



## Responding to President Zelensky`s Call for Reforming the United Nations Security Council

Kyoto Peacebuilding Center in association with  
Global Peacebuilding Association of Japan presents  
an online discussion meeting on  
A New Global Institution to Prevent an Armed Aggression by  
A Permanent Member of the UN Security Council

Saturday 9 April 2020  
9:00 p.m. Tokyo, 2:00 p.m. Paris, 8:00 a.m. New York

Report compiled by: Maciej Witek

### Part 1: Presentations



**Mr. Takahiro Shinyo Councilor of the Kyoto Peacebuilding Center, Professor of Kwansai Gakuin University, and Former Ambassador to the United Nations and the Federal Republic of Germany**

Mr. Shinyo started by expressing his gratitude toward the organizers and participants. He stated that the request made by the president of Ukraine when he talked to the parliament of Japan on March 24, was a great encouragement for those who want to reform the Security Council, but also a kind of a shock. When president Zelensky talked to the Security Council days later it was more of a blow, to the present members. He asked to change, introduce a new system, to take initiative, and if it is not possible then you have to dissolve the council. It was very bland, perhaps shocking to the permanent members. We have also seen the suspension of the rights and privileges of membership of Russia in the Human Rights Council. It has been already written in the establishment resolution paragraph 8 – it already considered that such kind of expulsion is possible, and that has been already done in accordance with that provision. Mr. Shinyo also asked could it be possible for the UN to expel Russia from the Security Council or even from the UN itself? The charter of the UN provides two articles to make it possible – article 5 and article 6. But in both cases they need of course a recommendation of the Security Council, this is a must. If the members use the veto, then it would not be

possible to make a recommendation to the general assembly, and Russia will not be expelled or suspended. It is not possible to use the already established articles, but how can we do this?

An interesting point was the case of South Africa. When South Africa wanted to take seats or participate in the work of the UN in 1974, it was the credential committees of the General Assembly who denied this because of the apartheid. It was then referred to the Security Council, and the council agreed. It was also referred to the General Assembly again, and it was once again rejected. Then in 1974, South Africa was not able to take a seat in General Assembly, although the nameplate was there. It was based on the resolution of the General Assembly 22 81, paragraph 185. For South Africa, it was not possible to participate in any kind of work for the UN until 1994. Maybe if there is a common will of the General Assembly, this could be applied as a form of resolution. Not to admit the delegation of Russia, which is committing a crime against humanity.

Then Mr. Shinyo referred to the reform of the UN Security Council and mentioned that there are three ways of reforming the council. The first one is the short-term, urgent which does not necessitate any change or any amendment to the present charter of the UN. The second and third types are the long-term or mid-term, which will cause an amendment. First: Limit the unilateral use of the veto right. We need of course the agreement among the five members, or maybe we can also ask the General Assembly in the form of a resolution, to ask to change the practice. Second: Stop the exercise of veto rights against genocide, war crimes, or crimes against humanity. Third: Introduce accountability for exercising veto rights. All those three points were already proposed, they were about to put those reforms to the General Assembly, but they were pressurized by parliament fives. All the parliament members pressurized the countries should not do this. The situation has been changing, so why not revitalize those ideas with other members, for example, the ACT groups: Accountability, Transparency, and Coherence, which consists of 25 countries led by Switzerland. They are also seeking the same way, why not encourage and participate in this movement, and make it possible to pass this resolution in the general assembly? This is one way.

The next one is the active utilization of a mechanism that is already existing in the UN charter or in the form of the General Assembly resolution. First is the obligation to abstain from voting by the parties in the case of peaceful resolution of disputes. Article 27 paragraph 3 states that in case of the peaceful resolution of a conflict, parties of the conflict must abstain from voting. But it has not been practiced this way. The voting system was already agreed upon in the Yalta conference in 1945, this was a very important point. That could also include a permanent member of the Security Council. In many cases where peace resolution, the humanitarian operation in conflicted like Syria, Russia and China refused many times using vetoes. If Russia is a party to the conflict, it should abstain from voting. It is a very strange practice to prevail in the Security Council. Second is more frequent use of the 1950 resolution of the Uniting for Peace. Thanks to this resolution, it was possible for present days members of the UN to introduce, and open the emergency special session of the General Assembly. Third, this is very important for us, it is of course the concern for Russia, to reexamine the legal justification of the fact that Russia is a part of the Security Council after the collapse of the Soviet Union. In those days Mr. Shinyo was in charge of the UN policy in the Japanese Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1992 there was the first summit of the Security Council. Japan was a non-permanent member of the council and was also participating. And then the attitude of the permanent members was to close their eyes to the fact that no discussions were held in the General Assembly or Security Council to examine the legality or justification of the permanent membership of Russia. Nobody wanted it. Mr. Shinyo himself wanted to raise this issue but the mood these days was very negative. And so with the participation of Mr. Jelcyn, in the first-ever meeting in January 1992, the succession of the Security Council seat was acquired. Perhaps it would be an interesting moment to examine this again, whether it is possible that this permanent seat with veto right could be succeeded this way, without any discussion.

Somebody would be thinking that a new Security Council can be established or there can be a dramatic change, but we should be very realistic. If the Security Council could be revised it must be newly established. Of course, we have to change the charter of the UN, if that is the case, Mr. Shinyo personally prefers not to

have a system like the Security Council which gives special status to a very limited number of countries. We are living in a very different age to the ending of World War II. We should improve the mechanism of the General Assembly where everybody is equal, and do not create any councils with privileges. We should perhaps think about a moderate reform plan, whether to increase permanent members should be a topic of negotiations. We also have to cope with other permanent members, they are not happy with the change. We should also keep in mind that the US and China would be opposing. At this time we should not enlarge the enemies of the reform, we should only limit the cardinal enemy of the Security Council system only confining to Russia. We should not enlarge the battlefield. If that is the case, there would be no outcome.

**Mr. Shahr-Yar Mahmoud Sharei**

**Executive Director of the Center for UN Constitutional Research (CUNCR)**



Mr. Sharei stated that CUNCR spent the last 10 years focusing on how the UN can be changed, especially in terms of charter changes. As we know, the UN charter is basically frozen and has only 3 amendments. Why? Because as prof Shinyo mentioned, the footprint of the permanent fight over veto is all over the charter: on the addition of new states, Palestine, Taiwan, peace and security, even the article 5.

In CUNCR research, maybe accidentally, we realized that the veto actually has been reversed when it counts the most. There are two ways to amend the charter, one is through article 108, and one is 109. Both require two tiers of General Assembly approval, a permanent member can veto, but the veto is not effective. Otherwise, they can say no, but that stage is not going to stop the discussion of the amendment or the review process. The second stage is to convey the review. The charter actually does not get too much into detail. What it appears it is outside of New York, General Assembly does not require the Security Council's approval the conference can set its own rules of the charter, own rules of procedure. There is however one catch. Both in amendments and the charter review. The catch is that it requires ratification, and here the permanent 5 can use the veto. There were three amendments so far.

1. SC Expansion, Res. 1991 A(XVIII) October 1963

UK and US abstained, Russia and France said no, and China said yes. At ratification, during two years period, all members said yes. Amendment was adopted.

2. ECOSOC Expansion, Res. 1991 B(XVIII) October 1963

Exactly the same situation, the only difference is that China abstained along with UK and US.

3. ECOSOC Expansion II, Res. 2847 GA December 1971

UK and Russia abstained, the US said yes, France said no, and China did not participate.

How did this happen? CUNCR research shows that the decision-making was shifted from New York to the capital cities of these countries, to the people and their legislative powers. This is very significant. It shows that where it counts the most is when you can take away the veto, you can dissolve the Security Council, replace it with another system, and add permanent members. All of those are possible under a charter review article 109. It was shown historically that veto can be reversed.

## Part 2: Commentators



### **Ms. Lise Howard Professor of Georgetown University and President of ACUNS**

Ms. Howard draws attention to the importance of legitimacy. If we think of the definition, it is the belief by an actor that the rule or institution ought to be obeyed. What we are talking about today is the legitimacy of the UN Security Council. In Ms. Howard's opinion, states still see the UN Security Council as legitimate. Not everyone is happy with the decisions of course, but there is still a general sense that the decisions ought to be obeyed, more importantly, the basic principles of the UN charter and sovereignty norms ought to be obeyed. In the literature legitimacy can have 3 basic roots, it can come from divine right, democratic representativeness, or bureaucratic ability to produce outcomes. The UN Security Council's legitimacy comes from its ability to make and issue decisions that carry the weight of international law. Ms. Howard agreed with Mr. Shinyo, if we look at the record, even though we focus on the exceptions, most of the time the veto use is quite rare over time. The Security Council has been regulating war between states. The instances of war between states are extremely rare. And if you go back to look at the record of the UN Security Council, every time there is a militarized dispute between members of the UN, it goes to the council, and it is most often successfully resolved. So the Security Council is regulating violent conflict between states, within states by the mechanisms of peacekeeping. We see a downward till around 2014 in civil wars. Since that time we have seen a rise in one specific time of war – internationalized civil war. Ukraine is also a part of that trend, it is not unique, and is unique at the same time, it is the only instance when we have a neighbor trying to crush its neighbor in modern times. What I would propose is if we want the Security Council to maintain its function of regulating the legitimate use of force in the international system, we need to come up with better mechanisms for ensuring that states do not legitimately send troops to civil wars. That this principle become one of the working norms in the Security Council and the international system because that is the precise type of conflict that is on the rise now. We need China and Russia to go along with Security Council, we need them as members of the international system. If we do not have some kind of mechanism to uphold international law, we can foresee a world where there will be a lot more war between states. Ms. Howard's main warning is that we should be careful of what we ask for. That expanding the number of permanent members of the Security Council could have unintended consequences of less decision-making in the UN Security Council, and what we need in the international system now is more decision-making on the legitimacy of the use of force.



### **Mr. Yasushi Akashi Honorary Chair of the Kyoto Peacebuilding Center and former USG for Humanitarian and Disarmament Affairs, SRSO for Cambodia and former Yugoslavia**

Mr. Akashi made two major points. The veto in the Security Council is based on the serious reflection on the record of the League of Nations which did not have any similar provision. In consequence, the United States decided not to participate in the League, Japan and Germany withdrew from it, and the Soviet Union was expelled. All of this weakened the League. Veto for five Permanent members of the Security Council was therefore considered "necessary evil" for the United Nations, to ensure the lasting support of the largest military powers. By 1947, however, serious division among the five permanent powers became clear on issues such as the size of armed forces to be used by the Security Council. When North Korea invaded South Korea in June 1950, the Soviet Union was boycotting the Council, while the United States took advantage of it in order to mobilize ad hoc UN force of

45 countries, dominated by 150,000 US troops under UN flag. When the Soviet Union came back to the Council, the US and its allies decided to convene the first emergency special session of the General Assembly in November 1950 in order to continue support for the Korean UN force. Mr. Akashi feels that the emergency special session of the General Assembly this year was a fresh breeze that brought political as well as moral factors into the UN on Ukraine. This year, more than 140 favorable votes were cast in the two emergency special sessions of the General Assembly on March 3 and March 24, one ensuring UN disapproval of Russian military action in Ukraine, and the other vote requesting all UN bodies and others to participate in humanitarian and other support action of the international community. The third vote by the special assembly ensured expelling of Russia from the Human Rights Council. Thus, in the Ukraine case the international community ensured the right kind of balance between the General Assembly and the Security Council. In the two previous cases of the Korean War and the Gulf War, the UN created its ad hoc force based on the threat to peace under Chapter 7 of the Charter. But in all these three forces, the predominant country behind was the United States. Mr. Akashi thinks that in the present case, it is remarkable that President Zelensky of Ukraine, has almost captured the hearts and imaginations of the world. However, President Putin of Russia still has a strong military force, and the world is watching what is taking place in northern Ukraine around Kyiv as well as in the east and south of Ukraine. As the overall political and military balance emerges in time, we will know the new situation in Europe between East and West (with Sweden and Finland joining NATO). President Erdoğan of Turkey seemed at one time to be an excellent mediator in bringing Ukraine and Russia together. Whoever undertakes international mediation and intensive diplomacy at the end, we have to make sure that both Ukraine and Russia are prepared to participate fully in it. It goes without saying that UN Secretary-General Guterres has to be associated with all major peace endeavours, in political, humanitarian as well as peace-building fields.



**Ms. Shin-wha Lee Professor of Korea University, President of Korean Academic Council on the United Nations System, KACUNS**

Ms. Lee stated that Russia as we all know lost its status as a member of the Human Rights Council. More than 2/3 decided in favor of the resolution. It is the second case after Libya and the first case as a member of the Security Council. And they say it is a barometer of the outrage over the atrocities in Ukraine. This expulsion is an example of disapproval of human rights violating countries from taking a leadership position in the UN. Ms. Lee thinks it would be an opportunity of depriving a country undermining international peace and security, of its leadership position in the Security Council in theory. But in practice, it is not easy if not impossible at all. However still at least it should be a wake-up call for a UN Security Council reform debate, which had been stagnant for a while. As we all hear in president Zelensky's speech, he compares the Russian military massacre of civilians, to the extremist Islamic State of ISIS, and says that Russia must be expelled from the Security Council of the UN. But if we get rid of Russia and China from this UN body, probably our world will be even more unstable, as it was with Germany in Japan in the case of the League of Nations. UN Security Council reform is also important in the case of the Korean peninsula where the mandatory provision made in response to North Korea's reckless provocation, is not valid. Still, Ms. Lee thinks we must try to reform the Security Council on one hand, and on the other hand supplement the function of the Security Council by uniting nations who share the value and order of the freedom such as the G7 but also representing all other countries. So as the reform of the Security Council reflects the reality of international politics, it should be pursued in the direction that announces the transparency, effectiveness, democracy, accountability, and representation and allows reforms to proceed based on a broad consensus among member countries. South Korea's official position is to participate constructively in the Security Council reform debate, as a member of the UN consensus called UFC. In other words, we oppose the expansion of Security Council permanent members and support the expansion of the nonpermanent members. If Japan's drive for Security Council reform increases in the wake of the Ukraine crisis, it can backfire on neighboring countries including South Korea. There is a greater probability of a split of opinion, than Korea and Japan's cooperation which



is already pretty low. Therefore at least a lot of scholarly meetings like this effort should be very carefully made to develop agendas and strategic plans to bring to the scope of a common understating between the countries.



**Mr. Vesselin Popovski Vice Dean and Professor, Center for the UN Studies, Jindal University, Dehli, India**

Mr. Popovski noted that it is really an important moment, some people say Copernican moment, to really reconsider everything that we have, rediscuss this form of the UN Security Council and it does not go anywhere. I think we should not worry to go to the General Assembly and adopt any resolution with the support of the 2/3 majority and see what the permanent members say as they did in 1963. They don't want to be in the corner, fully isolated, and Mr. Popovski fully appreciated what Liechtenstein said, that every time there is a veto on R2P, that automatically goes to the General Assembly. The veto should

be very costly. Every time it goes to the General Assembly it faces the global voice against the vetoing member. That is the only approach here. Obviously, the Security Council's decisions are obeyed, but 90% of the resolutions are so obvious that everybody will obey them. The problem is exactly that people die because of veto. The problem is Syria for 11 years, Ukraine for 8, Myanmar, Yemen, Rwanda, you name it. More people died because of the veto, not because of any overexposure to the Security Council's powers. Look if people respect the Security Council decisions – no, they do not. The obedience of the Security Council happens just because of those very consensus-based resolutions. Mr. Popovski supports Mr. Shinyo's strategy here, that we need to think out of the box. If that does not work, then we should go more radical, go for a new organization. Imagine 140 countries of the world decide that it is not going to work, establish a new organization and invite China and Russia. They should be invited and if they do not join, they will isolate themselves. Nobody isolates China and Russia, they would be invited to join the new UN with no veto, and larger composition of the Security Council, and if China and Russia do not want to join that new global organization, and want to keep the old small UN, let them stay there. As the League of Nations did not do the work, or the UN cannot let's go to the next page.



**Mr. Yasuhiro Ueki  
Professor, Sophia University, former Spokesperson, the United Nations**

First of all, Mr. Ueki referred to Mr. Shinyo's two possible solutions. Any effort to restrict the use of the veto is opposed by the most permanent members including the US. As for the genocide in Ukraine, the UK and France are more supportive of the idea, but the other members Russia and China would never accept any limitations on a veto. Article 27.3 obliges parties of the dispute to abstain from voting, the Security Council never agreed on the definition of how this works, what kind of dispute are we talking about, and under what kind of circumstances we should abstain. As some members argue, such judgment should be subject to a non-procedural vote. There is precedence, but as permanent members are concerned, they have never accepted that proposition, unfortunately. The Russian status as a permanent member, at that time US facilitated the continuation of the new Russia continuing to be a permanent member because the US did not want any debate on Security Council at that time. Besides Russia succeeded the Soviet Union, and it was a peaceful breakup. The US in particular did not want to disturb that breakup. Of course, Russia's legitimacy is being questioned right now, but the only way to adopt any meaningful action is to use a more skillfully United for Peace resolution. Russia did lose legitimacy as both a permanent member of the Security Council and the UN member because Russia did violate all the basic norms and principles written in the UN

charter. And China did support Russia up until it decided to abstain because the US persuaded China to do it by offering to amend the language of the resolution. The problem is that even if Russia has lost legitimacy as a permanent member, any effort to kick out Russia would not succeed until the UN charter is formally amended. UN charter article 109, regarding the process, even if UN members come up with a proposal to change the way the UN is constituted, whatever decisions they adopt, are also subjected to the amendment process and will probably not succeed. This time the general assembly resumed the emergency special session and adopted decisions as well, removing Russia from the Human Rights Council. When the council cannot act due to veto, we should probably transfer the mandate to the General Assembly more often. The General Assembly this time, indirectly legitimized the efforts of western nations to condemn the demand for the immediate ceasefire as well as the provision of arms for Ukraine. Ever since the G4 effort failed in 2005, Security Council reform should be considered in two stages. First: we should touch on nonpermanent membership. Any council reform if it wants to be viable, has to have the support of countries like South Korea as well. Expanding non-permanent membership could increase the legitimacy. Second: it is important to get some sort of agreement to discuss the permanent members' veto power.

### Part 3: Open Discussion



#### **Mr. Takaaki Mizuno Professor of Kanda University of International Studies**

Mr. Mizuno expressed his surprise that nobody mentioned the role of nuclear weapons in this conflict. This is an aggression by the permanent member of the security council, but at the same time, Russia is the world's largest nuclear power in terms of nuclear warheads. In his view, the Ukraine invasion cannot be compared to the Gulf War, but rather this is parallel to the Soviet Invasion of Afghanistan or the Chinese invasion of Vietnam. During the Cold War time, Security Council did not do anything because they were paralyzed. Putin's explicit comment on nuclear weapons is unique in this conflict. There might be a parallel situation to 1970 when the US explicitly put its nuclear forces on alert, to stop the Soviet involvement in the Middle East. The point is we can discuss a legal matter or institutional reform, but in fact, the Ukrainian people are on the ground, they are killed right now, and they are asking to do something. And we are discussing this explicit threat of use of nuclear weapons by the permanent member of the Security Council, we cannot go ahead.



#### **Mr. Sukehiro Hasegawa Director, Kyoto Peacebuilding Center**

Mr. Hasegawa shared with participants his proposal. First, the SecretaryGeneral proposes the idea of sending a UN peacekeeping mission with only one mandate – to protect the civilians. And to balance the General Assembly and the Security Council, we go in a reverse way. The secretary-General proposal is taken up first by the General Assembly. Mr. Hasegawa the proposal will receive 2/3 majority as the mission mandate is only to save lives. The proposal will then be sent to the Security Council where Russia will veto it. The proposal will then be sent back to the General Assembly as a procedural item under article 109 of the UN Charter and then the General Conference will take up the proposal and adopt it by 2/3 as a resolution that the veto cast by the Security Council can be overcome by the General Assembly by the majority vote of two-thirds of its members casting votes. The resolution will then be sent back to the Security Council with another proposal – to temporarily bring G20 countries into the new reinvented Security Council. The G20 members have 90% of the military power, 80% of the global GDP, and 70% of the population of the world. The proposal should be brought

forward as a consensus resolution. According to Mr. Hasegawa, the UN should be able to send with legitimacy a humanitarian mission if it is accepted by the government of a sovereign member state, Ukraine, as the UN sends many peacekeeping missions with the consent of host governments without consulting rebels or terrorists. In reinventing the UN Security Council with G20 members, we go back to Russia, and we will say we will not take any veto power away and we do not oust Russia, and the only thing we want is for Russia to protect the civilian population with the approval of the new Security Council with G20 countries and EU and five other regional organizations as the new Council members. (Mr. Hasegawa would provide the details of his proposal to those who are interested in examining it.)

**Mr. Vesselin Popovski Vice Dean and Professor, Center for the UN Studies, Jindal University, Dehli, India**

Mr. Popovski agreed. At least what the Secretary-General should do is establish the humanitarian mission, this is an excellent proposal. UN is full of successful stories, and what he can envision is a transition of administration in Donbas and Crimea for several years, until the new referendum happens. It happened already everywhere where there is a need for the UN to step into territory which is disputed, to offer the transition of administration, so people can freely express their will. UN should propose to monitor the borders between Russia, Ukraine, and Belarus in the same way as it has been done in Cyprus, Lebanon, and many other places. There are a lot of opportunities for the UN to step in and I wish to have a more active Secretary-General.

**Ms. Lise Howard Professor of Georgetown University and President of ACUNS**

Ms. Howard asked what can we do since so many Ukrainians are being killed? We did not say it but it is imperative that Russia has to be stopped and at the same time we have a responsibility to not only protect the Ukrainians but also prevent more armed conflicts. Because we are dealing with nuclear power it is so dangerous. We have the possibility of a wider escalation. And at the same time, we have a third imperative: to bring as many countries around the world on board with decision-making about the situation as possible. If we look at the vote on suspending Russia on the Human Rights Council, there were 24 against it. And 58 abstentions. There are big important countries in the world that are not on board with this idea of excluding Russia, even if they engage in human rights abuses. Ms. Howard fears the unintended consequences of going the route of exclusion as opposed to inclusion. Her strategy would be to bring as many countries on board as possible and make sure that sovereignty is the basic foundation of the international law in this system.

**Mr. Takahiro Shinyo Former Japanese Ambassador to the United Nations and Germany**

Mr. Shinyo noted that It is too early and too dangerous to establish a peacekeeping operation during this very critical moment when the eastern part of Ukraine will be bombed on a larger scale. Only possible if the ceasefire agreement would be tentatively agreed on. Utilizing the mechanism of the special emergency session to establish another peacekeeping operation is possible with majority voting. But we should wait until the critical and very dangerous moment is over. Otherwise, there would be a war between the UN and Russia, but we have to avoid it. The US and NATO are exercising a maximum constraint and that is the quite right decision. We should not act emotionally, it should be prevented. Also, we are not criticizing the legitimacy of the Security Council itself. We are questioning the decision. That is the critical moment, the moment for asking whether it is legitimate or not. In this case, Security Council has legitimacy, they can authorize the use of forces despite the fact it is not mandatory, but the General Assembly can also do this and it is legitimate. Legitimacy does not only lie in hands of the Security Council, it lies also in the General Assembly, we should be aware of this. We should try everything possible, not hesitate to use the existing mechanism. We should be more pragmatic and bold in the sense we are embarking on a very important stage to revitalize the functioning of the UN, and particularly the General Assembly if the Security Council does not function.



**Mr. Shahr-Yar Mahmoud Sharei Executive Director of the Center for UN Constitutional Research (CUNCR)**

Mr. Sharei stated that in terms of the proposal to not lose the momentum, bringing the issue back to the General Assembly, invoking article 109 is fantastic. This type of dynamism and energy is not new. In 1945, the smaller states faced the permanent five in San Francisco, and this is unacceptable. How would we expect the permanent five to have veto power, violate international law, and use the veto power? Out of the 50, about 33 nations were opposed to the Security Council. UN has a birth defect, and it is a Security Council. They were not ready to sign the charter, the compromise was the introduction of 109 paragraph 3. It says that in effect UN charter has an expiration date, and it is in 1955. The charter has to be reviewed and the legislative history behind it is that the Security Council has to be democratized. And it has to be changed, either replaced or changed. This is a part of the history of the UN which is neglected by the textbooks. There was a rebellion against the Security Council. We have to use the momentum, there are many proposals, and the point is to review the charter. It is a legal obligation as well as a moral obligation.



**Mr. Ken Inoue Vice-President, Global Peacebuilding Association of Japan**

Mr. Inoue fully agreed that without the agreement or consent of Russia it is very difficult or dangerous to send the peacekeeping operation. We need to also recall what happened in Somalia. The Russian army is not a militia in Africa, if you send a peacekeeping operation to the war zone, what will happen? We need at least a ceasefire, but this is so difficult at this moment. The UN charter was very well structured to protect the interest of the permanent five countries. The charter could be amended only when Russia and China become democratic countries. We do not know how long does it take. Otherwise, it is almost impossible. However, we should not forget that the only benefit of this unfair system is not to repeat the world war. We have to admit, this problem of the UN system and focus on this point – to avoid the third world war. We have to rely on the diplomacy of the UN or any country, but we should not be panicking about the current situation. For example, what happened when the US invaded Iraq, or China invaded Tibet? In some way, we cannot do anything, but still, at least we maintain peace. It is really unfortunate, but this is the reality and we should continue all the diplomatic efforts.



**Mr. Tadanori Inomata Strategic Advisor for Global Relations and Visiting professor of Nagasaki University**

Mr. Inomata agreed with Mr. Hasegawa's proposal. To cover the non-military aspects of the security is a very good idea, that is why we should bring the G20 members. Of course, they do not have a mandate for peace and security matters, but the involvement of that group means we would better reflect the views of all countries which are being affected by sanctions. We have to first define what kind of security we are talking about and the discussion should not be limited to political-military security, we must think about the security of persons, and the wealth of the people. To stop Russia, we are waging economic wars, we are antagonizing Russia, and we need to have a recovery plan in case the fight stops. That is the real problem we will have to face at a later stage. We need to think first about how to stop Russia, and how to take care of the humanitarian issues.



**Mr. Kazuhide Kuroda Development consultant, Doshisha University  
Graduate School of Global Studies**

Mr. Kuroda thanked all the speakers for their insights on Ukraine and the implications for the United Nations. Furthering the comment made by Ambassador Inomata on the precarious humanitarian situation, he noted that Emergency Relief Coordinator USG Martin Griffiths in his statement to the Security Council informed that he had just returned from Moscow where he met Foreign Minister Lavrov mentioning productive discussions. Since there appears no change on the ground, the UN's urgent focus continues to be on helping to establish a ceasefire and for securing a humanitarian corridor to the most affected areas.