



Reformation of the United Nations Security Council as a Key Issue in World Politics

Tsvetkov Yuri,

Candidate of Law, Docent,
Head of the Research Department
Moscow Academy of the Investigative Committee
of the Russian Federation
E-mail: Yutsvet@yandex.ru

Abstract. *The author of the article substantiates the position that the issue of reform of the Security Council, the main political body of the UN, is a key issue in world politics and international law, and intersects with the strategic interests of states, the most active players on the world stage, as well as the interests of all regions of the world. The article analyzes the advantages afforded to permanent members of this body and describes the main approaches to Security Council reform. It critically assesses attempts to deconstruct the world order through such reform and suggests ways to counter them. It also formulates criteria for evaluating compliance with the status of a permanent member of the Security Council. and demonstrates the potential of these criteria by evaluating the validity of claims and real chances for this status by the group of four G-4 states (Brazil, India, Germany, and Japan), as well as by European and African countries. The author offers a model of UN Security Council reform that takes into account the interests of Russia and world realities.*

Keywords: *World politics, world order, UN, security council, veto, "unity for peace," G-4.*

If the key issues of world politics are passed through the prism of international law, they will all focus on one point: the reform of the United Nations Security Council. The explanation for this thesis should be sought in the nature of international law. The problem of its substantiality is one of the fundamental scientific problems of jurisprudence. Can what we call international law be considered a right? A norm acquires the quality of law only when it is generally binding and supported by coercion. Hegel used the concept of "external state law" instead of "international law". He proceeded from the view that states in relation to each other are in a natural condition. The contract between them as a source of law is just a reflection of the will, not imposed upon it from above, but coming from the state itself. Only good faith decides whether to fulfill such an agreement. "There is no praetor over the states", the philosopher argued, implying that there is no supranational body which they would obey and which could resolve their disputes arising from international treaties [1, pp. 364-369]. Hegel's argument in favor of the international law accident seemed very convincing until the Charter of the United Nations was adopted in 1945, which provided for a more-or-less full-fledged "praetor over states" in the person of one of its six main organs, the Security Council.

The UN Security Council is the only supranational body whose decisions are generally binding. By virtue of Article 25 of the Organization's Charter, all of its members agree to obey and implement the decisions of the Security Council. Only this body, according to international law, has the right to legitimately interfere in the internal affairs of other states, or for violations of international law. Moreover, these decisions can be supported by coercive measures, including armed force. Thus, the concept of international law rests on the point of support for the UN Security Council in the form of coercive mechanisms. Accordingly, control of this body and right of *veto* is the main nerve node of the world order.

What is the status of UN Security Council members?

First, as it follows from the sign of permanence, Security Council states hold this status indefinitely. The terms of other Council member offices are limited to two years, although they can be elected an unlimited number of times. There is no way to terminate the status of a permanent member of the Council, except by voluntary refusal.

The threat to deprive Russia of this status has been repeatedly voiced. The former Foreign Affairs Minister of Ukraine, P. Klimkin, demanded that Russia be excluded from voting on the conflict

in the Donbas. He was referring to Article 27 of the Charter, which requires the parties involved in a dispute to abstain from voting'. This demand was not supported by either the United States or China, since they had probably "tried it on" and realized that the launch of this mechanism would create a potential threat to themselves in their own disputes.

Another, much more radical, plan is to exclude Russia from permanent membership in the Security Council. It was formulated by a Ukrainian diplomat who proposed to withdraw Ukraine's consent to the transfer of the USSR's place in the UN and its highest body to Russia, which was proposed at the Alma-Ata conference. The next step should be to appeal to the UN International Court of Justice to challenge the current status of Russia. If the Court's decision does not favor Ukraine, then it is proposed to vote in the General Assembly on the issue of depriving Russia of their Security Council membership².

The described mechanism is legally flawed, but theoretically quite feasible. The inferiority of the Alma-Ata Declaration is found at every turn. Adopted on December 21, 1991 and signed by the heads of 11 of the 15 Soviet Union republics, it is a legally meaningless document, since there is no reference to the transfer of the USSR's place in the main UN bodies to Russia. There is no reason to link the legitimization of Russia's status as a permanent member of the Security Council with this document, which has become a commonplace of international legal doctrine. Russia has taken this position not as a legal successor, but as a successor of the USSR, as the President of the RSFSR, Boris Yeltsin, said. Yeltsin announced it to the world community in a letter, to the UN Secretary-General, No. Pr-2338, dated three days later, on December 24, 1991. There were no objections from other UN member states, and with the tacit consent of the international community, Russia took the place of the Soviet Union in the Security Council. Since 1992, this position has been recognized by the entire world community. These events override the isolated attempts to revise it after almost 30 years. The second link is the UN International Court of Justice. How can we be sure that the International Court of Justice will grant such an appeal? Even if this

were hypothetically possible, there may be serious obstacles of a procedural nature. In accordance with Article 59 of the Court Statutes, its decisions are binding only on the parties involved in the case, and previously, by virtue of Article 36 of the Statutes, a separate declaration recognizing its jurisdiction is required. The USSR, and later Russia, has recognized the jurisdiction of this Court only in matters of compliance with the conventions on human rights and combating terrorism. The dispute about jurisdiction had been decided by the Court (Article 36 of the Statutes), so there were precedents when the Court involved a state as a party (even the United States), declaring that the dispute was not subject to the Court due to non-recognition in one or another part of its jurisdiction. Therefore, if a state that has the ability to form a majority in the General Assembly sets out to launch this mechanism, it theoretically has a chance of success. However, if such an unfavorable scenario for Russia as expulsion from the Security Council is realized, it still has the possibility of a powerful asymmetric response, withdrawal from the UN. And the withdrawal of a founding state from the UN is the first step toward the complete collapse of the Organization. Therefore, it is necessary to immediately and unequivocally state the price of the consequences for the entire organization in case Russia is deprived of its status.

Secondly, a permanent Security Council member confers on a nation the status of what is imprecisely called the "veto right". Decisions of the Security Council on any issues other than procedural ones are considered adopted if they were passed by at least nine members of the Council, including the concurring votes of all its permanent members (Article 27 of the UN Charter). In keeping with the letter of the Charter, the adoption of a resolution requires yeas of all five permanent members. However, the practice has developed in such a way that a decision will be considered adopted if none of the permanent members votes nay. In other words, one or even all of them may abstain from voting, which is exactly what Russia and four other countries did in the vote on Resolution No. 1973 of March 17, 2011. That bill authorized the use of "all necessary measures" by member states "to protect civilians under threat of attack" in Libya. Under the guise of those measures, the French Air Force and its allies supported the rebels, which led to a turning point in the civil war and the overthrow of the Gaddafi regime.

A first attempt to circumvent the veto was first made in 1950 in General Assembly resolution No. 377 of November 3, 1950 the "Unity for Peace". It states that the General Assembly has the right to not only consider any situation involving a threat to or breach of the peace, or an act of aggression, but also to use armed forces to

¹ Kiev proposed to deprive Russia of the veto right in the UN Security Council when considering the situation in Ukraine // TASS (22.02.2017). URL: <https://tass.ru/mezhdunarodnaya-panorama/4043667> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

² Revocation of the signature and appeal to the court: Ukraine has planned to deprive Russia of its place in the UN Security Council // Politika segodnya (16.05.2020). URL: <https://polit.info/495619-otzyv-podpisi-i-obrasheniye-v-sud-ukraina-zadumala-lishit-rossiyu-mesta-v-sovbeze-oon> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

maintain or restore international peace and security. This procedure directly contradicts the provisions of the UN Charter, which clearly divides the competence between its main organs. The General Assembly does not have the right to make any decisions, or even any recommendations, regarding a dispute or situation, if the Security Council has already accepted them for its consideration (Part 1 of Article 12 of the UN Charter). The notorious resolution employs a streamlined wording that supposedly gives the General Assembly the right to intervene in the exclusive competence of the main political body, if the Security Council, as a result of the permanent members' disagreement, is unable to fulfill its primary responsibility to maintain international peace and security. In fact, this formulation devalues the "veto", since it allows a state capable of forming a majority in the General Assembly to overcome it. This resolution was adopted during the Korean War, when the Communist army of North Korea was developing a successful offensive on Seoul, and capitalist South Korea was on the verge of military defeat. The USSR, in protest against the United States' non-recognition of the right of the People's Republic of China to replace the Kuomintang Republic of China in the UN, boycotted the Security Council meetings in 1950. Bypassing the main political body, the United States initiated the adoption of this resolution, which allowed it to legalize the use of its armed forces against the North Korean army and push it behind the dividing line between the two territories. This was the first and only time that the resolution was used as a mandate for the use of armed forces by one state against another. Subsequently, on the basis of this resolution, emergency sessions of the UN General Assembly were convened six more times and international peacekeeping missions were established twice.

The International Court of Justice, in its advisory opinion of July 20, 1962, "Certain Expenses of the United Nations (Article 17, paragraph 2, of the Charter)", indirectly assessed the legitimacy of the resolution "Unity for Peace". The immediate subject of the Court's consideration was the question of financing the UN Emergency Armed Forces in the Middle East and the UN Operation in the Congo, which were created by the General Assembly within the legal framework laid out by Resolution No. 377. Indirectly, the International Court of Justice legitimized the resolution by considering the General Assembly request within the framework of this resolution. The Court stressed the following: the Charter provision that the Security Council has primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security does not mean that it has an "exclusive" responsibility in this area, and the General Assembly

has the right to deal with these issues. The Court did not disavow the provisions of Part 1, Article 12 of the Charter on Competence Division, stating that the international armed forces in the first case are created with the conflicting parties' consent, and in the second case, considering the Security Council resolutions. Accordingly, neither case falls under the concept of coercive measures, the application of which is attributed to the supreme political body's exclusive competence. Thus, considering the rare use of the "Unity for Peace" mechanism and the weak legal basis under it in the form of a compromise in content and a legally non-binding advisory opinion, it is impossible to consider it a full-fledged alternative to the Security Council. The basic international legal practice is for the Security Council to resolve the issue of the use of force, so the right to veto remains one of the most powerful legal instruments in world politics.

In 2013, France called for limiting the veto right on issues of genocide and other mass crimes against civilians³. The background for the initiative was the desire to apply pressure on Syria to remove its President Bashar al-Assad from power. France has consistently striven to play a leading role in solving various problems of its formerly mandated territory. This initiative was officially confirmed during a speech in September 2015 at the 70th session of the General Assembly by French President Francois Hollande⁴. France has not used the veto right since 1989. It calls for such a moratorium and other permanent members of the UN Security Council. This initiative is supported by many countries, but it is clear that the voluntary refusal of the Council permanent members to use this tool will equalize their powers with non-permanent members. With regard to France, this position is quite justified. The country voluntarily lowers its status, since its power and influence today are not comparable with Russia and the United States, even with the applicants for this status, which will be discussed below.

Third, a permanent member of the Security Council is automatically in the most prestigious closed club of states. Since the mid-1970s, the privileged international club has been the G7, whose members are among the most developed industrial countries, known in Russia as the "Big

³ The head of the French Foreign Ministry proposed to abandon the veto right of the UN Security Council in the case of "mass crimes" // RFI International French Radio (04.10.2013). URL: <https://www.rfi.fr/ru/frantsiya/20131004-glava-mida-frantsii-predlozhit-otkazatsya-ot-prava-na-veto-v-sb-oon-v-sluchae-mas> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

⁴ Hollande called on the members of the Security Council to limit use of the veto // RBC (28.09.2015). URL: <https://www.rbc.ru/rbcfreenews/560982c89a79478e8ea63809> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

Seven" (USA, Canada, Great Britain, France, Italy, Germany, and Japan). Later, the G20 group of twenty states emerged in parallel. Along with the seven above-mentioned states, the G20 includes 13 more developing countries with the largest economies.

Another informal club is the so-called Nuclear Club, which includes five countries that legally possess nuclear weapons⁵, meaning states that produced and detonated nuclear devices before January 1, 1967 (the United States, the USSR, the People's Republic of China, Great Britain and France). Those five have all signed the 1968 international Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons. Other countries that actually or supposedly possess nuclear weapons (India, Pakistan, Israel, and the DPRK) are de facto but not legal members of the "Nuclear Club." Given that none of the latter four have signed the Treaty, the world community does not recognize their right to possess nuclear weapons. Strictly speaking, there are no international legal mechanisms for prohibiting the possession of nuclear weapons, other than the obligations voluntarily assumed under the treaty. In fact, all of these actual and virtual associations are informal.

There is only one official club whose membership, ipso facto, makes a country a great power — the "club" of UN Security Council permanent members. This situation reflects, first, these states' status as "victors" in the Second World War, and secondly, as pillars of the world order. It is no coincidence that the circle of its participants coincides with the "Nuclear Club". It is why the attainment of permanent membership in the Security Council is the main foreign policy goal for a number of states and acts as their official recognition as great powers.

Objective prerequisites for Security Council reform

The issue of Security Council reform cannot be viewed via through the prism of encroachment on the world order and machinations against Russia. The issue has appeared on the world agenda for objective reasons. The composition of the "club" of the Security Council permanent members reflects the historical realities of the post-World War II world, which was clearly divided into winners and losers, with the winners assigned key roles in the management of the world. In the 21st century, there is no longer the sharp antagonism between the winners and losers of the last century's war. The question of containing Germany and Japan in their claims to world domination has lost its relevance. There are only three winners who at the time of

the USSR collapse remained the strongest military powers: the United States, Russia and China. These states share respectively the first, the second and the third places in the world ranking of military power, while France and Great Britain dropped to 7th and 8th places, respectively⁶.

There is no proportionality of representation in terms of an equitable geographical distribution principle (Part 1, Article 23 of the UN Charter). The three permanent member states are European, while not a one is African, Muslim, or South American. Three permanent members (the United States, Great Britain, and France) are part of one military-political bloc, NATO. The foreign policy of the United States and Great Britain developed in the post-war world on a single fairway. There was not a single significant issue of international politics on which the United Kingdom did not side with the United States. For example, on the issue of the 2004 intervention in Iraq, the United States met resistance even from its NATO allies Germany and France but retained support from its "unsinkable aircraft carrier," Britain.

The reform of the Security Council is officially listed on the international agenda as UN General Assembly Resolution No. 48/26 of December 12, 1993. "The question of equitable representation on and increase in the membership of the Security Council". It has established an open-ended working group to consider any proposals aimed at improving the effectiveness of this body. According to the comments about this resolution on the official UN website, all discussions on the issue since 2009 have been conducted within the framework of intergovernmental negotiations⁷. At the same time, in 2003, UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan established a "High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change", with representatives from 16 states. From Russia, it was E.M. Primakov. In 2004, the group prepared the report, "A Safer World: Our Shared Responsibility", in which it outlined ways to reform the UN Security Council. It provided for an increase in the size of the Council to 24 members, with six representatives each from four regions of the world: Africa, Asia-Pacific, Europe and the Americas. The authors of the report proposed two models for changing the structure of the UN's highest political body. The first model involved the introduction of six more permanent seats without the right to veto. The second model provided for the introduction of eight new seats for a four-year term of office with the right to re-election, while prohibiting the powers' extension for the countries elected for

⁵ Approved by UN General Assembly Resolution No. 2372 of 12.06.1968, entered into force on 05.03.1970.

⁶ 2020 Military Strength Ranking. Global firepower 2020. URL: globalfirpower.com (accessed: 01.09.2020).

⁷ UN official website. URL: <https://www.un.org/securitycouncil/ru/content/faq#process> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

a two-year term⁸. Despite the fact that, in general, the proposals were considered and compromising in nature, they were not implemented.

To date, four countries directly declare their claims to permanent membership in the UN Security Council: Brazil, India, Germany, and Japan. In 2009, they formed the G4 group, supporting each other in their quests to become permanent member of the UN Security Council. At the time of writing, on September 23, 2020, the Foreign Ministers of the G4 States, during the 75th anniversary session of the General Assembly, reiterated their readiness to immediately become permanent members of the Security Council and "expressed disappointment at attempts to disrupt this process"⁹. Indeed, despite the assurances of some Security Council permanent members about their support for the G4, no one is in a hurry to take real action in their favor. To wit, the U.S. authorities publicly promise to promote the candidacy of Japan, but behind-the-scenes American diplomats have done everything to prevent the expansion of the Security Council¹⁰. For example, France, via politicians, has repeatedly spoken about the introduction of the European Union into it, but when it came to concrete actions, it has refused to give up its place to anyone¹¹.

Criteria for evaluating candidates for permanent members of the Security Council

In order to assess the validity of the claims made by the G4 member states, as well as any other claims or proposals for the future introduction of country(ies) into permanent membership in the UN Security Council, it is necessary to determine the criteria that they must meet. Some, even if formulated for the election of non-permanent members, are contained in Part 1, Article 23 of the UN Charter: 1) the degree of a country's

participation in the maintenance of international peace and security and in the achievement of other UN goals; 2) equitable geographical distribution. For the first criterion, if we understand it in a narrow sense as the size of its share of UN financing and the number of peacekeeping operations in which a particular state needs to participate, then it could independently influence in its favor the change in these indicators, and it would not affect the deep foundations of the world order in any way. However, if we interpret it in a broad sense, we are talking about the extent to which states in general are able to influence other countries and world processes and actively participate in them. The second criterion is absolutely objective, and no one can influence it. If we add two more closely related criteria to these two, then the following four criteria would seem to be the most reasonable ones: 1) the power and influence of the state; 2) the presence of the applicant's full sovereignty; 3) representativeness; and 4) the moral authority of the country.

Power and influence. A state has a real impact on world processes only if it is strong. The strength of a state traditionally depends on the condition of its armed forces. At the same time, quantitative indicators are not even as important as qualitative ones, which can only be determined by their real effectiveness, tested in armed conflicts. The permanent members of the UN Security Council have confirmed their strength by the fact that they were victorious in the Second World War, and constantly maintain their reputation by the fact that their armed forces are involved in wars and conflicts. For example, the United Kingdom proved its military superiority and readiness to use force in 1982 during its clash with Argentina over the Falkland Islands. Thus, the exclusive powers of the Security Council permanent members belong to them by the right of the strong, which is the archetypal idea underlying international relations. That said, armed force alone is no longer enough to influence the world. No less, and perhaps even more importantly, is the economic power of the state, the competitiveness of its production, as well as the stability and convertibility of its national currency. Along with those two factors — armed force and economic power — the strength of a state depends indirectly on the size of its population and its territory. These two factors indicate the country's potential development, its ability to mobilize the population, and the exploitation of its natural resources.

Sovereignty. A state without full sovereignty becomes subject to influence. Ideally, it is an agent of influence. The strength of the state and its sovereignty are interrelated, since only the presence of armed forces and a stable economy allow it to pursue independent policy. Sovereignty in this

⁸ A more secure world, Our shared responsibility: Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, 2004. P. 79-82. UN website. URL: https://www.un.org/ar/peacebuilding/pdf/historical/hlp_more_secure_world.pdf (accessed: 01.09.2020).

⁹ Japanese news agency Kyodo News (24.09.2020). URL: <https://english.kyodonews.net/news/2020/09/ffa7443a9ab5-japan-brazil-germany-india-call-for-un-security-council-reform.html> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

¹⁰ Wikileaks exposes the US double game on the expansion of the UN Security Council (25.07.2011) // Global Policy Forum. URL: <https://www.globalpolicy.org/security-council/security-council-reform/membership-including-expansion-and-representation.html/> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

¹¹ France refused to give up its place in the UN to the European Union // RFI "International French Radio" (29.11.2018). URL: <https://www.rfi.fr/ru/frantsiya/20181129-frantsiya-otkazalas-ustupat-evrosoyuzu-svoe-mesto-v-oon> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

sense is an expensive value, and not every state can afford it. Its absence makes it pointless for a country to participate in the Security Council, since it will not express its own position, but someone else's, and that will most likely be that of a current permanent member, which will only be strengthened by the puppet's presence.

Representativeness. A state applying for the status of permanent Security Council member must represent not only itself, but also the interests of its region or civilizational group. Geopolitical realities are such that "in every region with a dominant state, peace can be achieved only under the leadership of that state" [2, p. 240]. S. Huntington calls such a country "the core." Russia, for example, is backed by most of the countries from the post-Soviet space, as well as a number of countries united with it by their mutual connection to a single civilization (Serbia, Macedonia, Cyprus, Ethiopia), geographical proximity and historical ties (Mongolia, Syria, Cuba, Venezuela). The U.S. defends the position of Japan and the Western world as a whole. The United Kingdom represents the British Commonwealth, which is 53 countries in all parts of the world. Some great powers, such as China, express the interests of one-sixth of all humanity. Ideally, a group of countries would explicitly declare their confidence in a particular nation as the representative of the entire group's interests. However, regional cohesion is rare. It is necessary that a state that claims to decide international affairs and use its veto correctly, at least not confront the majority of countries in its region or use its status to enhance its position in regional conflicts.

Moral authority. It is extremely difficult to objectively and unambiguously assess a state for compliance with these criteria. It is obvious that even with sovereignty, power, influence, and satellites, if it is an aggressor and pollutes the environment, grossly violates treaties and norms of international law, and does not respect human rights, its behavior runs directly contrary to the values, goals and principles of the United Nations, proclaimed in the preamble and Articles 1 and 2 of the that body's Charter. By virtue of Article 6, such a state is subject to exclusion from the organization. The moral authority of the five permanent members of the Security Council is based on the fact that they were all victims of Nazi aggression and Japanese militarism and won a righteous victory in the Second World War. Today, we believe that a state that claims the highest international status should be peaceful, consistent in its foreign policy, and adhere both to national interests and clear moral principles. It is preferable that it be democratic, since the people's participation in deciding their fate reflects the state's sociopolitical maturity. If a country has

not yet reached the level of a mature democracy, it should at least respect basic human rights and freedoms. It is important that the state has a great culture and (or) is of interest to a significant part of humanity for its achievements in science, space exploration, sports, and other highly valued fields of human endeavor.

With these clearly defined criteria, we will be able to assess with a high degree of scientific objectivity, the potential for a particular state to join the most privileged international club. We will test this matrix on the G4 member states.

G4

Brazil

Power and influence. Brazil is the largest country in South America in terms of territory and population. In the world, according to those markers, it runs 5th and 6th, respectively, with more than 207 million people. It became a sovereign state 200 years ago, in 1822, following its war of independence from Portugal. It has the most numerous armed forces among the countries of South and Latin America as a whole, as well as a developed military industry. Brazil was the only country in South America whose army took part in World War II combat, although, according to the number of dead (some two thousand), this participation was somewhat symbolic. Brazil didn't organize any serious military campaigns, the results of which could give a real assessment of the combat capacity of its armed forces in the 20th and 21st centuries. The country is among the largest economies in the world, which explains its membership in the G20. In terms of GDP, it ranks first in Latin America and ninth in the world¹². The leading role in its economy is still played by the agricultural sector (let us remember, for example, the brand of Brazilian coffee). In industrial production, Brazil has not created any world brands.

Sovereignty. The main challenge to Brazil's desire to play an independent role on the world stage is to overcome its dependence on the United States, as a legacy of the notorious Monroe doctrine. The country moved further in this direction during the rule of Socialist Presidents Lula da Silva (2003–2011) and Dilma Rousseff (2011–2016). A landmark event was the establishment in 2006 by Brazil, together with Russia, India, China, and later South Africa, of the interstate BRICS association. What is BRICS? On its official website, there is a category with such a question, but clicking on it does not display any information. Even the BRICS don't

¹² World Economic Outlook Database // Website of the International Monetary Fund. URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2020/01/weodata/index.aspx> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

know what BRICS is, aside from its acronym. It is implicitly assumed to be a club of large developing states, claiming to be a counterweight to the economic and political U.S. hegemony. In response to Dilma Rousseff's boldly independent foreign policy, that casually disregarded U.S. interests, the United States hit Brazil in its most vulnerable place, its finances. Having shifted the terms of lending to foreign debt in 2015, the United States brought down the exchange rate of the Brazilian national currency, the real, by almost 50%. Inflation caused a chain reaction that resulted in total economic crisis. In the midst of this crisis, the Parliament in 2016 impeached Rousseff, the country's first female president, using an unconvincing excuse of corruption. In political terms, Brazil is a rather polarized country, subject to volatility. The balance of power between Right and Left is nearly split down the middle for elections, with a hairsbreadth margin on one side or the other. Both parts of society are irreconcilable, which is an indelible legacy of the repressive military dictatorship, with its harsh, anti-socialist regime, that ruled from 1964–1985. The political processes taking place in the country had a strong influence on its international relations. The power transition in Brazil from the left to the right, led by President Jair Bolsonaro, elected in 2019, led to a sharp reversal of its foreign policy toward the United States. Although there was no formal withdrawal of Brazil from BRICS, it is obvious that the globalist agenda of the association has become irrelevant for the country.

Representativeness. In terms of population and size, Brazil certainly has a reason to represent South America and even Latin America as a whole. Latin America is a young, but fully formed and independent civilization. In a broad sense, it is part of the borders of the Western world, but it has a distinct identity. At the heart of this civilization there are three powerful unifying factors. The first is its historical unity, which arose on the basis of the Mayan, Incan, and Aztec civilizations destroyed by the Conquistadors. The second is its religious unity, since the vast majority of the population of Latin American countries are Catholics, and Brazil has the the largest Catholic population in the world. The third factor is the linguistic and overall cultural community. Latin America is a bilingual civilization. The population of almost all countries except Brazil speaks Spanish, while Brazilians speak Portuguese. However, it is impossible to fully agree with the statement that only because of linguistic differences, Brazil is to Latin America as Iran is for the Islamic world [2, p. 204]. Due to the close relationship of both languages, there is no civilizational boundary between their speakers, and in general, it can be argued that Latin Americans are a single superethnos.

At the same time, there is no reason to talk about the obvious dominance of Brazil in the region in the sense that Huntington put it. Brazil failed to form a coalition of Latin American countries in its support. On the contrary, although Argentina and Mexico do not claim permanent membership in the UN Security Council, they do not hide their foreign policy ambitions and are jealous of the Brazilian rise. The ambitions of neighboring Argentina were abruptly diminished after their ignominious defeat in 1982 in the armed conflict with Britain over the Falkland Islands. Argentina had had a fascist party since the 1920s, and after World War II, the country became a favorite destination for European Nazi immigration. At the domestic level, some Argentines, who are mostly white, feel a sense of racial superiority over Brazilians, whose skin color is darker due to mulatization. Mexico's position is more principled. Mexico is the second Latin American country after Brazil in all major indicators. However, its moral authority was promoted by the fact that in foreign policy it was repeatedly elected to the Security Council after 1946. Decades later, Mexico continued to take principled positions that opposed key U.S. positions on such important issues as the Iraq invasion (1990–1991, 2003–2011+), refusal to recognize Kosovo (2008–present), and its attitude toward the civil war in Syria (2011–present). On the issue of Security Council reform, Mexico has consistently maintained a different position from the G4 platform. It favors expanding the composition of the UN's highest political body to include non-permanent members, while maintaining the number of permanent members, which reflects the "United for Consensus" program (Italy, Spain, Pakistan, etc.). Mexico also agrees with the French proposal to establish a moratorium on veto use by permanent members [3, pp. 150, 153–155]. Thus, without directly opposing Brazil, Mexico actively supports the concept of Security Council reform, which is contrary to the G4 plans.

Moral authority. For most of the twentieth century, the form of government in Brazil was a military dictatorship, until 1985 when it finally became a democratic country. In general, the State recognizes and respects human rights. An important moral factor is that from 1942 until the Victory three years later, Brazil participated in the Second World War on the side of the Allies in the anti-Hitler coalition. It is Brazil, by virtue of the tradition established since 1947 (or 1949, depending on the event cited), that always opens each new session of the UN General Assembly.

The country has developed a vibrant culture that in many ways surpasses the culture of its parent Portugal, although it is widely known primarily for its annual carnival in Rio de Janeiro. Brazil's most outstanding achievements are in sports, where it

is the greatest football power. The recognition of its role in world sports was connected with the Olympic Games in 2016.

Unfortunately, Brazil has many unresolved social problems, as well, such as a sharp stratification of society by income level, a large number of poor people living in urban favelas, and, as a result, a high-level of crime, corruption, and drug addiction [4, p. 98-109]. The Brazilian Armed Forces take part in many peacekeeping operations around the world under the auspices of the United Nations. It is not in any conflicts with other countries and generally pursues a peaceful policy. Its foreign policy, however, badly lacks initiative, brightness and charisma. Brazil tried to find those in the person of President Dilma Rousseff (2011-2016). However, under the far-right President Jair Bolsonaro, who arrived in the shadow of his political idol Donald Trump, the country quickly abandoned this course.

Conclusion. To a large extent, among the countries of Southern and Latin America, Brazil meets the criteria of a permanent member of the UN Security Council. There are four major obstacles in this path for the country. First, Brazil is a young country that has not yet played a prominent role in world history. Secondly, its economy and foreign policy remains dependent on the United States. Attempts to overcome this dependence, although made during the period of socialist rule, have not yet been successful. Third, Brazil has failed to build a Latin American consensus around itself and has failed to gain support from its two main competitors, Mexico and Argentina. Fourth, social problems within the country, such as high levels of corruption, crime and poverty, require that all efforts, including material ones, be focused on domestic policy rather than foreign one. All these circumstances can be eliminated, but it will take more than one year and maybe even more than one decade.

India

Power and influence. India is the world's second most populous country (1.3 billion people) and the seventh largest. The core of the Indian population (80%) is formed by Hindus, who comprise several large ethnic groups that include not just Hinduism but other religions of national origin, including Jainism, Sikhism and Buddhism. There are also ethnic groups related to Hindus who profess Islam (13.4%) and Christianity (2.4%). Despite the fact that there are a minority of Muslims in India, they total 170 million people, which makes India the third largest Muslim population after Indonesia and Pakistan. The Hindu majority periodically puts pressure on Muslims and Christians to return to Hinduism, which creates high sectarian tension in the country. India is home to numerous tribes,

small ethnic groups with their own local religions, which together make up 8% of the population [5, pp. 206-219]. They are a source of constant separatist activity on the fringes of the society and create the ground for terrorism, the main threat to the internal security of the country.

In terms of GDP, India ranked 7th in the world as of 2019 and is a member of the G20 club of the world's largest economies. The economy is mixed, with state regulation combined with a free market. This balance has made it possible to overcome the crises and recessions of recent years. In terms of GDP growth (+7%), India is second only to China. Like Brazil, its structure is dominated by agriculture. The country also has a developed industry, although, as in Brazil, it boasts no world-famous brands, so one of the government's strategic goals is the production of competitive products [6, p. 30-28; 7, pp. 47-64]. Its role in the pharmaceutical industry has been significant: it takes first place in the market for generic drugs (analogs of original medicines), which gives grounds for reproach as the primary manufacturer of counterfeit medicine¹⁴.

India has the third largest army in the world and ranks 4th in the ranking of the strongest countries (after the United States, Russia and China)¹⁵. Since 1974, the country has had its own nuclear weapons, which is not only a military but also a political argument: all five permanent members of the Security Council are officially nuclear powers.

Sovereignty. In 1947, India was the first among the former colonies to gain independence. This status did not come by force of arms, but nor was it granted from above. The Indian nation, led by Mahatma Gandhi, showed maturity and unity by offering systematic nonviolent resistance to the British colonialists: a general boycott of British goods and administrative decisions. This policy was named "Gandhism" in honor of its ideologue. Later, India, along with Yugoslavia and Egypt, became a co-founder of the Non-Aligned Movement, which united more than 100 states around the principle of non-participation in military blocs, which, at the time, referred to NATO and the Warsaw Pact Organization). The wisdom of this strategy was highly appreciated by the

¹³ World Economic Outlook Database // Сайт Международного валютного фонда. URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2020/01/weodata/index.aspx> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

¹⁴ India rejects US accusations and calls it an attack on cheap generics // GMP News. URL: <https://gmpnews.ru/2019/04/indiya-otvergaet-obviniya-ssha-i-nazyvaet-etonapadeniem-na-deshevye-dzheneriki/> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

¹⁵ 2020 Military Strength Ranking / Global firepower 2020. URL: globalfirepower.com (accessed: 01.09.2020).

former American diplomat, Henry Kissinger, who said that India "measured success by its ability to avoid conflicts unrelated to national interests" [8, p. 260]. Thus, since its independence, India has played and continues to play an independent role in world politics.

Representativeness. India is the birthplace of one of the three world religions — Buddhism — and the oldest, Hinduism. Yet, the country does not represent the Buddhist world. It is a separate civilization and does not express the interests of other countries in the region. The exceptions are the Tamils, an ethnically related Hindu people who practice Hinduism, a significant fraction of whom live in predominantly Buddhist Sri Lanka. India is in a state of permanent conflict with the countries of its region, primarily Pakistan. The latter is a part of historical India, inhabited by ethnically related Hindu ethnic groups professing Islam. The cause of the conflict are the disputed territories of Jammu and Kashmir. Around them, three full-fledged wars and two military conflicts have taken place in the last 70 years. India is also China's main geopolitical competitor in the region, with which it has had border clashes in the Ladakh region. The last occurred during the work on this article¹⁶. In search of a geostrategic balance in the region, the contour of the triangle opposing China has been outlined: India — Vietnam-Japan, and vice versa, the tandem of China and Pakistan opposing India. The danger of these confrontations is compounded by the fact that three of its participants possess nuclear weapons. India's relations with the Buddhist world also remain strained due to its intervention in the Sri Lankan civil war on the Tamil side against the Buddhist majority of the Ceylon archipelago. At the same time, India, representing a sixth of the world's population, is representative by virtue of this fact alone.

Moral authority. India is a country with an ancient history and a foundational culture, the birthplace of one of the three world religions. Its policy of Gandhism, with the ideal of non-violence, as well as its leadership in the Non-Aligned Movement, gives India high moral authority in the world community.

By virtue of its population, India is the largest democracy in the world, a parliamentary republic with a true multiparty system and political competition. However, it is a caste democracy. The fifth Prime Minister of India, V.P. Singh, stated in 1990 that the caste system, not the parliament and the government, is the main power structure

in the country [9, p. 13]. This feature should be understood in more detail in view of its defining influence on Indian society.

In everyday life, two concepts are often mixed: varnas and castes. There are only four varnas: brahmins (priests), kshatriyas (warriors and rulers), vaisyas (farmers, artisans and merchants) and sudras (servants of the three higher varnas). Representatives of the four varnas are considered pure, and those who have not entered any of them are considered unclean or untouchable. Within each of the varnas are their own castes, with three vertical levels. The castes of the third and lowest level are the smallest cells of Hindu society, like local communities. The impenetrability of caste barriers is ensured by endogamy, the rule of marriage only between members of the same caste. Varnas and castes make up the caste system. It applies only to Hindus, i.e. those who practice Hinduism, Buddhism, Jainism and Sikhism, and make up 80% of the Indian population. It is impossible to name the exact number of castes, only the untouchables, who number about 200 million people among 4 thousand castes.

Social and financial status, level of education, and access to the levers of power are largely determined by caste. While the sudras were traditionally engaged in "dirty" work, the *untouchables* were often denied access to any permanent work at all. Political power in India was concentrated among the Brahmins. Their privileged position was supported by two factors. First, they enjoyed the support of the British colonial administration and, by way of reciprocity, served as its support within Indian society. Secondly, they had a monopoly on the performance of priestly rites and thus use the authority of the Hindu religion to further strengthen the caste system, which is sanctified by its postulates. That is why the struggle against colonialism was largely parallel to the struggle of the lower *varnas*' and the *untouchables*' representatives against the monopoly of political and economic power represented by the higher *Varnas*, primarily the Brahmins. One of the motives of anti-Brahminism is racial. The Brahmins are identified with the representatives of the ancient Aryans, who, coming from the North, partially displaced and partially subjugated the representatives of the endemic Dravidian race. One of the struggle methods was the adoption of Buddhism and Christianity by the *untouchables* to escape the Hindu system of inequality. The spiritual leader of the independence movement, Mahatma Gandhi, who was a representative of vaishya, tried to destroy the practice of *untouchability*. In addition to moral motives, he was also motivated by political reasons, since he understood that this practice could push the *untouchables* to leave Hinduism and break the ethnic community of

¹⁶ China has accused India of violating its sovereignty // RIA "Novosti" on August 31, 2020. URL: https://ria.ru/20200831/kitay-1576537152.html?utm_source=yxnews&utm_medium=desktop (accessed: 01.09.2020).

Hindus. However, the caste stereotypes of Hindus were so strong that in the end, a Brahmin terrorist killed Gandhi. The strategic-minded politicians of the higher *varnas* understand that caste limits the development of Indian society.

The Indian Constitution of 1950 proclaimed the equality of all Indians before the law, regardless of caste, and prohibited the practice of "untouchability" under the threat of criminal liability (articles 15-17). However, this was only a formal step toward breaking the caste system. The first Prime Minister of Independent India, J. Nehru, along with his daughter I. Gandhi, her grandson R. Gandhi, and two other heads of government were Brahmins. A real step toward the weakening of casteism was the legislative introduction of quotas for former *untouchables* (they became known as "Dalits," which means "the oppressed") and representatives of the poorest *varnas* in state and educational institutions. There are even cases when representatives of the higher *varnas* were registered in the lower ones and even in the Dalits in order to be appointed to high-ranking positions [9, p. 10-17]. Victory in the 2014 parliamentary elections of The Indian People's Party led by Narendra Modi was a landmark event in the political life of the country. Socially, this party represents the interests of the lower *varnas* and Dravidians. With its arrival, the Indian National Congress, which mainly represents the upper varna, lost its power monopoly. At the same time, Modi's party, whose backbone is the peasantry (*vaishyas*), is the most conservative Hindu part of the population. This part, by definition, cannot oppose a caste system that is sanctified by religion. They only demand the extension of their influence and the restriction of the brahmin power monopoly, which is now really being lost by them. However, even the Constitution itself did not abolish the caste system, but only prohibited the "untouchability" practice. No one has set the goal of completely abolishing the caste system, which is strong at the household level. It is still the social matrix of India.

It is the caste system that has become one of the main reasons for the sharp material stratification of Indian society. From 455 to 620 million people in India live in extreme poverty (their income is no more than \$1.35 per month), while the country ranks third in the world in terms of the number of dollar billionaires (250). Traditionally, the level of sanitation and hygiene is low, half of the families do not have sewage, water supply and other civilized benefits [10, p. 13-28]. All of these signs of backwardness, combined with a caste system that embodies social injustice, do not strengthen the moral authority of India in the world community.

Conclusion. Modern India has been an independent state for a very short time.

Nevertheless, in that time, it has approached the level of a superpower, not only because of its size and population, but also because of the level of economic development and the power of its armed forces. India enjoys prestige in the world community, primarily for its consistently independent role as the founder of the Non-Aligned Movement, as well as support from both the United States and Russia. However, two factors pose a serious obstacle before it can gain the status of a permanent member of the UN Security Council. The first is the sharp opposition of countries of the region, primarily Pakistan, and therefore the entire Muslim world. The second is the unresolved problems with overcoming the backwardness of the population, which is fixed by the caste system.

The federative republic of Germany

Power and influence. Germany belongs to the category of medium-sized countries (62nd place in the world and 8th place in Europe), and in terms of population (83 million), it belongs to large countries (on the 17th place in the world and the 2nd place, after Russia, in Europe). Modern Germany is a monoethnic state (92% are Germans). Along confessional lines, the nation is split exactly in half, into Catholics, who inhabit the western part of the country, and Protestants, who inhabit its eastern part, including its core, Prussia, with its capital Berlin. As the birthplace of Protestantism, Germany remains a very influential part of the Catholic world, which was recognized by the election of the Bavarian J.A. Ratzinger in 2005 as Pope under the name of Benedict the 16th. Russians, from the Baltic Sea to the Sea of Japan, speak a single Russian language and understand each other perfectly, but German has 10 main dialects and 50 local dialects, which is explained by the long history of fragmentation and the relatively recent unification of the country. Nevertheless, Germany has a stable society, Germans are aware of themselves as a single nation, and interfaith differences have been overcome at the political level in the face of the ruling CDU/CSU party coalition, which united Catholics and Protestants on a platform of common Christian and democratic values.

The armed forces of Germany occupy only the 13th place in terms of its combined power, behind countries such as Turkey and Egypt¹⁷. After the military defeat in both world wars, Germany, did not abandon its ambitions for at least regional influence. This time, it was no longer relying on armed forces, but on soft power, using its attractive image to promote its culture and legal system in other countries, including in the post-Soviet space.

¹⁷ 2020 Military Strength Ranking / Global firepower 2020. URL: globalfirepower.com (accessed: 01.09.2020).

The strength and global influence of the Federal Republic of Germany is determined primarily by its economic power. In terms of GDP, it ranks 4th in the world and 1st in Europe¹⁸, and is a member of the G7. The country has a highly developed industrial sector, is a world leader in the machine and automobile industries, and its companies own many world brands. Frankfurt am Main is the financial capital of the European Union, one of the world's key banking and exchange centers. Its role was crucial in saving the economies of Greece, Italy, and Spain after the 2008 global economic crisis.

Sovereignty. The occupation regime in post-war Germany officially ended in 1949, and after its unification in 1990, it became a fully sovereign state. At the same time, Germany has not severed its ties with NATO and continues to be one of the most active members of the alliance, which is dominated by the United States. Germany is the main military base of the United States in Europe. The contingent of the American armed forces there is 50 thousand people, the largest in Europe and 2nd in the world (after Japan). Also, 20 American missiles with nuclear warheads are located on German territory¹⁹. Only twice in recent history has Germany acted in foreign policy that was not right in step with the United States. The first was when it refused to support the U.S. in the 2003 attack on Iraq, and the second was its unwavering commitment to complete the joint project with Russia to build the Nord Stream 2 gas pipeline, despite U.S. pressure. Under this project, Germany has proved its ability to solve any issue in the European Union, even with the resistance of the majority. But we don't know whether it is able to eventually win in this dispute with the United States; it will indicate the level of its real sovereignty.

Representativeness. The European Union is based on the German-French axis. At the same time, it is Germany, not France, that is the undisputed economic and political leader of the European Union. This conclusion can be drawn from the fact that Germany played a crucial role in saving the economies of Greece, Italy and Spain after the 2008 crisis and thus prevented their exit from the Union. However, the Security Council already has a member State of the European Union. It is France. In addition, the UN's highest political body is already Eurocentric,

since three of its five permanent members are European states. Moreover, Germany is a member of NATO, and that organization is well-represented in the Security Council by three-out-of-its-five permanent members. Therefore, the introduction of Germany into the highest political body of the UN, considering representativeness, is possible only if France or the United Kingdom leaves, which is currently impossible.

Moral authority. The modern world order was formed as a result of the Second World War. It is reflected in the principles of the main political body of the United Nations, according to which the winning states received a privileged position in the status of its permanent members. Germany is the defeated side that initiated both world wars. However, in the 75 years since the end of the war, both Germany and the whole world have changed. The country repented of the crimes committed by its people, carried out denazification and became a full-fledged democratic country committed to liberal values and human rights. Germany has abandoned the policy of militarism and, as we noted above, actively uses soft power tools. Its authority on the world stage was greatly strengthened after its refusal to support the U.S. invasion of Iraq. Russia also recognizes Germany's mediating role in resolving the crisis in the Donbas. In the post-war world, Germany became the second most attractive country for immigration, as it achieved one of the highest living standards of the population.

Conclusion. Due to its economic power, social stability and political influence, as well as its high moral authority, the Federal Republic of Germany has serious grounds to claim permanent membership in the UN Security Council. However, its heavy military dependence on the United States, as well as problems with representativeness, are serious obstacles in this path. The first problem is solvable and depends on Germany: it should withdraw from NATO and withdraw foreign armed forces from its territory. Germany must pay this price if it wants to count on the real support of the international community in realizing its ambitions. Solution of the second problem does not depend on Germany, although if the country solves the first problem, then the second one can automatically lose its significance, since both problems create mutual negative synergy.

Japan

Power and influence. In terms of size, Japan belongs to the category of medium-sized countries (it's 61st place in the world), and in terms of population (125 million) it closes the top 10 largest countries. It is a monoethnic and monoconfessional state, the dominant religion is the synthesis of Buddhism with the national Shinto religion. The power and influence of Japan, as well as Germany,

¹⁸ World Economic Outlook Database // Website of the International Monetary Fund. URL: <https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/2020/01/weodata/index.aspx> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

¹⁹ Night B., Elkina A. What you need to know about American troops in Germany // Deutsche Welle. URL: <https://www.dw.com> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

are determined by the level of its economic development. Today, it is the third economy in the world, having lost the second position only in 2010 to its powerful neighbor China. Japan has a highly developed industrial sector, is a world leader in many of its industries, in particular automotive, electronics, and robotics. It is characterized by a unique management culture *kaizen*, as well as the highest competitiveness and the world standard of product quality. It possesses world industrial brands, as well as the highest achievements in the world of culture, and the interest of Westerners in its spiritual practices (Zen Buddhism, etc.) ensures the influence of Japan's soft power.

Sovereignty. Article 9 of the Japanese Constitution of 1947 declares the complete renunciation of war as a sovereign right of the nation. In accordance with the doctrine of non-war, the same article prohibits the creation of land, sea, and air forces. Until 1951, there was a regime occupation on its territory, which was formally terminated after the signing of the security treaty with the United States. However, the same treaty confirmed the rights of the United States to deploy its military bases in Japan, granted the American "nuclear umbrella" to Japan and deprived the country of the right to conclude international military treaties without U.S. consent.

Having abandoned the army and navy, the Land of the Rising Sun assigned some of their functions to the police, and in 1954 created the Self-Defense Forces. The legal basis for their creation was Article 51 of the UN Charter, which proclaimed the right of nations to individual and collective self-defense. In 1992, Japan passed a law allowing the use of Self-Defense Forces outside the country, but only to participate in UN peacekeeping operations, which they actively do, having participated in dozens of such operations. Currently, the Japanese armed forces rank 5th in terms of combat capability, surpassing even the two permanent members of the Security Council (France and the United Kingdom)²⁰. At the same time, the country was and remains a springboard for the American armed forces to wage wars and combat operations in the Asia-Pacific region, as during the Korean War. At present, Japan ranks first in the world in terms of the number of American military personnel stationed on its territory.

Representativeness. From the point of view of representativeness, it should be understood that, as Huntington accurately defined its position, Japan is a lone country. It has never had and does not have any real allies (the U.S. alliance is imposed and, in fact, is a continuation of the occupation), it is not a real Buddhist country, since Japanese

Buddhism is vividly colored by the features of the national Shinto religion, which is informally the state religion, since it is professed by the emperor and his dynasty. In this regard, Huntington draws an analogy between Japan and India: "Pakistan, Bangladesh, and even Sri Lanka will never accept India as a guarantor of order in South Asia, and no East Asian state will allow Japan to fulfill this role in East Asia" [2, p. 240].

Moral authority. The Japanese are one of the most united nations. They once again demonstrated their national unity and readiness for self-sacrifice in the face of the Fukushima nuclear disaster in 2011. However, as in the case of Germany, Japan's moral authority is undermined by its role as an aggressor country in World War II. Germany has made a long and respectable journey of denazification, democratization and repentance. The Land of the Rising Sun also followed this path. It abandoned militarism and achieved its recognition due to the "Japanese economic miracle." At present, it is a state with an established democracy based on the Western-liberal model. The preamble to its Constitution declares that the State must follow the principles of political morality. At the same time, Japan has never shown true and deep repentance, it has not even apologized to its closest neighbor China, which lost about 35 million people during the war. This Japanese "ambiguity"²¹ was mentioned by Kissinger: "Japan's post-war policy is often described as the 'new pacifism'; in fact, it is much more complex <...> This policy reflects a tacit acceptance of American dominance and a balanced assessment of the strategic landscape and the imperatives of long-term survival. The post-war ruling elite of Japan adopted the Constitution developed by the American occupation authorities with a strict ban on military actions, solely under the pressure of circumstances" [8, p. 243-244]. Japan's refusal to conclude a peace treaty with the USSR, and subsequently with Russia, and the promotion of territorial claims against it, is a fact that indicates the absence of true remorse and is certainly an argument for our country against supporting Japan's ambitions to deconstruct the post-war world order.

Conclusion. Of the four candidates for permanent membership in the UN Security Council, Japan's chances are the lowest.

Other candidates

Along with the G4, other candidates for permanent members of the Security Council are also being discussed. So, we mentioned above about the proposals to introduce the European Union into

²⁰ 2020 Military Strength Ranking / Global firepower 2020. URL: globalfirepower.com (accessed: 01.09.2020).

²¹ The expression belongs to the Japanese writer Kenzaburo Oe, who called his lecture on the occasion of the award of the Nobel Prize (1994) "Born by Japanese ambiguity".

this structure, if France cedes such a place to it, and Germany renounces its claims to membership in this club. Indeed, this practice already exists in international law: the European Union is a member of the World Trade Organization, while its members are not individually members of the WTO. However, along with France's unwillingness to concede its position, there are at least three strong arguments against this initiative. The legal nature of the European Union as a subject of international law is very unique and combines both the characteristics of an international organization and an interstate association in a confederation form. In any case, the European Union is not a state, while only states can be the UN members (Article 4 of the UN Charter). Secondly, all major decisions on foreign and security policy issues of the European Union are taken by consensus of its highest political body, the European Council, including the heads of the Union member States (Part 4, Article 15 of the Treaty on European Union). Therefore, any state that is a member of the European Union, even if its role in world affairs is insignificant, can influence the decision of the entire Union, and therefore the entire UN Security Council. Finally, the European Union does not have its own armed forces, and therefore it will not be able to participate in peacekeeping operations.

The second major gap is the absence of representatives from Africa and Muslim countries among the permanent members of the Security Council. The reason for this was that at the time of the UN establishment, most of the current African and Middle Eastern countries did not have sovereignty and were in a state of colonial dependence on their European metropolises. The common position of African States, known as the "Ezulwini Consensus", provides for the granting of two permanent and five non-permanent seats to Africa on the Security Council²². The most realistic and suitable candidate for permanent membership in the main UN political body UN could be Egypt. It would simultaneously represent the African continent, the Arab ethnic group, and the Muslim world. However, even if we compare it in the same parameters with the G4 countries, which we concluded that none of them fully corresponds to them, then Egypt will be inferior even to them. First of all, it has an unstable sociopolitical situation, the lack of a mature democracy with well-developed mechanisms for changing power, as shown by the events of the "Arab spring". Egypt's economy is significantly inferior to other applicants for membership in this

club. All these factors make its foreign policy not always consistent and subject to the great powers' influence. In addition, the inclusion of Egypt as a permanent member of the Security Council would require balancing it with a large country having a Black population, such as Nigeria or South Africa, but their compliance with the highlighted criteria is even more problematic. Therefore, today Russia could claim to represent the Muslim world. In this respect, it has a unique advantage over all other permanent members of the Security Council: it is home to about 20 million Muslims from the peoples who historically profess Islam in the country.

Reforming ways

To date, the most balanced and realistic proposals for the reform of the UN Security Council are still those formulated in 2004 by the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change under the UN Secretary-General. These proposals can be modified and refined, but they are based on a realistic approach. Of course, it would be optimal for the United Kingdom to refuse the status of the Security Council permanent member, since in foreign policy it is a stand-in for the United States. Such a step would significantly correct the existing imbalance due to the pronounced NATO and Eurocentrism of the main UN political body. However, we believe that, most likely, none of the current permanent members of the Security Council will give up their status, and none of them is currently ready to expand this club, at least to entrust another country with such a powerful tool as the veto right. Therefore, the most realistic reforms to date may be those that provide for a number of compromise measures.

The UN Security Council provides for two levels of membership: permanent and non-permanent (elected) members. It is proposed to build it on a three-level principle, creating a new, intermediate, level-permanent members without the veto right. Thus, without encroaching on the privileges of the five winning countries, all representatives of the G4 and a number of other leading countries of their regions can be permanently appointed to the Security Council, in order to even out the geographical distribution. Such a step implies an increase in the size of the Security Council. However, the proliferation of this body should be moderate (up to 20–24 countries), since, as experts rightly note, a sharp increase in the number of its members will complicate the coordination of resolutions texts and decision-making and, in general, make it incapable of decisive and effective action [11, p. 48].

The experts put forward compromise options for amortizing the veto right. Thus, if nine or more members, including four permanent members, voted in favor of the resolution, the fifth member

²² See: Niger's speech at the 61st session of the UN General Assembly (12.10.2006) // UN Website. URL: <https://www.un.org/ru/ga/61/plenary/niger.pdf> (accessed: 01.09.2020).

"agrees not to exercise the right to endorse the draft, and it is considered adopted" [11, p. 49]. Such proposals, even if we do not consider their unreality, reveal a lack of understanding of the legal decision-making mechanism in the highest UN political body. At the beginning of our work, we made a reservation that the use of the "veto" term for referring to the decision-making mechanism of the Security Council permanent members is inaccurate. None of its resolutions is considered adopted if at least one permanent member voted against it. The veto mechanism involves a very different sequence of actions. The decision is taken by a majority vote, regardless of how the permanent members voted. However, each of the permanent members has the right to veto a decision, and only then it is not enforceable, or it may not exercise this right, even if it voted "against", and then the decision will enter into force. What is the significant difference and why do we need such an order? Practice shows that it is extremely important. So, if the winning country does not agree with a decision and for moral reasons does not approve of it, but, nevertheless, does not consider the issue so important that it goes against the entire world community or the majority of the Security Council members, then it is deprived of the opportunity to express its negative attitude to this decision without blocking its implementation. Of course, it can abstain from voting, but, firstly, such an act will not fully reflect its true opinion, and secondly, abstaining diminishes the authority of a great power. A good example is the vote on resolution No. 1973 of 17.03.2011 on Libya, in which Russia abstained, although in general it did not support the violent overthrow of Gaddafi. As a result, this resolution became one of the conditions that contributed to the ongoing civil war in Libya. Russia would be in a better position if it could vote against, but not veto, lest it be accused of patronizing a regime at war with its citizens. Thus, a permanent member of the Security Council should have the right to vote against a decision without automatically blocking its adoption, unless it decides to veto its entry into force afterwards.

The third step could be establishing the institute of candidate countries for permanent members of the Security Council. The nomination of such candidates must come from one of the four regional sections by a majority of the votes by its members or (if there is no common position in the region) by a majority of the General Assembly votes, provided that these countries have a majority of the Region, or the land, population, respectively. In order for this institution not to become a way to erase the issue, it is necessary to establish guarantees for the implementation of its purpose. Thus, a certain period of time

in the candidate status is required, for example, four years, after which the question of granting permanent member status must necessarily be voted on in both the General Assembly and the Security Council, according to the procedure provided for in the previous paragraph. Within four years, the candidate's compliance with the criteria for permanent members (these can be either the criteria of Article 23 of the Charter, or the four criteria proposed by us) is checked by the Organization. To directly monitor the activities and work of candidates, their participation in international affairs and peacekeeping operations, a special UN commission is created, which, at the end of the probationary period, makes its report to the General Assembly and the Security Council on each of the evaluation criteria. At the same time, the institute of candidates can be used both for the formation of the permanent members' second level (without the veto right) proposed by us in the first paragraph, and for the replenishment of the third level (with the veto right) from among the members of the second level. After the report, a vote will be held in the General Assembly and the Security Council, which will result in one of three decisions: inclusion in the UN Security Council; refusal to include, or; the extension of the probationary period, not to exceed four years.

Conclusion

The mission of the Security Council is to eliminate wars and establish and maintain "eternal peace". If we evaluate the results of its work from the position of implementing this maximum task, then we can say that it has failed, in particular because in certain wars the interests of the permanent members often contradict one other. However, if we proceed from more realistic, minimal tasks to prevent future world wars and global crises, we could say that the Council coped with this task quite well.

"The balance of power alone cannot ensure peace", Kissinger says, "but if it is carefully worked out and strictly observed, this balance can limit the scale and frequency of fundamental confrontations and prevent them from turning into a global catastrophes" [8, p. 21]. The current balance in the Security Council did not prevent all wars and conflicts, but it did prevent many of them, or significantly localized and temporarily stopped them, preventing them from growing into full-scale wars with millions of victims. Thus, the composition of the Security Council is a true reflection of the power balance on the planet. If in such a composition it at least copes with its task, then making changes to it may lead to a violation of the established balance.

Ambitions of the G4 countries are dictated by the fact that they seek to institutionalize their

increased power and influence in an international legal format. However, it is premature to say that any of them has objectively grown to the point that without their participation, achieving balance and preventing global crises is impossible. When this happens, then there will be natural, objective historical prerequisites for granting such a country the status of the UN Security Council permanent member.

References

1. Gegel G. V. F. Philosophy of law. Moscow: Thought, 1990. 524 p. (In Russ.).
2. Samuel P. Huntington Clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order. Moscow: AST, 2003. 603 p. (In Russ.).
3. Kosevich E.Yu. Mexico in search of reform of the UN Security Council. *Actual problems of Russian law*. 2017;12(85):148-159. (In Russ.).
4. Chekova Zh.M. Reform of the UN Security Council as one of the priorities of Brazil's international political activity. *Ibero-American notebooks*. 2015;3(9):98-109. (In Russ.).
5. Yurlova E.S. India: government policy towards religious minorities, Dalits and tribes. *Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental studies*. 2018;(12):206-219. (In Russ.).
6. Sdasyuk G.V. Programme of accelerated economic development of India: achievements, problems and prospects. *Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental studies*. 2018;(12):30-46. (In Russ.).
7. Kamenev S.N. Economy of India: government of Narendra Modi in power. *Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. 2018;(12):47-64. (In Russ.).
8. Kissinger G. World order. Moscow: AST, 2017. 512 p. (In Russ.).
9. Yurlova E.S. The role of castes in modern India. *Asia and Africa today*. 2018;(4):10-17. (In Russ.).
10. Yurlov F.N. Experience of independent India. *Proceedings of the Institute of Oriental studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences*. 2018;(12):13-28. (In Russ.).
11. Kalyadin A.N. What reform does the UN Security Council need? *World economy and international relations*. 2016;7(60):48-59. (In Russ.).

Реформа Совета Безопасности ООН как узловой вопрос мировой политики

Цветков Юрий Анатольевич,

кандидат юридических наук, доцент,
заведующий научно-исследовательским отделом
Московской академии Следственного комитета России
E-mail: Yutsvet@yandex.ru

Аннотация. Автор статьи обосновывает позицию о том, что вопрос о реформе главного политического органа ООН — Совета Безопасности является узловым вопросом мировой политики и международно-го права, в котором переплелись стратегические интересы государств — наиболее активных игроков на мировой арене, а также интересы всех регионов мира. Анализирует преимущества, которые дает государству статус постоянного члена этого органа. Характеризует основные подходы к реформе Совета Безопасности. Критически оценивает попытки с помощью такой реформы провести деконструкцию мирового порядка и предлагает способы противодействия им. Формулирует критерии оценки на соответствие статусу постоянного члена Совета Безопасности. Демонстрирует потенциал этих критериев на примере оценки обоснованности притязаний и реальных шансов на получение этого статуса группой четырех государств — G-4 (Бразилия, Индия, ФРГ и Япония), а также Европейским Союзом и африканскими странами. Предлагает авторскую модель реформирования Совета Безопасности ООН с учетом интересов России и мировых реалий.

Ключевые слова: мировая политика, мировой порядок, ООН, Совет Безопасности, право вето, «Единство в пользу мира», G-4.

Список литературы

1. Гегель Г.В.Ф. Философия права / Пер. с нем., ред. и сост. Д.А. Керимов, В.С. Нерсесянц. М.: Мысль, 1990. 524 с.
2. Хантингтон С. Столкновение цивилизаций / Пер. с англ. Т. Велимеева, Ю. Новикова. М.: АСТ, 2003. 603 с.
3. Косевич Е.Ю. Мексика в поисках реформы Совета Безопасности ООН // Актуальные проблемы российского права. 2017. № 12(85). С. 148–159.
4. Чекова Ж.М. Реформа Совета Безопасности ООН как один из приоритетов международно-политической деятельности Бразилии // Ибероамериканские тетради. 2015. Вып. 3 (9). С. 98–109.

5. Юрлова Е.С. Индия: политика правительства в отношении религиозных меньшинств, далитов и племен // Труды института востоковедения РАН. 2018. № 12. С. 206–219.
6. Сдасюк Г.В. Программы ускорения экономического развития Индии: достижения, проблемы и перспективы // Труды Института востоковедения РАН. 2018. № 12. С. 30–46.
7. Каменев С.Н. Экономика Индии: правительство Нарендры Моди у власти // Труды Института востоковедения РАН. 2018. № 12. С. 47–64.
8. Киссинджер Г. Мировой порядок / Пер. с англ. В. Желнинова, А. Милюкова. М.: АСТ, 2017. 512 с.
9. Юрлова Е.С. Роль каст в современной Индии // Азия и Африка сегодня. 2018. № 4. С. 10–17.
10. Юрлов Ф.Н. Опыт независимой Индии // Труды Института востоковедения РАН. 2018. № 12. С. 13–28.
11. Калядин А.Н. В какой реформе нуждается Совет Безопасности ООН? // Мировая экономика и международные отношения. 2016. Т. 60. № 7. С. 48–59.