ANTON GRIZOLD*

Institutionalization of the prevention and solution of conflicts among states

The development of international mechanisms for ensuring international peace and security

Ideas on how to organize an international system in which wars between states would no longer be possible go far back in the history of international relations. The development of the contemporary state was followed by the first serious attempt to prevent the outbreak of war between states within a European concept, established after the defeat of Napoleon in 1815.

However, the European concept was overtaken by entropy (the Crimean War and the Paris Peace Congress of 1856) which completely consumed it with the outbreak of World War I.

European states started shaping rules for solving conflicts between states at the Hague Conferences of 1899 and 1907. That, however, did not prevent the out break of the first World War. The old system of balance of power, as an instrument for ensuring international peace and security was primarily blamed by many for this. Traditionally, the system of balance of power is a silent agreement between states on the division of power between them in such a way that one cannot be threatened by the other. The key principle of this system for ensuring international peace and security is based on the expectation of states that the potential aggressor may reconsider attacking its potential victim because of the latter's strength, or capability of inflicting unacceptably heavy damage.

The basic aim of the system of balance of power was not primarily in preventing the outbreak of war between states, but rather in preserving the balance and with it the national sovereignties and systems of the states that formed this balance.[1]

Many were convinced by World War I that wars will continue to occur as long as national states are responsible for their own defence and thus "caught" in a vicious circle of armament and mutual competition. At the same time, the first world war finally devalued the traditional concept of national defence with the armed forces as its principal instrument.[2]

* Dr. Anton Grizold, docent na FDV v Ljubljani.

[1] David. P. Barash, Introduction to Peace Studies, Wadsworth Publishing Company, Belmont, California, 1991, pages 324–327.

[2] The use of force and threat of using it are the basic characteristics of international relations' dynamics, which help in defining the significance of the defence dilemma phenomenon. This dilemma arises from the contradictions between ensuring a state's military defence and its national security. These are most obvious in two cases:firstly, when the state's defence budget prevents the achievement of other national security objectives, and secondly, when defence preparedness may be more threatning to the state (economic damage etc) than outside threats. For the time being, the defence dilemma is insoluble since continuous contradictions between national defence and national security prevent the isolation of defence

The traditional concept of national defence should be supplemented by the idea of collective security which has also gained importance because the first world war proved yet again that war was an unacceptable means of politics for contemporary states. However, recognizing war as a threat did not spontaneously abolish threat(s) of war. Alongside fear of defeat, fear of war also emerged among states. So the importance of forming an appropriate system of collective security for the prevention of war grew, where until then, mechanisms for consultation and co-operation prevailed, primarily between the big powers. The system of collective security gradually began to take shape through the Vienna Congress, the League of Nations, and the United Nations Organization. The essence of collective security is that states within this system bind themselves not to use force against other member states; however, should one of the members attack another, all other members act together against the aggressor state. The main difference between the system of collective security and the system of balance of power is that the first is based on the participation of every individual state as a nonaligned entity, in contrast to the formation of unstable and constantly changing alliances in the system of balance of power.[3]

The system of collective security may have some advantages over the system of balance of power, namely:

a) in the system of collective security its members agree to oppose every act of aggression with force, while in the latter system the potential aggressor may speculate with a "minor" breach of the agreement as long as the other participants do not consider the balance in the system to be disturbed;[4]

b) in the system of balance of power, the attainment of greater power of one state on account of another one may be in the interest of a third state, which usually supports the aggressor-state, in contrast to the system of collective security. In the mid 18th century, when Frederich the Great of Prussia aggressively annexed the Austrian province of Silesia, France sided with him, since this diminished the power of Austria, who was at the time France's greatest rival.[5]

However, it should also be noted that the system of collective security begun with the League of Nations, which formed the rules for coexistence of states on the basis of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, and suppression of the

---

from the sphere of security for the following reasons:

1. military threats are constant and society is forced to arm;

2. historically the existence of national defence is based on the fact that the majority of states were established by using a certain amount of armed force, and

3. national defence cannot be abolished until an efficient system of collective security is established. (See more on this topic in Barry Buzan's People, States and Fear, Harvester Wheatsheaf, London, 1991, pages 271–291).

The classical question concerning national security is also:

How much is enough?, i. e. what armed force is considered sufficient for successful defence from potential, and real sources of outside threat? The answer to this question concerns the term known as the "security dilemma" in international relations. Henry Kissinger defined it in the following manner:the efforts of one state to achieve absolute security will cause other states to feel absolutely threatened. These states will try to achieve greater security by developing their own military potential, thus this spiral of armament will continue. More on this:H. Ullman, Securing Europe, Twentieth Century Fund, Inc., 1991, page 38. Also see: Martin Edmonds, Armed Services and Society, Leicester University Press, London, 1988, pages 2–3.

[3] David P. Barash, op. cit., page 330.

[4] No larger European state reacted when the balance of power preponderated to Prussia in mid 1880s, eg.: Bismarck's aggressive annexation of Alsace-Lorraine, which caused the outbreak of the Franco-Prussian war several years later.

[5] David P. Barach, op. cit., page 331.

use of force in solving disputes among them, to the present day has not proved optimum or effective. There are several reasons for this:

a) agreements on collective security are successful only if there is readiness and interest of all the signatories to respect them;

b) since states incorporated in the system of collective security have a different "weight" in shaping and conducting world politics there is a possibility that stronger states may prolong, or intensify an international armed conflict (eg. the war between North and South Korea could have been different had not the USA and China been involved, the Vietnam War, etc);

c) there are examples even of allies attacking each other (eg.: the military intervention of the Soviet Union in Afghanistan, or the US military interventions in the Dominican Republic in 1965, in Grenada in 1983, etc).[6]

Collective Security within the League of Nations (LN)

This presupposed that states believed in the indivisibility of international security, as well as in their automatic and indivisible right to security.

The League of Nations was established in 1920. In the Covenant of the LN the member states committed themselves to refrain from the use of force in their mutual relations, and to settle their mutual disputes through arbitation or the Council of the LN. The latter was composed on similar lines as the Security Council of the United Nations, i. e. of big powers as permanent members, and of a varying number of non-permanent members. The Council's primary responsibility was the maintenance of world peace.

The mission of the League of Nations was successful only as long as there were no serious international crises. Thus it assisted in solving armed conflicts between Bulgaria and Greece (1925), Lithuania and Poland (1927), and Bolivia and Paraguay (1932). On the other hand, when bigger and more powerful states became involved in international conflicts, the LN could not be a match for them.[7]

The primary reason for this lay in the obvious gap between the expectations of the founders of the LN about its universal nature, and the actual situation. In addition, there were several other factors that contributed to the failure and disintegration of the LN, namely:[8]

a) different, even conflicting interests that existed among stronger states prevented them from giving their support to solve international conflicts within the LN;

b) non-membership of some important states prevented the adopted sanctions from being carried out against potential aggressors. Although Woodrow Wilson was the intellectual father of the LN, the USA was not a member of this internati-

---

[6] David P. Barash, op. cit., page 331.

[7] Eg. the Japanese occupation of Manchuria in 1931. The LN set up a commission to investigate the case; after a year and a half it produced its final report in which Japan was named as the aggressor. However, since Japan had not formally declared war, the principles of the LN had no legal basis. So the LN could only morally condemn and refute the legitimacy of the Japanese occupation. Japan simply withdrew from the LN. The key crisis which directly contributed to the disintegration of the LN's authority and the organization as such , was the Italian occupation of Abyssina (Ethiopia) in 1935. The LN accused Italy as the aggressor and even proposed a number of economic sanctions. These were not effective primarily because many important states such as the USA, Germany, Japan were not members of the LN.

[8] David P. Barash, op. cit., pages 383–385.

onal organization. Germany joined the LN in 1926, and withdrew from it in 1933 after the LN refused to lift the restrictions that had been laid out in the Treaty of Versailles, on its armament;

c) narrow national interests prevented the functioning of the system of collective security, which also presupposes the indivisibility of international peace;

d) questions related to the definition of aggression, whose origins were both theoretical (in guaranteeing its universality and validity in all cases and always) and concrete, based on the intricate and interconnected examples in the international surroundings.

In spite of the overall failure of the LN (it finally disintegrated in 1946), it was an important step in organizing the international political community towards institutionalizing different international mechanisms for the peaceful settlement of disputes among states through a system of collective security.

Collective Security within the UNO

The establishment of an international organization that would take care of international peace and security more efficiently that the LN had done was being considered even during the second word war by the anti-Hitler coalition. That is why the Atlantic Charter, which was signed in 1941 by Franklin Delano Roosevelt and Winston Churchill, states that all countries must abanden the use of force.[9]

The formal idea on creating an international organization for the maintenance of international peace was confirmed by Roosevelt, Churchill and Stalin at the Teheran Conference in 1943, and implemented by the delegates of 50 states in San Francisco, where they adopted the Charter of the United Nations in spring of 1945. The two essential differences between the UNO and its predecessor the LN are firstly, that the UNO represents the global community and thereby confirms its universal character, and secondly, besides maintaining international peace and security, the UNO also has many other important functions such as: economic, social, educational, humanitarian, scientific, etc.

In order to carry out these functions, the UNO has a structure with the following elements:

a) The Security Council (SC), which has primary responsibility for settling requests concerning "international peace and security". The SC adopts decisions for concrete actions of the UN (military and non-military) on solving conflicts between states.

The SC is composed of 5 permanent members-big powers (USA, United Kingdom, France, China and Russia, as the most important successor of the former USSR), and 10 non-permanent members. The permanent members of the SC have the right of veto.

---

[9] Harry B. Hollins, Averill L. Powers and Mark Sommer, The Conquest of War, Westview Press In., Boulder, 1989, page 21.

b) The General Assembly is composed of representatives of all the member states of the UNO, and is the most important decision making organ on economic, political, educational and other matters, with the exception of international peace and security, where it may only recommend solutions.

c) The Economic and Social Council is responsible for questions relating to the quality of life.

d) The International Court of Justice in the Hague deals with international disputes.

e) The Trusteeship Council supervises the results of the process of decolonization (liberalization of former colonies).

f) The Secretariat is the administrative-executive organ of the UN and is headed by the Secretary-General.

Mechanisms of the UNO for the prevention and the solution of conflicts among states

The Charter of the United Nations emphasizes that the most important goal of this organization is "to maintain internationl peace and security by peaceful means, and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law, to that end: take collective measures for the prevention and removal of threats to peace, for the prohibition (and suppression) of acts of aggression and breaches other of the peace, and adjustment or settlement of international disputes or situations which could threaten peace in the world.[10]

In order to achieve these goals, a number of concrete measures are necessary. These are adopted by the SC, and their formal basis are Chapters VI and VII of the Charter of the UN. Chapter VI determines that all international disputes "which are likely to endanger international peace and security" become a matter to be settled by the SC or the General Assembly. The SC has the authority to turn to the parties to a dispute, and to call upon them to settle it by peaceful means. The SC may also recommend to the parties to a dispute, appropriate procedures or methods for solving the dispute. In this case, the activity of the SC is limited to shaping propositions for the solution of international disputes, since in reality, the states which are involved should be the ones to solve the dispute by voluntarily carrying out the SC's recommendations. However, when the SC determines the existence of a serious threat to the peace, or an act of aggression, it may use broader competences given to it in Chapter VII of the UN Charter. In order to prevent the aggravation of a concrete international conflict situation the SC may make recommendations to the parties in the conflict to solve it. Furthermore, according to Article 41 the SC may decide on what measures (with the exception of the use of force), adopted by the members of the UN, may be applied against a state which is threatening international peace and security. These include complete or partial interruption of economic relations and of rail, sea, air, postal and telegraphic services, and the severance of diplomatic relations. If these measures prove to be inadequate, the SC may, in accordance with Article 42 of the Charter of the UN, consider taking even military action to maintain international peace and security. All members of the UN are obliged to make available to the SC the

[10] The Blue Helmets, A Review of United Nations Peace-keeping. United Nations Department of Public Information, August, 1990, page 3.

necessary armed forces, appropriate assistance and facilities. The SC assisted by the Military Staff Committee determines plans on the use of armed force in solving international conflicts.

Measures which are defined in Articles 41 and 42 of the Charter of the UN are the core of the system of collective security. The basic driving force of the system is understanding and co-operation among the permanent members of the SC, which have a right of veto and control the functioning of the Military Staff Committee, made up of their military representatives.[11]

Article 33 of the Charter of the UN obliges all its members, first of all to solve their conflicts directly between themselves, and only after that turn them over to the SC. In this they may also apply different forms of solving conflicts within the framework of regional international organizations (CSCE, European Union, Organization of African Unity, etc) such as: negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement.[12]

While the League of Nations provided economic and financial against measures the offendor in cases of aggression or use of force for solving international conflicts, the Charter of the UN prohibits the use of force more fully, i. e. for a violator of the Principles of the world organization, economic, diplomatic and military sanctions are provided. At the same time, it demands that all members make available a certain part (contingent) of its armed forces for the UN forces. However, until now it has not been possible to put consistently into practise all of these provisions, the main reason being that, in accordance with the Charter of the UN, each collective action (military or non-military) has depended on the consensus of the SC permanent members. On the other hand, the logic of ideological and political globalism, which lasted from the end of the second world war to 1989, prevented the functioning of the UN mechanism of collective security.[13]

In the post-war period, the UN has on two occasions decided on collective armed action against the violator of the Principles of the UN Charter: firstly against Korea, and later against Iraq. In the first instance, the USA succeeded in evading the veto of the Soviet Union by diverting the decision concerning the military action from the SC (where the Soviet Union's representative was absent at the time because of a boycott) to the General Assembly. Furthermore, although a number of states took part in the military operation in South Korea, the largest contingent, armament and equipment was provided by the USA, who also commanded the whole operation.

In fact this was a classical military operation which has been known from the times of military alliances among states. A variant to this is also the so-called Gulf

---

[11] The Blue Helmets, op. cit., pages 3–4.

[12] The Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Društvo za ZN R Slovenije, 1992, page 19.

[13] The first misunderstandings occured in the Military Staff Committee, which was to determine the military requirements (armament, disarmament, command, etc) for the employment and command of forces to be made available to it by the member states. The five permanent members carried out intensive, 15 month negotiations on this matter from 1945 to 1947.

The first task of this Committee was to improve on Article 43 of the UN Charter, which determines that all members of the UN are obliged to make available to the SC, on its call, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, necessary for maintaining international peace and security. Theoretically, in this way the UN could have gathered strong collective armed forces under the SC's command, to be used against any potential aggressor. However, because of misunderstandings between the permanent members Article 43 remained ineffective. While the USA had suggested the formation of a large military force under the leadership of the SC, emphasizing its mobility and great striking power, other permanent members, especially the Soviet Union, had serious reservations to this proposal. Harry B. Hollins et al, op. cit., pages 24–25.

War, in which the USA, under the UN, gathered a strong military coalition force and forced Iraq to withdraw from the territories it had occupied in Kuwait. In this case, the interests of one superpower (USA) were closely linked with the interests of occupied Kuwait to get rid of the occupier (Iraq). The atmosphere of easing of tension between the superpowers also contributed to this.

The functioning of the system of collective security within the framework of the UNO has so far been hampered by the cold war, as well as other factors such as:

a) The effectiveness of this system depends on the consensus of (primarily) the permanent members on whether to reduce their own national armed forces, or whether to enlarge the international forces under the UN so that the latter would be stronger than the armed forces of individual states. This has caused a vicious circle, namely: collective security cannot function unless states are appropriately disarmed, states will not do this until collective security has proved its effectiveness and credibility.[14]

b) The right of veto of the permanent members of the SC (determined in Yalta and in San Francisco) was at the time an expression of political necessity, because without this right, none of the big powers would have signed the document on the establishment of the UNO. At the same time, the permanent members of the SC, who have the greatest possibilities of abusing their great military power, were also protected from UN sanctions.

c) The failed attempt of the big powers (permanent members of the SC) to agree on the formation of an appropriate collective security force for the maintenance of international peace and security was a significant signal to the other, militarily weaker members of the world organization, that in ensuring their own security they could not primarily depend on the UN.

d) Many analysts stress that the Charter of the UN is distinctly a document from the post-war period when the founders were still very much under the influence of a possible reemergence of Japanese or German militarism, and did not anticipate the fateful split between the East and the West.

e) Collective security as conceived by the founders is based primarily on the strategy of stopping a war by going to war.

Looking back, it seems hardly likely that such a punitive strategy could have achieved any real reconciliation between the warring sides.[15]

The development of international relations since the second world war has exposed that many differences exist among all the members of the World Organization, not only among the permanent members of the SC. Numerous international conflicts are primarily conditional on the economic and political organization of the contemporary world, whose fundamental starting points are in the concept of national sovereignty and territorial integrity of the contemporary state. That is why the UNO, in spite of its universal character, does not act like a universal/global government, and its goals, resolutions and actions are not above the national interests of its members.

---

[14] Harry B. Hollins et al. op. cit., pages 26–27.
[15] Harry B. Hollins et al. op. cit., pages 26–27.

The basic function of the UNO for the maintenance of international peace and security is aquiring new dimensions in the new cultural-civilisation relations

At the present stage of development of the world, international security is not merely a sum of national securities, but also means determining appropriate values in international relations, as well as in relations within the state. In an increasingly interdependent world, national survival requires a constant international framework of generally acceptable values, upon which international subjects regulate their mutual relations.

International security indicates the intricacy and stratification of international relations, the level of the integration and globalization processes, the effectivness or ineffectivness of mechanisms for ensuring national and international security, the level of military-political, economic and other relations among states, etc.[16] In this respect, international security is a sum of measures which ensure the existence of all states, the fundamental condition for the existence and development of the international community.

The efficiency of ensuring international peace and security that has been achieved so far by the systems of balance of power and/or collective security, is now being limited by new elements in the contemporary world. Both of the mentioned systems are based on the principles of national sovereignty and territorial integrity, which direct states, in an unfriendly and even hostile international environment, to strive at all costs to preserve their national independence and improve their own national security by attaining a dominant position in the international community. The principle here is that one state gains on account of another. Interdependence in international relations among states has grown significantly during the 80s.

Co-operation among states, which is aimed at achieving common benefits rather than individual ones of one state on account of another, is required for the solution of numerous economic, environmental and developmental questions.

Taking into consideration the radical changes which have occured in the international community, the last two-year period may be defined as a unique turning point in contemporary inter-state relations. New relations which are now being established among states will have particular long-term effects on individual states, and the world as a whole. Changes such as the end of the cold war and the lifting of the iron curtain, which had separated states for decades, the fall of communist regimes in the East, the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact, the unification of Germany, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia and the establishment of new, independent states on the territories of these two former states, the institutionalization of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (CSCE), have once more proved the necessity of shaping, i. e. applying a new qualitative approach for ensuring security in the contemporary world. These and other changes in the international community have established favourable conditions for the following:

– surmounting ideological-political antagonisms, which have for decades separated contemporary states,
– "taming" military hostilities and conflicts,
– forming new structures for the ensurance of national and international securi-

---

[16] Mario Nobilo. Pojam sigurnosti u terminologiji međunarodnih odnosa. Politika misao. Vol. XXV (1988). pages 72–73.

ty, as a means for the peaceful solution of conflicts between states and within them,

– carrying out the ideas and proposals on the modernization of national military-defence systems, which were based almost exclusively on the philosophy of armed threat and doctrines of armed defence after the second world war.

The realization of the mentioned development possibilities of contemporary security may enable the strengthening of new civilization relations in the world, in which the following should be stressed:

– military power, traditionally the central element of power of national states, is increasingly being replaced by other factors such as: communication, organization and the institution capabilities of a contemporary state;[17]

– because of growing interdependence among states, the borders of national sovereignty, which overlap with state frontiers, are being seen as an obstruction to a successful and democratic settlement of numerous current international problems (ecology, epidemics, terrorism, etc);

– democratic freedoms and human rights are becoming effective as the paramount values of every society, and the international community as a whole, etc.

In today's multipolar[18] world, alongside positive trends in the field of national and international security, new tensions and threats are also emerging, namely:

– many problems and questions are imminent to the West European integration processes, thus creating new dangers (eg. new forms of ethnic competition and confrontation, problems of legitimacy of individual states and their governments);

– changes in East European countries, in transit from totalitarian to pluralistic and democratic societies, have so far primarily had effect on the political systems, while social-economic, national and other matters are just becoming complicated;

– the whole structure of world political power has undergone change. The USA are topping the pyramid of world power, with the possibility of Western Europe and Japan joining it. Especially in the case of the latter, there is an obvious asymmetry between its economic and political significance in the world on one side, and its position in decision-making on the most important international issues on the other;

– in spite of talks being initiated (in 1991) between the sides which have been in dispute for decades in the Middle East, the end of dangers and hostilities in this region cannot be foreseen, at least not in the near future: the Israeli-Arab conflict, the Arab-Arab conflicts (Iraq-Iran, Iraq-Syria, etc), the Kurd question in Iran, Iraq and Turkey, etc;

– two big states, India and China, are currently pre-occupied with internal problems, primarily on their economic growth. Whereas in India this issue is connected to its unsolved relations with Pakistan, in China it is linked to regional imbalances. In addition, China's foreign policy (especially with regards to Cambodia, Vietnam and Tibet) is conditioned more by its geopolitical strategy, whose origins are in its history, rather than the current economic and security situation.

– developing countries (where I include most of the Third World countries) are still an important factor of international peace and security. Besides having pro-

---

[17] Joseph S. Nye, Jr., "The Changing Nature of World Power", PREGLED, January, 1991, page 5.

[18] S. P. Huntington defines the world of today as a uni-multipolar world with an overpowering singular power – USA, and 6 states, big powers – the Soviet Union (i. e. Russia as its successor), Japan, China, Germany, Great Britain, France. Following them are the emerging powers of the Third World, where India is currently among the most important and with a tendency to predominate over the region. S. P. Huntington, America's Changing Strategic Interests, Survival, Vol. 33, No. 1, January–February 1991, page 6.

blems in their relations with wealthier states (indebtedness, etc), they are also facing serious internal problems (ethnic and other conflicts in Latin American, African and Asian countries);

– the modernization of war and military doctrines in many countries is not directed at eliminating the army, but rather in organizing smaller, professional armed forces with sophisticated armament;

– the disintegration of the former Soviet Union and the dismantling of the Warsaw Pact have resulted in military bloc monism (NATO) on the one hand, and the existence of a single military super power (USA) on the other.

In this context, one of the the key questions of the contemporary world is how to achieve that degree of security which is necessary for the creation of the maximum quality of an individual's life, society and the international community. Contemporary states try to achieve various security aspects of the whole society through national security systems. However, experience has shown that the majority of states are not all that successful in this. At the same time, it is important to stress that there is no system which can assure a society's complete, i. e. absolute security, we can only get more or less close to this goal. On the other hand, states, within their national security, until recently paid greatest attention to stengthening their armed forces.

There are indications that an increasing number of contemporary states are realising that even in the present circumstances of civilisation, national security is structurally linked to a society's other basic needs, and that its contents are much broader. Societies-states and the whole international community are faced with the demand to re-shape the contents of security, taking into account two concepts: universality, which means recognizing the substantial wholeness of the present defitition of security, and demilitarization[19], which enables the abolition of asymmetric national and international security in the form of a marked dependency on military mechanisms.[20]

The existing world relations are conditioning a new approach in assuring contemporary security, to which many had already pointed in the past. The essence of this "new" approach to the security issue, as a fundamental element of an individual's life and work and of a society, is to make a step forward from merely solving the problem (where armed defence is the predominant element in the national security system) to assuring integral security which considers different aspects of the quality of life and defence in a particular society , as well as the international community.[21]

Apart from the traditional concept of assuring security at the level of the national state and the international community, different alternative aspects were constantly appearing. An important attempt at an alternative concept of assuring international security was collective security within the League of Nations, which

---

[19] Demilitarization in this case means a process stimulated by development changes which have taken place in states and the international community until now, whereby a qualitative new approach to the institutional assurance of national and international security is being developed, i. e. by balancing military and non-military mechanisms, and simultaneously by reducing the significant influence of the military factor. More on this:Anton Grizold et al, Demilitarizacija Slovenije in nacionalna varnost, Zbornik ZPS, Ljubljana 1991.

[20] Compare Wolfgang R. Vogt, Time of Change:Military Sociology in the Paradigm Controversy, Forum Internationl, SOWI, 1992, pages 19–32.

[21] S. P. Hungtington is also convinced that "in the new world", to achieve its interests, the USA must firstly create "institutional facilities" for the development of a more complete approach to its national security policy which will take into account different aspects od national security (external, internal, military, economic, etc). S. P. Hungtington, op. cit., page 15.

was continued by the process of internationalization during the second world War, and was followed by the UNO to present ideas such as:

common security,[22] alternative security, shared security, non-provocative defence, etc.[23] The common denominator of different ideas on the alternative concept of ensuring security today is the transition from the traditional model of assuring national and international security (based on the principles of national armed defence, deterrence and competition between states) to a contemporary model, which will to a greater degree be based on an awareness that contemporary states share common security interests. This new co-operative model of assuring security is based on the fact that contemporary states share common security interests in the existence of the international order, as well as the ever-increasing sources of threat which affect the whole international community (eg. the existence and proliferation of weapons for mass destruction – nuclear, biological, chemical, terrorism, destruction of the environment, spreading of contagious diseases, etc) and which are today being achieved within the the common international framework – the UNO.

UN Activities for the Maintenance of International Peace and Security

The concept of peace may be broadly defined as a state of absence of any form of violence in a society and/or the international community. This is passive peace, which does not explain the reality of an entity, but is a methodological construction enabling us to talk about peace as a category. However, the evolution of our conception of peace incorporates a defined state (passive peace), as well as deliberate activity for the constant maintenance of peace as a value, which is the condition for developing security as a superior goal (active peace) of living on the level of an individual society and the international community as a whole.[24]

Today, numerous international organizations (governmental and non- governmental) are concerned with the maintenance of international peace and security, contributing to the establishment of such dynamic conditions in the international community as embody aspirations on forms of stability in the material and

---

[22] Common security is a state of the international order whereby states enjoy security as a common good. In its broadest definition, it is a state of intenational order in which the right to development and freedom from external threat, and the principle of self-determination are guaranteed to all peoples. One of the concrete proposals for the formation of a common security system, within a reformed security system of the UNO, consists of the following elements:

– qualitative disarmament as a starting point for achieving a whole new set of agreements and contracts between states in the field of security,

– minimum deterrence,

– civil defence,

– common defence,

– measures for solving conflicts,

– peacekeeping measures,

– supervision,

– reliable sources of finance,

– states' consent to the common security system.

See Harry B. Hollins, Averill L. Powers, Mark Sommer, op. cit., pages 182–191.

[23] See also Anton Grizold: Obrambne pobude zahodnoevropskih držav – članic pakta Nato, Tip 25 (1988)3–4, pages 456–462.

[24] Compare Amin Hewedy, Militarization and Security in the Middle East, Pinter Publishers, London, 1989, pages 30 and 48.

spiritual spheres of life within the international framework. The UNO, as the universal international organization, whose primary purpose (according to the Charter of the UNO) is "to maintain international peace and security", undoubtedly plays the main role.

Today the UNO uses four organized forms for the maintenance of active peace in the international community:

a) preventive diplomacy – reducing tensions which lead to the outbreak of conflicts,

b) peacemaking,

c) peacekeeping,

d) peacebuilding.

Differentiating among the mentioned forms of activity of the UN for the assurance of international peace and security does not mean a negation of the close link of the diplomatic-political, military and humanitarian aspects of solving contemporary conflicts between states. The combination of all four forms of solving international defence-security issues is the basic characteristic of the functioning of the UNO today.

Preventive Diplomacy

Is a mechanism of the UN for ensuring international peace and security, enabling the reduction of tensions and disputes between members of the international community by diplomatic-political means before these could lead to the outbreak of conflict. Although the mechanism of preventive diplomacy has been an element of the UN structure since its creation, it was rendered powerless throughout the post-war period to the end of the cold war. On the initiative of the Security Council of the UN (adopted on January 31, 1992), the Secretary-General Boutros Boutros Ghali (on July 1, 1992) prepared a written report in which he presented a number of recommendations on ways of improving the UN mechanisms for preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peacemaking.

In this report, preventive diplomacy is defined as an action to prevent disputes from arising between parties in the international community, to prevent existing disputes from escalating into conflicts and to limit the spread of the latter when they occur.[25]

The key factors of preventive diplomacy, as a mechanism of the UN for resolving disputes before they turn into conflicts are: the Secretary-General, specialized agencies and programmes, the Security Council, the General Assembly and regional organizations in co-operation with the UN.

In carrying out preventive diplomacy activities, the mentioned factors of the UN are directed to the following actions:

– measures to build confidence, eg. by ensuring the free flow of information, systematic exchange of military missions, opening of national activities, policies and military potentials for inspections, establishment of regional risk reducion centres, etc,

– informal fact-finding through constant contacts between the Secretary-General and the governments of member states and formal fact-finding mandated by

---

[25] See Boutros Boutros Ghali, An Agenda for Peace, Report of the Secretary-General pursuant to the statement adopted by the Summit Meeting of the Security Council on 31 January 1992, United Nations, New York, 1992, page 11.

the Security Council or the General Assembly to form missions that will establish the conditions in crises situations,

- early warning, eg. concerning various threats
- environmental, nuclear, natural disasters, famines, the spread of disease, etc,
- preventive deployment of UN forces, eg. in conditions of national crisis at the request of the government or all confronting parties; in inter-state disputes the UN may preventively deploy military, para-military and/or civilian personnell at the request of or with the consent of all the parties to the dispute,
- establishment of demilitarized zones – as a form of preventive deployment of UN forces on both sides of a border, with the agreement of the two parties, as a means of separating potential belligerents, or at the request of one side, for the purpose of removing any pretext for attack.[26]

Peacemaking

Peace making is the element of UN activities for the maintenance of international peace and security which restores the state of affairs, previous to the outburst of the armed conflict within the nation state or international community. Chapter VI of UN Charter enables to solve the conflict, threatening international peace and security, primarily by non-military means. In cases when this is insufficient, the Security Council can pass the decision (art. 42, UN Charter) on using the military means to restore international peace.

Although UN Charter gives the possibility to form and use of international armed forces (art. 42 and 43) as a response to open aggression, so far the Security Council has never used this competence. The present situation in the troubled international community, nonetheless, increasingly requires the use of peace forces to restore international peace. In this respect, the present UN Secretary General, Boutros Boutros Ghali, suggested to Security Council to set up peace-enforcement units. These peaceenforcement units would differ from both, the peace forces, which can, according to UN Charter, be set up in cases of aggression, and the peace keeping forces which are supposed to preserve international peace. Specially trained and equipped, these peace units should actively intervene in the ongoing international armed conflict and restore peace. Subsequently, the UN peace forces could be deployed[27].

Peacekeeping

Today, this expression is most frequently used for the UN activity whose aim is ensuring conditions for the prevention of the outbreak of an international conflict that could endanger international peace.

Inis Claude has given this overall definition of the function of peacekeeping: peacekeeping is a temporary measure for preventing the globalization of a local conflict until political solutions are found.[28]

---

[26] Boutros Boutros Ghali, An Agenda for Peace, op. cit., 13–19

[27] Boutros Boutros Ghali, op. cit. p. 26.

[28] Inis L. Claude, Jr., The Peace-keeping Role of the United Nations, v: E. Berkeley Tompkins (ed), The United Nations in Perspective, Hoover Institution Press, Stanford, California, 1972, page 52.

The latest "official" definition of peacekeeping is contained in the mentioned Report of the Secretary-General of the UN, Boutros Boutros Ghali. According to it, peacekeeping refers to the deployment of UN forces, which include military, para-military or civilian personnel, to the crisis area, with the consent of all the parties concerned in this UN action. Peacekeeping is, therefore, a technique that expands the possibilities for both the prevention of conflict and the making of peace.[29]

In the literature, one also runs across the following derivations from peace-keeping: peacekeeping force, peacekeeping operations and peace soldier. For our purpose, we may define a peacekeeping force as military components from different countries that function under the command of a neutral international body, striving to minimize or prevent hostilities with the minimal use of force. The term peacekeeping operation includes not only military peacekeeping forces, but also police personnel and civilians. A peace soldier, i.e. a member of the UN peace-keeping forces is a person serving in the international military forces under UN command, and is in his activity bound to strict rules on the minimal use of force (only in the case of self-defence).[30]

Peacebuilding

The UN activities for the maintenance of international peace and security would not be successful if they did not include activities, involving peace-building activities. The basic purpose of such activities is to settle the economic, social, humanitarian, cultural and other problems within the nation state or internati-onal community after the restoration of peace. Herewith, the crisis situations, which could lead to recurring armed conflicts, could be prevented. The basic aim of peace-building activities is to create conditions for the prevention of recurren-ce of crises, while the aim of preventive diplomacy is to prevent the outburst of crisis[31].

The authors of the Charter of the United Nations had not envisaged peace-keeping operations. They appeared at a certain point in time as a practical answer to concrete problems in the international community. No particular theory or doctrine supports them as yet.

There are fundamental differences between these UN operations and colletive security. While collective security is a cooperative process activated by the identifi-cation and proclamation of a common enemy, peacekeeping operations are based on the assumption that there are no enemies, only hostile parties.

ON activities for the maintenance of international peace and security are therefore activities for preventing, containing, easing and ending hostilities within individual states, and also between them, organized under the world organization

---

[29] Boutros Boutros Ghali. cit. op. page 11.

[30] Charles Moscos. Jr.. Peace Soldiers (The Sociology of Chicago Press. Chicago and London. 1976. Pg. 4.

[31] Boutros Boutros Ghali. op. cit. pp. 32–34.

with the aim of maintaining and/or re-establishing international peace and security in conflict areas.

Preserving international peace and security is actually a nonviolent activity since its main weapon is peaceful mediation for the maintenance of peace, based on the principles of impartiality and neutrality. This activity is not based on the possible use of force, but rather on the capabilitiy of mediation with the least possible use of force – only for self-defence. That is why people who are carrying out this activity are also called "soldiers without enemies".[32]

The UN has so far developed the following three forms of activities for the preservation of internation peace and security, namely:

a) Peace observation, which represents smaller groups of UN observers that are stationed in crises areas to collect facts on concrete conflict situations. UN observers forward the data to the SecretaryGeneral and the Security Council. Some examples: Greece 1947, Palestine 1948, Kashmir 1949, Lebanon 1958, Macedonia 1992.

b) Mediation and Reconstruction

UN activities for the preservation of international peace involve military and some diplomatic functions, including mediation and arbitration on conflicts, as well as mediation of social and economic aid. A typical example of these activities is Cyprus, where the UN are also engaged in the local social and economic problems, which would undoubtedly lead to a continuation of the conflict if left unsolved. In addition, UN activity in Cyprus includes helping refugees, as well as assistance in other fields: health, agriculture, education etc.

Therefore, there is a close link between the basic purpose of the UN – securing international peace and security – and the political-diplomatic, humanitarian, economic, military and other dimensions.

c) Interposition of Forces

The most frequent form of UN activity for securing international peace is the non-violent interposition of UN forces in armed intra-state and inter-state conflicts. The main aims of this interposition are: to prevent the continuation of the conflict, ensure a ceasefire, preserve demilitarized zones and prevent external intervention.

It would be difficult to find clear starting points in the UN Charter for various UN peacekeeping operations. As one of the UN's Secretary-Generals, Dag Hammarskjold, stated: peacekeeping should be placed in a new chapter "Six and a half" of the Charter.[33]

Today, UN peacekeeping operations arise from a broad consensus of its members, primarily on the conditions that are required for these operations to succeed. In this context we may mention the following characteristics of these operations:[34]

a) Their first characteristic is that they may occur only with the consent of all the parties involved in the conflict. Consent of all the parties broadly applies also

---

[32] Harry B. Hollinset et all, op. cit., del, page 28.
[33] The Blue Helmets, op. cit., page 5.
[34] The Blue Helmets, op. cit., page 5–7.

to the way in which such operations are carried out, and to the states that contribute their forces for the operation.

b) Non-interference in the internal affairs of the host states and impartiality to all the hostile parties are essential in these operations.

c) Hostile parties are expected to ensure their support to the peace operation by rendering free movement and other facilities that the peacekeepers require in carrying out their duties.

d) Members of the peacekeeping forces do not have the right of intrusion, and their use of force is restricted to self-defence as a means in extremity.

e) The majority of these operations have been established by decision of the Security Council and, in two exceptional cases, by the General Assembly. This means that such an operation may be set up only by consensus within the international community. It is the Security Council's responsibility to devise a clear mandate to the operation, which is acceptable to all the hostile parties.

f) Military personnel for the peacekeeping operations are placed at the disposal of the UN by the member states, thus coming under the command of the Secretary-General.

g) These operations may be classified into two categories: observer missions, consisting of mainly unarmed officers, and peacekeeping forces, composed of lightly armed ground troops with appropriate back-up support.

In practice it frequently happens that in special cases observer missions are backed up by ground and/or support troops for a short period of time, and that peacekeeping forces are assisted by un-armed military observers.

h) Today practically all of these operations are financed by compulsory contributions from member states. The financial liquidity of these operations is most often a serious problem, since some members are not prompt in their payments.

i) Semi-strong countries such as: Canada, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Finland, Ireland, Austria and the Netherlands have become the main source for these operations. Until now the multinational forces of the UN have been mostly organized on an ad hoc basis, i. e. without having been specially qualified within their national armed forces. The exception are some Scandinavian states, which as far back as 1964, established common training for about 45,000 military volunteers operating within the UN.

Conclusion

The emergence of the natioanl state and the development of the international community was followed by in which a longterm global aim of establishing an international system in which war, as a means of politics, would be abolished. The achievement of this goal was gradually institutionalized, beginning with the European concept (1915), then through the Vienna Congress and the League of Nations up to the UNO. In its Charter, the latter not only prohibits the use of force as

a means of politics, but also imposes on its member states the obligation to solve their mutual disputes peacefully. Of course, this does not mean that disputes, or even conflicts between states, can be solved by the world organization. Consensus among all the members of the UN is essential in respecting international norms and rules for the peaceful solution of their disputes and, in this context, on creating different mechanisms and means, diplomatic, political, military, etc for the prevention, control, solution and elimination of all problems and conflicts arising in relations between the basic parties in the international community.

However, the activity of the UN for the preservation of peace and security was "chained" in the logic of ideological and geopolitical globalism of ever-opposed super powers during most of its existence, and in spite of some of its achievements in concrete operations, its institutional frame has still to be more clearly defined.

The fact is that the Charter of the UN does not provide a more detailed description or normative definition on preventing and solving conflicts between states, which are of recent origin and primarily reflect the achieved level of development in an increasingly integrated international community. This means that it is necessary to prevent and/or stop further escalation of international conflicts that have appeared primarily in the decolonization process after the second world war, as well as those after the end of the cold war (1989/90), because of the close link and growing interdependence of the contemporary world, thus creating conditions for their peaceful, non-violent solution.

On the basis of earlier practice, the mentioned functioning of the UN may be broadly defined as the use of multinational military, civilian or police personnel under an international mandate and with the consent of all of the hostile parties, with the aim of controlling and solving intra-state and inter-state disputes and conflicts.

The idea of the maintenance of international peace and security is based on the principle of minimum use of force, which is also reflected in the number and armament of the UN peace forces. The latter have so far been used for peace-keeping and not warfare. Their strength should lie in their moral authority, rather than military power. However, throughout the post-World War II period, the UN has presented a whole set of mechanisms for the preservation of international peace and security, which have been used by the more prominent factors of the international community (big powers) whenever it suited them, otherwise these mechanisms have remained unused.

The end of the cold war opens a new possibility for the whole international community to ensure efficient maintenance of peace and security, through the system of collective security. The two basic preconditions of security are: firstly, the shaping of a clear cat development vision for the ancuring of international peace and security which will express an harmoniced political will of the member states and, secondly, that the UN should be re-organized so as really to enable the participation of all its members in adopting the most important decisions on world peace and security, as well as to create appropriately qualified and equipped forces that will be able not only to preserve, but also to establish peace where this is necessary.