that certainly await us in the future.

Honorable participants,

The current challenges that we are faced with are a good opportunity to recall traditional threats to international security such as armed conflict, aggression, and the illegitimate use of force. It was the primary motive for the founding of the United Nations – an organization that undoubtedly represents a civilizational achievement after a long period of war horrors, and which should greatly contribute to collective security.

The scale of the tragedy caused by the Second World War led humanity to create mechanisms that would prevent this evil from ever happening again. The United Nations is an attempt to institutionalize international cooperation in order to establish and preserve lasting global peace, which would be based on agreements reached through the broadest consensus of all nations while respecting the principle of equality of states. Unfortunately, this has not prevented the outbreak of new conflicts, so lasting peace remains the ideal we strive

for, but it has undoubtedly contributed to preventing those conflicts from taking on global proportions.

We are proud to point out that the former Yugoslavia actively participates and contributes to the creation of the United Nations, and is among the first fifty countries signatories to the United Nations Charter. The Republic of Serbia emphasizes at every opportunity that this organization is as necessary today as at the time when it was formed and that its relevance must not be questioned, as well as that the principles and goals of the United Nations defined by the Charter remain equally relevant. Sovereign equality of states, respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, renunciation of the use of force, non-interference in the internal affairs of other states, peaceful settlement of disputes, the fulfillment of international legal obligations, and respect for diversity are just some of the principles whose relevance has not been overcome in time. On the contrary, it has strengthened in the conditions of significant changes at the international level brought by the 21st century.

I would like to emphasize that the Security Council, being one of the most important bodies of the United Nations, has a primary role in maintaining international peace, but also in collective deterrence against the illegal use of armed forces in international relations and is obliged to base its actions on the principles that are the foundation of the United Nations. However, due to conflicting interests on the international scene, we are witnessing occasional recourse to unilateral measures and actions that undermine and endanger the effectiveness of multilateralism and international cooperation mechanisms and lead to a crisis of legitimacy of institutions one of which is the United Nations. This primarily refers to the use of armed forces against sovereign states

Countries like the Republic of Serbia must insist on the consistent implementation of the principles of international public law and on respect for the role of international organizations in preventing violations of agreed and harmonized rules.

contrary to the basic principles of collective security, without the consent of the United Nations Security Council.

Unfortunately, Serbia has experienced the disastrous effects of this approach and can testify to the tragic consequences of neglecting the key role of the Security Council in overcoming conflicts and contributing to the peaceful settlement of internal disputes in sovereign states. I will remind you that the decision to use armed forces against FR Yugoslavia in 1999 was made and executed without the consent of the UN Security Council, which not only violates the sovereign rights of our country but also undermines the authority of the United Nations and seriously endangers its primary peacekeeping function. This sets a precedent and makes space for bypassing and derogating the United Nations as a key framework for overcoming disagreements that could be a threat to peace. The aggression on FR Yugoslavia must be a lesson for the future on the importance of consistent compliance with the United Nations Charter and the achieved standards in international public law.

Countries like the Republic of Serbia must insist on the consistent implementation of the principles of international public law and on respect for the role of international organizations in preventing violations of agreed and harmonized rules.

International relations that are not based on law and lack the structure and support of multilateralism are a threat to states that are unable to independently, without

the modern *acquis* of multilateralism and international law, protect their security and basic national interests in conflict with powerful forces acting on the principle of the rights of the stronger.

It is important to mention the firm determination of the Republic of Serbia to continue with giving support to global efforts in the fight against terrorism, primarily through the full implementation of the UN Global Strategy of Fight against Terrorism and relevant resolutions of the United Nations Security Council, as well as through an active participation in the Global Coalition in the Fight Against ISIS.

Esteemed participants of the Conference,

I am convinced that the defense of multilateralism begins at the national level, by protecting our vital interests and priorities. We believe that by defending our sovereignty and territorial integrity we are at the same time defending international law and the Charter of the United Nations. The contribution of the United Nations to the preservation of regional peace and security in the Western Balkans is also visible through the actions and activities of the UNMIK Mission, whose presence on a constantly large scale is of great importance for creating conditions leading to a long-lasting and sustainable solution to the Kosovo and Metohija issue. We expect UNMIK to continue to implement its mandate, especially in the areas relevant to the normal life of the Serbs and members of other non-Albanian communities, regarding the sustainable return of some 200,000 internally displaced persons from Kosovo and Metohija, of whom less than 2% have returned so far, as well as the issue of protection of Serbian cultural and religious heritage. Equally important is the continued action of the rest of the international presence, primarily KFOR as the main

guarantor of security and EULEX due to its engagement in the area of rule of law. I will use this opportunity to reiterate that the Republic of Serbia remains committed to finding a compromise solution to the issue of Kosovo and Metohija that will ensure long-lasting peace and stability and is ready to build a common future with all peoples in our environment through a policy of peace and cooperation.

Distinguished participants of the meeting,

Finally, once again I would like to emphasize the full commitment of the Republic of Serbia to the values of multilateralism contained in the United Nations Charter, as well as to the existing mechanisms of collective security. At the same time, I call upon all of us to work together on the redefinition and necessary adjustment of multilateralism and the system of collective security, so that we would be ready and able to adequately respond to current, but also to any future crises and challenges.

Thank you for your attention.

SIMONA-MIRELA MICXULESCU

*Representative of the UN Secretary-General and Head
of UN Office in Belgrade*

MULTILATERALISM
MUST BE INCLUSIVE
AND GLOBALLY
CONNECTED

Your Excellency, Deputy Prime Minister and Minister
of Foreign Affairs Ivica Dačić,
Excellencies,
Distinguished Guests,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

Let me begin by first thanking the Energypact Foundation, the Faculty of Security Studies of the University of Belgrade, and Institute of International Politics and Economics for inviting me to participate in this Special Session on such an important subject at this moment in our world. What a perfect timing of this conference, as exactly today in the afternoon, in New York, the most important solemn high-level meeting on UN's 75th anniversary will take place, and its theme will be "The Future We Want, the United Nations We Need: Reaffirming our Collective Commitment to Multilateralism".

It is also a rare pleasure to be able to address you in person, not via one of the virtual platforms that we have been obliged to use and become accustomed with during the COVID-19 pandemic. This pandemic, in itself, is demonstrating once again how precious is the value of multilateralism if we are to tackle the greatest human challenges, those which transcend all state and national divisions. In today's world, the quality of multilateral cooperation, whether it be high or low, is a matter of life or death, for millions of human beings. Under very different circumstances, the recognition of this essential truth was the impulse behind the United Nations Charter, with Yugoslavia once of its signatories and founding members, and the truly multilateral authority that it established for human affairs.

Since the founding of the United Nations, the letter and spirit of multilateralism has been under continuous pressure from its obverse, the competitive politics and economics which have guided most of recorded human history. Today, these forces are clearly often still dominant: populism, national egoism, and resource protectionism often win out over solidarity and mutually beneficial cooperation. Perhaps ironically, this remains the case even at the time when collective challenges are increasing, not decreasing. These include of course changes in climate that threaten the quality of life of our children and grandchildren, the freedom of peoples to trade goods and to innovate, the control of disease by advancing medical technology, to name only a few examples.

So, leaving aside philosophical questions about what in human beings leads to this constant battles between self-interest and collective interest, we can pose the question: Seventy-five years into this great experiment, how much is the United Nations, and the multilateral principles its

founders intended, holding up? We only have to turn on practically any local, regional or international news to see security volatility, the prolonging of age old disputes, and the almost daily generation of new ones, all of which carry heavy costs to human life and well-being.

Soon after the onset of the coronavirus pandemic, UN Secretary-General Guterres appealed to governments for a cessation of ongoing violent conflict in order to focus their efforts upon this new worldwide threat. He saw in this crisis an opportunity for “promoting unity and aligning thinking,” specifically to orienting more of our thinking toward the reality of common welfare across the globe. As another former UN high official, former Under Secretary-General Jeffrey Feltman, wrote recently, the UN organisation itself remains torn between “transition and trepidation”. The need for transition in order to

Since the founding of the United Nations, the letter and spirit of multilateralism has been under continuous pressure from its obverse, the competitive politics and economics which have guided most of recorded human history.

improve relations among states and nations, and the trepidation that is felt any time an existing system is faced with the need to make a transition. In

an ever more interconnected world, public opinion and media fly in different directions depending on who or what captures the narrative on any given day.

While the United Nations should be leading agile responses to these rapidly changing tides, from the inside I can say this is not always the case, and that is something I believe needs to change.

Many observers of today’s world recognise that, in the classical senses, it is neither bipolar, unipolar, nor

multipolar. It is something different, and it can often appear more chaotic and uncertain than ever.

As recognised by our Secretary-General, multilateralism must be both globally connected and locally close to the minds of people. It must be inclusive, with the participation of the youngest and the oldest, women and men, businesses and charities, academia and philanthropy, religion and secularism.

Serbia and her partners are frequent supporters of multilateralism, not only through its active participation in the work of the UN multilateral bodies and active contribution to UN peace operations, but also through countless new regional initiatives to promote cooperation. In this, we are all here in this room as sincere partners in greater cause. I hope that my introductory remarks help to stimulate what I'm sure will be a very high-level conversation on all these issues at this important time.

Allow me to close by once again thanking the organizers of this Special Session. Let us hope that, 75 years on, we can be part of lifting anew the spirit of multilateralism for which the UN foremost stands.

Hvala!

PROF. NENAD ZRNIĆ, PHD

*Vice-Rector of the University of Belgrade for International
Cooperation*

INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF BELGRADE

It is extremely important for the University of Belgrade that the Faculty of Security Studies, as part of the University and a member of the group of faculties of social sciences and humanities, is one of the organizers of this meeting – a special session dedicated to multilateralism and international security. This proves the commitment of the Faculty to organize important thematic conferences on current topics and to animate influential and competent speakers to present their thoughts on the topic and present views that deserve the attention not only of academia but also the wider community.

These activities of the Faculty of Security Studies comply with the engagement of the University of Belgrade, as the only Serbian university of national importance, to further intensify its already respectable international reputation, which is reflected, among other things, in the high ranking on the so-called.

Shanghai list of world-ranked universities. Namely, recently the University of Belgrade became a member of the CircleU alliance (<https://www.circle-u.eu/>) within the Erasmus project of European universities. In addition to our University, members of this university alliance are excellent higher education institutions (all of which have Nobel Prize winners and some Fields medals), the University of Oslo, the University of Paris, Humboldt University in Berlin, Catholic University of Leuven, Kings College London and Aarhus University of Denmark. This university alliance came to life in 2019, and with the acceptance of the Erasmus project, the realization of the planned activities begins on 1st November 2020.

The activities of this alliance will enable a significant increase in the mobility of students and teachers within this network, joint scientific research, interdisciplinary connections, as well as the gradual harmonization of individual curricula. As the pillars on which this alliance is based are democracy, climate change and sustainability, and public health, it is more than evident that this opens up great opportunities for connecting teachers, researchers and faculty students from all groups of our university with partner institutions to the purpose of further work improvement and raising the quality of the University of Belgrade.

I must especially emphasize that this is of crucial importance for our faculties of social sciences and humanities, which, perhaps due to their specificity, lag regarding international visibility compared to the faculties in the field of engineering, medicine and natural sciences. In that sense, I expect the full contribution of teachers and students of the Faculty of Security Studies in the realization of the set goals.

PROF. VLADIMIR N. CVETKOVIĆ, PHD

Dean of Faculty of Security Studies, University of Belgrade

NATIONAL STATE IN THE GLOBAL ORDER – REALITY AND HOPE

Allow me, please, to put the celebration of today's anniversary, even only in principle, in a specific historical

In attempts to legitimize the new forms and contents of governance, the said modern, therefore – nation-state, alternately plays the role of “night watchman” (minimalist liberal concept) and “Big Brother” (maximalist totalitarian concept).

and academic context. In this respect, the first thing that needs to be said, and it is something that people often forget in the current theoretical and practical

discourse, is that the modern (national) state is *a recent political invention*. The state is a modern political child, not more than two or three centuries old. All other, preceding political communities – polises, kingdoms, empires, etc., although partly resembling, was not the state because they did not have the institutions, actors, or legitimation principles that the modern, i.e. nation-

state has. Contrary to pre-modern political communities (usually based on transcendent values, strict social hierarchies and divinized political authority), the nation-state separates might from metaphysics, power from God, taking over many social functions that had never been the focus of politics before. The state retains the traditional character of the government, i.e. coercion, supervision and control, while at the same time becoming a powerful economic actor, market regulator, the guarantor of legal and social protection, *a doctor, teacher, employer and tutor of the society* so to speak.

In attempts to legitimize the new forms and contents of governance, the said modern, therefore – *nation-state*, alternately plays the role of “night watchman” (minimalist liberal concept) and “Big Brother” (maximalist totalitarian concept). It is a “social engineer” (communism) and a “secular deity” (fascism / Nazism), a value-neutral “free market regulator” (liberalism), but also a value-interested “wealth distributor” (social democracy). Paradoxically, in the last great economic recession (2008), it becomes a “nanny state” for the richest strata of society, only to function as a voluntary “prison state” in the current world pandemic (2020).

For each of the new “roles” and “functions” of the modern state, appropriate ideological templates have been created to justify specific concepts of political organization. In each of them, the responsibility and power of state administrators far outweigh the strength and capabilities (though certainly not the ambition) that premodern rulers and their political elites and institutions have or demonstrate. That is why the legitimation narratives in modern, as a rule, secular political communities are more complex than they were in pre-modern, sacral communities. Virtually, all the ideological stories that have been offered so far in that

sense appear in pairs of opposites: starting from the initial one – liberalism vs conservatism (18th–19th century), through a ground, originally modern conflict: liberalism vs socialism/communism (20th century), all the way to parallel but also much more disastrous alternatives: fascism / Nazism vs liberalism and/or communism (20th century). The same is true for modern combinations, crossbreeding and opposition of different derivatives of old ideological templates that establish a new kind of “mixed order” – postmodern political regimes made according to the pattern of “a little bit of everything”.

The reason for the current political schizophrenia lies in the disappointment that ensues the failure of all original ideological promises and calls for freedom and equality, honour and tradition, solidarity and progress, strength and power of race, nation, class or elite, and in the proven inability to “fairly” regulate the free economy as well as the public sphere and create conditions for a safe and free and/or dignified life.

Due to the stated above, the relations *between* the states have one more dimension relative to the classic premodern tensions, i.e. armed conflicts between traditional political communities.

This dimension has as much its political and legal side (establishment of international public law) as it has its particular social and especially “advanced” technological aspects (corrupt public opinion and effective “total war” waging). In short, the conflicts remain the same or similar, only more devastating with lots more casualties and even potentially apocalyptic. To that extent, the former awareness or assumption of their “naturalness”, especially after the horrors of the two global “world wars” in the first half of the 20th century, becomes critical to the point that wars are now “forbidden” according to the

international law. All this, of course, does not prevent the “great powers” and “local players” from continuing to wage wars in accordance with the general (unfavourable) circumstances and their own needs.

Be as it may, owing to the current digital technology, the world has become “smaller” and more clearly visible. Time is almost “compressed”, so that what has always been in progress – but with delayed action and belated reflection, *the interconnectedness of every local economy, culture and politics with world (“global”) trends*, becomes crystal clear and available to everyone today. By becoming a media “global village”, the world only presents to a larger number of “users” what leading businessmen, politicians or historians have always known, only they did not have the need, interest or opportunity to communicate to others.

For example, long before it became commonplace in the 20th century, it was well known that every war in the Middle East had

direct consequences for Europe and Central Asia and consequently for other parts of the world. However, for a long time, it was only “secret” or “expert” knowledge of politicians and military leaders,

Similar to Marx’s expectations that the state would “die”, a good number of modern “futurologists” in the characters of philosophers, sociologists, lawyers, politicians, and more recently medical doctors and engineers, predict that modern, i.e. the nation-state is “disappearing” or “decaying” faster and faster.

and of course, the privilege of great entrepreneurs and statesmen at the head of great powers. Today, it is a common topic of casual chat in provincial taverns. The same goes for all other types of news and their global

relevance from “umbrella demonstrations” in Hong Kong and “yellow vest” protests in Paris, through cold steel attacks on accidental passers-by in China or Germany, shooting at Muslims in a mosque in New Zealand, ideological conflicts and racial unrest in Iran or America, to fires in Australia or California. Not to mention the daily changes in world stock markets or the consequences of pandemics.

Various types of predictions in the form of “futurology” and self-proclaimed “scientific prediction” become popular in the given context. Most often, it is a simple wish for some things to “happen” or a naive assumption that current social and technological trends have their own written “preprogrammed development” (formerly called destiny and/or fate), which can be traced using common sense and as such grasped based on “existing trends”. In any case, on the basis of such “reflections” ideological entrepreneurs try to make money, politicians to prepare, and others to entertain themselves. In that sense, Alvin Tofler, Jacques Atalius, Noah Harari, or Martin Reese made in the last half-century that the futurological predictions are worth reading and comparing. They all have in common the limited possibilities of the particular nation-state, which follows the “necessity” of forming larger international forms of functioning of politics and economy and finally of culture.

Similar to Marx’s expectations that the state would “die”, a good number of modern “futurologists” in the characters of philosophers, sociologists, lawyers, politicians, and more recently medical doctors and engineers, predict that modern, i.e. the nation-state is “disappearing” or “decaying” faster and faster and that it will be replaced, if not by the “world government”, then certainly (because, allegedly, it is already largely *at work*)

by transnational, i.e. “international order” formed by the activities of leading nation-states, as well as various *transnational* (international) political, economic, cultural, sports and other similar organizations.

Following such thinking and understanding of the modern political scene, it was concluded that the “international community”, embodied in the form of numerous (in)formal groups and forums: from the United Nations and its various agencies and bodies (UNICEF, UNHCR, etc.), through political and economic alliances of nation-states (those “western”: NATO, IMF, World Bank, and perhaps “eastern”: BRIC, etc.), to less binding “political formats” such as gatherings of current and potentially great powers (meetings of states which are part of the G7 or G8 to G20), would *gradually form a transnational institutional* (political and economic) or *value* (moral and cultural) *order*, which would become binding on all political communities on Earth.

A step back in this and such understanding of things and projecting social and political relations would be, if not the creation of *a world state* and its government, then undoubtedly a more concrete institutionalisation of the global (world) system in which all political communities would share the same values. So, they would be equally motivated to achieve or protect those values. Such institutionalisation should, supposedly, be a reasonable solution to the contradiction between special (national) and general (international) interests, a path to international stability from which everyone would benefit equally – states and peoples, corporations and workers, social groups and individuals. However, no matter how potentially noble and reasonable such efforts may be, they usually only conceal the special interests of the most powerful states. In the end, it doesn’t matter whether it is

unlikely “naivety”, political mimicry or economic “hidden intentions”.

Experience and common sense tell us that the world state and its government are neither possible nor desirable. A world state could function only as an ideal or vision, by no means as a political reality. If the latter were at work, it would expose the world to the greatest possible tyranny – the world executive authorities without a democratic (but also any other) kind of control. History knows an endless series of customary, legal and political institutions related to the regulation of relations between individuals, each of them individually towards the political community and finally the communities among themselves. There is no real argument in favour of the thesis that all of them could one day (or should) be translated into a single – uniform pattern, i.e. common institutions and binding rules of a single (“world”) value system. Finally, it is unrealistic to expect that “wealth in differences” produces only the fruits of peace and cooperation. The millennial experience of humanity testifies to the exact opposite.

*

There is no doubt that the UN, the most important international political institution, was created as an expression of a concrete need for a more or less regulated international order within modernity (19th–20th century). The fundamental value of that order is global peace. Its realization implies, among other things, the existence of international law whose main task is to create mechanisms for making and maintaining peace.

The first step was achieved with the UN Charter of 1945, which prohibits war and declares it a criminal act.

However, as always, when it comes to human affairs, especially legal codes, there is a large space between the normative and the real. To truly realize a proclaimed political goal, especially of such colossal dimensions as global and continuous peace, it is necessary for nation-states, as the main and direct actors of international law, to accept certain binding documents. Of course, it immediately becomes clear that declarative acceptance of international law, together with mutual recognition of states and the belief that everyone shares the same or similar goals, is not enough, or even necessary, to establish peace. A necessary (though not sufficient) condition for peace is that all states have the same or similar political power. Certainly, this will never be possible. Therefore, one should look for a solution within the existing order, i.e. the world of unequal nation-states.

In other words, one should consider, understand and practice a policy that will not be satisfied only with diplomatic negotiations and taking daily political oaths that the “best solution” is wanted.

Goodwill and willingness to cooperate are necessary but not sufficient conditions for global peace. Unfortunately – or perhaps, fortunately – a “balance of power” is needed. This assumes that no one is strong and powerful enough to act unilaterally on the international scene. Although such action can and must be assumed to be “natural” or “expected”, the point is *to curb* it as such. Whenever the UN succeeds in doing that, this Organisation justifies its existence and makes the world, if not better, then at least a safer place to live.

The longer part of the UN duration has passed in the principal balance of two large ideological and military blocs led by two states. It is not easy for anyone to play such a hand of cards, but a certain or some kind of balance

of power still exists. Then, when the balance disappears, when one superpower prevails over another, a unipolar world emerges.

However, despite expectations and ideological proclamations, the world does not get better. On the

contrary, the unilateral world is noted to produce more, not less, conflict.

Whenever the UN succeeds in doing that, this Organisation justifies its existence and makes the world, if not better, then at least a safer place to live.

Immanuel Kant knows this and shows it in his famous article “Eternal Peace”, a text that, due to historical circumstances, becomes a kind of ideological manifesto of modern liberalism and even international law. Kant explicitly denies the possibility that some “world state” or “world government” could guarantee civil rights to anyone. Moreover, the “world government” would necessarily tend to level the difference between cultures, languages, mores and legal norms of the individual political communities. Ultimately, that would be their abolition. For this reason, Kant concludes, if by some miracle it were constituted, the “world government” would be nothing but the worst possible tyrant, i.e. an absolute despot!

Confirmation of this is the reality of the unipolar world from the end of the past and the beginning of this century when it is clearly shown that any presumed or self-proclaimed “exceptionality” easily and almost legally turns into arrogance and self-sufficiency, whereby the particular interests of the most powerful take the form of false universality. Those who have experienced or are still experiencing the consequences of inadvertently made decisions on economic and similar “international sanctions”, not to mention disastrous and illegal

“humanitarian interventions”, know best what this looks like. The political dishonesty of that phrase and the corresponding political practice is already largely exposed in international law textbooks, regardless of the ideological prism that creates them.

In the meantime, the world becomes *multipolar*, which should be accepted first (which was avoided until recently) and then understood (which also seems to be a problem). Today’s confrontation of three or four great powers (there may be more tomorrow), along with many other security challenges and threats – from poverty, pandemics and environmental pollution to terrorism and cybersecurity – requires continued international *cooperation* and the creation of *joint* (not exclusive!) institutions that would be able to channel conflicts, restrain the great and discipline the small powers of this world.

One must be prudent: international organizations will never be more than what the nation-states allow them to be. That is why it is in vain to lament over national egoisms or curse the arrogance of the great. Instead, it is better to look for cooperation mechanisms that will bring more mutual benefits. Only in this way can preconditions be created to establish a global “eternal peace”, perhaps an unattainable but always desirable goal of the human race. Unreachability is not the same as an impossibility. Perhaps the already mentioned Immanuel Kant has the right solution when he paradoxically hybridizes tradition and modern enlightenment: a categorical imperative is achievable if we believe that God exists, that the soul is immortal, and the will is free.

JEAN LUI FALCONI

Ambassador of France to the Republic of Serbia

FRENCH COMMITMENTS TO IMPROVE THE MULTILATERAL SYSTEM

Thank you for this invitation. 2020 is an important year for celebrating and promoting multilateralism. 75th anniversary of the UN Charter, but also the 50th anniversary of the NPT, 45th anniversary of the Helsinki agreements leading to OSCE, remain the founding treaties of our multilateral security system.

1 – State of play and commitment of France.

These treaties and the organizations that allow them to function aim at assuring a regional or (and this is the newer element of the 20th century aim at creating an order based on rules mutually agreed, mutually respected and mutually guaranteed by all international actors, independently of their strength in terms of territory, population, economy or armed forces.

France has played a crucial role in this process, even well before 1945. It has participated to all major international conferences since Westphalia in 1648; it was the promoter

of the league of nations and let me remind you that 2020 is the 100th anniversary of the award of the Peace Nobel prize to Léon Bourgeois, a French statesman, 1st chairman

The European project is a very specific scheme of international cooperation: more than multilateralism (fully integrated bodies and policies), less than a State. Despite the difficulties and the critics, it has managed for more than 60 years to strengthen its institutions while welcoming new members, assure peace, democracy and development among its members.

of the Council of the League of Nations, for his contribution to the edification of what we call “collective security”, which is at the heart of the UN Charter and, more globally, the multilateral system.

R e a s o n s
for this French commitment:

- our geographic situations and the lessons learnt from the past (war with all neighbors and beyond); President Mitterrand’s speech in the EU Parliament in Strasbourg in 1995;
- values of the 1789 French revolution human rights, equality of rights which are the fundamentals of the universal values upon which the universal conventions are based.

Produced some positive results:

- NPT and IAEA succeeded in avoiding broad nuclear weapons proliferation;
- Palermo Convention (UN convention against transnational organized crime signed in 2020 is a minimal basis for universal judicial cooperation in the fight against crime;
- WTO has succeeded, through several rounds, in fostering international trade and growth.

But the multilateral system is challenged (all multilateral organizations from the past fell apart, generally leading to wars...):

- Values on which it is based are challenged: “relativity of human rights” / confrontation of values “freedom of speech” / “freedom of religion”;
- Temptation for “unilateralism”: leads to mess stability and predictability: ex IAEA and JCPoA Iran nuclear;
- COVID-19: (not key but) importance of the organizations that allow the international system to function, culture of dialogue. Hostile acts come after hostile words. Online 75th UNGA will certainly bring a lot of lost opportunities. Example of P5 meetings. Macron calling for P5 heads of State meetings.

2 - French commitments to improve the multilateral system:

- Reiterate our commitment to multilateralism: Alliance for Multilateralism which has been launched in 2 April 2019 by the French and German Foreign Ministers, is an informal alliance of countries that wish to coordinate their action in promoting multilateralism;
- The aim is both to discuss on the ways to reform our system and defend international norms and, also, to launch concrete initiative in fields where there is obviously a lack of international governance, as, for instance, security in the cyberspace. 50 foreign affairs ministers have rallied. Invite minister Dacic to participate;
- More inclusiveness of the present multilateral system, which continues to a large extend to function of the basis of rules and institutions

created in 1945. France promotes UNSC reform with more permanent members for a better representation of today's world;

- New forms of multilateralism : taking into account globalization (all subjects linked : climate change, migrations, security...) and new actors outside governments NGOs, foundations, companies, academies, researchers, civil societies... To that aim the Paris Peace Forum was launched by President Macron in November 2018 – 100 years after the end of WWI, and which gathers every year hundreds of participants both from states and civil societies on specific projects aiming to reinforce international cooperation and multilateralism. The next edition will take place in November and we also do hope that Serbia will be represented at high level.

I would like to close with a last specific remark on the European Union, The European project is a very specific scheme of international cooperation: more than multilateralism (fully integrated bodies and policies), less than a State. Despite the difficulties and the critics, it has managed for more than 60 years to strengthen its institutions while welcoming new members, assure peace, democracy and development among its members.

This is why the conditions to join EU are severe, in order not to import instability inside a fragile construction.

Despite economic strength, efforts remain to be made to make EU a fully relevant actor in the field of securities inside the multilateral framework: President Macron is pushing towards a strategic autonomy of EU, more means, autonomous capacity of action of the Europeans around a strategic culture of its own and strategic visions.

ALEXANDER BOTSAN-KHARCHENKO
*Ambassador of the Russian Federation to the Republic
of Serbia*

THE UNITED NATIONS AS AN INDISPENSABLE MULTILATERAL PLATFORM

As an architect of the UN and the permanent member of the UN Security Council, Russia attributes particular importance to the 75th anniversary of the Organisation.

We expect that the anniversary will bring into sharp focus the priority of further strengthening the central and coordinating role of the UN in global affairs, building

fair and equal interstate relations, and consolidating efforts to counter contemporary challenges and threats – from international terrorism to COVID-19.

The UN is an indispensable multilateral platform that possesses unique representativeness and legitimacy.

Nevertheless, the intent of a number of countries to keep their aspirations for 'global domination' by means of political blackmail, economic pressure, and unilateral use of force is incapable of reversing the objective course of history.

Within its competence are all areas of international life with no exception: military and political sphere, security and peaceful resolution of conflicts (including preventive diplomacy, peace-keeping and peace-building), development of economic and humanitarian cooperation, and improvement of the norms and instruments of international law.

The UN Security Council is the key mechanism for maintaining international peace and security. The veto power is the privilege and responsibility of the UNSC permanent member-states. Retaining its high relevance, the Council plays a leading role in resolving international crises.

The President of the Russian Federation Vladimir Putin put forward a proposal to convene a meeting of the heads of UNSC permanent member-states. As the President emphasised, the summit would provide an opportunity to discuss steps to develop collective approaches in global affairs, issues of preserving peace and strengthening global and regional security, countering current challenges and threats, and alleviating the economic impact of the 'coronacrisis'. Russia is ready to offer specific ideas and best practices on all the topics.

Considering positive initial response from the other P5 capitals, we expect that such summit will take place in person once conditions allow. The meeting will be of a profound symbolic significance as it will demonstrate a common commitment to the spirit of alliance, high ideals and values bequeathed to us by the great generation of victors in World War II.

The UN was established in the year of the Great Victory over fascism. The Allies, having withstood terrible ordeals with honour and having defeated Nazism, united their efforts to lay a solid foundation of the new world

order based on collective security and equal interstate cooperation.

The UN saved the humankind from repeating the tragedy of a global conflict. Owing to the UN, major powers have for three quarters of a century strictly adhered to diplomatic methods when resolving disagreements between them.

Historical revisionism, the manifestations of which we witness with greater frequency as regards World War II and its results, is dangerous because it cynically distorts the understanding of the principles of peaceful development established in 1945. The malicious aim is evident; it is to induce the public to question the justice of the world order set out in the UN Charter, to discredit the system of international law, and replace it with the so-called 'rule-based order'.

Nevertheless, the intent of a number of countries to keep their aspirations for 'global domination' by means of political blackmail, economic pressure, and unilateral use of force is incapable of reversing the objective course of history.

The megatrend of the modern world is the emergence of new centres and driving forces of economic growth and political influence and the formation of a truly polycentric world.

On this path, of important help is the constructive contribution to discussions and devising collective compromise solutions within the UN on the part of interstate associations guided in their work by the principles of collegiality, equality, civilisational diversity, and repudiation of bloc mentality, i.e. G20, BRICS, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, as well as the Commonwealth of Independent States, the Collective Security Treaty Organisation, and the Eurasian Economic Union.

Only together can we make life on our planet stable and safe, ensure sustainable development, prosperity and welfare of all nations and peoples. Russia advocates strengthening multilateralism in interstate relations and global economy based on the universal norms of international law, the UN Charter above all, with an emphasis on absolute respect for sovereignty of all states and unacceptability of interfering in their domestic affairs. We are convinced that such world order possesses great resilience and immense creative potential.

We are glad that our vision for international environment is shared here in Serbia.

FRANCOISE JACOB

United Nations Resident Coordinator in Serbia

MULTILATERALISM IS ABOUT THE PEOPLES

Good morning, *Dobro jutro*

Drago mi je sto sam ovde danas, when we share many perspectives on the topic of Multilateralism and Security, in the context of the UN75 anniversary. Today i will try and give a vision that is people centered.

We started the year with lots of great plans for the celebration of this UN75. We thought that it would give another occasion to explore and celebrate the future together, including through a global consultation similar to the one that led to the formulation of Agenda 2030. We launched a worldwide survey in January. We were monitoring the results over the months: initially inequalities – including on gender – and climate change were the hot topics. As the pandemic engulfed us, people's health became the area of concern #1, naturally. But then came an unexpected outsider (in the context of general public survey): the importance of collaboration between countries, solidarity between people, to resolve global

challenges, among which the current pandemic. 87% of those surveyed believe international cooperation is vital to deal with today's challenges, and COVID made this more evident. Six in ten respondents believe the UN has made the world a better place. Looking to the future, 74% see the UN as "essential" in tackling global challenges. The global report is being released today, and you will all receive a copy.

I have 3 points today, and this is my first point:

1. **Multilateralism is not only about the Security Council, it is not only about high-level politics, it is about people and how they see the challenges of globalization, security and sustainable development should be dealt with.** We heard a lot in the past few years that Multilateralism was on its last breath, but it is very much alive! We have seen that when countries decide to move away from coalitions, and rule-based order, they create anxiety, chaos and suffering. We have seen that when states decide to pull away from international agreements, their citizens, their cities, their regions, reach out to remain committed to such agreements. In the context of COVID, global cooperation, despite the rumours, has demonstrated once again its values in pulling resources and solutions together, and my colleague from WHO will talk about this later.

We need a lot more women leaders, at the helm of countries, international organisations, global companies, think tanks, and universities.

Of course, there are persistent challenges. But the response to the pandemic, which is still unravelling, has shown the global cooperation today is about mutual

responsibility and shared accountability, between countries, between citizens and their state, between generations. So as the UN Secretary general said and Simona has already mentioned, we need a more inclusive multilateralism, drawing on the contributions of civil society, businesses, cities, and with greater weight given to the voices of youth.

2. My second point is on **Multilateralism and gender**. Yes we have made progress, in some regions, in many countries, on gender equality and gender empowerment. But not enough. We need a lot more women leaders, at the helm of countries, international organisations, global companies, think tanks, universities, etc. Including in this room. Today, only 10% of heads of state are women. The barriers to women's participation are often invisible, underpinned by gender stereotypes, cultural practices and longstanding structural, social and economic inequalities.

2020 also marks the anniversary of the UN Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. The resolution stresses the important role of women in the prevention and resolution of conflicts and in peacebuilding.

It underlines the importance of women having the opportunity for equal participation and full involvement in all efforts to maintain and promote peace and security, as well as the need to increase their role in decision-making at all levels.

In that respect, I was happy to see the results in the parliament in Serbia, with now 38,8% of MPs being women. It is short of the 40% threshold requested, but it is more than the previous 30%. Let's aim for parity in the next elections.

One more point on this. You are all aware of the narrative that countries led by women such as Germany, Finland, New Zealand, Norway, Taiwan, may have managed the Covid crisis better. While it is too early to see which countries are really faring better, the past 6 months have highlighted a different approach to risk management, communication and leadership style¹ between men and women leaders. Women leaders seem to have been significantly more risk averse in the domain of human life, but more risk taking in the domain of the economy. Let's mix both, and we will have a better world.

My third point is on the nexus between Climate Change, International Security, and Multilateralism.

It is now clearly established and accepted, including by military institutions, that Climate Change, abusive exploitation and destruction of natural resources, pollution, have become root causes of extreme and extended tensions between communities, people and countries. It is not a coincidence that many conflict affected countries are also those badly hit by climate change and competition for natural resources, particularly around water and energy. We know very well that a large share of the migrants and refugees stuck in Greece and elsewhere on the European shores are climate migrants. It is therefore imperative to dedicate much larger resources, in money, time, efforts, capacities to fighting the complex issue of climate change, both locally and regionally. Technology and solutions exist, financial resources exist, so it is now primarily a question of political vision, political will, allocation of efforts, close and intelligent coordination between partners, to make this urgent fight a successful one, including in Serbia. On that topic, I can

¹ <https://theconversation.com/are-women-leaders-really-doing-better-on-coronavirus-the-data-backs-it-up-144809>

only urge for a greater, tighter cooperation between the UN, the EU, other MS and the Government of Serbia, now on this topic. And the Green Deal is a good start to do that. Let's make every infrastructure investment a step towards a greener economy. Let's solve the air pollution problem this winter and next winter, not in 5 or 10 years. Let's remember that this is what the people want, and what we need to stay healthy.

To conclude, I ask you to share messages of hope, optimism, and visions that call for action together. We are going through a mad period, and it is easy to indulge in catastrophism, cynicism and blame others. We need to remember our fundamental principles and values that define the Charter of the United Nations. Peace and human rights is our most precious value. Well Being of the people is our most precious asset. A healthy planet is our most precious resource. It does not matter that we have different ways of looking at life, different ambitions, different understandings. We must still work better together and achieve this beautiful Agenda 2030. **It is in this spirit that the UN in Serbia will work with you in the years to come and galvanize global cooperation. As UN SG Antonio Gutterez said, let's go for a Multilateralism with more teeth, scale and ambition.**

Hvala!

PROF. BORIS KRIVOKAPIĆ, PHD

*Full Professor, Business and Law Faculty, University
“Union – Nikola Tesla”, Belgrade & Law Faculty,
Samara National University “S. P. Korolev”, Samara*

INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE UNITED NATIONS

1. INTERNATIONAL LAW IS LAW

International law is law. No matter how you define it, it is essentially set of norms and principles that determine the mandatory rules of conduct i.e. rights and obligations of the relevant entities.¹

This should be emphasized because, no matter how strange it may be, sometimes one can hear claims that what is called international law is not law, but a sum of some moral and similar rules. This is pointed out by some politicians,² and even some theorists, who claim that at

1 For various definitions of international law, see: Krivokapić Boris, *Međunarodno javno pravo*, Beograd 2017, 28–44.

2 The former US ambassador to the UN (2005–2006) and later (2018–2019) National Security Advisor to US President D. Trump, concluded his article (whose title speaks for itself) with the following comment: “International law is not law; it is a series of political and moral arrangements that stand or fall on their own merits, and anything else is simply theology or superstition masquerading as law.” Bolton John R., “Is there Really ‘Law’ in

best one can speak of an incomplete law or an emerging law.³

Such understandings are defended by various arguments. We will briefly look at the most important ones.

1. The problem of the development of international law. – Sometimes it is claimed that international law is not law because it is too young and not sufficiently developed, that is. there are too few norms that regulate only a small circle of issues.

That is simply not true. We can talk about international legal norms since the creation of the first states, and thus the first international relations.⁴ Every contact between the two societies has always meant either an agreement (cooperation) or a conflict, which

International Affairs?”, *Transnational Law & Contemporary Problems*, vol. 10, Spring 2000, 48.

3 In essence, from the same positions, although with a different experience and explanation, some in international law see the decor for the steps based on the so-called, real politics or, in other words, something that should not be taken too seriously. In this regard, it is rightly noted that this disparagement of international law comes at a time when the global problems facing the world can hardly be greater and when their solution more than requires urgent international cooperation. BilderRichard B., “On Being an International Lawyer”, *Loyola University Chicago International Law Review*, No. 2, 2006, 136.

4 More than four centuries ago, the Spanish writer Suarez correctly remarked: “Every state – kingdom or republic – is a whole for itself, at the same time a member of that great community, which is called the human race. No state alone can be self-sufficient to such an extent that there is no need for any help, for any kind of relationship, or for any association with others for the common good. States therefore need one right, which will govern them and which will guide them in these relations and in this great society.” SuarezFrancois, *Tractatus de legibus ac Deo legislator* (1612) L. II. c. 19, no. 9. Quoted from: Nis Ernest, *Poreklo međunarodnog prava*, Beograd 1895, 12–13.

in both cases, by the logic of things, caused the need for legal regulation.

This is confirmed by the oldest historical documents, which indicate that the ancient peoples had branched mutual relations that were accompanied by the formation and development of international legal institutions. The first norms of international law arose through customs and dealt with the conclusion and binding nature of international treaties, the immunity of diplomatic representatives (envoys) and certain rules of war.

Very few know that the oldest surviving treaty, the one between Ebla and Abarsal, was concluded at least 4,300 years ago (between 2350 and 2250 BC) and that it is at least 200 years older than the oldest surviving state internal law code (Ur-Nammu Code, circa 2050 before).

Older agreements are also known (for example, between Lagash and Umma, more than 4,500 years ago), but they have not been preserved. It should be especially pointed out that even in antiquity, international agreements were much more developed than we would expect. Thus, e.g. the famous treaty between the Egyptian pharaoh Ramesses II and the Hittite emperor Hattusilis III (around 1278 BC) dealt with a number of issues (making peace, creating a military alliance, mutual assistance in quelling rebellions, regulating asylum and extradition) and had as many as 18 articles!

So international law is nothing new. It cannot be claimed, especially in our time, that it is not sufficiently developed. Truth be told, it does not regulate the whole of relations in the international community. However, even in the internal orders of the states, not all relevant issues are regulated by law. If it were not so, there would be no legal gaps, and it is known that there are. The point is that no matter how developed it is, every law by the nature of

things always lags behind life and cannot fully predict and regulate all social relations.

There is no doubt that international law is comprehensive today and is developing more and more,

On the other hand, to claim that international law has no sanction means to simplify things unjustifiably and excessively. Most international legal norms have a sanction. It differs from what occurs in the internal orders of states, but it exists.

so that not only does it more and more completely regulate relations in the international community, but it also covers new and new areas. This is sufficiently evidenced by the

constant increase in international treaties, especially those codifying certain matters. The role of other sources of international law is also stronger, especially the decisions of certain international organizations. Finally, international law increasingly regulates relations that until recently were considered issues within the exclusive internal competence of states (*domaine réservé, reserved domain*), such as. position of individuals and groups (human rights).

2. Theoretical challenge to international law. –

There are opinions that the existence of international law is not possible from a theoretical point of view already. Since it should be a kind of supranational law, it should be created and applied by a power that is higher than states, and it does not exist. Moreover, it is claimed, such a power is not even possible, because its existence would mean the negation of the sovereignty of states. So, either states are sovereign, which means that they cannot be bound by any “external” (international) law, or they are not, in which case again there is no international law

(because there are no sovereign entities that would bind that law).⁵

It would be enough to answer these remarks that they overlook the reality, and that is that international law has existed since the time of the first states, and that today there is a noticeable tendency to increase the number of states, and at the same time the system of international law is more and more developed and complete. Those are the facts.

When it comes to theoretical moments, the mentioned critiques have in mind the so-called absolute sovereignty, and it never existed, nor is it possible. The incompatibility of the sovereignty of states with the existence of international law is only apparent. It is international law that recognizes and guarantees the sovereignty of states. And when it comes to the fact that it partly limits it, the matter is similar to all other legally recognized rights, including the rights of individuals – the enjoyment of rights is always accompanied by certain restrictions, at least the requirement to respect the equally valid rights of others. This is nothing new, nor is it something that would be specific to international law. After all, international law is not creation of some “higher” authority, but it is a common product of states.

In addition, modern international law is not limited to relations between states. It regulates the rights and obligations of international organizations and a number of other entities.

3. The problem of sanction. – One of the arguments for the claim that international law is not law is that it does not have an effective legal sanction, and that it cannot

5 For example. Austin John, *Lectures on Jurisprudence or the Philosophy of the Positive Law*, Robert Campbell ed., John Murray, London 1885, 182.

have it because it is about relations between sovereign entities, each of which has a monopoly of force.

Indeed, even today, many rules of international law are not consistently sanctioned, ie. in case of their violation, there is no possibility of enforcement. However, it is forgotten that this is more or less characteristic of every legal system. Not so small number of legal rules can be found in internal legal orders, even very important ones, which do not and cannot have an effective legal sanction. This can be said about a number of norms of family, inheritance, and even constitutional law (for example, norms on the rights and duties and mutual relations of the highest state bodies).

On the other hand, to claim that international law has no sanction means to simplify things unjustifiably and excessively. Most international legal norms have a sanction. It differs from what occurs in the internal orders of states, but it exists.

Sanctions in international law are based on international treaties and customary legal rules, and increasingly on the decisions of international organizations. They are applied by states, international organizations, international courts and other entities. They apply against states, international organizations and other entities, including individuals. By their nature (considering the nature of the measures in which they consist), the sanctions of international law are legal-political, diplomatic, economic, military, criminal, etc. They are not only very diverse, but also, when applied consistently, very effective.

On the other hand, it must be acknowledged that in practice international sanctions are not always applied to everyone, in the same way. However, this is not a problem of international law itself, but of those who need to implement its norms. Unfortunately, even in internal

orders, sanctions are not always applied in the same way to everyone. One who is in power or very wealthy will usually not be punished for what would not be forgiven to another. This is not a mistake in law, but in people. Sometimes we forget that man is imperfect, society is imperfect, the world we live in is imperfect. In international relations, everything is much more complex, because in some situations, international sanctions, especially against a powerful state, cannot be achieved without the use of force. The reason why no sanction is taken against the offender in such cases is the effort to avoid a greater evil (great or even general conflict). However, these are exceptional phenomena.

4. Unpunished violation. – It is especially often claimed that what is called international law is not a law, but something else (a certain set of desires, moral principles, etc.) because its rules are arbitrarily interpreted and applied in practice, and even violated with impunity. Here, therefore, practice is taken as an argument. This remark, however, does not stand either.

First of all, it is not only international law that is being violated. Unfortunately, every law is occasionally violated. In every state, no matter how developed and democratic it may be, there are examples of unpunished violations of domestic law – acts and sometimes even the constitution. Simply put, life is much more complex than any legal order. Among other things, in no country are all criminals in prisons; in every community there are numerous examples of corrupt politicians, judges, police officers etc.; in a number of countries, the theft of elections was recorded... However, all this does not give the right to claim that there is no law in a given country. Such things are perceived as occasional excessive phenomena, as certain diseases of society, which are an integral part of life.

It is true that international law is sometimes violated. However, even when they violate it, states not only know that they are doing it (meaning, they are aware that this law exists), but in every way try to present their actions as actions within the limits of international law. If there was no international law as a legally binding system, states, as sovereign entities, would not need it and they would have full freedom of action. After all, if things are put logically, as soon as there is talk of a violation of international law, it means that it exists. Something that is not there (does not exist) cannot be violated.

In fact, it is often overlooked that serious violations of international law (eg. an act of aggression) are always striking, as they are often fraught with severe consequences.

This makes we forget that in practice, the vast majority of international legal norms are applied without any problems. Analysis of the practice shows that states respect incomparably more international law than they violate it.⁶ They do it in their own interest, because it is a precondition for satisfying mutual needs and general cooperation, as opposed to the chaos that would arise if it were not so. If it were not so, war, not peace, would be a natural state; states would not have diplomatic missions with each other; international agreements would not even be concluded; there would be no international organizations; there would be no sea, air, PTT and other modes of transport between different countries; etc.

There should be no illusions that states and other subjects of international law will not sometimes violate international law. That will always be to a greater or lesser

6 An interesting review of why states respect international law can be found in: Koh Harold Hongju, "Why Do Nations Obey International Law", *Yale Law Journal*, v. 106, 1997, 2599-2659.

degree. However, the right approach is not to deny the existence of international law (which, after all, is not possible), but to work on the development of awareness that it must not be violated, to prevent the most serious forms of its violation, especially those that are related to the use of force and, finally, that, if a serious violation of international law does occur, the envisaged sanctions be consistently and effectively applied. For that, it will be necessary for the governments of the states, and especially the leading powers of the world, to reject selfish interests and sincerely embrace the interests and values of all humanity. International law alone cannot solve this.

2. INTERNATIONAL LAW AND THE UNITED NATIONS

The United Nations and international law are inextricably linked. On the one hand, the UN is a product and institution of international law and functions on the rules of that law, while on the other hand, the UN contributes in various ways to the development and realization of international law. All this serves the widest possible cooperation in satisfying the various interests of the UN member states and all of humanity, and thus directly or indirectly in preserving world peace and security.

1. The importance of international law for the UN. – The UN was established after the Second World War as a system of collective security that should ensure lasting peace in the world. Although they did not always succeed in that, in principle, they performed their role well during all these years. This would not be possible without international law.

First of all, without it, there would be no UN itself. The negotiations that preceded the founding assembly in San Francisco in 1945 and the founding of the UN would not have been possible if the rules of international diplomatic and treaty law had not been developed long ago and if there had been no previous experience in concluding multilateral agreements, holding international congresses and conferences, and, finally, if there was no legacy left by the work of the League of Nations.

After all, the UN Charter, which established the UN and which is the highest legal act (statute) of the UN is actually a multilateral international treaty. There is no way for an international organization to be established and function, except on the basis of international law and within the framework established by international law.

2. The significance of the UN for international law. – One of the main goals of the UN is the development of international law.

Already in the preamble of the Charter, it is stated that one of the main goals of the UN is: “To establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other sources of international law can be maintained.”

After all, Art. 13/1/a of the Charter reads: “The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international co-operation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.”

Indeed, the UN has made an immeasurable contribution to the development of international law. Let us mention only a few moments:

- The UN Charter is the most important document of modern international law. It also lists the most important principles of that right, which represent

the so-called cogent (imperative, peremptory) law, which means that all other norms must be in accordance with them. According to Art. 103 of the Charter: "In the event of a conflict between the obligations of the Members of the United Nations under the present Charter and their obligations under any other international agreement, their obligations under the present Charter shall prevail";

- The entire UN system was created, which includes many bodies, specialized UN agencies and other institutions, which all required precise international legal regulation. Thus arose various new norms of international law;
- Among the UN bodies and bodies, the Commission on International Law stands out, which was established by the General Assembly in 1947 as its auxiliary body, in charge of codification and progressive development of international law. The commission has done a great job, and is still doing it;
- Of special importance is the fact that a large number of important international documents have been prepared and adopted within the UN,⁷ especially that many multilateral international agreements have been adopted under the auspices of the UN, which codified the relevant areas of international law.⁸ Without them, international

7 Universal Declaration of Human Rights (1948), UN Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (1960), UN Declaration on the Principles of International Law on Friendly Relations and Cooperation of States under the UN Charter (1970), Definition of Aggression (1974), etc.

8 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961), Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (1963), International Covenants

law would not even closely resemble what we know today;

- many important multilateral international treaties were adopted in a manner that first the General Assembly adopted the text with its resolution, and then it called on states to ratify or accede to the treaty;⁹
- International law has enabled and fixed the success of the UN in various fields, including decolonization, protection of human rights, disarmament, promotion of cooperation in various fields (economics, transport, health, culture, etc.). On the other hand, all these results also meant the further development of international law, its norms and institutions;
- In terms of content, the greatest contribution of the UN is that the UN Charter has prohibited not only the use of force, but also the threat of force in international relations. This did not eradicate the use of force in practice, but declared it illegal and thus significantly diminished such practice. Aggression has become an international crime.

on Human Rights (1966), Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969), UN Convention on the Law of the Sea (1982), treaties in the field of outer space law etc.

9 Thus, for example. with relevant resolutions of the General Assembly adopted and opened for signature: Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948), International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966), the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966), Convention on Special Missions (1969), Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (1973), Second Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty (1989), etc.

The mere formulation of a right is not enough, its implementation is needed. And here the UN has made a remarkable contribution. Inter alia:

- UN bodies and institutions and related bodies work within the framework defined by international law and, within the limits of their competencies, ensure consistent respect for international law;
- A huge number of international agreements have been registered and deposited with the UN. About 51,000 international agreements have been registered within the UN system, and more than 500 multilateral agreements have been deposited with the Secretary General alone. When it is known that the purpose of registering and depositing treaties on the one hand is to prevent secret diplomacy (which often led to conflicts) and on the other hand to preserve the text of the agreement and thus avoid various disputes, it is clear that this is another contribution to peaceful relations in the world, but also international law; The United States were never a member of the League (the Senate refused to ratify the League of Nations Pact), Germany and Japan voluntarily left the League in 1933, Italy did so in 1937, and the USSR was expelled in 1939 for attacking Finland.
- The International Court of Justice is of special importance. It resolves international legal disputes with judgments, and also gives advisory opinions on legal issues when requested to do so by authorized bodies and specialized UN agencies.
- with the direct participation of UN bodies, international ad hoc criminal courts have been created, and in cooperation with the UN the

International Criminal Court was founded. These bodies are competent to prosecute and punish persons who have committed the most serious international crimes. It is clear that sanctioning the most serious violations of international law is in the function of ensuring its consistent application.

3. Perspectives. – We are facing new challenges that will require the adoption of new multilateral international legal instruments related to further conquest of space, relations in cyberspace, the fight against terrorism and organized transnational crime, further development of human rights, environmental protection, international legal subjectivity of non-state actors such as transnational corporations, the position of private military companies, issues

In order to cope properly with existing and future challenges, the UN will have to face serious and urgent reform. Awareness of this has existed for years, so certain measures have already been taken to improve its work.

related to artificial intelligence, the ban or by restricting the use of new weapons (lasers, new types of missiles, armed drones, etc.). This can only be achieved under the auspices of the UN.

In order to cope properly with existing and future challenges, the UN will have to face serious and urgent reform. Awareness of this has existed for years, so certain measures have already been taken to improve its work. However, for now, it is not possible to reach an agreement on the directions or on concrete solutions.¹⁰ However, it is clear that the new solutions, whatever they are, will mean

¹⁰ Krivokapić Boris, *op. cit.*, 445–467.

important changes in international law that we have today.

With 75 years behind her, the Organization is an old lady, worthy of respect. In the human world, she would have long ago enjoyed a well-deserved retirement. However, in real life, the UN has just come out of puberty. Their whole life is just ahead of them. The comparison with the League of Nations, which was founded with a lot of ambition, but managed to last only 20 years (1919–1939), comes to our mind. When only 2 of the 7 great powers of that time remained in its membership (France and Great Britain), the greatest war in human history immediately broke out.¹¹ History repeats itself, but we should make sure that it does not happen again in this case.

11 The United States were never a member of the League (the Senate refused to ratify the League of Nations Pact), Germany and Japan voluntarily left the League in 1933, Italy did so in 1937, and the USSR was expelled in 1939 for attacking Finland.

PROF. BRANISLAV ĐORĐEVIĆ, PHD

*Director of the Institute of International
Politics and Economics*

CHALLENGES FOR THE GLOBAL PEACE

Ladies and gentlemen, Your Excellencies,
distinguished guests,

I cordially greet you on behalf of the co-organizers of this gathering, the Institute for International Politics and Economics, the oldest and largest state scientific institute in the field of international relations in Europe.

Ladies and gentlemen,

The United Nations was formed at a time when figuratively speaking, rifle, cannon and tank barrels had not yet cooled because the bloodiest conflict in the history of mankind, in which, according to the most frequently used sources, 48.2 million people died, was still in progress.

When the representatives of fifty countries, Yugoslavia among them, met in San Francisco on April 25th, 1945, the creation of a single and powerful umbrella world organization was expected, the guiding idea of which would be primarily peace, unlike the League of Nations, which became a part of history precisely because this organisation could not provide it!

World peace, as the ideal to which it aspires, has remained the guiding idea of the UN to this day, although we should not forget other important areas dealt with by the UN, such as human rights, disarmament, humanitarian aid, international development, food, children's programme, preservation of cultural heritage, world health, etc.

Dear guests,

Perhaps this is the right time to focus exclusively on the results of the work of the UN, its 44,000 employees and the budget of over three billion dollars.

Undoubtedly, world peace is a precondition for universal development. Individuals, non-governmental organizations, states, international institutions, etc. participate in peacebuilding.

Realistically, in which one, and in what kind of peacebuilding can an individual participate when the modern world is facing poverty and infectious diseases, which are the primary life issues of every inhabitant of the planet.

The facts, which I draw attention to as disturbing, speak best in support of the above statement:

- 868 million people in the world are chronically malnourished,
- 2 billion people do not have access to basic medicines,
- 738 million do not have clean drinking water,
- one billion and 600 million do not have adequate accommodation,
- the equal number of people do not have electricity,
- two and a half billion do not have adequate hygienic conditions,
- 796 million adults are illiterate,
- 218 million children (aged 5 to 17) are soldiers, prostitutes or servants,

- almost 11 million children die of hunger every year, and more than half a million women die during pregnancy or childbirth,
- in sub-Saharan Africa, the average life expectancy for the last 20 years has been reduced from 50 to 46,
- while in developed countries less than one child per 100 children dies before the age of five, in most countries of Sub-Saharan Africa this ratio is one child out of 10, and in 14 countries even one out of five.

We have to admit, the data is frightening!

Ladies and gentlemen,

Let's dwell a little bit more on the issue of world peace.

After the Second World War, 248 wars have been fought or are being fought in the world, of which 179 are interstate. It is estimated that over 23 million people have died in those wars, out of which 10-15 per cent were soldiers and 85-90 per cent were civilians.

Extremely worrying is the fact that the ratio between soldiers and civilians killed in the wars after 1945 is about 1: 7, while in World War II the ratio was 1: 1.35, or out of a total of 48.2 million casualties, 20.8 million were soldiers and 27.4 million were civilians.

After the Second World War, 69 internal conflicts, ie civil wars have been or are being fought in the world.

Currently, there are 12 active armed conflicts in the world that claim more than 1,000 lives a year. According to the characterization of the United Nations, this classifies them as wars.

In addition, there is a large number of smaller clashes in the world. Most of the currently existing wars last

between three and ten years, and there are conflicts such as the war in Gaza, which has lasted for more than 60 years.

The highest number of victims in an internal armed conflict occurred in Rwanda in 1994. UN officials failed to provide the Security Council with a timely warning of extremists' plans to kill thousands of Tutsi and moderate Hutu members. When the genocide began, the number of "blue helmets" that were engaged in that country was reduced from 2,548 to only 270 men, and the Security Council and the UN failed to react. The result is about 1,000,000 victims!

When it comes to civil wars, the wars fought in the former Yugoslavia 1991–1995 are also an unavoidable topic. These wars result in about 130,000 casualties, including 240 members of the United Nations peacekeeping force.

Ladies and gentlemen,

It is indisputable that the UN, ie the Security Council, is doing a lot for world peace but there is a question of whether that is enough.

I will refer to one aspect of these efforts, and that is the UN peacekeeping operations.

From the time of the first peacekeeping missions in 1948 until today, the UN has carried out 71 peacekeeping missions involving personnel from more than 120 countries.

According to only a few days old official data, 3,993 "peacekeepers" have lost their lives from 1948 until today,, of which 167 are members of UNPROFOR.

Let me remind you that Serbia has made and continues to make a contribution to world security, first by its peaceful policy, and then by its engagement in UN peacekeeping missions.

At the moment, 94,875 people are fully engaged in 13 UN peacekeeping missions.

In 2020 alone, 86 people lost their lives in UN peacekeeping missions.

Let me remind you that Serbia has made and continues to make a contribution to world security, first by its peaceful policy, and then by its engagement in UN peacekeeping missions.

The former Yugoslavia has participated in five peacekeeping missions, in which the Republic of Serbia is currently participating. Since 2002, Serbia has had about 4,000 military personnel in peacekeeping missions.

I will present you with two more facts that I believe most of you are not privy to. Firstly, a Serbian hospital is a part of the MINUSCA mission in the Central African Republic, and it is the only European hospital in the UN missions in Africa. And secondly, at this moment, out of the total number of Serbian “peacekeepers”, 12 per cent are women, the fact of which my country is especially proud.

Ladies and gentlemen,

We will agree that globalization has given rise to new security threats and made a shift towards non-military and asymmetric, made them totalitarian and produced a demand for global security cooperation. In this, the UN plays an irreplaceable role.

Nevertheless, the number of wars currently being fought in the world, with the constant threat of terrorism in every part of the planet and other threats facing humanity, including the Coronavirus pandemic, unequivocally raises the question of whether World War III is already being waged for a period of time.

There are many ways to ensure world peace, and the most responsible for finding those ways are rich and

powerful countries and international organizations, whereby the UN is playing a particularly important role.

Everything that is being done in the field of UN reform, and let's be honest, the pace of it is very slow, should provide a framework for modern international relations and confrontation with new security threats.

Finally, the idea of universal peace and cooperative security based on collaboration is far from an attainable reality, but we must not forget that the UN was not created in order to usher the world into the heavens but to avoid hell.

World peace, as the ideal to which it aspires, has remained the guiding idea of the UN to this day, although we should not forget other important areas dealt with by the UN, such as human rights, disarmament, humanitarian aid, international development, food, children's programme, preservation of cultural heritage, world health, etc.

THOMAS SCHIEB

*Ambassador of Germany to the Republic
of Serbia*

UNITED NATIONS ARE NEEDED MORE THAN EVER

Pleasure to be here and mark the 75th anniversary of UN.

I am a dedicated multilateralist, having worked at our Mission in NY from 2014 to 2018.

With the signing of UN Charter in San Francisco in June 1945, right after the catastrophe of World War II, after the tragic failure of the League of Nations before, wise political leaders embarked on one of the most significant and courageous projects of mankind.

From the perspective of my country that had unleashed that horrible war with its crimes, the most horrendous of them being the Holocaust, the main lesson of it was: Never Again! War and crimes against humanity must never again arise from German soil; this is the immovable core of German foreign policy today.

Consequence of this over-arching principle is our advocacy for a strong and united Europe, for human rights as a universal expression of human dignity, for rules-based international cooperation – in short: for multilateralism and for the UN.

The European Union supports the United Nations to advance this same purpose: peace and human dignity. Driven by our firm belief in a multilateral approach based on the principles of global solidarity and global responsibility.

*

75 years after their founding, the United Nations have a proven track record in saving lives, generating economic and social progress and avoiding another descent into world war.

However, we are aware that international institutions need political backing and cannot be taken for granted.

This was the lesson from the tragic failure of the League of Nations that was not able to withstand the storm of nationalism and racism unleashed

We need to advance on a more preventive agenda. We need to look beyond the immediate crises – do more on crisis prevention and to address catalysts of conflict such as the effects of climate change and also threats to global health.

in Europe leading to World War Two.

If we want to uphold the multilateral order, we have to invest in it. We have to nurture it every day, particularly when the sands start shifting under the foundations, when its legitimacy is questioned and the support it needs is denied.

The rules-based international order that has developed over the past seventy-five years has produced freedom and prosperity like never before in human history. The UN are at the core of this order. And a strong

UN is needed to find effective responses to common challenges.

*

Let me briefly focus on the UN Security Council. Pivotal role in safeguarding peace and security, central role to play in showing the value of international cooperation.

Its functioning is essential for the UN's overall reputation. However, the crises in Syria or Libya, the lack of progress in the Middle East peace process and elsewhere have shaken faith in the potential of the international community to deliver solutions.

We need to do what we can to keep the Council relevant, effective and credible. We need to ensure continued authority and legitimacy of the Council at the heart of our multilateral order for peace and security. This is why also a reform of the Security Council is needed.

*

Innovation is needed when it comes to dealing with emerging threats to international peace and security. We need to advance on a more preventive agenda. We need to look beyond the immediate crises – do more on crisis prevention and to address catalysts of conflict such as the effects of climate change and also threats to global health.

We need to strengthen international health architecture and the relevant bodies – first and foremost the WHO. This is a major lesson of Covid-19.

That is why we – Germany and the EU – are strong allies in the struggle for adequate financing of the WHO and the united search for a vaccine to be at universal disposal.

In conclusion maybe one remark on a more security related issue: I would like to underline respect and appreciation for Serbia's very constructive and successful role in UN and EU led peace missions, such as mission UNIFIL in Lebanon. Hope that recent government decision does not jeopardize participation in these missions.

Germany is convinced: We have never needed truly United Nations more than we do today.

AMR ALJOWAILY

*Ambassador of Arab Republic of Egypt to the Republic
of Serbia*

A PLATINUM JUBILEE
FOR THE UNITED
NATIONS, REFLECTIONS
FOR A BRIGHTER
FUTURE FOR
MULTILATERALISM

As we convene in person today, maybe exceptionally so in these circumstances, the United Nations General Assembly will be meeting mostly virtually throughout the High-Level Segment for the first time in its history. This exploration of a new spatial dimension for the United Nations is a reflection of the potential and challenges of our time today. It is also further proof of how interlinked the modern world has become. No country is immune from the effect of cross border infectious diseases, and no country is out of reach of the powerful information and communication technologies. In every crisis is an opportunity, and this global challenge facing the pandemic is also a catalyst for adopting solutions that were long put on the backburner. What we should not forget is that we

are at a historic crossroad, and that the path we choose is one that will determine our direction for years to come. The choice at this juncture is either to further pave the road of multilateralism despite bumps on the way, or to take the seemingly easy unilateralism lane, yet face the future alone. Making the choice of which road to take at this traffic crossing is not enough. Investing efforts and resources to chart the way forward is required to ease the journey through.

This pandemic was not only further proof of the interlinkage among all units of the international system. It was also a further reminder that three main pillars of

Multilateralism is much needed in each of the three pillars through a mutually reinforcing mandate. This is not necessarily an expansion of the concept of security, but a realization of the interdependence between the three pillars, as much as between all states.

work of the United Nations, the world's only universal organization with comprehensive mandate, remain organically interlinked of the preservation of prosperity and wellbeing of states

and peoples globally. Multilateralism is much needed in each of the three pillars through a mutually reinforcing mandate. This is not necessarily an expansion of the concept of security, but a realization of the interdependence between the three pillars, as much as between all states. It is also a recognition of the interlinkage among the needs and challenges among states. Further empowering developing countries, thus enabling them to confront the daunting challenges that they face, adds a reassurance to the wellbeing and stability of the whole international system. Covid-19 has proven that the vulnerability of any

unit of the system is as much a vulnerability of the system as a whole. 'Collective development' appears as a corollary of collective security. A developmental threat to any one of its units, including through a pandemic, should thus be met with a collective response by all the rest for the benefit of all. The only way to realize such a collective response is through the well-established tradition of multilateralism, albeit admittedly with sufficient innovation necessary for adapting to the new challenges.

Commemorating the 75th anniversary of the United Nations in a world plagued by Covid-19 may not an unintentional coincidence. Well, even if it is, a "coincidence may be better than a thousand appointment (or plan)". It is a reminder of the common destiny of humankind. It is an invitation to reflect on the value of multilateralism. It is opportunity to explore the potential of working together. It is also a moment of truth that exposes the selfish drive by some blinded by narrow perspectives of self-interest, which would only serve them for a limited time.

The anniversary, with the pandemic context, should offer a corrective lens for the shortsighted unilateralists. It is the United Nations System, with the necessary adaptations, that can offer joint solutions to common challenges.

The Platinum Jubilee of the United Nations System should be a time of reflection for a brighter future of multilateralism. One that comprehends that diseases recognize no frontiers, and hence their cure should also not stop at any borders!

Tian Yishu

*Counselor of Political Affairs, Embassy of PR China
to the Republic of Serbia*

BUILDING A
“COMMUNITY OF THE
COMMON DESTINY OF
HUMANITY”

Ladies and gentlemen, dear friends,

75 years ago, the peoples of all countries of the world, determined to “save future generations from suffering resulting from two catastrophic wars that befell modern society,” founded the United Nations, an all-embracing, representative and most authoritative international organization, and established an international order and system based on the goals and principles of the United Nations Charter and opened a new chapter with the aim of preserving world peace and development.

For the past 75 years, the United Nations has taken upon itself peace as its own responsibility, development as its goal, and justice as its essence. Globally, the United Nations has maintained peace and stability in the world, encouraged billions of people to modernize, successfully rescued more than one billion people from poverty, and led 193 member states to jointly formulate international

rules, jointly manage global affairs and share development results.

Today, we are still in an era of endless challenges and growing risks. World economic growth is weak, the development gap is more and more perceptible, and military battles occur from time to time. The spirit of the Cold War mentality and policy of power is still haunting, and terrorism, the refugee crisis, major epidemics of infectious diseases, climate change and other non-traditional security threats continue to spread.

Today's world is facing a challenge unseen in the past hundred years, a global coronavirus epidemic that is accelerating current major changes is ushering the world to a period of turbulence. Protectionism, unilateralism and hegemony are on the rise. Some states and political forces are impatient to "let someone else take the blame", to "separate" and "withdraw from the group", to undermine international cooperation and try to provoke antagonism between ideology and the social system, thus putting the world in a dangerous situation.

Facing extraordinary changes and the most serious global epidemic of infectious disease unseen in the past hundred years, we need a strong United Nations more than ever. The international community should construe the celebration of the 75th anniversary of the founding of the United Nations as an important opportunity for starting the fight against the epidemic of the new coronavirus, to reconsider the original UN mission, ensure consensus of all countries of the world, and continue to build a "community of common destiny of humanity.", an orderly and beautiful world of lasting peace, equal security for all, a world of common prosperity.

UN member states have no choice but to redouble their efforts to strengthen the essential role of the United Nations and firmly maintain the right direction of multilateralism; we must strongly preserve the international order based on international law and we must never allow the politics of power to draw back the world to an age ruled by the laws of the jungle; we must make the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development a priority, focusing on helping developing countries mitigate the impact of the epidemic, we must strengthen trust and coordinate action to deal effectively with global challenges such as the public health crisis, climate change, cybersecurity, terrorism, transnational organized crime, etc.

China is a founding member of the United Nations, the first country to sign the United Nations Charter and has always been a strong supporter of the United Nations. The Chinese side has always believed that multilateralism is the only way that is largely in line with the interests of the peoples of all countries of the world.

China strongly supports the United Nations global governance system, which is in its foundations, the basic norms of international relations based on the goals and principles of the UN Charter, the authority and status of the UN, and the key role of the UN in international affairs. China has acceded to almost all multilateral intergovernmental organizations and more than 500 international conventions. It consistently fulfils its international obligations and strictly adheres to them. Together with the international community, China will resolutely fight against acts that undermine the international order and violate international rules.

As the largest developing country and a permanent member of the Security Council, China actively pursues the lofty ideals of the United Nations, constantly promotes the main goal: peace and development of humanity and builds a “community of common destiny of humanity” through practical action. China consistently follows the path of peaceful development, it resorts neither to aggression nor to expansion and does not seek a sphere of influence. China is committed to developing friendly cooperation with all countries based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, while at the same time firmly preserving national sovereignty and national dignity, and strongly defending its legitimate rights and interests, and firmly supporting international justice and fairness. China has actively participated in resolving major regional burning issues, such as the nuclear issue of the Korean Peninsula, the nuclear issue of Iran, Afghanistan, Myanmar, the Middle East and Syria. It has participated in more than 30 peacekeeping operations and sent more than 40,000 peacekeepers, making China currently the number one permanent member of the Security Council in this respect. At the United Nations, China has 8,000 registered members in the reserve force and 300 permanent members of the police force in peacekeeping missions, making China the country with the largest number and most complete units among the UN peacekeeping forces. China and the United Nations Peace and Development Fund have carried out more than 80 projects totalling \$ 67.7 million, supporting UN peacekeeping operations, counterterrorism, energy, agriculture, infrastructure, health, education and other areas.

In response to the new coronavirus epidemic, China is actively responding in compliance with the global plan for a humanitarian response to the coronavirus epidemic

China is committed to developing friendly cooperation with all countries based on the five principles of peaceful coexistence, while at the same time firmly preserving national sovereignty and national dignity, and strongly defending its legitimate rights and interests, and firmly supporting international justice and fairness.

launched by the United Nations. It has provided \$ 50 million in aid to the World Health Organization, material assistance to more than 150 countries and international organizations, and sent materials and equipment to fight the epidemic to more than 200 countries and regions. At the opening ceremony of the 73rd World Health Organization Conference, President Xi Jinping announced that he would provide \$2 billion in international assistance

within two years, cooperate with the United Nations in establishing a depot and hub in China for a global humanitarian response, and establish mechanisms for the cooperation of 30 Chinese and African hospitals, offer the Chinese vaccine as a global public product after the development and testing, cooperate with G20 member states on the implementation of the "debt relief initiative for the poorest countries", as well as other important initiatives. China will resolutely implement these important measures in order to contribute to the encouragement of building a "community for the health of humanity".

At a critical time of global turbulence and change, China will continue to fulfil and demonstrate its responsibility as a great power, to make a great contribution and to provide even more global public goods to contribute to world peace and development. We are ready to cooperate with other countries of the world on maintaining and promoting multilateralism, protection of the international system based on the United Nations and the international order based on international law. With the help of Chinese wisdom and ingenuity, China will act to give its new contribution to the development of the United Nations, global peace and prosperity, and to encourage the building of a “community of the common destiny of humanity.”

MARIJAN IVANUŠA

*WHO Representative and Head of WHO Office
in Belgrade*

THE ROLE OF THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION WITHIN THE UN INSTITUTIONAL SYSTEM

Your excellences, ladies and gentlemen, dear colleagues and friends,

In 2008, the Commission on social determinants of health concluded its final report with the striking statement:

Social injustice is killing people on a grand scale.

Not much has changed since. Instead of closing the gap, the situation has deteriorated in many areas not only between the countries but also within them.

This is also visible during the covid-19 pandemic; some countries already reported dramatic inequalities in mortality between different ethnic or social groups.

What we want to see, is better health and well-being for all, as an equal human right.

What makes societies prosper and flourish also makes people healthy. Good health benefits all sectors and the whole of society – making it a valuable resource.

Promotion of health equity is essential to sustainable development and to a better quality of life and well-being for all, which in turn can contribute to peace and security.

This refers to health in general and not only to communicable diseases, although nowadays you may know more about quarantine than social determinants of health.

The word “quarantine”, ladies and gentlemen, originates from quarantena, the Venetian language form, meaning “forty days”. This is due to the 40-day isolation of ships that was enforced as a measure of disease prevention related to the plague. In 14th century the Black Death wiped out an estimated 30% of Europe’s population.

In the past centuries public health development has been predominantly driven by the challenges faced due to the communicable diseases.

There are many WHO precursors and I will only mention 3 of them

- 1843 Egyptian quarantine board;
- 1902 Pan-American Sanitary Bureau in Washington;
- 1922 Hygiene Organization of the Ligue of Nations in Geneva was established.

Soon after the WWII, in 1945, the United Nations Conference in San Francisco approved the establishment of a new, autonomous, international health organization, and in 1948 the World Health Organization Constitution came into force.

The World Health Organization is the directing and coordinating authority for health within the United Nations system.

The work of the organization is governed by the governing bodies, the World Health Assembly being the ultimate one, which also endorsed the 13th General programme of Work (2019–2023) indicating 3 main priority areas: promoting healthier populations; achieving UHC; addressing health emergencies.

Not much more than 20% of the budget is secured in form of assessed contributions by the member states, while almost 80% of budget is represented by voluntary donations.

In total budget is as low as 2.2 billion USD, which equals for example the budget of Charity hospital in Berlin, Germany; for comparison, the budget of US CDC, Atlanta, USA, has the annual budget of 11 billion USD (but of course the mandate is different).

WHO has several policy instruments in place, incl. conventions (i.e. Framework Convention on Tobacco Control) and regulations (i.e. International Health Regulation),

Recent International Health Regulation has been adopted by the World Health Assembly in 2005.

It is legally binding document and it clearly defines procedures – how to work together for global health security.

Every month WHO detects around 3000 signals of potential public health threats, but the world actually knows very few of them.

6 public health emergencies of international concern have been declared by WHO in the last decade or so: Pandemic flu (2009), poliomyelitis, Ebola (2-times), Zika, and finally covid-19 in January 2020.

What is the time-line of the recent pandemic?

On the 31st of December, WHO's Epidemic Intelligence System picked up a report about a cluster of cases of pneumonia of unknown cause in Wuhan, China.

The following day WHO's Incident Management Support Team was activated, to coordinate the response.

On the 5th of January, we shared detailed technical information through the Event Information System. This included advice to all Member States to take precautions to reduce the risk of acute respiratory infections.

On the 10th of January, WHO published a comprehensive package of guidance to help countries.

On 30th of January, when there were less than 100 cases and no deaths outside China, WHO declared the global public health emergency – WHO's highest level of alarm.

More than 30 million cases of covid-19 have been detected so far globally, and close to 1 million people died due to the covid-19.

Without doubts, this pandemic is changing the world, but the choice is ours, how this world will be changed: for the worse or for the better.

As a WHO representative I can only see one choice – unity and global solidarity, enhanced by the multilateral organizations (incl. WHO).

MILORAD KONDIĆ

President, United Nations Association of Serbia

MULTILATERALISM
AS A NECESSARY
COMPONENT OF
INTERNATIONAL
SECURITY

Your Excellencies, Ladies and Gentlemen,

It is really an honour and a great pleasure for me to address this eminent audience on behalf of the United Nations Association of Serbia.

For those of us who have been promoting for decades the high ideals of the UN Charter and supporting the activities of the United Nations, it is of great importance to mark the 75th anniversary of this organization.

That is why we support the Energy Pact Foundation initiative and we are glad to see that the organizers of this gathering are reputable academic institutions, the Faculty of Security Studies of the University of Belgrade and the Institute of International Politics and Economics. We are very happy that the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia, as well as the highest officials of

the United Nations in Belgrade, Excellency Ambassadors and representatives of the academic community, spoke today on the occasion of the great jubilee of the UN.

It is a confirmation of the importance of the United Nations in the modern world and in Serbia, which since the founding of the organization has given its full contribution to its original principles. Efforts in our Association are aimed at making the values of the United Nations as accepted as possible among citizens, and especially among young people.

The time when we are celebrating the 75th anniversary is the one of great challenges and upheavals – from a global pandemic to an increase in nationalist and anti-democratic rhetoric and activities in many countries once seen as strongholds of freedom and democracy.

Over the past 75 years, the United Nations has witnessed and to some extent shaped different periods of international relations, in part by raising awareness of issues and trends that are not yet on the world agenda. The UN has always been at the forefront of social and political progress, either through the creation of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights or by supporting decolonization processes.

The time when we are celebrating the 75th anniversary is the one of great challenges and upheavals – from a global pandemic to an increase in nationalist and anti-democratic rhetoric and activities in many countries once seen as strongholds of freedom and democracy. It is ironic that in an era in which we face transnational problems, which can only be solved by multilateralism and international collaboration, there is a growing chorus of voices condemning precisely these ideas.

That is why it is more important than ever to talk about the future of multilateralism as a necessary component of international security, and especially to draw attention to the crucial role that the United Nations must play in achieving the future we want. Not only among politicians but also diplomats, civil society organizations, members of the academic community and ordinary people.

The United Nations was created 75 years ago, in the aftermath of the most devastating conflict the world has ever seen, to maintain international peace and security. Before sustainable development, before economic growth, before culture and science and human rights and youth issues, the creators of the UN Charter understood the priority of maintaining peace and security and the vital role that the organization must play in this endeavour.

However, that does not mean that the UN should have a narrow focus on security issues. Today, we are talking about multiple dimensions of security, including human security, recognizing that military power and the absence of violence are not enough to protect our world for future generations.

All these topics – improving human rights, access to education, health and decent work, together with preserving the environment – must be included in our understanding of what international security means.

In particular, young people will eventually play a major role in these efforts. As John F. Kennedy said, “The future prospects of any nation can be directly measured by the present prospects of its youth.”

Therefore, the United Nations Association of Serbia focuses its activities primarily on working with young people, from education to advocacy and beyond, teaching them the values and goals of the UN system, raising awareness of global citizenship, spreading a culture of peace, dialogue and solidarity and giving young people’s

voices the opportunity to be heard and to ensure their full participation in community building. There can be no lasting international peace and security without the participation of the youth.

As I said earlier, the United Nations system has proven to be a necessary framework for promoting these universally beneficial priorities. This important anniversary of the only universal international organization is not only an opportunity to highlight the results of the organization, which are numerous and self-evident but also an opportunity to look to the future, identify weaknesses and obstacles, as well as ways to strengthen global solidarity and act by way of multilateral cooperation. This is an opportunity to look at the next 75 years and build a better UN for a better world.

The pandemic confirms how vulnerable we all are and how important a common response is in facing global danger. Will we wait for the catastrophic consequences of climate change or development that is unsustainable and threatening the planet we live on without joint multilateral action, and only then realize that a joint response has been necessary all along?

In this time of great challenges, we need a new vision of statesmen all around the world; we need new energy of current generations, a new joint action to strengthen multilateralism, to successfully use the potential for collaboration within the UN system and to change the UN itself according to the needs of the forthcoming time. Only then we can really be optimistic about the prospects of the United Nations, multilateralism and international security?

And today I wish everyone a happy International Day of Peace and the successful work of this gathering.

Thank you for your attention!

PROF. ŽARKO OBRADOVIĆ, PhD
University of Belgrade, Faculty of Security Studies

THE INTERDEPENDENCE BETWEEN THE STATES IS STRONGER THAN EVER BEFORE

The idea of creating the United Nations Organisation appears and is being developed by the member states of the anti-Hitler Coalition during WW2, and the very foundation of the UN Organisation happens at the Conference in San Francisco, USA, on 26th June, 1945, when 26 states signed the UN Charter. Poland, which signs the Charter later on is considered to be one of the founders. Yugoslavia is one of the signatories to the UN Charter on 1st January, 1942, and also one of the 26 states that signed the United Nations Declaration on the Acceptance of the Goals and Principles of the Atlantic Charter. It is the first international document to use the name “United Nations” and to accept the goals and principles of all, large and small, members of the anti-Hitler coalition in the fight against the members of the Triple Alliance and the countries that joined it. The United Nations Charter enters into force on 25th October, 1945.

In the 75 years to follow, the UN has proven to be a far more permanent, flexible, and the most significant multilateral organisation to many states in the world than it could have been anticipated at the time of its foundation and during the first years of its work.

Without a doubt, the great powers that won the Second World War, the same ones who agreed on issues relevant to the establishment and work of the United Nations, have molded this Organisation (proclaimed the goals and principles and set the organization of the UN and the structure of the Security Council with five permanent members having the right of veto) by the measure of their interests, the balance of power established between them at the end of the war and the projection of future relations in the international community. The balance of power among the great powers has changed over the years, but they have always sought to pursue their interests by resolving numerous issues debated in the Security Council or the UN General Assembly. Meanwhile, the number of UN members has grown from 51 to 193. The increase in the number of member states also objectively means an increase in the number of issues that may be the subject of the work of the United Nations. A number of issues have a special, state character. For most member states, the United Nations has become the most important (not the only but certainly the most important) place, where their voice can be heard regarding the issues and problems they face and where the given problem can be solved. In addition, with the increasing interdependence between countries, and especially within the process of globalization of the world, it has become clear that the UN is indeed the only place where issues of a general nature, affecting the entire international community and the lives of people around the world, such as climate changes,

natural disasters, the fight against terrorism and other various security challenges, sustainable development, human rights, education and science in the service of health risk suppressing and other issues can be addressed.

Moreover, the United Nations has become a place where international, generally accepted values and standards are created, which later become the legal norm for member states. Under the auspices of the United Nations, numerous international documents (declarations, conventions, pacts) have been adopted, which codify various areas of international law.

Throughout the period of its existence, the United Nations strives to achieve two closely related goals; maintaining international peace and security and improving life in the world. Without peace and security, there is no economic development and a better life for everyone, and vice versa, conflicts between states cause human casualties, numerous destructions, the devastation of states, and general impoverishment of countries and citizens.

Power relations among the permanent members of the Security Council, ie. different interests and the option of exercising the right of veto, in many cases “holt” the United Nations in resolving certain issues, and sometimes even war conflicts, or made UN activity less effective. And power relations (economic, military, and political) among other Security Council members change over time, which, along with other changes in international relations, is affecting not only the contents of the work of the United Nations but also the success of resolving certain issues.

The end of the Second World War also establishes power relations between two blocs of states: the Western, led by the United States, and the Eastern, led by the

USSR. Such a competitive relationship brings into being the state of the Cold War, which lasts for more than four decades. The rivalry between the two blocs is expressed in different ways in the international community. At the United Nations itself, opposing views are converted into the use of veto rights. According to certain data, during the Cold War, the two most powerful members of the Security Council used their veto rights more than 230 times, which stopped the actions of about one-third of the UN resolutions. This, logically, also limited the accomplishments of the UN in achieving peace, that is, it forced the UN to look for other ways of operating, to preserve peace, and restrain conflict between the opposite parties. Despite the limitations due to the mutual relations of the permanent members of the Security Council, the UN, was very active in promoting the independence of the colonial states, and the activities of the member states of the Non-Aligned Movement.

Changes in the international community in the late 1980s and early 1990s (the disintegration of the Soviet Union, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the

One thing is certain, no great power is going to wave the option to protect its interests by using the veto. Also, the right to use the veto should not be connected to any negative meaning.

changes of societal system in Eastern European countries, the reunification of Germany, etc.) pinpoint the creation of a unipolar world. The United States supported by western countries become a global leader with the capability to affect (militarily, economically, and politically) numerous events in almost every part of the world. This new balance of power between members of the United Nations Security

Council manufactures two consequences. First, the so-called efficiency of the United Nations increases. The veto is not so frequently used (e.g. only six times between 1996 and 2001). The UN peacekeeping missions increase in number. Almost the largest number of decisions are adopted unanimously, which does not mean that all of them are fair and that they do not produce negative consequences for individual countries and their citizens. Let me remind you of a blatant example of a decision with destructive consequences. It is the imposition of sanctions on the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1992 due to the accusations of participating in the war in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The years of sanctions have produced a major economic crisis in the country, the collapse of the economy, a drop in the living standards of citizens, and a shortage of bare necessities, food, medicines, and energy. Once again it has been confirmed that sanctions are the strongest economic weapon for achieving political goals. Fifteen years later, in 2007, the International Court of Justice does not confirm the justification of the UN Security Council's decision to impose sanctions on FR Yugoslavia. But there was no discussion ensuing in the United Nations as to the consequences of the sanctions nor the responsibility of the states that made that decision. This case shows that the mechanism for verifying the decisions made is very relative and that there is no accountability for wrong decisions. It turns out to be true that the great powers rarely or almost never consider the consequences of their decisions, especially the wrong ones.

In the 1990s, the unipolar world produces one more consequence that has a serious impact on the United Nations. It is the ignoring or marginalization of the UN whenever it is obvious that the desired decision cannot be

adopted in the Security Council due to the capability of other states to use the veto. An example of such a case is the armed action of NATO member states on FR Yugoslavia, from March till June 1999, without the consent of the UN Security Council.

NATO aggression caused numerous human casualties and destroyed the country's infrastructure, businesses, schools, and health and other facilities. The material damage suffered by the FRY ranges between 40 and 100 billion dollars (according to various estimates).

The airstrikes on FR Yugoslavia started without the UN Security Council's approval but they were put to a stop by the adoption of a Security Council resolution thus reinstating the UN as the place at which an international issue is resolved.

The events in the ongoing decade (military intervention of the Russian Federation, rebuilding of its powers and the engagement in Syria, the economic rise of the People's Republic of China and the realisation of the Belt and Road global development project, the preoccupation of the United States with its internal political issues, the Exit, the rise of several regional powers, and other mean values) show that the world is not at "the end of history and the last man", as Francis Fukuyama argues in 1992, praising the values of the liberal model of organisation of society as being the best and universally valid (constant). On the contrary, as many times before in the history of the world, a series of changes happens in international relations and the world again becomes truly multipolar.

Even Germany, the strongest EU member state, is aware of the fact that multipolarity has become reality at the end of the second decade of the 21st Century. In February, last year, Angela Merkel, the German Chancellor

declares that “we must fight for multilateralism against those who think that they can do everything themselves!” as well as that “contemporary challenges demand that we reform the existing structures,” established as a consequence of WW2.

The same states that created this organisation 75 years ago will decline on the change of the United Nations. One thing is certain, no great power is going to waive the option to protect its interests by using the veto. Also, the right to use the veto should not be connected to any negative meaning. In a number of situations the veto was the only way to preserve international values and territorial integrity of a state. But the world is not as it was at the time the United Nations was created. The interdependence between the states is much stronger and consequently the need to make an agreement on how to respond to general and special but common challenges the world is facing. This state of affairs gives the United Nations the opportunity to be the centre of negotiation and decision making of states, respecting the fact that the multipolar world exists and respecting the interests of member states, as well as to protect humanity and upgrade the quality of life.

The importance of the existence and work of UN members for the future of the world stems from another reason, which had its public promotion in the same year when the UN was founded, and that is the possibility of using nuclear weapons. In 1945, the use of atomic bombs in Hiroshima and Nagasaki stops the war but also shows that nuclear weapons, more precisely their use, represents the greatest real threat to the extinction of the human species and the annihilation of our planet. Although the number of countries that produce and possess nuclear weapons is relatively small, the amount of weapons

produced is quite sufficient to destroy Earth. Despite this clear danger to the world, ie. humanity, the world's leading nations continue the arms race, which presumes an increase in nuclear weapons.

The United Nations can respond to this challenge, as a place where all states participate in the process of negotiations and agreement making provided, of course, that all states have the same responsibility for the future of humanity.

In addition to all the previously known challenges facing the modern world, starting from January this year, we have faced yet another one – the virus covid 19, which has become a global health phenomenon and a danger to all people in the world. On 20th September, more than 31 million people were infected in the world, and the number of deaths was over 960 thousand. All UN member states are facing the consequences of this pandemic.

For the time being, there is no cure, for the virus, nor can it be stopped. The World Health Organization is giving general recommendations on how to combat covid 19 and states fight against it individually according to their knowledge and abilities. In a way, the pandemic has stopped the world, “locked” the states, stopped the movement of people and the exchange of goods. On the other hand, the pandemic also indicates how not just the covid 19 virus, but also any future virus can be defeated. It is through the cooperation of the states, the exchange of research findings and experience to the purpose of providing the necessary vaccine in the shortest possible time. The United Nations is the right place that can provide the required cooperation of states. The decisive “step further” in order to overcome the pandemic through state cooperation can be taken in the UN.

In any case, both multiculturalism and the existence of the UN are the reality of the modern world. The collaboration of states on resolving the issues relevant to the future of the world will increase the efficacy and significance of the UN as the most important multilateral organisation, save our planet and make it a safe place to live in.

MULTILATERALISM AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY
(75th Anniversary of the UN)

Publisher

University of Belgrade – Faculty of Security Studies

For the publisher

Prof. Vladimir N. Cvetkovic, PhD

Graphic editor

Biljana Živojinović

Print

Čigoja
S T A M P A

office@cigoja.com

www.cigoja.com

Circulation

200

ISBN 978-86-80144-48-1

