

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM
EDUCATION

Special Paper No. 4

Security Council Reform Models:

Models A and B, Italian (Regional)
Proposal, Blue and Green Models and
A New Model C

May 2005

Walter Hoffmann
Ayca Ariyoruk

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

The UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's well-intended effort to enlarge the Security Council may be in danger. A Group of Four (G4) Japan, Germany, Brazil and India are each campaigning for permanent seats and they each have evoked regional objectors. For example, Chinese citizens are protesting vigorously Japan's bid for a permanent seat. Small and medium states are also worried about the proposed enlargement models, which, if implemented, could reduce their opportunities to be represented on the Council.

Even so, a "Heads of State" summit of world leaders is due to tackle Security Council enlargement this September. Annan is backing the two models proposed by a high-level panel last December, namely Model A or Model B; "or any other viable proposals in terms of size and balance that have emerged on the basis of either model." The high level panel recommended no change at the present time in the status of the five permanent members, but noted that "under any reform proposal, there should be no expansion of the veto." The panel calls for a complete review of the membership of the Council—both permanent and non-permanent members – in the year 2020.

This paper reviews the reform options made available to the member states including the Green and Blue Models recently put forward by the *Uniting for Consensus* movement; the regional model proposed by the Italian government, and introduces Model C, a product of a study conducted by one of the authors.

Model A and Model B

Model A proposes the addition of six new permanent seats without the veto: two for Africa; two for Asia and the Pacific; one for Europe; and one for the Americas; plus three more non-permanent seats. Model B proposes no new permanent seats but creates a new category of eight four-year renewable term seats; two each for Africa; Asia and the Pacific; Europe; and the Americas; plus one additional non-permanent seat. Model A and B expands the Council to 24.

The problem with Model A is that it creates six new permanent seats which will be difficult to change in 2020, particularly since each new holder of a permanent seat will probably contend that it should have a veto power similar to the original five members.

The major problem, however, with both Models A and B is that both have scrapped the customary regional groupings that the General Assembly has used since 1965 to elect the non-permanent members of the Security Council (five seats for Asia and Africa, two for Latin America; one for Eastern Europe and two for Western Europe and Other States).

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

Continental Groupings and Gross Population Disparity

Instead the panel has substituted four new continental groupings; (1) Combining all of Asia with all of the island countries in the Pacific, (2) combining Eastern and Western Europe, (3) combining North and South America, and (4) only keeping Africa as one continent. A rough population comparison of these new continental groupings (the Americas- 857 million; Europe-727 million; Africa-835 million; Asia and the Pacific- 3 billion, 836 million) indicates a gross population disparity between Asia and the Pacific compared to the three other continental groupings.

Italian Proposal (Regional Model) and Blue and Green Models

The regional model proposed by the Italian government and Blue and Green Models proposed by *Uniting for Consensus* Movement, rejected the continental groupings and opted instead for the existing regional groupings on which non-permanent members have been elected since 1965.

The model proposed recently by the Italian government, maintains the current regional groupings (Asia, Africa, Western Europe and Other Groups, Eastern Europe and Latin America and the Caribbean) and assigns ten new permanent seats (without veto) to the regions, not to individual states. Ambassador Marcello Spatafora, Permanent Representative of Italy explained to the General Assembly (May 02, 2005) that the Italian Model envisions a “true” regional seating as opposed to seats regionally assigned but occupied nationally. According to the Italian Model¹, each regional group would have the “operational management” of the seats and that each region would define principles and mechanisms with appropriate checks and balances to prevent national occupation of the seats and ensure regional representation. The main shortcoming of the Italian model lies in its implementation. Current member states do not readily have the capacity to manage a Security Council seat regionally. Maybe only through regional organizations can that capacity be developed, (for instance EU could manage the seat for the Western Europe) but not every country can readily be represented by a regional organization (for example, in Asia there are few regional groups and not all of Europe is part of EU).

Shortly after the Italian proposal, *Uniting for Consensus*, an unlikely coalition of countries who are united by a common view point which opposes expanding the Security Council in permanent category (Model A), put forward the Blue and Green Models for discussion. In terms of size and balance, the Green Model is the same as Italian’s regional model; it divides the Council into five regional groups, and expands the Council with ten new seats. The difference is that the seats in Green Model are assigned to individual states, not to the regional groups and that they are not

¹ For more regional proposals see *Better Globalization: Legitimacy, Governance and Reform* by Kemal Dervis (2005) and *Regional Representation as a Basis for Security Council Reform* by Joseph E. Schwartzberg (2004).

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

permanent. The Green Model is also the most similar to the Council's current composition; it uses the same five regional groupings, it doesn't create a new tier, instead expands the Council's current two-year category by adding ten more seats. According to the Green Model, the 20 non-permanent seats in the two-year category are all open to re-election and that each region may evolve ad hoc criteria for re-election/ rotation of its allocated seats. Currently, the states that occupy the two-year seats cannot be eligible for immediate re-election. How does the Green Model differ from Model B? Green Model avoids the creation of a "third category" of four-year renewable terms as proposed in Model B.

Blue Model, a variation of Model B, creates a third category of seats with longer terms (3 or 4 years) and expands the two-year term category by adding 2 or 3 seats. It is flexible on the term length and on the re-election of the longer-term seats. Blue Model meets the interests of the larger countries by creating longer-term seats and at the same time addresses the concerns of smaller countries by expanding the two-year category. This is not possible in Model B, because continental groupings limit the allocation of more seats to smaller states, especially in Europe.

One shortcoming of Blue and Green Model is their reliance on the old regional groupings. The five existing regional groupings in the Security Council are sometimes being criticized because three of the five veto powers are from Europe, and ensuring seat allocation to smaller states in both Western and Eastern Europe results in an a more Euro-centric composition.

A New Model C

Instead of the continental groupings and the old regional groupings, a New Model C suggested by Professor Hoffmann, divides Asia and the Pacific into two regions, namely the Pacific Rim countries (U.S., Canada, Japan, the Philippines, the states other than China along the East Asian coastline, Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Island States) with China plus South and Southwest Asia constituting the remainder of the Asian region. This way, the New Model C gives greater recognition to the heavily populated states of Asia.

Model C also offers a creative solution to a problem shared by Model A and B; that is how to parcel out the permanent seats in Model A or the eight renewable four-year terms in Model B without causing great political rancor from the large states in each region which are not selected. Model C suggests that the answer to the problem may lie in the suggestion made more than a decade ago by Professor Louis Sohn for "dual seating"² of two States with the first State's ambassador sitting in the seat the first two

² The concept of "dual seating" was originally presented by Professor Louis Sohn, former president of The American Society for International Law, at a conference organized by The Hague Academy of International Law at The Hague in July 1992.

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

years and alternating with the ambassador from the second State every two years thereafter with close consultation between the two States.

Models A and B also fail to provide sufficient representation for the states that have been the top contributors in each region for UN peace operations. Instead of relying on their election to non-renewable two-year terms, Model C suggests rewarding top troop and other personnel contributors (including military and civilian police) to peace and state building operations with a four-year term, which would encourage other states to make the sacrifice of people so essential for the maintenance of international peace and security. (If two states are relatively close in the amount of personnel they have contributed in the past two years, then those two states could share a four-year term.)

A possible Model C for a 25 member Council might then look like this: Europe-three permanent members (UK, France, Russia), one eight-year term possibly shared initially by Germany and Italy, and one four year term, either Ukraine or Sweden, for the current top peace operation contributor. Pacific Rim-one permanent member (U.S.), one eight-year term, possibly shared initially by Japan and Australia; one four year term for Canada, the current top peace operation contributor; and two two-year non-renewable seats. South and Southwest Asia-one permanent seat (China), one eight-year term, possibly shared initially by India and Indonesia; one four-year term for the current top peace operation contributor either Pakistan or Bangladesh; and two two-year non-renewable seats. Latin America & the Caribbean- no permanent member, one eight-year term possibly shared initially by Brazil and Mexico; one four year term for the current top peace operation contributor, Uruguay; and two two-year non-renewable seats. Africa- no permanent member, one eight-year term, possibly shared initially by Nigeria and South Africa, (perhaps later by Egypt and Ethiopia); one four year term for the current top peace operation contributor, Ghana; and three two-year non-renewable seats.

The states listed above in Model C, are nothing more than suggestions. Each region should make its own choices with respect to the states that are the top contributors to the UN mandated peace operations and also to the states that are viewed as leaders in their respective regions. Contributions to voluntary activities of the United Nations in the areas of security and development, diplomatic activities in support of UN objectives and mandates; and among developed countries, achieving the internationally recognized level of 0.7 per cent of GNP for Official Development Assistance (ODA) should all be considered as important criteria of leadership. Each region should be free to change its selections every eight years for the 8-year terms and every four years for the 4-year term.

Model C has two serious shortcomings; 1) Through 'dual seating' rotating states will be on the Council technically but would not each have a vote, 2) Determination of the

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

top troop and personnel contributors for each region may face obstacles from less populated countries who are making significant sacrifices proportionally.

According to Professor Hoffmann, Model C has the advantage of having more flexibility in integrating the support and assistance of more major powers in each region through the use of dual seating; of giving greater recognition to the heavily populated states of South Asia; and of ensuring a more effective Council because it rewards the top UN peace operation contributors in every region with a four-year term.

Would a 24 or 25 member Security Council be more representative? Emphatically yes. In 1945, when there were only 52 Members, the Security Council had 11 members – five permanent, and six non-permanent. By 1963, the number of states had increased from 52 to 118. The Charter was then amended to increase the Security Council to 15 (the same PERM-5 plus ten instead of six non-permanent members). Today the number of UN Member states has reached 191, and a further enlargement is clearly essential.

The question for each mission studying various proposals is which model will make the Security Council more effective. Will Model A or B with its continental groupings and gross population disparity? Will the Italian Regional Proposal or the Green or Blue Models with their existing regional groupings and the accompanied criticism of Euro-centrism? Or will Model C with its untried dual seating and its problematic reward of four-year terms for peace operation contributors? Or will some combination of each of the above?

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

MODELS PROPOSED BY THE HIGH LEVEL PANEL³

MODEL A (December 2004)

Regional Area	No. of States	Permanent Seat (Continuing)	EXPANSION		TOTAL
			Proposed new permanent seats	Proposed two years seats (non-renewable)	
Africa	53	0	2	4	6
Asia and Pacific	56	1	2	3	6
Europe	47	3	1	2	6
Americas	35	1	1	4	6
Total	191	5	6	13	24

MODEL B (December 2004)

Regional Area	No. of States	Permanent Seat (Continuing)	EXPANSION		TOTAL
			Proposed four year renewable seats	Proposed two years seats (non-renewable)	
Africa	53	0	2	4	6
Asia and Pacific	56	1	2	3	6
Europe	47	3	2	1	6
Americas	35	1	2	3	6
Total	191	5	8	11	24

³ Model A and B as proposed by the Report of the Secretary General's High- Level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change (source A/59/565)

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

UNITING FOR CONSENSUS PROPOSALS

Blue Model (April 2005)

Region	No. of States	Current		Expansion (Non-Permanent)		Total	Elected Seats as % of Regional Groups ⁴
		Permanent	Non-Permanent	Longer-Term	2 years		
Asia	54	1	2	2	1	6	9.4
Africa	53	0	3	2	1	6	11.3
GRULAC	33	0	2	2	0	4	12.1
WEOG	29	3	2	1 (or 2)	0	6	11.5
Eastern Europe	22	1	1	1 ⁵		3	9.5
Total	191	5	10	10		25	10.8 (Overall)

Green Model (April 2005)

Regional Area	No. of States	PERMANENT	NON-PERMANENT		Total	Elected seats as % of Regional Groups
			Current	Expansion		
Asia	54	1	2	3	6	9.4
Africa	53	0	3	3	6	11.3
GRULAC	33	0	2	2	4	12.1
WEOG	29	3	2	1	6	11.5
Eastern Europe	22	1	1	1	3	9.5
Total	191	5	10	10	25	10.8 (Overall)

⁴ The percentage of members of each regional group that would sit on the Security Council excluding Permanent Members. For example, the Asian Group, excluding China, has 53 countries and would hold five elected seats: $5 \div 53 = 9.4\%$. Likewise, the *Overall* percentage is the total number of elected seats (20) divided by the total number of Member States, excluding Permanent Members (186): $20 \div 186 = 10.8\%$.

⁵ Longer-Term or Non-Permanent open to further discussion.

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

ITALIAN PROPOSAL

Regional Model (April 2005)

Region	No. of States	Current National Seats		EXPANSION Regional Seats	Total
		Permanent	Non-Permanent	Permanently Assigned to Regional Groups	
Asia	54	1	2	3	6
Africa	53	0	3	3	6
GRULAC ⁶	33	0	2	2	4
WEOG ⁷	29	3	2	1	6
Eastern Europe	22	1	1	1	3
Total	191	5	10	10	25

SPECIAL PAPER PROPOSAL

The New Model C (May 2005)

Regional Area	No. of States	Permanent Seat (Continuing)	EXPANSION			TOTAL
			Two states sharing one-eight year term	Four-year term for troop & personnel contributors	Two years seats (non-renewable)	
Africa	53	0	1	1	3	5
South Asia	29	1	1	1	2	5
Europe	47	3	1	1	1	6
Pacific Rim	29	1	1	1	2	5
Latin America & the Caribbean	33	0	1	1	2	4
Total	191	5	5	5	10	25

⁶ Group of United Nations Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), used to elect member states to main UN bodies

⁷ Western European Other Groups (WEOG) is a regional group within the United Nations, used to elect member states to main UN bodies.

CENTER FOR U.N. REFORM EDUCATION

About Center for U.N. Reform Education

The Center for U.N. Reform Education is a non-profit policy research organization. Founded in 1978, the mission of the Center is to encourage, generate and sustain discussion of various specific proposals to reform and restructure the United Nations through the publication and distribution of monographs, papers and books and its widely attended forums and conferences. The Center does not take positions regarding specific proposals and has a consultative status with Department of Public Information at the United Nations.

About the Authors

Walter Hoffmann: Walter Hoffmann is an Adjunct Professor at Ramapo College of New Jersey and former Executive Director of the Center for UN Reform Education. He was appointed in 1992 by House Speaker Tom Foley to the United State Commission on Improving the Effectiveness of the United Nations. A lawyer in private practice for more than 30 years, he served as chair of the Arms Control and Disarmament Committee of the American Bar Association, and as chair of the International Organizations Section of the American Society for International Law. He holds degrees from the University of Michigan (B.A.) and the University of Chicago Law School (J.D.).

Ayca Ariyoruk: Ayca Ariyoruk is expected to join the Center as a research fellow in July 2005. Previously, Ms. Ariyoruk worked at the Washington Institute for Near East Policy as a Dr. Marcia Robbins-Wilf Young Scholar. Ms. Ariyoruk's graduate thesis investigated U.S. policy towards Somalia and Rwanda and focused on the role of decision-makers in Washington D.C. She received her B.A. in political science from University of Nebraska, Lincoln and M.A. from John C. Whitehead School of Diplomacy and International Relations at Seton Hall University.