



RESOLUTION:

REFORM OF THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL

Adopted at the YEPP Council of Presidents
In Athens, Greece, on the 6th of the December 2014

Recognising that:

- The UN Security Council has existed since the foundation of the UN and has held, concerning the permanent members (except the addition of the People's Republic of China), the same composition since then;
- The goal of the UN Security Council at its foundation was to organise the sanctions structure and to maintain collective security in emergency situations;¹
- Geopolitical relations have changed greatly since 1945;²
- The nature of conflicts have changed vastly since 1945;
- Concerning the UN's responsibilities to protect, the idea has diversified from largely national sovereignty towards national sovereignty and human rights;³
- There is a certain amount of criticism of the workings of the UN Security Council, most recently on its lack of decisiveness concerning the situation in Syria;

Acknowledging that:

- The United Nations as a whole has a useful function as meeting place for governments and therefore as an international negotiation forum, and needs to stay as such;
- A role in the area of conflict resolution fits an organisation like the UN, whose objective is the maintenance of peace and security. In addition to

¹ P. Baehr and L. Gordenker, "Needs the UN to retire?" Houten-Antwerpen: Spectrum 2010, p. 32 and 34-35.

²Rising regions as Latin America and South East Asia are not represented for example.

³ See UN Handbook article 1 and 2.

that it also fits as an organ which can create sanctions and ensure collective security, such as the UN Security Council;

- It is important that the composition of the UN Security Council corresponds with the geopolitical balance of power, yet the idea of permanent members needs no change;⁴
- The current veto system is a weakness and must be dealt with. It leads to a lack of decisiveness in crucial situations. Furthermore, permanent members abuse their veto right, by simply not using it in situations where they feel they would be forced to ignore the resolution and form a threat for world peace, but for a power game;⁵
- The veto system for resolutions which do not legitimise a military intervention can be abolished without affecting the veto system.⁶

YEPP calls on:

- The UN to adjust the Security Council to the geopolitical power balance in a way that ensures flexibility in the future.
- The Security Council to change the veto system. The right to veto will be abolished for resolutions that do not legitimise military intervention, for example the request for investigations and the nomination of the Secretary General. Where the right to veto will remain, it can be overruled by a two-thirds majority of the Security Council.
- The UN to take a close look at, and reform when needed, other institutions if they lack transparency, efficiency and failing to reach the goals for which the UN has been established.

4 Current members of the Council are the winners of WWII and China.

5 For example Russia and China who vetoed an investigation on the use of chemical weapons in Syria.

6 Examples as investigations, election of the Secretary General.