

Statement by Mr. Vladimir Petrovsky  
Under-Secretary General  
Director General of the United Nations Office at Geneva

For the Geneva Centre for Security Policy's  
Special Course: "Security Challenges at the Turn of the Millennium"

**United Nations: Problems and Prospects**  
**of Global Security**

Thursday, 14 January, 1999  
Institut Henri Dunant, Geneva, Switzerland

First of all, I would like to thank the Geneva Centre for Security Policy for this opportunity to talk to you today about the challenges to global security at the turn of the millennium and the UN's role in preserving that security. I would like to address several issues of particular importance with regard to security and peace by highlighting some of the challenges of the past and by illuminating for you the ways in which the UN is addressing these challenges as we approach the next century. I will begin by presenting to you some thoughts on emerging trends in today's world that I believe might become important factors for the security concerns of states in the years to come. I will then present some of the ways in which the UN strives to maintain an environment of security and stability throughout the world. And in closing, I will offer up another set of questions that will need to be addressed in an ever-enlarging Europe. I have organized my thoughts on these issues under a few headings that, forgive me if they do not appear clear to you now, will provide a thread in the progression of my presentation to you today. These headings are the following: I) Electrons, National Borders and Maxim Litvinov; II) A joint US-Soviet Declaration, 4 Ps and a C, and David Ricardo; and finally, III) American highways, 'Interlocking Memberships', and the Euro.

#### **I) Electrons, National Borders and Maxim Litvinov**

As we approach the dawn of the 21st Century, the world looks vastly different from this time a century ago. The technological advances which have driven the world economy, international politics and humanitarianism have had a tremendous impact on the factors which both divide and unite nations, and shrink our world all the while expanding our horizons. The exponential speed of progress in the technological age has meant that giant technological leaps that would normally only have occurred every generation or so are being achieved almost yearly. The velocity of these innovations is paralleled only by the increased volatility of world markets and by the wealth of new opportunities this world economy has to offer. The recent economic boom in the United States and the coinciding economic depression of the Asian economies are on scales previously unseen since the Second World War.

What I do not want to do is to present to you a vision of a 21st Century vastly different from what we see today. All these technological advances aside, I believe that the next century will be governed by many of the same principles and difficulties, where the root causes of conflict will largely remain the same, namely, scarcity of resources, national self-determination and ethnic, as well as religious, tension.

One element that I would like to focus on is the issue of national borders in this technological age. A trend seems to be appearing in today's society that I believe could emerge to become a significant challenge to the preservation of global security in the 21st Century. Many people argue today that national borders are weakening. It would also seem that the new common denominator in the world is information, and the essential element of this new reality is the electron.

In his book Being Digital, Nicolas Negroponte of MIT explains how the technological age is transforming every aspect of our lives and businesses. He explains that world business, politics and services in general are no longer governed by the movement of atoms, that is the movement of products, hard currency, newspapers, and people, but rather by bits of information made up of electrons traveling at the speed of light. This new "digitalization" explains how many countries in the developed world no longer fight wars with soldiers but by deploying remote controlled 'smart' weapons which are guided to their distant target with deadly accuracy. It is no longer justifiable to send troops into combat where computers will have the same impact. As far as information goes, scenes of war as they are unfolding are regularly being beamed into every living room, bar and government building in every corner of the globe. Your proximity to a location today is of less importance than your connectedness to the means of staying informed and 'in contact.' Censorship of information has become almost irrelevant, a losing battle for those Governments accustomed to controlling the information that reaches their population. The fast growing Internet knows no boundaries of nation state or limitations by private enterprise. And power in many developed countries is expressed less and less in terms of Dollars, Yen or stockpiles of weapons but in little ones and zeros, computer language that makes up the information we need and use everyday. What will become even more true in the next century is that 'he who controls the information, controls the world.'

As the result of this technological revolution, electrons penetrate and leave nations unhindered, neither requiring visas nor succumbing to regular customs restrictions. The natural integrity of national boundaries seems to be becoming very porous. And with the impression of weaker borders, national Governments will be asserting themselves ever more strongly to solidify them. This natural reflex to resist technological evolution and compensate for the loss of control over government, economic, corporate, cultural, and criminal information and the provision of services could most likely bring increased social and cultural isolation and protectionism by the State. This may even lead to instances of new tension between previously peaceful neighbours trying to preserve some semblance of economic and cultural integrity. The nation state of today



rests largely on the principle of the inviolability of borders and the mutual understanding between nations to leave domestic concerns abroad to that particular country's State to resolve. But as information begins to flow freely in every direction, every nation will become aware, in intimate detail, of the national concerns of each country. This will further contribute to a sense that the problems of a people in one country are also the concern, and more importantly the responsibility, of all countries. Through its activities in international humanitarianism and the promotion of human rights, the UN has begun to address these issues. But the consequences of this apparent shift in the principles of national sovereignty will most likely continue to worsen and will undoubtedly challenge the preservation of security and stability throughout the world.

Disputes over boundaries are one of the most common causes of conflict. As a student of history, I know that conflicts which cause borders to shift set the foundation for renewed conflict in order to return the borders to their original position. History has shown us that war begets war and violence is self-perpetuating. We have also learned that the seeds for a future conflict are most often found in the untapered ashes of a previous one. These are some of the important realizations at the core of the UN's activities in the post-war rebuilding and conflict prevention. We must learn from the past in order to build a more peaceful future.

Although peace often translates into an unjust maintenance of the status quo and the suppression of legitimate aspirations for self-determination, peace is still the 'best' worst case scenario. In the words of the Roman statesman and poet Cicero, "an unjust peace is better than a just war." This means that in an atmosphere of peace, dialogue can be fostered and difficulties overcome. But in war, the opportunities for dialogue and reconciliation are often the first bridges burned.

As an aside, we must also try to overcome the unfortunate marriage of the ideas of self-determination and secessionism. These are ideas which were propagated in the Wilson-Leninist mindset and they should be challenged today as more and more 'nations', in the original meaning of the word, find their own voices within the structure of their respective countries.

And so, as the integrity of national borders comes into question and states find themselves having to redefine their national identities and, ultimately, their sense of security vis-a-vis their neighbours and enemies, there will unfortunately be many new instigations of conflict. This is why the UN's work in securing peace and stability is just as important today as it has ever been. But the UN too needs to adapt to the realities of the new regime for national delimitations and sovereignty.

It is confronted with these issues regularly in its activities for international humanitarian intervention and conflict prevention, which I will come to shortly.

The end of the 20th Century has also been marked by the emergence of new international actors following the breakup of the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and the assertion of national identity and self-determination in places like Eritrea, East Timor, and Chechnya. Other developments have been the continued proliferation of weapons of mass destruction throughout the world, the unfettered contagion of what the Secretary General calls "uncivil society," i.e., criminal elements and the threat that they pose to regimes based on the rule of law. Also, the gap between rich and poor continues to grow and has become an ever more troublesome reality of world affairs. These are old problems that only seem to be getting worse.

This degeneration of world stability must be met with an equally comprehensive approach to the maintenance of peace and security. The UN has a responsibility to assure this security equitably across the broad spectrum of rich and poor nations. Discrimination, even at the global level, is antithetical to comprehensive security.

As we approach the end of this Century, I can't help but be reminded of the words of Maxim Litvinov, a former diplomat from my country, who, in 1936, addressed the League of Nations here in Geneva and proclaimed those very simple, but meaningful words: "Peace is indivisible." These words are as true today as they were in 1936. The roots for increased divisiveness between states brought about by the backlash to globalization and technology's attack on the structure of the nation state will only be quelled by what the UN Secretary General calls an overriding "culture of peace."

The Secretary General believes that peace is achievable if countries practice good governance. Good governance entails a visionary conception of leadership based on a strong commitment to the values of democracy and the rule of law. It conveys the idea of "effectiveness on the part of a governing institution, of transparency and accountability in the management of public affairs, and of respect for human rights." Good governance does not refer to the moral rectitude of the authorities in power. It implies the existence of a system based on the active participation of all actors involved in the political process. Good governance is closely related to UN peace operations in as much as "economic development, social justice, environmental protection, democratization, disarmament, respect for human rights are the principal pillars that together build the house of peace and stability".

So as the information age poses new challenges to national sovereignty, we need to anticipate the difficulties to come and ensure the promotion of peace and security through dialogue and understanding.



## II) A joint US-Soviet Declaration, 4 Ps and a C, and David Ricardo

The reality of post World War II diplomacy was dominated by the rise of Superpowers' rivalry, military confrontation, and the total subservience of international relations to ideological considerations. The logic of the cold war, with its trail of proxies' wars, has altered the original spirit of the Charter and restricted the activities of the United Nations to a narrow interpretation of this document. The Organization was driven to focus exclusively on the "Peace and Security" components of its mandate. More than that, for many years, "peace" was interpreted only in a negative sense - as the absence of war - while "security" referred to military balance and political alliances.

With the end of the cold war, a new approach was necessary. Devising new parameters was now possible due to the spirit of cooperation which prevailed among the permanent members of the Security Council. A new vision of security began to emerge, as early as November 1989, as a result of a joint Soviet-American initiative. At that time, I had the privilege, as Deputy Head of the Soviet Delegation, to introduce together with my American counterpart, Mr. John Bolton, on the agenda of the forty-fourth session of the General Assembly, a draft resolution calling upon all States to "enhance international peace, security and international cooperation in all its aspects in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations". Presented on 3 November 1989 for urgent consideration, resolution A/RES/44/21 was adopted in a plenary meeting on 15 November 1989. This landmark resolution opened the way to an integrated approach to peace promotion. Specifically, it mentioned the role of the United Nations "in resolving international problems of a political, economic, social, cultural or humanitarian character" and referred to the need to "find *multifaceted* approaches to implement and strengthen the principles and system of international peace, security and international cooperation laid down in the Charter". Based on this new all-encompassing method, the United Nations was able to embark upon a more assertive and ambitious approach to peace promotion. This period was characterised by greater activism and success in traditional peace operations.

The United Nations is now operating under a new concept of security. Throughout the Charter, the words "peace" and "security" are consistently linked and treated as synonymous for all practical purposes. Nowadays, it has become generally accepted that security is a notion of a higher order than peace, involving more than the mere absence of war. Security is a guarantee against violent, chaotic changes and the preservation of an environment conducive to sustainable development in all aspects of life.

In an attempt to identify some of the ingredients of the new definition of security, I should like to focus on the human component which is definitely at the core of the modern concept of security. This week, your programme is dedicated to a reflection on “Security Challenges at the Turn of the Millennium”. In security matters, these preoccupations are echoed by the recognition of the fact that human security should be granted an overriding priority over any other consideration.

Human security means that people should be free from the fear of war, which, of course, cannot be limited to international conflicts. It must apply as well to civil wars and this explains why the traditional doctrine of non interference in the internal matters of a sovereign State is being increasingly challenged by those who claim that the international community has “a duty” to intervene for humanitarian purposes. Human security however, is a concept that extends far beyond warfare situations. It also means freeing people from the fear of arbitrary abuses from totalitarian regimes, a concept which carries an implicit mandate for the international community to promote democratisation and human rights. Human security means freeing people from the fear of hunger, poverty, illness and the threat of natural disasters. Accordingly, one of the newest ideas to be explored by the Human Rights’ machinery of the United Nations is the “right to food”. This broad definition of human security involves as well the need to further develop the concrete implications of the right to development.

Focusing the action of the international community around the needs of “the peoples” of the United Nations is thus the prime rationale for the evolution of the concept of security.

Two other characteristics enter the modern definition of security. First, the recognition that security is common. In other terms, one cannot achieve its own security at the expense of others. Secondly, the recognition that security is comprehensive. Political, military, economic, energy, and environmental factors are closely interlinked and must be considered together in order for security to be meaningful at all.

The UN works tirelessly to realize the fundamental goals of peace and security for all people regardless of the presence or lack of good governance in their country. I have categorized some of the tools the UN has at its disposal to achieve these goals under what I call the 4 Ps and a C: Preventive diplomacy, Peacemaking, Peacekeeping and Peacebuilding and lastly, if all else fails, Conflict Management.

#### **- Preventive diplomacy**



Preventive diplomacy is a complex task which involves the whole array of political, diplomatic, legal and military tools available to the United Nations. The political/diplomatic tools which can be resorted to in the context of preventive diplomacy mostly overlap those enumerated in article 33 of the Charter on the pacific settlement of disputes. This article specifically refers to:

‘...negotiations, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means...’

In recent years, the concept of preventive diplomacy has been broadened to include the use of military tools in peace promotion. It is no longer considered anachronistic for the United Nations to deploy troops for preventive purposes. To this day, the UN Preventive Deployment mission, also known as UNPREDEP, in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, is still the only instance of preventive deployment, but it has proved effective and it has created a precedent. The mission of UNPREDEP was to prevent a spillover of the Yugoslav conflict into the entire Balkan region. Beyond its basic mandate to monitor the border area, UNPREDEP successfully served as a deterrent to external aggression.

Recognizing the potential of preventive diplomacy, the Security Council, as early as January 1992, adopted a declaration (S/23500) mandating the Secretary-General to give priority to this activity. Accordingly, Former Secretary General, Mr. Boutros Boutros-Ghali, created the Department of Political Affairs to follow political developments worldwide, provide early-warning of impending conflicts and analyze possibilities for preventive action.

In the present context of the reform proposals introduced by Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, on 15 July 1997, the priority granted to preventive action is further reaffirmed and the objective of upgrading the global watch system of the Organization is specifically mentioned. Early-warning systems are essential to support the efforts of the Security Council and of the Secretary-General to deter conflict.

Also, legal tools available to the United Nations should not be under-estimated for preventive purposes. The decisions or advisory opinions of the International Court of Justice (ICJ) can prevent disputes from erupting into full-fledged conflicts.

### **- Peacemaking**

Despite the current trend to promote preventive activities, a significant part of UN peace operations still revolves around the peacemaking process which aims at reconciling political and



strategic discrepancies through the use of political, diplomatic and legal tools. In other words, this UN responsibility lies between the task of conflict prevention and peacekeeping. The United Nations has a great deal of experience in the use of various peacemaking methods, the most often utilized being mediation and negotiation.

I would like to stress the particularly important role the Secretary-General has come to play over time in these matters. Although he is most often mandated to act by the Security Council, the General Assembly, or the parties to the conflict themselves, the Secretary-General has developed the capacity to initiate action under his own authority, an authority he derives from article 99 of the Charter. According to this article 'the Secretary-General may bring to the attention of the Security Council any matter which in his opinion threatens the maintenance of international peace and security'. In order to fulfill this duty, he has developed information gathering capabilities, and has used such tools as 'fact finding missions' or 'missions of inquiry'.

Perhaps among the most well-known diplomatic tools available to the Secretary-General is the function of 'good offices', the exercise of which has often been considered as indicative of the influence of the Secretary-General within the UN system. This tool is among the most popular of all peacemaking options. One example of a successful peacemaking operation was the case of the civil war in El Salvador. The peacemaking efforts were comprehensive in nature, including the establishment of a cease-fire and the development of modalities for mutually disarming the combatants. Peacebuilding elements were also utilized such as monitoring human rights and negotiating constitutional guarantees. Finally, it made use for the first time of a tool which has proved its usefulness, the so-called 'Friends of the Secretary-General for El Salvador', an informal support group formed of States which have a particular interest in the conflict and which might be asked to intervene at critical moments in the negotiation. This instrument has been replicated in the context of other conflicts.

With the proliferation of issues now before the United Nations, it has become standard practice for the Secretary-General to delegate part of his political/diplomatic responsibilities, and to entrust 'Special representatives' or 'Special Envoys' with some of his mediation responsibilities. These are usually selected from a pool of senior UN staff or among statesmen of recognized experience and international stature. The Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, for example, has designated special envoys to revive deadlocked negotiations in the Western Sahara, in East Timor and in Cyprus.

One last element of peacemaking that I would like to mention is that sanctions have become the tool of last resort before the use of force in efforts to bring about the peaceful settlement of

tenuous situations. The sanctions against Libya are a case in point where a country is being punished for non-adherence to the rules of established international law.

### **- Peace-keeping**

Peace-keeping actions aim at halting, or at least reducing, the manifest violence of conflicts through the intervention of military forces. The mission of these forces is often to supervise and help maintain a previously agreed cease-fire based on a Security Council resolution, and to assist in the implementation of the settlement procedures, usually including troop withdrawals.

Few realise that the term “peace-keeping operation” which has become so closely associated with the United Nations over time, is nowhere to be found in the Charter. It is a concept which lies somewhere between the provisions of Chapter VI (on the peaceful settlement of disputes) and Chapter VII (on peace enforcement) of the Charter, and this explains why peace-keeping operations are sometimes referred to as measures in accordance with Chapter 6.5 of the Charter. The legal basis for such operations is derived from a specific mandate issued by the Security Council for each separate mission.

Traditionally, PKOs used to be composed predominantly of military personnel provided by contributing nations, but they now include police forces and a growing number of civilians. This evolution reflects the considerable extension of the civilian dimension of PKOs.

Currently, there are approximately 14,500 people (military and civilians included) deployed in the context of 17 peace-keeping missions around the world. This represents a decrease from the peak years of the early 1990s. The less successful operations of Somalia, the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda have led to a reappraisal of the PKO operations. It is now generally admitted that certain prerequisites must be met in order for a PKO to have a reasonable chance of success. These are:

- prospective PKOs must be given clear mandates. This has been repeatedly stressed within the Secretariat. Instructions regarding for instance the use or non-use of force in cases of self-defense are essential to the credibility of peacekeeping operations.
- PKOs must rely on a sound financial basis which is less and less the case. PKOs have traditionally been plagued with financial problems, but the present crisis, caused by the accumulation of Member States' arrears to the PKO budget, is seriously undermining the viability of such operations. According to recent estimates released by the Under Secretary-General for Management, the levels of unpaid assessments to the peacekeeping budget have



more than doubled since 1992. Peacekeeping cash is dwindling due in large part to the practice of borrowing from this fund to cover the shortfalls of the regular budget.

- PKOs must develop a rapid deployment capability. Presently, there is about a six month gap between the authorization of a PK mission by the Security Council and full deployment. Past experience has demonstrated the critical need for the UN to establish a presence at an early stage in order to help prevent the further intensification of a conflict. UN Secretary-General, Kofi Annan, inaugurated the United Nations Standby Forces High Readiness Brigade in Copenhagen in September 1997, but unfortunately funds for the necessary posts to staff this headquarters have not been forthcoming.

### **- Peacebuilding**

The essential goal of peacebuilding operations is the creation of structures for the institutionalization of peace. These operations were initially launched in a post-conflict environment, but they have proved their validity for preventive action as well as in conflict situations.

The scope of the United Nations activities, especially in the peace-building field, is rapidly enlarging, targeting virtually all elements of good governance: safeguarding the rule of law; verifying elections; training police; monitoring human rights; fostering investments; and promoting accountable administration.

Peacebuilding refers to the practical steps which can be implemented to bring about non-violent change through activities linked to socio-economic reconstruction, development or democratization. It aims at eliminating the root causes of conflicts in order to prevent their emergence or recurrence. Given a specific cultural background, peacebuilding will promote the most appropriate measures to consolidate peace, create trust, encourage tolerance and foster interaction among protagonists.

Also, electoral assistance has become an important aspect of United Nations activities, especially where elections are the focal point of a comprehensive peace settlement. The United Nations has developed a unique experience in the field of elections monitoring and has conducted this type of operations on all continents.

Finally, I would like to include as peacebuilding the activities of the international community in terms of disarmament. Indeed, in this post-cold war period, a discrepancy has appeared between considerably reduced needs for military equipment and the existing productive capacity of the

industry. Overproduction feeds the illicit traffic of arms, in particular of light conventional weapons, and poses a serious threat to international security. Any activity aimed at curbing or banning altogether the production and sales of such weapons, may be deemed 'Peacebuilding'. The efforts of the international community to ban antipersonnel landmines which culminated last year in the signature of the Treaty of Ottawa by more than 120 countries, were also definitely of a peacebuilding nature.

And finally,

### **- Conflict management**

Crisis management entails modulating one's policy and operational responses during a conflict, so as to minimize the damaging effect of the conflict and maximize the prospects for future solutions.

One of the most important element of conflict management is to make sure that the principles of humanitarian law which are embodied in the Hague and Geneva Conventions are duly observed in conflict situation. These codes of conduct on the treatment of military personnel and civilian populations, as well as on the use on certain types of weapons need to be given wider publicity among elected officials and military leaders around the world. Efforts to promote educational campaigns on these matters should be reinforced. The upcoming 100th anniversary of the Hague convention and the 50th anniversary of the Geneva convention will undoubtedly serve to give greater visibility to international humanitarian law.

On 17 July 1998 in Rome, 160 nations decided to establish a permanent international criminal court to try individuals for the most serious offences of global concern, such as genocide, war crimes and crimes against humanity. The necessity for creating such a court now came from the realization that the ad-hoc tribunals set up to try suspected criminals following specific conflicts were too limited in their jurisdiction and not flexible enough to address larger, more complex circumstances surrounding these conflicts. But most important of all, the world did not have a permanent body to ~~d~~ deter new violations from occurring in the first place. In the words of the UN Secretary General, Kofi Annan, "A person stands a better chance of being tried and judged for killing one human being than for killing 100,000." This new court will ensure that all military and government officials conduct themselves in accordance with established international laws on the rights of both combatants and non-combatants.



This has been a brief presentation of some of the ways in which the UN works towards comprehensive peace and sustained stability in the context of existing and future fractious conflicts. But the UN is not alone in this effort.

In 1817, a British economist by the name of David Ricardo put forth a theory known as Comparative Advantage. This theory helped to explain the changes he saw in the efficiency and geographical vectors of manufacturing patterns, whereby products were no longer being produced by any and every country but only where it was most cost effective. Today this theory governs the mobility of product manufacturing throughout the world and explains why shoe companies prefer to produce their shoes in Korea and microchip makers to develop microchips in Silicon Valley. Well, the UN is not resistant to this theory, and in the context of the UN reforms, has embraced this notion as the best means "to do more with less." The peace operations I have outlined above are now being undertaken in cooperation with regional organizations throughout the world in order to take advantage of each organization's 'comparative advantage' in its particular field of activity.

In his report entitled "Renewing the United Nations: A Programme for Reform," Secretary General Annan stated that cooperation between the United Nations and regional organizations "will be intensified and regional organizations will increasingly become partners of the UN in all activities related to the maintenance of international peace and security, including conflict prevention." With a view to enhancing such cooperation, he convened on 28 and 29 July 1998 a third meeting with heads of regional organizations. The first two meetings (held in 1994 and 1996) had focused on general principles and modalities to guide cooperation between the UN and regional organizations in the field of international peace and security.

An informal agreement between the United Nations and the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has led to a clear division of labour, with the UN retaining the lead in the peacemaking efforts in Tajikistan and Abkhazia (Georgia), while the OSCE has had the lead in the Republic of Moldova, South Ossetia, and in the conflict over Nagorno-Karabakh.

Within Europe, a mechanism for coordination and consultation between the United Nations and regional structures already exists which, in my view, might serve as a model for interaction between the UN and organizations elsewhere in the world. In July 1993, a process of informal, tripartite consultations was initiated between the Geneva-based UN bodies, the then CSCE and the Council of Europe. These consultations, which focused initially on humanitarian emergencies, have in recent years begun to address a broader range of issues such as good governance, and post-conflict rehabilitation and development. Above all, these consultations are aimed at sharing

information, improving coordination, avoiding duplication and optimizing the utilization of scarce resources. There is an annual high-level meeting, the most recent of which was chaired by OSCE in Geneva in January 1998. The Council of Europe will convene the next such gathering in Strasbourg early this year. This has been a most fruitful process of collaboration and the UN will continue to foster it in the future.

### **III) American Highways, the Challenge to European Stability and the Euro**

I hope this presentation has provided you with an overall familiarity with the UN's work in promoting peace and security in the face of conflict. In this last part of my presentation I would like to focus on Europe because, amid the great turmoil of world events over the past couple decades, Europe has emerged as a model of integration and stability. And having achieved relatively firm integration on the western part of the continent, the forces of integration are beginning to extend eastward into the democratically 'young' region of Central and Eastern Europe. The implications of this enlarging regional integration on the improvement of European security are tremendous and deserve to be addressed in my presentation accordingly.

In the late 1950s and early 1960s, a young social scientist who later went on to become a Congressional representative, then a senator from the US state of NY, had the foresight to recognize the dangers of the post-war expansion of the US's transportation infrastructure, ie., national highways, and railways. The development of this infrastructure, the ready availability of cheap gasoline and American cars as well as the need for an expanded fleet of trucks to ship products all over the country, encouraged many men to travel far in search of new business opportunities. This social scientist argued that this trend would eventually lead to the breakup of the American family, an idea scoffed at at that time. He believed that the structure of the families these men left behind would begin to crumble on a national scale. And what followed was that the rate of divorce and child delinquency soared in the US as more and more men were no longer present in their families' lives. These families, and those a generation later, were deeply affected by this fact which was characteristic of the period of economic opportunism in the post-war United States.

In today's Europe, I believe that there is a similar trend developing before our eyes. The European Union is now courting several countries of the former Eastern Bloc who are at a stage where they are just beginning to find their first democratic and capitalist 'legs.' The North Atlantic



Treaty Organization (NATO) is also actively wooing several countries of that region into its sphere in the hopes that this will firmly solidify their allegiances and resolution to becoming part of the 'West.' The haste to find economic opportunity away from home of the post Second World War United States and the haste of the West in expanding into the political vacuum of Central and Eastern Europe at the end of the Cold War are of similar alacrity. But as the 'West' drives East in the hopes of finding new opportunities, it must remember to choose its road carefully all the while keeping a watchful eye on the stability of the family left behind.

The haste for change characteristic of the Post-Cold War era, has been promulgated mainly by well-established regional institutions such as the European Union and NATO. The memberships in these institutions, although in the process of expansion, are exclusionary and therefore do not foster multilateralism with those who are not yet members. However, other regional structures currently in place permit greater inter-regional dialogue and cooperation. These structures include the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) whose membership extends from Vancouver to Vladivostok, from Murmansk to Malta and Dublin to Dushanbe. This is an example of a truly trans-continental structure which was created on the principle of inclusiveness and offers a useful forum for promoting more than just 'Pan-European' integration and security since the structure extends across the Atlantic Ocean and incorporates North ~~America~~ <sup>Asia</sup> as well.

When confronted with the myriad of different regional superstructures and frameworks present in Europe today, I like to think of this complex web in terms of 'interlocking memberships.' For a particular country, the idea of interlocking membership means that participation in one framework does not exclude or diminish that same country's participation in others. A country's participation in several frameworks is an endorsement of a process wherein disputes are resolved by peaceful means and cooperation is fostered among open-minded partners. These frameworks are therefore mutually reinforcing in that they, by their very existence and membership base, are each part of a larger, self-perpetuating process based on the primacy of peace. Therefore, I believe that we must embrace the diversity of international frameworks just as we embrace the rich diversity of the international community as humanity's greatest attribute.

Nevertheless, as is sometimes the case in Europe, the confusion of identities that can occur from multiple memberships in regional frameworks can limit the potential for a unified front among actors addressing crucial situations. We saw this in the case of the Former Yugoslavia and most recently in Kosovo. These are the questions that need to be addressed before the new actors of Central and Eastern Europe become prematurely drawn into a complex web of regional groupings

that have difficulty in finding a unity of purpose and a common voice on matters of humanitarian and security concerns.

The United Nations, however, is the one constant among the myriad of different frameworks, because of its near universal membership and clear determination to work for peace and security for all, regardless of regional considerations. For this reason, I believe the United Nations will increasingly be called upon to provide a wider framework of issues for international dialogue and coordination in the future.

Because of the integration achieved in Europe, there are certain things that we expect from the region. First of all, Europe must use its extensive experience in overcoming challenges to regional integration in order to lay the groundwork for other countries to join when the time is right for them. Essentially, Europe must learn from its mistakes and help its Eastern neighbors avoid making those same mistakes. Secondly, Europe must actively facilitate the introduction of non-violent channels for democratic change. In many countries this might entail a strong support for burgeoning civil societies. In other countries, this may entail the provision of guidance on legal and constitutional methods for embedding the rule of law into the fabric of society and government activities. Western Europe has a particularly important responsibility in this regard towards the countries of Central and Eastern Europe. Some of these countries are at a fragile stage in their conversion towards a market economy and democratic standards for good governance. This is a unique opportunity for Western Europe, not to step in and dominate the scene, but to assist the natural processes for democratisation as they develop. Unfortunately, the excitement of many countries of the East to join Western frameworks has translated, in many cases, into a diversion of important resources and attention away from issues of greater concern to national democratic sustainability. Among other things, these include unemployment, the lack of enforceable tax legislation and collection and criminal activity. Of course these problems are present all throughout Europe, but in the countries of the East, they are of particular concern.

Another responsibility that falls on the shoulders of Western Europe is the building of a 'Grand Europe.' By this I mean the creation of a Europe that actively resists falling back into the dividing, exclusionary blocs characteristic of the Cold War. A Europe open to all is the key to the stability of the 'European Security Architecture' of the future. This new reality must shed the detrimental balance of power perspective and focus more on the principle of the balance of interests. Interdependence is the glue that will maintain the structural integrity of the new Europe.

All this said, I believe the advent of the Euro will have a stabilizing and further unifying effect on the countries which have adopted it. As is most often the case, political integration begins



with economic integration. As I am sure you are all well aware, the European Union began as an agreement between a small group of countries of Western Europe on the trading of steel and coal. The political cooperation between these countries followed from the excellent relations that they had fostered in their economic dealings. The Euro will undoubtedly have a similarly unifying effect as this monetary interdependence ties these 11 countries into building, maintaining and protecting a common dream for the future. Hopefully, the Euro will have a lasting effect on improving the coordination of a common European approach to matters far beyond the search for economic opportunity and prosperity. Eventually, this could include matters of collective security and the maintenance of security both within as well as outside Europe.

In conclusion, I would like to stress the lesson that I brought up earlier regarding the root causes of conflict. As I have tried to illustrate today, I believe that as we approach the 21st Century, we must keep in mind that the roots of conflict in the future are most often found in the ruins of a previous one. Also, I hope that I communicated to you that we must be very conscious of the impacts of innovations and changes that technology is ushering into our homes, businesses, and workplaces, and how this might come to affect both our personal and collective sense of security. The United Nations is at an exciting moment in its evolution. More than ever, the institution is sensitive to the need to remain adaptable to important changes in the world, all the while remaining a steadfast protector of the integrity of its Charter. The 21st Century will undoubtedly bring opportunity for conflict and insecurity but the United Nations and its partner organizations stand ready to address them all with equal resolve.

Thank you for your attention.