



Clingendael

Netherlands Institute of International Relations

Setting a Progressive United Nations Peace and Security Agenda

Searching for New Narratives

Dr Bibi van Ginkel, LLM
Rosa Dinnissen, MA

Symposium Report



Clingendael

Netherlands Institute of International Relations

Setting a Progressive United Nations Peace and Security Agenda

Searching for New Narratives

Dr Bibi van Ginkel, LLM
Rosa Dinnissen, MA*

Symposium Report
December 2014

* We are grateful for the commitment and support of the Clingendael trainees Julian Slotman, Charlotte Hamar de la Brethonière and Lucas van Bilderbeek, who were closely involved in the organization of the conference, and note-taking during the conference.

December 2014

© Netherlands Institute of International Relations Clingendael.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright holders.

Photos: Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs and *VOOG Beeld en Tekst*.

About the authors

Dr Bibi van Ginkel, LL.M is Coordinator Security Research and Senior Research Fellow at the Clingendael Institute. She is also a fellow at the International Centre for Counter-Terrorism (ICCT) in The Hague. Her main areas of expertise are security and law, more in particular: the system of collective security, public international law and human rights, terrorism and counter-terrorism, and counter-piracy. She has functioned as the General Secretary of the Executive Board of the Netherlands Helsinki Committee, and she is still a member of the Committee on Peace and Security of the Advisory Council on International Affairs of the Dutch Government.

Rosa Dinnissen, MA works for the Clingendael Research Department. She has edited the Clingendael Strategic Monitor 2013 and has acted as a workgroup coordinator for the National Risk Assessment, and as the communication and PR manager for the Nuclear Knowledge Summit, the official scientific side-event of the Nuclear Security Summit, which took place in The Hague in 2014. In a broader sense, she is engaged in climate change issues, food security, and the meaning and growing influence of social media in relation to self-organizing grassroots movements and the impact on various security fields and conflicts.

Clingendael Institute
P.O. Box 93080
2509 AB The Hague
The Netherlands

Email: info@clingendael.nl

Website: <http://www.clingendael.nl/>

Table of Contents

Introduction	7
The UNSC: Current State of Affairs	9
Keynote Address by Professor Marianne van Leeuwen	14
Session I: ' <i>Communio est mater discordiarum</i> '	16
Introductory Note by Professor Wouter Werner (Free University of Amsterdam)	16
Panel discussion	17
Session II: A Changing World with Emerging Powers, New Stakeholders and Other Factors of Influence	18
Introductory Note by Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen)	18
Panel discussion	18
Session III: 'The World is Over-armed and Peace is Under-funded'	20
Introductory Note by Professor Joris Voorhoeve (University of Leiden)	21
Panel discussion	21
Session IV: Unpacking Positions and Interests on UNSC Reform	23
Introductory Note by Lydia Swart (Center for UN Reform)	23
Panel discussion	24
Session V: High-level Addresses from the Netherlands and Brazil; Proposals for Reform from the Next Generation: Thinking Outside the Box	26
Winning Essays	27
Session VI: Creating a User-friendly Roadmap for UNSC Reform	29
Recap by the Students on the Shadow Conference and its Proposals	29
Reflection on the Main Points of the Conference by Lianne Boer (Free University of Amsterdam)	30
Panel discussion	30
Concluding Observations	33
Annex	36

Introduction

There have been hundreds of events over the past decade focusing on reform of the United Nations (UN) and the UN Security Council (UNSC). The UN reform agenda typically focuses on an array of topics, ranging from system-wide coherence to the strengthening of political autonomy of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and the Secretariat. Meanwhile, debates on UNSC reform have concentrated on expanding permanent and non-permanent membership, the voting system and working methods. It is true that the UNSC has undertaken some structural reforms since its inception, but apart from China, the UNSC still represents the main powers of 1945, and not the reality of the twenty-first century. To become more legitimate, many argue that the UNSC needs expansion and reforms.

Notwithstanding early enthusiasm, concrete progress in reform on both fronts has stalled. There is an urgent need for *new and innovative thinking* to move the agenda forwards.

For that purpose, on 10 and 11 November 2014, the Netherlands Institute of International Relations 'Clingendael', at the request of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs and in cooperation with the Brazilian think tank *Igarapé*, organized a thought-provoking symposium on reform of the UN, and in particular the UNSC. The initiative was developed in response to the shared ambition of the Netherlands and Brazil to address the need for reform, and to reach out to younger generations in order to engage them in the debate.



The questions that took centre stage during this conference were particularly: What are the underlying values and principles that the international community finds worthy of protection? What are the trends and developments in the international arena with regard to upcoming

powers, the role of civil society, or the private sector? What ideas spur the next generation of policy-makers when challenged to think about reform? And how can we translate these new narratives in a roadmap for UN reform?

This report reflects the presentations that were made and the discussions that took place during the symposium. The symposium's programme can be found in the annexe. The report will furthermore highlight the key recommendations that were made during and at the end of the symposium. The full texts of the essays written in preparation for this symposium, the keynote addresses and other background information are available online, via the [conference page](#) on the Clingendael website. The discussions on this topic took place against the backdrop of continuing negotiations on reform. The next paragraph first highlights the current state of affairs regarding UNSC reform.

The UNSC: Current State of Affairs

The UNSC currently consists of fifteen member states, of which five hold permanent seats and have a veto right with regard to all resolutions that the UNSC wishes to adopt. The current membership status of the UNSC was established in 1965, when the UNSC was enlarged from eleven to fifteen members. It is also relevant to note that the UNSC is the only body of the UN system where decisions are mandatory for all member states.

Notwithstanding the obvious need for reform, the last twenty years have effectually not shown much progress in the debate on the UNSC's reform. At the 2005 World Summit, world leaders called for an early reform of the UN Security Council. Since then, the debate and negotiations moved from the Working Group to the Intergovernmental Negotiations (ING) in 2009, a compilation/negotiations text was established in 2010, various draft resolutions were circulated to create momentum, and interim measures have been suggested. One example of such an interim measure is the French proposal to draft a voluntary code of conduct to limit the use of the veto in cases of mass atrocities. Notwithstanding these proposals, however, no real progress has been made in bringing the negotiations any nearer to a meaningful compromise.

The former chair of the ING, the Afghan Ambassador Zahir Tanin,¹ in July 2012 proposed compiling a concise working document to move the negotiations along. Many versions of a working document have since been drafted. Tanin has support for this proposal from the G4, L69, CARICOM, and SIDS, but opposition to it from the C10/African Group, UfC and three permanent members, namely China, Russia and the US.²

1 In November 2014, Ambassador Courtenay Rattray (Jamaica) was appointed as the new Chair of Intergovernmental Negotiations.

2 **G4:** The four nations – Brazil, Germany, India and Japan – that aim to become permanent members of the UNSC.

L69: A group of 40 nations from *Africa, Asia, the Caribbean, Latin America* and the *Pacific* that supports and actively promotes comprehensive UNSC reform

CARICOM: An organization consisting of fifteen Caribbean dependencies and nations that represents the Caribbean Community.

SIDS: The International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS) has been developed to support the follow-up to the Third International Conference on Small Island Developing States (SIDS Conference), including through a partnership platform, a partnership framework and a UN Implementation Matrix.

C10/African Group: The Committee of Ten African Ministers of Finance and Central Bank Governors was established to represent the interests of the nations involved (Algeria, Botswana, Cameroon, Egypt, Kenya, Nigeria, South Africa, Tanzania, the Central Bank of West African States (CBWAS) and the Central Bank of Central African States (CBCAS)).

UfC: The Uniting for Consensus movement underlines the importance of consensus before expansion of the UNSC, and therefore aims to counter the objectives of the G4.



In October 2013, the President of the UN General Assembly (UNGA), Ambassador John Ashe (Antigua and Barbuda), established an Advisory Group to provide a basis for negotiations. This group produced a non-paper, but one of the six members dissented and issued a memo explaining that position. The non-paper nevertheless became the basis of the discussions in the ING's first informal meeting on 12 December 2013, followed by a meeting on the 16 December. Many proposals were made and positions presented. During this meeting, France again voiced its initiative that the five permanent members of the UNSC (the P5) should voluntarily refrain from using their veto in cases of mass atrocities. According to France, this framework needs to be formulated by the P5 members themselves, mass crimes need to be defined, and a warning mechanism established.

In July 2014, a common understanding of the use of the non-paper as a basis for discussions within the context of the Intergovernmental Negotiations had not yet been reached, yet six thematic meetings were held:

1. On the topic of categories of membership:

There is agreement on the need for enlargement. The remaining questions concern how this enlargement should take place, and which states or group of states are eligible for these new seats.

 - A. Possible variations for enlargement:
 - a. Both permanent and non-permanent seats
 - b. Non-permanent seats only
 - c. A new category of seats with various options related to term length and new focus on immediate re-election. Longer-term seats to regional groups with either terms of three to five years with the possibility of re-election, or two years with two immediate re-elections.

- B. Various options are discussed in relation to the eligible candidates for these seats. These are not either/or options, but rather represent multiple variations and possible combinations:
 - a. Extend the number of permanent seats?
 - i. For the G4
 - ii. One or two for African countries. Which country/ies?
 - iii. One for the Arab grouping
 - iv. Two for Asian states
 - v. One for Latin American and Caribbean states
 - b. Extend the number of non-permanent seats?
 - i. Long-term or short-term seats?
 - ii. Two non-permanent seats for the African states
 - iii. One non-permanent seat for Asian states
 - iv. Cross-regional non-permanent seat for small island states
 - v. One for East European states
 - vi. One for Latin America and Caribbean states
2. On the question of the veto, various options were discussed:
 - A. A veto for all (including new) permanent members of the Security Council (SC)
 - B. New permanent members should not have a veto
 - C. Restriction of the veto power altogether, by
 - a. Amendment only to allow a veto if cast by two or more permanent members
 - b. Amendment to allow permanent members to cast a non-concurring vote that is not considered to be a veto
 - c. Regional veto option: this would block action if Council members from the region under discussion, acting on the basis of regional consensus, all voted against the action
 - d. Limiting use of the veto to Chapter VII decisions
 - e. Prohibiting use of the veto on Chapter VI-related matters
 - f. No use of the veto in cases where action is aimed at preventing genocide, crimes against humanity, or war crimes.
3. On the topic of regional representation, the following issues were discussed:
 - A. Agreement on the need for enhancement of regional representation
 - B. The increasing role played by regional groups and regional organizations in international relations and matters of peace and security
 - C. Distinction between an 'equitable geographic distribution' of regional seats and enhanced 'regional representation'
 - D. Cross-regional representation should include factors such as size, development status, or specifically the inclusion of Arab states and the Islamic *Ummah*.
4. On the topic of the size of an enlarged Council and working methods of the UNSC, the following were discussed:
 - A. The exact size of the UNSC after enlargement will probably depend on the model chosen
 - B. The number of members will likely be in the mid- to upper 20s
 - C. Enlargement should not hamper the Council's efficiency
 - D. The effects of Council enlargement on working methods, for instance with regard to the rotating presidency system, which in an enlarged Council would not provide an

- opportunity for each non-permanent member to hold that position in a two-year term, and the provisions concerning decision-making majorities
- E. Working methods in relation to the Council's current composition.
5. On the topic of the relationship between the Security Council and the General Assembly:
- A. Role for the GA if SC is deadlocked; Uniting for Peace-mechanism?
- B. Idea that Permanent members circulate an explanation to the GA on the rationale behind casting a non-concurring vote.
6. On the topic of cross-cutting issues, member states used this session to clarify further their positions, and some stressed the importance of a clause that would provide for a review with a clear scope and at a set moment, following the implementation of the Charter amendment.

The different positions of the various country groups on these six thematic meetings and suggestions can be summarized as follows:

G4/Group of 4 (Brazil, Germany, India and Japan): In favour of six new permanent seats and four new non-permanent seats. New member-States would be elected by the General Assembly. The new permanent members would be willing to forgo veto rights until a review conference, to be held 15 years later

L69 (a group of 43 developing countries, also including Brazil and India): In favour of new permanent seats, in favour of giving veto rights to new permanent seats, and also in favour of a dedicated non-permanent seat for small island states.

C10/African Union (53 African countries): In favour of two permanent seats for Africa, including veto rights. Fourteen African countries are also part of the L69 group. Furthermore, South Africa and Nigeria concur with the G4 position. The C10 coordinates the African Union's position and consists of Algeria, the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Equatorial Guinea, Kenya, Libya, Namibia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Uganda and Zambia.

UfC (Uniting for Consensus, also known as the 'Coffee Club', has 12 core members: Argentina, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Italy, Malta, Mexico, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, San Marino, Spain and Turkey): Indonesia and China participate in UfC meetings. Against new permanent seats. In favour of adding non-permanent seats and/or longer-term and renewable seats.

Arab Group: In favour of a new permanent seat for Arab states.

ACT (Accountability, Coherence and Transparency) (21 countries actively working on reforming the working methods of the existing SC: Austria, Chile, Costa Rica, Estonia, Finland, Gabon, Hungary, Ireland, Jordan, Liechtenstein, New Zealand, Norway, Papua New Guinea, Peru, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Tanzania and Uruguay).
Not involved in the expansion debate.

CARICOM (Caribbean Community): group aligned with the L69's position.

Pacific SIDS (Small Island Developing States): Aligned with L69. In favour of a non-permanent seat for SIDS.

The procedure for reform requires that a two-thirds majority of the entire UNGA membership votes in favour of a resolution with a proposal for UNSC reform, followed by a two-thirds majority of the UNSC membership, including the P5 concurring with the reform proposal.

Keynote Address by Professor Marianne van Leeuwen

During her keynote address, Marianne van Leeuwen outlined the modern history of the last century, starting with the outbreak of the First World War, and followed by the Second World War, which started only 21 years later. Few wars have seen such intensity of death and destruction within a relatively short period of time, both on the Western and Eastern Fronts in Europe, and elsewhere in the world. Professor van Leeuwen then continued with the history of the League of Nations and the relevance of its inheritance, in an attempt to draw lessons learned for the challenges that the UN faces today.



Historians have initiated fresh studies into the League of Nations, focusing not so much on matters of hard security and high politics, but on the League's 'softer' side. With its own fallacies, the League was notably innovative, fielding international officials who tried to work with non-governmental organizations and who sought to activate public opinion. Moreover, it was a harbinger of global governance, van Leeuwen argued. It worked to manage epidemic diseases, provide care for refugees and halt trafficking in drugs and sex workers. In these and similar areas, the League provided the foundation for present-day UN regimes such as the World Health Organization.

In October 1945, the UN, which built upon the foundations of the League, was established as the leading force behind the maintenance of international peace. To maintain international peace and security, the UNSC was established.

In major instances throughout its history, the UNSC has lived up to its task. Nevertheless, the UNSC's membership and its competences have also frequently proven to be as problematic as the League's consensus voting. While mending some of the League's shortcomings, the UN replaced others with equally serious organizational flaws. The representativeness and proceedings at the UNGA compare favourably with those of the League's Assembly. As a result of geopolitical circumstances, full inclusiveness has been hard to reach, yet the inclusiveness of the UN compares highly favourably to that of the League.

In order to support greater decisiveness, the debilitating system of consensus voting within the Assembly of the League of Nations has been succeeded by majority voting in the UNGA. The UN has also developed specialized organs whose work has greatly benefited people in distress around the world. Van Leeuwen argued that it is only fair to emphasize again here that the foundation for these organs, as we have seen, was often laid by their predecessor, the League of Nations.

The victors of the Second World War including China are the sole permanent members of the UNSC. While the superpower status of the United States and China can be justified, French, British and Russian claims to superpower status rest mainly on past glories, present ambitions and the possession of nuclear weapons' arsenals. Yet these five *have-been* or *would-be* superpowers combine their permanent status with individual veto rights in the UNSC. Those rights have arguably impeded organizational flexibility to adjust the UN to changing geopolitical realities. They have also impeded effective UN decision-making in international conflict situations, as soon as disagreements between the P5 arose. Deadlock in the UNSC and the powerlessness of the UNGA in the case of the Syrian civil war are only the most contemporary, sobering cases in point.

Van Leeuwen argued that there are good reasons to be very critical of the League of Nations and the UN. However, she stressed that this should not make us oblivious to the many important ways in which both organizations have been of concrete benefit to innumerable people around the world. The League of Nations and the UN introduced the ideas that international relations should be based on international law; that international conflicts should be settled peacefully by negotiation; and the concept of the defence of human rights, which we now take for granted. Instead of giving up, we should try and 'save' the UNSC, with necessary adjustments to its structure in order to prepare it for a better future.

Session I: 'Communio est mater discordiarum'

The first panel in the opening session focused on new and emerging trends with respect to security challenges. During the panel, the speakers were asked to question themselves: Is the UN a twentieth century institution, fit for its purpose to face twenty-first century challenges? With this question in mind, the moderator and panellists further elaborated on the essence of the main principles, values and purposes of the UN. It was questioned whether the original values were still valid in today's complex world, which is full of new emerging challenges, of which change is the only constant factor. Which international developments and risks have undermined compliance with these original principles? Based on the developments of the last 70 years, the speakers consequently discussed whether there is a need to change the values and, if so, what is required to face these challenges and what should be the guiding principles in meeting these challenges. The overarching purpose of these questions was to find innovative ways to promote development as a tool of conflict prevention and peace promotion.

Introductory Note by Professor Wouter Werner (Free University of Amsterdam)

In his introductory note, Wouter Werner of the Free University of Amsterdam argued that the UN system is based on universal values, such as sovereignty, equality and human rights. However, the world is divided into political communities that interpret these universal values differently. These political communities are also reflected in the design of the UN system, resulting in an ongoing tension between universalism and pluralism. This tension, Werner argued, influences developments within the UN, such as the evolution of peacekeeping operations. The debate on UNSC reform should be viewed in the same light. Werner pointed to four other developments that influence the debate on UNSC reform:

- The rising power of states such as Brazil, India and China, but also regional (security) organizations such as the African Union.
- New emerging forms of violence, such as terrorism.
- A growing sensibility of humanitarianism, for instance in the responsibility to protect and in the humanitarian values enshrined in international criminal law.
- The new roles that the UNSC has assumed, such as the establishment of international tribunals and referring situations to the International Criminal Court (ICC), but also its role as semi-legislator and semi-adjudicator.

With respect to the latter development, Werner questioned whether a political security institution should fulfil a function in governing issues of justice. The UNSC has assumed more legislative functions and increasingly interferes in matters of domestic policy within states. Moreover, increasing individual sanctioning through blacklisting policies is a sign of a shift of focus from states to individuals.

The UNSC has a tendency to securitize issues by labelling them as potential terrorist threats. They are thereby placed high on the agenda, which allows for bypassing norms that would normally apply. For example, by issuing individual sanctions against a person who forms

a terrorist threat, his or her right to a fair trial is being denied. Domestic and regional courts have increasingly ruled against this prerogative of the UNSC and have advocated for the right to fair trial, with some successful outcomes.

This latter example shows how the development of reform of the global politics of peace and security might take place outside of the existing institution of the UNSC. Domestic courts and other non-traditional actors can attain more prominent roles. The institutional outcomes of this process can influence, or even partly replace, the existing institutions.



Panel discussion

Moderator: Godelieve van Heteren

During the panel debate with four speakers – Mathilda Flemming (UNOY), Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen), Lars van Troost (Amnesty International) and Wouter Werner, which was moderated by Godelieve van Heteren (Rotterdam Health Initiative), the emerging importance and the need for increased inclusion of non-state actors in the UN were discussed. These groups can help to push the reform agenda forwards, because they add flavour to the UN system and bring innovative perspectives, which state officials might not consider since they have already been part of the UN system for a long time. One such group consists of young people. Young people are often either referred to as a vulnerable group or as trouble-makers, whereas they can also function as vectors of change. Another group is formed by (non-Western) regional organizations. To work with them, we – the West – must better interpret the values underlying international cooperation. States build international institutions, because Western states see this as the ultimate goal of international cooperation. If the UN had been dominated by non-Western states, however, it would have focused more on national institution-building.

Session II: A Changing World with Emerging Powers, New Stakeholders and Other Factors of Influence

Globalization, multipolarity, grass-roots-initiated mechanisms of change and technological developments, especially with regard to communications, are all factors of influence in the way in which the international community can organize itself with regard to preserving peace and security. New actors, such as emerging powers, multinational corporations and civil society, with different priorities will try to influence the agenda for sustainable security and development, including in the context of the post-2015 agenda. They will consider whether existing tools and procedures are adequate, and what kinds of upgrades are needed. The second session focused on the positions of these parties with regard to reform of the UNSC. The moderator and panelists discussed the current state of the world system (is it still characterized by multilateralism, or are we moving towards a multipolar or network society?) and the emergence of new actors, such as multinationals and civil society organizations. Their values and principles, their influence on the international agenda concerned with international peace and security, and other factors of influence, such as technological development, depletion of national resources and climate change, took centre stage during the panel debate. The panellists were subsequently asked to question themselves as to whether the increasing influence of these new actors and factors should be taken into account when discussing UNSC reform. Finally, the speakers discussed the ways in which the post 2015-agenda could be incorporated in order to influence how the international community can organize itself with regard to peace and security.

Introductory Note by Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen)

During his introductory note, Jaap de Wilde argued that power politics are ‘played’ on different chessboards: the global; regional; state; and domestic level. All of the major powers are on the same page economically; they all adhere to a liberal capitalist ideology. Another similarity is that they are all deeply concerned with their territorial sovereignty, and almost all have conflicts about their territory.

Non-traditional actors such as transnational corporations are gaining power. Their increasing power is not necessarily a dangerous prospect, as long as they are properly included in processes of international politics. Furthermore, Professor de Wilde’s hope for UNSC reform is not focused on the UNSC or UNGA, but on the specialized agencies, which are not paralyzed by political deadlock.

Panel discussion

Moderator: Professor Yvonne Donders

During the panel debate with three speakers – Caroline van Leenders (Ministry of Economic Affairs; RVO), Fulco van Deventer (Human Security Collective) and Jaap de Wilde, which was moderated by Yvonne Donders, the characteristics of international institutions, their current fallacies and the challenges of including new emerging players (and how to do that) were discussed. Caroline van Leenders compared international institutions with nature. There are

some essential similarities, from which we could learn greatly. First, everything in nature is connected, just as in the globalized world (so all stakeholders need to be included). Second, there is a strong diversity in nature, which benefits the planet as a whole. Similarly, humans are very diverse, an aspect that should be preserved and celebrated. Third, nature is organized in a decentralized manner, which has important advantages.

One of the future challenges will be to create a more open and diverse UNSC, so it can reach the ungoverned spaces of the world that are strongly affected by conflict. Since 9/11, a trend has emerged, in which UNSC resolutions have made 'the people' (as referred to in the preamble of the Charter) part of the problem, rather than the solution. This should be reversed by increasing civil society participation in the UNSC. There are civil society organizations (CSOs) that have successfully executed counter-terrorism projects. One such example is a taskforce consisting of fifteen people, which has made recommendations about financial transactions to 190 governments, informing them of how to identify illicit transactions with terrorist intentions.

One of the challenges discussed during the panel debate was the gap that exists between the UN and the new emerging actors, such as multinational corporations and civil society, and the consequences of this gap for inclusion of these new actors. For example, the panelists stressed that there are major problems with including civil society in the UNSC debates. First, the civil society community is greatly dispersed, consisting of many different organizations, communities and constituencies. Second, it is difficult to identify one 'representative of civil society' that can speak on its behalf. Third, many CSOs do not 'speak the language', or the jargon of the UNSC. There is therefore the need for an interface, which knows how to channel voices, to function as a bridge between the UN and civil society. The UNSC can learn a lot from other UN institutions where civil society engagement is part and parcel of the internal processes, such as the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), and where security issues are understood more through the lens of human security.

Session III: 'The World is Over-armed and Peace is Under-funded'

The third panel focused on the main trends for the next five to ten years in terms of financing peace and security and their relation to the trends of funding development assistance. This concerned, for example, how financial resources should be allocated to support the principles and values as discussed in panels I and II. During this third panel, the question arose as to whether Brazil and the Netherlands could play any decisive role in improving the current situation. The measures needed to strike a fair balance – for example via international regulation, restriction of arms trade, binding norms in terms of development goals, and other instruments and their effectiveness – were touched upon. The importance and added value of cooperation between the UN and other parties, such as the Peacebuilding Commission (PBC), was touched upon during the panel debate, as well as consideration of how this should take place. In addition, the panellists were asked how to address the systemic gaps – often caused by a problematic sequencing and prioritization of the areas of engagement, as well as inadequate mandates and programmatic support – that undermine the effectiveness of the UN: are the existing instruments sufficient to fill these gaps or do we need new mechanisms to ensure a (more) comprehensive and sustainable approach to deal with security challenges?



Introductory Note by Professor Joris Voorhoeve (University of Leiden)

Professor Voorhoeve identified six important aspects for building international peace and security, which he discussed during the introductory note of the third panel session:

- The French proposal to introduce a code of conduct in which permanent members agree not to use their veto power in cases of mass atrocities.
- The rise of India: the state, which has the world's second largest population, will have more power in world politics in the short term.
- After the UNSC approves a deviation from the prohibition of the use of force through issuing a resolution, faster military action should be pursued. Like-minded states should assemble and create a force, which can be mobilized quickly, to react promptly to UNSC mandates.
- More attention should be paid and more resources should be spent on post-conflict state-building. The international community could temporarily take over sovereignty of a state (for example, in Syria). There are successful examples of this in the past.
- The current arms treaty is obsolete: it does not attain any results. Small arms cause twenty times more casualties than weapons of mass destruction (WMD), but are easily obtainable.
- More resources should be spent on fulfilling the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), which indirectly contribute to peace and security. The world has enough money to spend on development cooperation, but does not have its priorities in order. US\$ 3,000 billion has been spent by the United States on the war in Iraq, while it would have gained a lot more credibility had those funds been spent on development cooperation or the rule of law.

Panel discussion

Moderator: Dr Eduarda Hamann (Igarapé)

During the panel debate with Kees Homan (Clingendael Institute), Jan Jaap van Oosterzee (Pax for Peace), Georg Frerks (Wageningen University), Joris Voorhoeve, which was moderated by Eduarda Hamann (Igarapé Institute), the importance of strong institutions, a common international approach to post-conflict state-building, and financial means to fulfil international ambitions were discussed.

The operationalization of the concept of human security was regarded as a problem during the panel debate, because it was argued that this concept entails too many issues, such as criminality and protection of civilians, thus rendering it too broad to be effective in the eyes of some participants.

Post-conflict state-building played an important role throughout the panel debate, because peace can only exist if there is a legitimate government.



The current international approach to post-conflict state-building is very weak, and we should embrace failures and learn from our mistakes.

Investment in such institutions calls for financial support. It was discussed whether recent budget cuts for defence have made it difficult to fulfil international ambitions. The so-called 3D approach (making use of Defence, Development and Diplomacy instruments) only works if there are enough diplomatic personnel on the ground so that substantial contributions to state-building can be made. Besides institutions, cities (and city diplomacy) have gained relevance in globalization and can thus also play an important role in state-building.

This session's speakers agreed that non-state actors play an important role, but they lack the possibility to use force – not taking into account the non-state organizations that use violence as a form of force. To reach international peace and security, 'hard power' is often required, instead of the 'soft power' of CSOs.

Session IV: Unpacking Positions and Interests on UNSC Reform

2015 will be a triple anniversary year: it will be 70 years since the creation of the UN; 50 years since the first (and last) expansion of the SC; and ten years since the start of the World Summit. This momentum should be used to breathe new life into the UNSC reform discussions. To come to a constructive idea about what these discussions should entail, the positions and interests on UNSC reform should first be unpacked. During this panel, the key challenges for UNSC reform and the underlying interests of positions with respect to membership, vetoes and working methods were discussed, with a special focus on the European Union (EU), the Netherlands and Brazil. The emergence of new actors was discussed on the first day, while the second day focused further on the ways in which the interests outside of the UNSC reform mechanisms could and should be addressed.

Introductory Note by Lydia Swart (Center for UN Reform)

Lydia Swart discussed the problems facing UNSC reform and argued that cooperation and the convergence of positions between different groups are crucial to move the reform agenda forwards. However, the current situation remains characterized by differing opinions and interests.

Efforts to reform the UNSC have been pursued for twenty years. Negotiations have been stuck for quite a while. There are considerable obstacles of a procedural nature and every grouping has internal differences that will make real compromise very hard to achieve.

Some groupings – for example, the Group of 4 (Brazil, Germany, India and Japan) – argue that with the 2015 Summit approaching, change is around the corner, because it could circumvent procedural difficulties that contribute to the slow progress. Other groups are less optimistic, however, arguing that with the two-thirds majority agreement norm, there is a good chance that the ratification threshold will not be reached.

The slow reform process frustrates many parties that are not part of the P5. Therefore, other parties increasingly come up with their own initiatives. All kinds of groups – from the UfC to the ACT – do their best to unite on UNSC reform issues, Swart argued. By cooperating, they hope to make the Council more effective and accountable, varying from the issue of working methods to the issue of two-thirds majority voting, or expansion of the UNSC. However, internal divisions within these groups decrease the likelihood of consensus and compromise.

Swart argued that the problem with adding new permanent seats to the Council is that the countries in contention would get those seats based on relative qualities that they may not necessarily possess in the future. If veto rights were effectively curtailed in cases of mass atrocities, adding a permanent African seat to the UNSC could be an option. In addition, longer-term and renewable seats could be established.

No region outside Africa currently has a strong enough supranational entity that could stimulate and coordinate regional representation on the UNSC. Every region has very strong internal divisions on this topic.

When it comes to expansion of the UNSC, the P5 members do not hold a common position. Furthermore, the P5 strongly feels that the matter of working methods is within the sole purview of the UNSC. It seems clear that the appetite to share their privileged position with others is minimal and that the P5 prefer the status quo. It is doubtful whether all P5 members will voluntarily reduce their privileges. However, Swart argued, this is exactly the point where change should take place. The need and reasons for reform are obvious, but the political will is clearly not there. Narrow national and group interests seem to trump a concerted and principled approach.

Panel discussion

Moderator: Dr Bibi van Ginkel (Clingendael Institute)

During the panel debate with Professor Edith Driessens, former Ambassador Frank Majoor, Dr Eduarda Hamann, and Lydia Swart, which was moderated by Bibi van Ginkel, various positions and interests on UNSC reform were discussed.



The panel debate showed that the EU's problem is that its member states are greatly divided when it comes to their positions and interests regarding UNSC reform. For example, the position of EU countries in the UNSC is very different from their position in the UNGA or in Brussels. It is therefore difficult for the EU to agree on a common position. Even if such a common position is reached, before adding countries to the UNSC, the question arises of whether these new countries are able to fulfil the responsibilities that their membership entails, because information and situations change on a weekly basis within the EU.

The question of regionalism was intensely debated. Would this be the only way forward? At the moment, there are no regional seats in the UNSC and the question remains whether they will ever exist. With the constant pressure of the G4 and the African group, however, something has to change, and all of the panellists agreed that the concept of regional permanent seats should be accepted.

On a higher level, international divisions make things complex, the panellists argued, with the result that the UNSC is not able to discuss in public what it discusses behind closed doors. Improvements in working methods are therefore needed. The limitation of the P5's veto rights and changes in working methods should be the first priority of UNSC reform. If the veto rights and two-thirds majority norms remain in place, change will be far from around the corner, because any reform can be blocked too easily.

The UNSC also has a legitimacy problem. Its legitimacy lies in the Charter, not with the member states. Therefore, to maintain and improve this legitimacy, the Charter needs to be changed. A suggestion was made to reduce the veto rights by eliminating the last sentence of article 23 of the UN Charter, which stipulates that non-permanent members are chosen for a period of two years. If countries can be chosen for a longer period of time, the issue of representation and inclusiveness would be partially addressed, and we could thus speak of effective permanent non-permanent seats. These measures could help to increase the UN's legitimacy. The case of an emerging country like Brazil was also discussed, highlighting that it wants to be a norm-maker instead of a norm-taker. It has a vision in which a new world order is characterized not only by hard power, but also by soft power. Moreover, to maintain and increase the UNSC's legitimacy sole objective, negotiations should also be more transparent.

Session V: High-level Addresses from the Netherlands and Brazil; Proposals for Reform from the Next Generation: Thinking Outside the Box

During Session V, Ambassador Carlos Antonio da Rocha Paranhos, Under-Secretary General for Political Affairs at the Ministry of External Relations of Brazil, and Wim Geerts, Director-General of Political Affairs at the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, delivered speeches to the speakers and conference delegates. As both speeches were delivered under Chatham House Rules, these addresses from the Netherlands and Brazil will not be published. After the high-level addresses, the winning authors of the student essay competition, who were awarded on the occasion of this symposium, had the opportunity to ask questions to Ambassador Paranhos and Mr Geerts. During the session, they had the opportunity to share their ideas on UNSC reform with the speakers and the audience.



Winning Essays

After a rigorous selection procedure, four winning essays were selected from 27 candidates. The essays focused on finding new, innovative ways to reform the UNSC and to improve its effectiveness. A short summary of the four winning essays is given below.

Security Council Reform: Towards *Ad Hoc* Security Councils

[Richard Clements](#)

The reality of international institutional reform is that ‘answers are reflective of merely temporary perceptions’. For this reason, any solution must be qualified with the concession that the challenges faced by the UNSC tomorrow may lead either to concerted action or fragmented *impasse*. Therefore, the author of the winning essay, Richard Clements, tries to go beyond the traditional approaches to UNSC reform. In doing so, he considers the contradiction between enhanced representation and effectiveness, as well as motivations for reform, the two most significant concerns of UNSC reform. Clements introduces the alternative of *Ad Hoc* Security Councils as a means to ensure greater representation while avoiding inefficacy, as well as ensuring that actors’ motivations accord with the underlying purpose of the UNSC in the twenty-first century. In such a changing international sphere, the UNSC can and must continue to provide leadership and maintain international peace and security, as it was originally tasked to do. This can be achieved by recognizing the occasional limitations of the existing model, while seeking to overcome these limitations via the alternative proposed in this essay.

Being Different Together

[Wendy Hendriks](#)

Wendy Hendriks argues that if we look at one of the UNSC’s major functions, namely peace-keeping, instead of addressing the failure of peace operations as the failure of the UN system itself, we should rather focus on how to mitigate the negative effect of the disunity in military behaviour by small-scale initiatives that are already in the preparation phase. We should aim to make it viable to be different together, which is the title of her essay. In this regard, under the name of ‘Being a Peacekeeper Series’, the International Peace Institute, in collaboration with the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations and Field Support, already took the initiative in 2010 to organize a series of high-level meetings in each region of the world to bring together not only existing but also potential contributing countries and senior UN officials. A strategic dialogue between these groups of countries provides better understanding in terms of each other’s strengths and shortcomings in advance of a peace operation. Another example of such an initiative is the ‘International Forum for the Challenges of Peace Operations’, which includes 21 partners, including the P5. Unfortunately, the Netherlands and Brazil are not among the partners.

What Makes a Just War Just? Towards More Inclusive Norms on Authorizing Force at the UN Security Council

[Rik Moors](#)

The dominance of Western-centric ‘just war’ paradigms is harming UNSC members’ ability to cooperate, and the UN’s capacity to prevent and intervene in global conflicts. Rik Moors argues that it is essential to understand non-Western theories and perspectives on international security and humanitarian intervention. Drawing other countries closer to the discussion on guidelines for intervention and prevention will provide the potential to lift norms such as the Responsibility to Protect beyond excuses to justify military intervention. Moors therefore advocates for the incorporation of non-Western, non-North Atlantic Treaty

Organization (NATO) perspectives on norms for humanitarian intervention. To substantiate this, he focuses on the case of China, a permanent UNSC member that is an aspiring responsible great power and ascendant developing country. Moors argues that as the so-called Middle Kingdom continues to grow into a global power, it needs to be taken seriously as an equal partner in the intellectual and practical challenge of the Brahimi UNSC reform report recommendation: 'the establishment by the Security Council of guidelines for future authorization of the use of force drawn from classical "just war" theory adapted to modern conditions'. These modern conditions need to account for the central place of China in the new international constellation of great powers.



The Reform of the UNSC: Why, to Whom and for What? A Critical Perspective to Get the Security Council We Need

[Gabriel Almeida Ferreira](#)

The UN is currently faced with new global threats and with the continuation of some old problems. Intrinsically related to the UNSC's mandate, dealing with these issues will determine its effectiveness, which is why discussing changes to achieve the UNSC that the world needs is so relevant. Gabriel Almeida Ferreira's essay provides us with a critical approach to key aspects surrounding the UNSC's reform. It briefly analyses the main reasons raised in the defence of such reform (the '*why*') and how it relates to the interested parties (the '*who*'). Critical focus is held on the connection between these two features (the '*why*' and '*to whom*') and the purposes of the reform ('*for what?*'). It argues that a disconnection between these features may jeopardize effective improvement of the organ. The essay concludes that structural reform is not necessarily the only way to achieve a more transparent, open and accountable UNSC.

Session VI: Creating a User-friendly Roadmap for UNSC Reform

Within a few years of the creation of the UN and its UNSC, there was an active debate on its reform. This is hardly surprising – a changing world often requires changes in the human-made institutions that are designed to manage peace, security and development. However, notwithstanding some minor shifts, the UNSC has been surprisingly resistant to meaningful reform. The last ten years have witnessed a surprisingly resilient stalemate, which risks undermining the legitimacy and authority of the UN itself. The final session of the symposium considered ways to break the deadlock. What are the practical ways to move a UNSC reform agenda forwards, both inside and outside the UN? The goal of the session was to identify ways to move innovative proposals emerging from the lofty heights of seminar discussions to the hallways of the UN and capitals around the world. The session considered how best to package key proposals for public consumption in both conventional and new social media. It also reflected on ways to use public and private diplomatic means inside and outside of the UN. It furthermore challenged Brazil and the Netherlands to identify new narratives for reform that are consistent with existing foreign policy priorities, but also aligned with core principles of the UN Charter.

Recap by the Students on the Shadow Conference and its Proposals

To learn from the younger generation – that is, the politicians, lawyers and policy-makers of tomorrow – the Clingendael Institute and *Instituto Igarapé* took the initiative to find a group of students for a shadow seminar, which took place prior to the symposium. More information about the students' shadow seminar, its organizers and their background can be found on the [website](#).



Conclusions of the Students' Seminar

The outcomes of the group seminars are grouped into three final ideas:

1. More Civil Representation and Transparency

- *Non-state and local actors* play an essential role in peace and security. These actors are often the first to observe a deterioration of the security situation, and are directly impacted by it. Their voices should therefore be better represented through briefings in the UNSC.
- *Transparency* should be increased, for instance through outreach programmes in which the UNSC shows its work to the world. Also, state and UN officials should make more use of (social) media to show their work to the public.
- *Expert groups* should advise the UNSC, to promote decisions being made on an impartial base.
- *There is a greater need for a 'bottom-up' approach*

2. Better Peacekeeping Operations

- A checklist should be developed, containing certain conditions, which a situation must meet in order for a peacekeeping operation to occur.
- Indicators should be created to assess the effectiveness of peacekeeping operations.

3. Regional Representation

- If that is not possible, more regional organization and ambition could function to increase 'competition' for UNSC seats, and possibly to motivate the UNSC to do better.

Reflection on the Main Points of the Conference by Lianne Boer (Free University of Amsterdam)

To kick off the final panel, Lianne Boer reflected on the two days of discussions. She highlighted that after two days of discussing the challenges, problems, pitfalls and difficulties that the UNSC is facing, one could easily become pessimistic and cynical about the possibilities for actual change. Despite the efforts of member states, other organizations and civil society worldwide, transition has stagnated. The UN has high hopes, aims and promises, but it constantly tries to balance this promise with its political reality, which is characterized by bureaucracy and a lack of flexibility. Is there, then, any hope left? To come up with solutions to its current problems, the mind-set of the P5 has to change. Yet how can we change their mind-set? Only if we use the youth, something that has made such a big difference in movements of the past.

Moderator: H.E. Ambassador Herman Schaper

Panel

During the final panel debate with Professor Willem van Genugten (Tilburg University), Paul Brill (*De Volkskrant*), Ahmad Fawzi (Former Communication Advisor for the UN Joint Special Envoy to Syria for Kofi Annan and Lahkdar Brahimi), Ton Huijzer (*Stichting Vluchtelingenwerk*), Jilt van Schayk (UN Youth Representative) and Professor Kees Koonings (CEDLA), which was moderated by Ambassador Herman Schaper, the discussion moved from positions and interests to practical ways in which improvements could be made to help reach successful UNSC reform. The panellists were challenged to find innovative possibilities and practical steps that could help to counter the security challenges of the future.

All of the panellists agreed that concrete plans are necessary to get the UNSC reform engine moving. However, their opinions differed when it came to the feasibility of such change. Primarily, the panellists agreed that more attention should be paid to the ability of (sub)regional organizations to foster change at the highest levels. By taking a more proactive approach *vis-à-vis* security issues in their region, regional organizations can compete with the UNSC, meanwhile pushing the latter to a less passive attitude in some cases. Simply changing practices, without going through difficult reform procedures, should furthermore render the UNSC more effective. Panellists moreover pleaded for more frequent abstentions of the veto by the P5. These steps towards change would ideally go hand in hand with good timing and public support as essential factors for sustainable change. Making use of various media outlets, including social media and advocacy campaigns by ambassadors of change and reform (perhaps even with a role for celebrities) to generate public support, the P5 needs to be influenced to at least implement practical changes.



An argument was made for the need to move the power for change outside of the UN and in doing so to make use of the younger generations. It was felt that *'the capacity of young people to see things differently, their enthusiasm and electrifying energy are crucial for change'*. The Youth Representative of the Netherlands to the UN further elaborated on this idea by also referring to the UNSC's ambition to become more representative. In this respect, he argued, it is necessary not only to support youth initiatives more fully, but younger generations should also be more actively involved during official events, such as this symposium. During the discussion, however, conference delegates emphasized that 'youth' is a state of mind. You are only too old to change when you have lost all hope.

In addition to new, innovative ideas, the approach towards reform also needs to change. Prioritizing is crucial to become more effective and successful at UN reform. In practice, however, prioritizing is too often still not the case. When the UN tries to do too much, it will not be able to fulfil all of its promises and will consequently lose its legitimacy. As a result, the UN will not succeed. For example, it was argued that the UN's focus should be aimed at peacekeeping, planning and coordination in the longer term, because effectiveness in peacekeeping is vital for the UN's legitimacy and its success on the ground.

The issue of representation remained one of the key problems throughout the conference. The question that remained unanswered at the end of the debate was how to include the voices of groups that are unheard in societies throughout the world on a daily basis, such as poor populations without access to a larger public, war victims, and (ex-)child soldiers.

Concluding Observations

Change always starts somewhere. When discussing new narratives for UNSC reform, it is impossible to decide immediately what these new narratives should become. During the symposium, however, it became possible to explore new thoughts for improving the effectiveness, representativeness and the legitimacy of the UN on the peace and security agenda.

These terms seem to be hard to reconcile, when taken as the main goals against which UNSC reform should be measured. However, when applied to the UN system as a whole, these terms set a goal, which is and should be attainable, simply by living up to its potential.

There is, however, a risk of reform fatigue. The debates on reform are circulating again and again, and it seems to be impossible to break out of those circles. Reform talks have been ongoing for decades, without many results. It is therefore necessary to learn from the past when looking at the future.

To give the negotiations for reform any chance, the topics on the reform agenda need to be divided into manageable components, without losing the required interlinkages for overall reform. Taking the negotiations on working methods out of the official reform negotiations, for example, might speed up the process on improving working methods, and bring some quicker results.

In order to live up to the promise and potential of the UN, we should take a closer look at the possibility of merely improving the practices of the different UN agents, for instance in the area of peacekeeping. Doing so is moreover of tremendous importance for the UN's image and reputation, and hence its legitimacy, for as Thomas Franck argued with respect to the binding force of international law, legitimacy is the 'pull to compliance' of international law. Yet this could just as well be said about other kinds of international commitments. When there is compliance, there is effectiveness.

Improving the working methods of the UNSC – by better engagement, more open consultations, public motivations for vetoes that are cast and voluntary abstentions instead of vetoes in cases of mass atrocities (as per the French proposal), or indeed a gradual reduction of the use of the veto generally – would also improve legitimacy and effectiveness, even though it still does not repair the need for better geographical representation.

Another suggestion was made to amend article 23 (2) of the UN Charter, by taking out the sentence that renders it impossible for non-permanent members to be re-elected immediately after their term, and introducing permanent re-election of big states such as Brazil and India on non-permanent seats. However, before truly aiming for UNSC reform, the mind-set of the P5 needs to be changed. In doing so, engagement on common interests will be crucial.

Non-state actors such as regional organizations like the Arab League or the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS), but also the G20, have more room to manoeuvre and can therefore challenge the UN on peace and security agendas, encouraging it to become more susceptible to change and reform. In this way, creating external competition could move the UNSC reform agenda forwards.



Moreover, more engagement is needed with the emergence of new powers, such as India and Brazil and other non-violent non-state actors. For example, the youth also needs to be empowered to contribute to state-building in post-conflict situations. However, states need to keep on playing their important part in the political game. More specifically, the P5 play a major role in deliberations on many agendas, since they are the ones that in the end have the power to block any reform.

Well-organized campaigns by civil society could call for more engagement and accountability, as well as for more effective action by the UN on peace and security concerns and issues of reform. This should at least trigger better outreach on the ‘service delivery’ undertaken by the UNSC on the issues on its agenda. As the number of ‘likes’ on the UN Facebook page is only 1.6 million, which is very low compared to some famous people – to compare: pop singer Lady Gaga has over 67 million Facebook ‘likes’ – the UN should definitely step up its efforts. The perception that it is an elite club that not only has the prerogative to take the decisions, but moreover can hardly be held publicly accountable for its actions and inactions, is bad for its image, yet this is far easier to repair than going through a complete reform process. More engagement with youth on peace and security themes – either through youth leadership programmes, capacity programmes, or otherwise – was furthermore felt by the symposium’s participants to be an important avenue for outreach that can be done by the UNSC as well as by other actors. Youth and other civic movements can furthermore call for better leadership on these important issues, and can align their actions, for instance with the ‘1 for 7 Billion’ campaign, which advocates for a new Secretary-General who can show the leadership that the UN needs.

In the same realm, youth and civic movements in each of the P5 countries could organize themselves to influence public opinion on the role that the governments of the P5 countries play in the UNSC, and through bottom-up approaches that warm public opinion to the need for reform, which is otherwise still mostly blocked by the P5 countries.

It is also important to realize that recent history has shown the revolutionary power that can be rallied by civic movements in order to change the social and political order within countries. However, follow-up and good strategy planning for the subsequent phase of a revolution is in many cases missing in order to prevent social structures from crumbling down. The challenge is therefore to support civil society organizations that can play such a crucial role in societies as a whole, also on security agendas. The UNSC could profit from more engagement with civil society, and civil society would also help the UNSC to be better informed about certain situations on the ground. Civil society organizations can also function as watchdogs *vis-à-vis* the performance of states as well as international organizations, including the UN. Moreover, because they possess early-warning mechanisms, as well as state-building, peace-brokering, conflict prevention and human rights capacities, civil society organizations could partner with the UN in post-conflict situations.

In addition, city diplomacy can also play a role when thinking about reform questions. For example, city diplomacy may help other cities to improve their local governance structures.

Finally, there is a need for more emphasis on soft power measures and prevention. This is not a matter of funds, but a matter of priorities. For this kind of change, a new mind-set needs to exist. Even though hard security is still the norm, making use of a human security lens could offer a new narrative in the future.

As contradictory as it might seem to be called the United Nations while the first words of the Charter read '*We the peoples*', the UN's working approach is very state-centric, and we need to realize that the UN is much more than the UN organization. It is more than the system. It is the cradle of universal values of peace, human rights and human dignity. As human beings, we own these values; they are not something that any state or organization can give us. These values are absolute.

In sum, we should strive for better representation and more inclusiveness in the UN, as well as in the discussions about the ways in which the UNSC should be reformed. However, this responsibility not only lies with the current members themselves. Even though their mind-set needs to be changed in order to change existing rules, which would make the UNSC more effective, the new emerging actors also need to be engaged and to fight for their place. To achieve the representation and inclusiveness that they want, the people for whom the UN was established 70 years ago should challenge the UN's own cradle by developing a world-wide civil movement.

Civil groups all around the world need to establish well-organized campaigns to involve everyone: from younger generations and poorer populations to the ones in power. The recent past has shown that such campaigns can actually make a difference, because they address everyone rather than a small group.

The biggest challenge for such a civil movement will be the necessity for unification and cooperation. The civil groups need to unite to make an impact and to move the traditional actors in the right direction. Before being able to unite successfully, however, they need to agree on their positions and accept each other's interests. This will be the first step of the long walk to representation and inclusiveness.

Annex



Setting a progressive United Nations peace and security agenda: searching for new narratives

10 and 11 November 2014

Venue: Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs.



#UNSCReform
@UNSC_Reform

PROVISIONAL AGENDA

10 November 2014

UN Reform: Matching guiding principles, actors and factors of influence with contemporary and pressing demands

- | | |
|-------------|---|
| 09:00-09:30 | Registration and coffee |
| 09:30-10:45 | Welcome and keynote speech
Welcome on behalf of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs by the Special Envoy for UN Affairs, Dr. Bahia Tahzib
Opening by the Conference Chair: H.E. Ambassador Herman Schaper
Keynote speaker: Prof. dr. Marianne van Leeuwen, University of Amsterdam,
<i>The need for reform of the UNSC</i> |
| 10:45-11:15 | Coffee break / refreshments |
| 11:15-12:45 | Session I: “Communio est mater discordiarum” |

Is the United Nations, a twentieth century institution, fit for purpose to face twenty-first century challenges? The panel in the opening session will focus on the new and emerging trends with respect to security challenges for the future. What is needed to face these challenges and what should be the guiding principles? What is the risk of securitization of the agenda? Likewise, attention will be given to innovative ways to promote development as a tool of conflict prevention and peace promotion.

Introductory note: Prof. dr. Wouter Werner, Free University of Amsterdam

Panel:

Prof. dr. Jaap de Wilde, University of Groningen

Mr. Lars van Troost, Amnesty International

Ms Matilda Flemming, United Network of Young Peacebuilders (UNOY)

Moderator: Mrs. Godelieve van Heteren

12:45-14:00 Lunch

Lunch will be served in the Lounge. At 13.00 hrs, the National Memorial Service on the Downing of Flight MH17 will be broadcasted in the Max van der Stoel meeting room for participants who would like to follow the service.

14:00-15:30 **Session II – A Changing World with emerging powers, new stakeholders and other factors of influence**

Globalisation, multipolarity, grass-root initiated mechanisms of change, and technological developments especially with regard to communications are all factors of influence with regard to the way the international community can organize itself with regard to preserving peace and security. New actors, such as emerging powers, multinational cooperations, and civil society, with different priorities will try to influence the agenda for sustainable security and development, including in the context of the post-2015 agenda. They will consider whether existing tools and procedures are adequate, and what kinds of upgrades are needed. What will or need to be their position with regard to the reform of the UNSC?

Introductory note: Prof. Jaap de Wilde (University of Groningen)

Panel:

Mr. Fulco van Deventer, Human Security Collective

Dr. Caroline van Leenders, Netherlands Enterprise Agency

Moderator: Prof. dr. Yvonne Donders, University of Amsterdam

15:30-15:45 Coffee break / refreshments

15:45-17:15 **Session III – “The world is over-armed and peace is underfunded” (UN Secretary-General Ban Ki Moon)**

What are the main trends for the next 5 or 10 years in terms of financing peace and security? How does this relate to the trends of funding development assistance? Can Brazil and the Netherlands play any decisive role in changing the current situation?

Introductory note: Prof. dr. Joris Voorhoeve, former Minister of Defence, chairman Oxfam International

Panel:

Gen. (ret) Kees Homan, Clingendael Institute

Mr. Jan Jaap van Oosterzee, Pax for Peace

Prof. dr. Georg Frerks, Dutch Defence Academy

Moderator: Dr. Eduarda Hamann, Igarapé

17:15-17:30 Wrap up by the Conference Chair

11 November 2014

The UN Security Council reform: Imagine the future

09:00-09:30 Registration and coffee

09:30-11:00 Session IV Unpacking positions and interests on UNSC reform

What are the key most challenging issues for the UNSC reform? What are the underlying interests, not only the positions, of the main actors or group of actors when dealing with the core themes of the UNSC reform, such as membership and working methods?

Introductory note: Mrs. Lydia Swart, Center for UN Reform Education, NY

Panel discussion:

Dr. Edith Drieskens, Catholic University of Leuven

Dr. Eduarda Hamann, Igarapé

Mr. Frank Majoor, Former Ambassador of the Netherlands to the Permanent Mission to the UN (NY)

Moderator: Dr. Bibi van Ginkel, Clingendael

11:00-11:30 Coffee break / refreshments

11:30-13:00 Session V: – High-level addresses by Ministers from the Netherlands and Brazil; Proposals for reform from the next generation: thinking out of the box

Opening by the Conference Chair: H.E. Ambassador Herman Schaper

Presenting the winning essays of the student essay contest, by the President of the Jury

Address by the Director General of Political Affairs of the Dutch Ministry of Foreign Affairs, mr. Wim Geerts

Address by the Under-Secretary of External Relations of Brazil, H.E. Mr. Carlos Antonio da Rocha Paranhos, Undersecretary for Political Affairs

Questions by the Students to the speakers

13:00-14:30 Lunch

14:30-16:30 Session VI: Creating a user-friendly roadmap for UNSC reform

“Ubi homo, ibi jus. Ubi societas, ibi jus”.

Locating new narratives for UNSC reform that emphasize peace and security

“A digito cognoscitur leo” / “In dubio pro libertate”

Within years of the creation of the UN and its Security Council, there has been an active debate on its reform. This is hardly surprising – a changing world often requires changes in the human-made institutions designed to manage peace, security and development. And yet notwithstanding some minor shifts, the UNSC has been surprisingly resistant to meaningful reform. The last ten years have witnessed a surprisingly resilient stalemate, one that risks undermining the legitimacy and authority of the UN itself. The final session will consider ways of breaking the deadlock. What are the practical ways to move a UNSC reform agenda

forward in and outside of the United Nations? The goal of the session is to identify ways of moving innovative proposals emerging from the lofty heights of seminar discussion to the hallways of the United Nations and capitals around the world. The session will consider how best to package key proposals for public consumption in both conventional and new social media. It will also reflect on ways of using public and private diplomatic means inside and outside of the United Nations. It will challenge Brazil and the Netherlands to identify new narratives for reform, ones that are consistent with existing foreign policy priorities but also aligned with core principles of the UN Charter. The goal will be to identify some practical strategies moving forward.

Panel moderator: H.E. Ambassador Herman Schaper

Rapporteur of Student Shadow Seminar on UN Reform

Rapporteur on main points during two Symposium days, Ms. Lianne Boer, Free University of Amsterdam

Panel:

Prof. Willem van Genugten, University of Tilburg

Mr. Paul Brill, Volkskrant,

Mr. Ahmad Fawzi, Former UN Joint Special Envoy to Syria for mr. Kofi Annan

Mr. Ton Huijzer, Refugee Foundation (Stichting Vluchteling)

Jilt van Schayk, Youth Representative to the United Nations

Prof. Kees Koonings, CEDLA, University of Amsterdam and University of Utrecht

16:30-16:45 **Closing remarks by H.E. Ambassador Herman Schaper and Dr. Bibi van Ginkel (Clingendael)**

16.45 Reception