

GCSP UN Dialogue Series

**Edited by Dr. Derek Lutterbeck
GCSP Project Officer**

**OCCASIONAL PAPER SERIES
No. 49. OCTOBER 2005**



Geneva Centre for Security Policy
Centre de Politique de Sécurité, Genève
Genfer Zentrum für Sicherheitspolitik

Introduction

Derek Lutterbeck, GCSP Project Officer

During the summer of 2005, the Geneva Centre for Security Policy (GCSP), with the generous financial support of the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland, Political Division III, organised a series of public presentations by distinguished personalities, focusing on the changing role of the UN system in the rapidly evolving international security landscape. The objective of these events was to provide a forum to discuss the most-pressing current challenges facing the UN, as well as other key players in the international system, and to chart possible ways forward in adapting the UN system to the demands of the contemporary security environment.

Over the past years and decades, the international system has undergone a number of profound transformations. With rapidly progressing globalisation, the development and spread of new technologies and the growing porosity of state borders, new actors and challenges have emerged in the international security field, calling for new and innovative responses for which the past may provide little, if any, guidance. 11 September 2001 was a landmark date, on which the fundamental pillars of the global system were shaken more than at any other moment since the fall of the Berlin Wall. The unprecedented and unpredictable acts of terrorism that occurred on that day, as well as the “war on terrorism” waged in response, opened new fissures within and between nations and the international community. As expressed by Kofi Annan, secretary-general of the United Nations, on 23 September 2003, “the events of the past year have exposed deep divisions among members of the United Nations on fundamental questions of policy and principle”. The US-led invasion of Iraq, as well as the doctrine of pre-emption adopted by the Bush administration, have seriously put into question the relevance of the UN as a collective security system and its underlying principles.

In response to these challenges, the UN secretary-general, in September 2003, created the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. Harking back to the original purpose of the UN and its Security Council of maintaining international peace and security, the High-Level Panel was mandated “to take effective collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to the peace”.

The Panel released a report entitled *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility* on 2 December 2004. On 21 March 2005, the UN secretary-general submitted his own report, *In Larger Freedom*, which, on the one hand, was a reaction to the Panel's recommendations, and, on the one hand, provided a review of the progress made in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. The secretary-general's report, the Panel's recommendations, and the review of Millennium Development Goals were all debated at the September 2005 Summit of the 60th session of the UN General Assembly.

This high-level process, which is taking place in the 60th-anniversary year of the UN system, invites fresh analysis of the challenges facing the international community and the responses necessary to address them. It has been the aim of this UN Dialogue Series to address major themes in international peace and security and to offer innovative solutions for improving collective security in the 21st century. This synthesis report summarises the individual contributions to this series.

Contributors to GCSP UN Dialogue Series:

Dr. Steven Stedman, Research Director, UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change
“Collective Security for the 21st Century”

Prof. Adam Rotfeld, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Poland

“UN Reforms: A Way Forward”

Amb. Kishore Mahbubani, Former Ambassador of Singapore to the UN

“UN Security Council: Sunrise or Sunset Institution?”

Mr. Gareth Evans, President of the International Crisis Group and Member of the UN High-Level Panel

“Halting Genocide: Intervention and Legitimacy”

Mr. Søren Jessen-Petersen, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and Head of the UN Interim Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

“Meeting the Challenges of Peace-building”

“Collective Security for the 21st Century”

Dr. Stephen Stedman, Research Director, UN Secretary-General's High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change

Dr. Stedman opened his presentation by pointing out that the tasks of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, created by UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan in November 2003, were to address current and possible future threats to international peace and security, to evaluate the UN's capacity to respond efficiently to these problems and, finally, to make recommendations on how to reform the United Nations and regenerate the existing collective security system.

The Panel published its report, *A More Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility*, in December 2004. In the preamble, it noted that there is no universal consensus on security threats: perceptions vary according to states' national interests, priorities, level of development or place in the community of nations. Threats are assessed very differently from one part of the world to another. Security challenges today are also vastly different from those after the Second World War; threats are transnational, more diverse, interconnected and global in nature. No state can tackle these new risks alone, and the collective security system must be adapted accordingly. The Panel concluded that, in the 21st century, the UN system must be made more effective, efficient and equitable. In this regard, priority should be given to conflict prevention, as well as to human and economic development. The Panel considered poverty, infectious diseases, environmental degradation, internal and regional conflicts, the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and terrorism as priority threats.

Dr. Stedman insisted on the need to allocate more resources to peacekeeping operations. On the one hand, he pointed to the declining number of civil wars since 1992, a development that has been at least in part due to the UN's efforts. On the other hand, he recalled the failure of the international community to act in

Angola, Rwanda and Srebrenica in Bosnia during the first half of the 1990s, which underscored the need for more investment in the area of peacekeeping. Dr. Stedman also underlined the urgency in the field of nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament. The non-proliferation regime, he suggested, has been rather successful in stemming the spread of nuclear weapons: some years ago, the US government had estimated that there would soon be between 15 and 25 nuclear-weapons states, while currently “only” eight states are known to possess nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, recent cases of nuclear smuggling, such as that of the A.Q. Khan network, as well as the growing risk of collusion between proliferation of weapon of mass destruction and terrorist organisations, underscore the need for strengthening the non-proliferation regime.

The Panel also examined closely Article 51 of the UN Charter, which authorises the use of force for self-defence. The Panel concluded that Article 51 need not be altered and that the use of force should be legitimate only if a threat is “imminent” or “latent”. Preventive military action, by contrast, would be lawful only if it is explicitly authorised by the UN Security Council. An unqualified right to take preventive action against another state would ultimately lead to international anarchy. The High-Level Panel report also recognises the right for the wider international community to interfere and intervene in the internal affairs of a state if it fails to ensure the security of its own citizens, following what has been called “the responsibility to protect”.

In conclusion, Dr. Stedman touched upon the recommendations made by the Panel on reform of the UN institutions in order to make the collective security system more effective in responding to the ever-changing international environment. He mentioned the reform of the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Commission on Human Rights, and the Secretariat itself. Regarding the General Assembly, the Panel called for measures to make its agenda more focused, e.g., through the establishment of an effective committee system. As to the UN Security Council, the High-Level Panel advocated its expansion for two

main reasons. First, the Security Council needs to become a more representative institution, which will also enhance compliance with its resolutions. Second, by expanding membership of the Council, it will be able to draw on more resources, thus allowing it to act more effectively. Finally, Dr. Stedman evoked the recommendation to establish a peacebuilding commission and a peacebuilding support office at the UN Secretariat, whose aim would also be to extend international assistance to countries emerging from violent conflict even after peacekeeping forces have left.

“UN Reforms: A Way Forward”

Prof. Adam Rotfeld, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Poland

Minister Rotfeld expressed his view that, today, the UN should play a central role in resolving global problems. In order to represent the core of a functioning global security system, however, the institutional structures and the UN mandate should be adjusted to the new international environment. Two fundamental questions arise: what changes have taken place that render present security structures inadequate in addressing current challenges, and what should the focus of necessary adaptations be: institutional or conceptual?

According to Minister Rotfeld, new threats and challenges to international security include threats posed by dictatorial regimes that support international terrorist networks and contribute to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, threats originating within state borders, internal conflicts, and risks related to globalisation, including the emergence of non-state actors.

Although institutional reforms are essential, the principles and goals of the UN should be reviewed as well. This does not mean the replacement of the UN Charter but the adoption of a new political document, a new political act for the UN, the elaboration of which was proposed by then-Polish Foreign Minister Włodzimierz Cimoszewicz at the 57th General Assembly session in 2002. This act should embody a consensus on the perception and application of key principles such as solidarity, responsibility, accountability and subsidiarity, and contain a code of conduct on how to respond to new security challenges. The aim of the Polish initiative is to reverse the marginalisation of the UN and to adjust the UN's operating principles so as to eliminate cases in which member states are forced to act outside its institutional framework. The act could be adopted and signed by the heads of states and governments at the planned 2005 UN Summit.

Minister Rotfeld then identified the necessary UN institutional reforms, giving priority to the Security Council, as its present composition does not reflect the current distribution of power on the international scene. Poland supports Germany, Japan and India in their bid to become permanent members, but also suggests that permanent members should include representatives from Africa and Latin America. For the non-permanent members, some additional seats should be allocated to the regional group of Eastern Europe, Minister Rotfeld said.

Minister Rotfeld also expressed Poland's support for the creation of a peacebuilding commission, as proposed by the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change. The principal tasks of the commission would be to identify states in danger of collapse, provide assistance to them, as well as to marshal and sustain efforts of the international community in post-conflict peacebuilding. The commission should be a compact but mobile and effective body, consisting of the permanent members of the Security Council, as well as some non-permanent members selected by regional groups on a rotation basis. Poland also supports the establishment of a human rights council as a long-term strategic objective, as well as the transformation of human rights protection into one of the three main pillars of the UN system. Minister Rotfeld also stated that the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights should be better equipped, and that its current culture of reaction should be transformed into a culture of prevention.

In conclusion, Minister Rotfeld underlined that the 2005 UN Summit was a unique opportunity for achieving a breakthrough in the process of UN reform. This, however, would require that states impose self-restrictions in pursuing their national interests, and respect the principles of solidarity, responsibility and subsidiarity. Minister Rotfeld also suggested that, in order to continue the reform process after the Summit, the UN should convene an international conference whose task would be to elaborate a framework agreement between the UN and regional organisations, covering issues such as exchange of information, early

warning, co-training of civilian and military personnel, and exchange of personnel within peace operations. Finally, Minister Rotfeld pointed out that the UN needed to recover credibility in the eyes of states and the public by creating stronger mechanisms for accountability and transparency. In democracies, the gap between public opinion and elite perceptions about security problems needs to be closed to achieve long-term success. For this reason, Poland recently launched a UN-awareness campaign.

"UN Security Council : Sunrise or Sunset Institution?"

Amb. Kishore Mahbubani, Former Ambassador of Singapore to the UN

Ambassador Mahbubani began his presentation by stating that the UN Security Council was both a sunrise, as well as a sunset, institution. On the one hand, the UN Security Council has become more important as a result of the world's changing realities and globalisation. He illustrated this shrunken world with the example of a sailing boat that has no captain or crew and whose passengers care only about their own cabins, but who create a fire brigade to put out fires that threaten to destroy the entire boat. In this metaphor, the UN Security Council is the boat's fire brigade, in charge of maintaining international peace with a mechanism of collective security. The demand for UN Security Council interventions has grown over the years, especially since the end of the Cold War, and its responsibilities have continuously expanded. The Security Council's successful interventions in East Timor and Sierra Leone, as well as a series of resolutions following 9/11, have illustrated the effectiveness of the Council. As long as no system of global governance exists, Ambassador Mahbubani argued, the demand for the services of an institution such as the UN Security Council will continue to increase.

On the other hand, the Security Council faces some pressing problems. First, the Council does not always meet its responsibilities. The Council has a record of selectivity when intervening in world affairs. As the case of Rwanda has shown, even though the Council knew about the genocide, it failed to respond and could only apologise thereafter. As long as the Security Council's decisions are dependent on the willingness of its permanent members, national interests (or the absence thereof) will determine the course followed. With respect to the question once asked whether the Council would intervene if a genocide broke out in Burundi, Ambassador Mahbubani was given the answer that, as long as no strategic national interests are at stake, no action would be taken. What the anti-Russian Jihadist movement of Afghanistan in relation to the 9/11 attacks has

shown is that the failure to intervene in one place may have devastating effects on a global scale in the future.

Second, Ambassador Mahbubani underscored that current reforms should make the Council a more dynamic institution. Learning the lessons of the League of Nations implies that the major powers must have a stake in international affairs and thus a veto right in the Security Council. Following this principle, as new countries and regions gain importance in international affairs, they should enjoy a more significant role in the Security Council. Otherwise, a large part of the world's population would begin to question the legitimacy of both the UN and the Council. In 1993, a working group launched a first attempt at reforming the Council, but this failed due to differences regarding who should become a permanent member.

Third, in order to maintain its credibility and authority, the Security Council must adjust to a changing international environment and reflect contemporary political realities. Ambassador Mahbubani emphasised that the Council cannot draw its authority from the past but needs to earn it every single day through its efforts. While the prospects for reform in the near future might be dim, without reform, the Council's performance will deteriorate.

Ambassador Mahbubani concluded that, to restore the authority and efficiency of the UN Security Council, some painful solutions might have to be considered. He proposed, *inter alia*, to link the privileges of permanent membership of the Council with the assumption of responsibilities towards the global community, whether these be political, financial or military in nature.

"Halting Genocide: Intervention and Legitimacy "

Mr. Gareth Evans, President of the International Crisis Group and Member of the UN High-Level Panel

Mr. Evans started out by highlighting what he considered the most important failing of the international community since the end of the Cold War in attempting to build a genuine collective security system: the apparent inability of the international community to react quickly and effectively in cases of conscience-shocking mass violence occurring within the borders of a sovereign state. According to Mr. Evans, there continues to be enormous disagreement as to whether there is a right of intervention, in particular coercive military intervention, in such cases, and regarding how, when and under whose authority such an intervention should be carried out. There are three main explanations for why this problem has proved so hard to resolve. First, there are no clear existing international rules governing humanitarian interventions. The UN Charter generally emphasises the principle of state sovereignty, while limits on state sovereignty implied by human rights standards are given only secondary importance in the Charter. And, even though the Security Council may characterise large-scale killings of a state's own population as a "threat to international peace and security", thus providing grounds for intervention, it is often difficult to achieve consensus on such measures. Second, emotional attachment to state sovereignty remains high, especially among those countries that in the past had suffered from interference in their internal affairs. Third, there has been growing suspicion towards the principle of "humanitarian intervention" in the aftermath of the war in Iraq, where, after weapons of mass destruction failed to show up, some policy-makers defending the war *ex post facto* were forced to justify the intervention on humanitarian-intervention grounds.

The most substantial effort thus far to identify the principles that should govern humanitarian intervention has been the work of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty. Mr. Evans detailed the four main

contributions of the Commission to the international policy debate on humanitarian intervention. First, and politically most important, the Commission invented a new way of talking about the whole issue of humanitarian intervention by turning the debate on the “right” to intervene into a question of a “responsibility” to protect people. Second, the Commission proposed a new way of talking about sovereignty, whose essence it saw not as control but rather as responsibility of the state towards its own citizens, as well as towards the international community at large. The third contribution of the Commission was to make clear that the responsibility to protect went beyond intervention and comprised a whole continuum of obligations ranging from prevention to reaction to rebuilding countries emerging from violent conflict. The Commission’s fourth main contribution was to come up with guidelines for when military intervention in another state is appropriate.

Mr. Evans continued by elaborating on the five criteria of legitimacy established by the Commission, against which the legitimacy of a humanitarian intervention should be measured. Adopting and applying these criteria may not guarantee that the objectively best outcome will always prevail, but it would maximise the possibility of achieving Security Council consensus about when it is appropriate to go war, as well as international support for the Security Council’s decisions. These criteria are as follows. First, there must be serious and irreparable harm occurring to human beings, or imminently likely to occur, either in the form of large-scale loss of life as a consequence of deliberate state (in)action or a failed state situation, or large-scale ethnic cleansing. Second, the primary purpose of the proposed military action must be to halt or avert the threat in question. Third, every non-military option needs to be explored before military intervention takes place. Fourth, military action must use proportional means. Fifth, there must be reasonable prospects that military action will be successful.

In conclusion, Mr. Evans pointed out that, despite the massive international preoccupation with terrorism, the concept of the responsibility to protect was

gaining international recognition and might in due course become accepted as customary international law. The concept has been embraced enthusiastically by Secretary-General Kofi Annan, as well as in the doctrine of the newly emerging African Union, and was also recently endorsed by the UN High-Level Panel and in the secretary-general's report *In Larger Freedom*. Mr. Evans concluded with some optimism for the concept to be embraced by the international community, so that, one day, large-scale atrocities, such as genocide can be avoided.

"Meeting the Challenges of Peace-building"

Mr. Søren Jessen-Petersen, Special Representative of the UN Secretary-General and Head of the UN Interim Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK)

In his opening remarks, Mr. Jessen-Petersen provided an overview of the security situation in Kosovo, which he described as being as good as it has ever been since the outbreak of the conflict in 1999. Nonetheless, serious challenges and tensions remain just beneath the surface and could easily come to the fore, given the sensitivities of the upcoming review process and potential opening of status talks. One key factor behind progress in the security area, according to Mr. Jessen-Petersen, has been the now excellent cooperation between UNMIK and KFOR.

In addressing the issue of returnees, Mr. Jessen-Petersen pointed out that the number of returning displaced persons remained disappointingly low. However, the return process should not be judged primarily in terms of the number of people who chose to return. Rather, the emphasis should be placed on creating the conditions that would encourage a displaced person to choose to return and to make sure that such conditions are developed in a sustainable manner. These conditions include creating a sense of security, including the ability to move freely; ensuring clear property rights and access to property; creating economic opportunities to sustain the success of the return; and, not least significantly, overcoming the psychological barrier of fear that the displaced persons are likely feel after having left their homes under duress.

Another area where further progress was necessary, Mr. Jessen-Petersen emphasised, is in the field of decentralisation. He stated: "I would like to recognise the valuable support from the [GCSP]. Decentralisation is a very complex matter anywhere, and it is important to have strong organisations, like the GCSP, to back up our work."

Having identified these challenges, Mr. Jessen-Petersen proceeded to discuss the policy processes that have been put into place to address them. The first was the creation of the Provisional Institutions of Self Government (PISG), including the Kosovo Assembly, and the gradual transfer of competencies to them. Mr. Jessen-Petersen emphasised that sustainable peacebuilding required local ownership and that the PISG provided exactly that. The second main policy that has helped peacebuilding efforts in Kosovo has been that of defining “Standards” for institutions and the greater society to achieve. Standards refer to the framework and codification of key elements needed for any society to function successfully. The Standards framework for Kosovo, according to Mr. Jessen-Petersen, is the first time the international community has created a specific template with objective and measurable criteria for monitoring and reporting progress to the international community

Mr. Jessen-Peterson also touched upon the issue of organised crime, pointing out that Kosovo was in many ways more vulnerable to this threat than other countries of the region, given the limitations of its own institutions and the necessarily temporary nature of international institutions. Organised crime, he argued, was one of the best examples of successful regional and multi-ethnic cooperation in the western Balkans. Accordingly, every effort should be made to ensure that policing and investigations of organised crime become an even better example of regional collaboration.

In conclusion, Mr. Jessen-Petersen came to the issue of status and emphasised that this issue was not only *a*, but rather *the*, peacebuilding problem in Kosovo. In many areas of peacebuilding in Kosovo, progress has been hampered by uncertainty regarding its final status. In the economic sphere, for example, Kosovo cannot borrow from international financial institutions or resolve its debts in the absence of a status resolution. Similarly, the legal ambiguities inherent in the current situation are too great for any large investor to tolerate, and without such investment economic improvement in Kosovo is unlikely. The return

process, as well, according to Mr. Jessen-Petersen, is being hampered by the unresolved status issue. In general, attempting to address peacebuilding problems in the absence of a resolution on the status issue was like “building a home from the roof downwards”, or, in other words, without the foundation of a legal basis and established institutions. Once status talks begin, most likely later this year, Mr. Jessen-Petersen considers that the true beginning of the end of the peacebuilding process in Kosovo will have been reached.

Summary and Conclusions

Derek Lutterbeck, GCSP Project Officer

While the different contributions to this GCSP UN Dialogue Series covered a broad range of contemporary international security issues, there are a number of common themes that run through these presentations and that will be briefly highlighted in this concluding section. First, all presenters to the series underscored the profound changes in the nature of security that have taken place over recent years and decades. While *security* long used to be conceived mainly in relation to the state and inter-state conflict, the security challenges of the 21st century have become much more complex and multifaceted in nature. Traditional inter-state conflicts have increasingly given way to conflicts within states, and the most daunting security threats nowadays seem to be posed by non-state actors, such as terrorist organisations armed with weapons of mass destruction. Challenges that have traditionally attracted only limited attention among security specialists, such as infectious diseases or environmental degradation, are also rapidly moving up on the international agenda. One important implication of this transformed security environment is that geographical distance is losing much of its relevance, as it is becoming increasingly impossible for states to ignore and isolate themselves from challenges even if these originate from far away. As evinced most tellingly by the events of 9/11, lawlessness and instability in one country can have devastating spill-over effects in countries located on the other side of the globe.

Second, the contributors to this series all agreed that, in this transformed international environment, the UN must continue to play a central role in providing security at a global level and that current trends towards its marginalisation in international affairs should be stopped and reversed. Given the complex, interconnected and global nature of contemporary security challenges, no state can adequately address these on its own, and there is thus a need for an effective collective security system. While the UN failed to respond effectively to

several internal conflicts and even acts of genocide that have occurred since the beginning of the 1990s, it has nevertheless met with significant success in resolving a number of other long-standing disputes within states over recent years. The declining number of civil wars since 1992 can also be seen, at least in part, as a result of the UN's efforts in the field of peacekeeping. Moreover, as the presenters have pointed out, the demands for the services of the UN, in particular in the areas of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, are likely to grow in the future.

At the same time, however, the speakers of this series also underscored that the UN system was in need of fundamental reform if it is to continue to play a significant role in international security affairs. On the one hand, there is a need for institutional reforms to enhance both the efficiency, as well as the legitimacy, of the UN and its institutions. Reforms are essential to make the UN's institutions more dynamic and better able to respond to crises in a rapidly evolving international security environment. One core issue in this respect is the reform of the UN Security Council, whose current composition no longer seems to adequately reflect the distribution of power on the international scene. Expanding the number of its permanent members would not only make the Security Council more representative but also generally enhance its legitimacy. Other important institutional reforms advocated by the presenters included the establishment of a peacebuilding commission to improve the UN's efforts in the field of peacekeeping and peacebuilding, and in particular to make its assistance to countries emerging from violent conflict more sustainable in the long run, and the creation of a human rights council, which would help transform human rights protection into a core pillar of the UN system.

While institutional reforms are important, it was also agreed among the contributors to this series that reforms should not be confined to institutions and that there was a need to review the basic principles and goals of the UN. In particular, there is a need to establish new guidelines of action or a code of conduct on how to deal with contemporary security challenges. While this does

not mean that the UN Charter should be replaced, the speakers suggested that, given the Charter's emphasis on the principles of state sovereignty and non-intervention in states' internal affairs, and the limited attention it devotes to human rights protection, it was necessary to develop new norms and guidelines on how to respond to security challenges and in particular to large-scale humanitarian crises occurring within the borders of a state. One core element of such guidelines should be the principle of the responsibility to protect and norms on humanitarian intervention, as they have been developed by the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty.

Finally, the contributions to this series have also highlighted that reforming the UN system and maintaining and enhancing its role in international security affairs also requires that its credibility in the eyes of the wider public be strengthened, not only by rendering it more accountable and transparent but also by increasing general awareness of the UN and its activities. For the reform of the UN system to be sustainable and successful in the long run, there is a need to close existing gaps between elite perceptions and public opinion regarding core international security issues. Increased efforts should thus be made to better communicate and explain the role of the UN and its actual and potential contributions to resolving contemporary security challenges in a cooperative manner.

Outcome of the 2005 UN World Summit

At the 2005 UN World Summit in New York, which took place from 14 to 16 September, world leaders discussed both the report of the High-Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change and the UN secretary-general's report, and also reviewed progress made in achieving the Millennium Development Goals. What has been the result of the UN Summit in light of these documents and the ambitions contained therein? The outcome document adopted at the Summit has generally been described as "disappointing" or "watered down". UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan, while not necessarily disagreeing with these assessments,

has, however, also suggested that the document still represented “a remarkable expression of world unity on a wide range of issues”.

On a positive note, it could be mentioned that the UN’s capacity in the field of peacemaking and peacebuilding has been strengthened, in particular by agreeing on a detailed blueprint for a new peacebuilding commission. Moreover, the proposal to create a human rights council has been accepted, without, however, specifying the details. The most remarkable achievement, however, was the clear acceptance of the responsibility to protect, i.e., of the collective responsibility to protect civilian populations in cases of genocide and widespread abuse of human rights.

On the negative side, by contrast, it can be noted that the UN member states did not succeed in agreeing on a definition of terrorism, even though, for the first time in the UN’s history, all member states expressed unqualified condemnation of terrorism in all its forms. Arguably the biggest shortcoming of the Summit, however, was the failure to address the issue of nuclear proliferation, generally considered one of the most-pressing threats facing the international community today. Fundamental differences in this area remain between those countries whose core objective is non-proliferation and those countries that consider efforts towards further disarmament on the part of the existing nuclear powers as key to the strengthening of the non-proliferation regime.