TWIN SISTERS' SURVIVAL STRUGGLE: CONFLICT THREATS AND PEACE[*]

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Füsun ÖZERDEM

Muğla Sıtkı Koçman University, Department of Political Science and International Relations, Muğla / TURKEY, ORCID: 0000-0002-8204-8635

ABSTRACT

Peace and democracy are just two sides of the same coin, where two components are assumed to reinforce one another. Thus to understand the prospects for world peace, we must understand why wars or potential threats are such a recurring event in the history of nation-states. In relation to that, it is also important to understand the nature of international affairs and the determining factors which cause action, reaction, cooperation, hostility and peace between states in the international system. Liberal democratic states, established individual rights such as equality before the law, free speech and other civil liberties, private property, and elected representation are supposed to be against war. When citizens who bear the burdens of war elect their governments, wars become needless. Furthermore, with liberal democracy, citizens appreciate that the benefits of trade, democracy and living in harmony can be enjoyed only under the conditions of peace. But this study claims that, establishing sustainable peace bears many unsolved problems. Especially in a world that hosts a wide variety of global threats, the sustainability of democratic principles and securing the world order become more and more difficult. Conflict and potential threats are still one of the most important survival issues of the democratic states. In order to protect their own citizens, the states can easily apply undemocratic approaches to other states. Is it possible to provide world peace? Is destroying potential threats sufficient to provide world peace? This study will present a historical analysis while answering these questions, and after explaining potential threats, assess how those who act to provide world peace become potential threats.

Key Words: 1. World Peace, 2. Liberal Democracy, 3. Security, 4. Conflict Threats

ÖZET

Barış ve demokrasi, iki kavramın da birbirini güçlendirdiği varsayılan, aynı madeni paranın iki yüzü gibidir. Bu nedenle, dünya barışına dair beklentileri anlamak için, savaşların veya potansiyel tehditlerin neden ulus devletlerin tarihinde böylesine tekrar eden olaylar olduğunu anlamak gerekmektedir. Bununla bağlantılı olarak, uluslararası ilişkilerin doğasını ve uluslararası sistemdeki devletlerarasında eylem, tepki, işbirliği, düşmanlık ve barışa neden olan belirleyici faktörleri de anlamlandırmak gerekmektedir. Liberal demokratik devletlerin, kanun önünde eşitlik, özgür konuşma ve diğer sivil özgürlükler, özel mülkiyet ve seçilmiş temsilciler gibi sağladığı bireysel hakların savaş karşıtı olması beklenmektedir. Yine, savaş yükünü taşıyan vatandaşların hükümetlerini seçebildiği bir sistemde savaşlar gereksiz hale gelmektedir. Dahası, liberal demokrasi ile vatandaşlar ticaretin, demokrasinin ve uyum içinde yaşamanın faydalarının ancak barış şartlarında kullanılabileceğini takdir etmektedirler. Ancak tüm bunlara rağmen bu çalışma, sürdürülebilir bir barış ortamı oluşturmanın birçok çözülmemiş problemi barındırdığını iddia etmektedir. Özellikle çok çeşitli küresel tehditleri barındıran bir dünyada, demokratik ilkelerin sürdürülebilirliği ve dünya düzeninin güvence altına alınması gittikçe zorlaşmaktadır. Çatışma ve potansiyel tehditler hala demokratik devletlerin en önemli hayatta kalma sorunlarından biridir. Kendi vatandaşlarını korumak için, devletler diğer devletlere demokratik olmayan yaklaşımları kolaylıkla uygulayabilmektedirler. Dünya barışını sağlamak mümkün müdür? Dünya barışını sağlamak için potansiyel tehditleri yok etmek yeterli midir? Bu çalışma, bu sorulara cevap verirken tarihsel bir analiz sunacak ve potansiyel tehditleri açıkladıktan sonra, dünya barışı sağlamak için hareket edenlerin nasıl potansiyel tehdit olabileceğinin değerlendirmesi yapılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: 1. Dünya Barışı, 2. Liberal Demokrasi, 3. Güvenlik, 4. Çatışma Tehditleri

---

[*] This study was discussed in the conference of "Historical, Legal and Ethical Aspects of Contemporary Military and Non-Military Conflict" which was organized by Cardinal Stefan Wyszynski University in Warsaw, Poland on March 12-13, 2018 and the abstract was published in the conference booklet

1. WHAT IS LIBERAL DEMOCRACY?

In this section, what liberal democracy means will be explained and defined in general terms. Firstly, what is democracy and then what is liberal democracy will be defined. As a result of these definitions, relations between basic concepts such as democracy, freedom, equality and peace will be analyzed.

According to Abraham Lincoln, "democracy is the rule of people for the people by the people." Considering the etymology of the word "democracy" in this definition, it seems that it comes from the composition of "demos" and "kratos" words in ancient Greek. It was first used by the Greek historian Herototus in the fifth century. But the word "demos" here has been used to mean "the poor majority". As a word that may correspond to this meaning of demos can be thought of as "commons" (Erdoğan 2003: 235). On the other hand, the word "kratos" meant "governance". In this sense, what Aristotle revealed in his Politics (3rd book, 7th and 8th chapters), meant with the word "democracy" in ancient Greek was the governance of the poor majority. This form of government first appeared in the ancient Greek police order. The most competent example of this governance model we call "classical democracy" today has been seen in Athens police.

"Democracy" has become such a widely accepted term that it has almost reached the point of nonsense. Almost every form of political (not just political) organization is called "democracy" or "democratic". To give an example, having very different political systems such as United States, United Kingdoms and even Soviet Union talk about themselves as democracy. Whereas the meaning of "democracy" cannot be found by examining only the systems which are described as democracy.

Democratic form of government requires being completely away from the domination of any other states. That's to say for example, with Athens democracy' entering the domination of Macedonia in 322 BC, democratic form of government was removed to the dusty shelves of history. It took about two thousand years for the rebirth of democracy. This time it emerged in the name of "liberal democracy". Liberal democracy first emerged in England as a result of the uprising of the bourgeoisie, a new class created by the Industrial Revolution, to the ruling monarchies of the aristocracy and the monarch, the privileged classes of feudal society order. As noted by Parekh (1993: 157), considering the democracy of Athens, along with emerging of democracy before liberalism, liberalism in the modern period emerged about two thousand years later than democracy. When entering the political scene again in nineteenth century, democracy was developed by and shaped within the framework of liberalism (Sartori, 1993: 418). In this context, it would be appropriate to discuss the basic concepts and institutions of liberal democracy with reference to liberalism.

Liberalism is ontologically based on individual. By the expression of Yayla (1992: 138), "[p]resence of the individual is more real than the beings of all such as class, people etc." According to liberals, these concepts are abstracts (Erdoğan, 1998: 21). Liberals believe the ambiguity of the concepts devoted to the collective beings such as "public interest", "public good", "common good". Because of this, in liberal democracy, unlike classical one, there is an individualistic interpretation of which (Holden, 2007: 11), people not seen as "a single, unified structure bonded with common or collective interests" (Heywood, 2006: 98).

According to Lord Acton, liberalism was born as a political doctrine, that strengthen the individual against the communities and to limit the sovereign's power over individual and individual groups (Yayla, 2004: 20). Liberals who place individual in the center of their philosophy in this way, obliged state to protect the rights and freedoms of the individual.

The most basic benefit provided by the state is ensuring social order and justice. In an environment without this institution, individuals who are prone to consider themselves and their relatives primarily and to prefer short-term interests to long-term interests will infringe on each other's property rights in a world where scarcity is the data. In order to be able to continue the benefits of social coexistence, inequalities of this kind must be prevented. Therefore, there is a need for state institution. However, classical liberals want to limit the functions of the state to the provision of justice, peace and some basic infrastructure services, as Adam Smith (1776) expressed in his "The Wealth of Nations".

The concept of liberal democracy tries to link the concepts of democracy and freedom. In fact, these are the concepts being in conformity with and support each other on a large scale. If freedom refers to the

independence within a social context, then individual freedom denotes the freedom of individual related to the social and especially political circles.

There is a very close relationship between individual freedom and limited government. Therefore, if there is a threat directed towards individual freedom, it is very likely that it comes from the state or government. To prevent individuals from attacking each other's freedoms, the state is necessary but the state itself can also be threatening for individual freedom. It has been formed to protect individual freedom and can be remain faithful to the purpose of its establishment only by abiding by its limited functions.

Beside freedom, the principle of equality has also played an important role in democratic belief. It is a requirement that all people to be treated equally based on the belief that they are created equal. This principle can only be realized and achieved with and in a democracy. Thus, commitment to the equality is closely related to the loyalty to democracy.

When looking at the link between democracy, freedom and equality, Tocqueville's definition depicts the picture very well "although democratic nations don't despise freedom, their idols are unfortunately not freedom, but equality. According to them, freedom is their secondary goal while equality is the primary one" (Bramsted and Melhuish, 1978).

2. WHAT ARE GLOBAL RISKS?

A brief introduction above, mentioned about concepts related to democracy and liberal democracy which requires equality, freedom, individuality and democratic states' duties expected for its citizens. However, all these 'ideal' concepts remain unfulfilled without establishing sustainable peace and struggling with global threats to peace. In the following sections, the possible scenarios that might be threaten the world security, order and peace will be analyzed according to 2018 Global Risks Report. Then the ambiguity of the concept of 'security' will be discussed.

World Economic Forum Global Risks Book 2018 Global Risks Report is published by the World Economic Forum. 93% of the participants expressed their expectation that the political or economic confrontations among the big players in the global arena will worsen. Approximately 80% of participants anticipate an increase in the risks associated with wars involving big players. Taking these results into consideration, it can be said that the pessimistic picture in 2018 is partly due to worsening of the geopolitical environment.

However, as in 2017, environmental issues are at the top of the list of concerns expressed by experts. Experts have been asked to prioritize the dimensions of probability and impact among 30 global risks; it has been found that all five environmental risks (severe weather, loss of biodiversity, collapse in the ecosystem, major natural disasters, human-generated environmental disasters and failure in the climate change improvement and compliance efforts) are in the upper ranks of both dimensions. The events caused by severe weather conditions are considered as the most noticeable risk.

On the other hand, the decline in the prevalence of economic risks to some extent this year has led some experts to worry that the improvement in the global GDP growth rates will lead to tolerance of the continuing structural risks in the global economic and financial systems. Even in this case, inequality is in the third place among the risk factors and emerges as one of the most frequently mentioned linked risks between undesirable consequences of technological progress and high structural unemployment or underemployment.

Cyber security concerns are also among global risks especially regarding the digitalization of economy. Marsh Global Risk and Digital President John Drzik said, "Geopolitical incompatibilities are the factors that lead to an increase in the scale and complexity of cyberattacks. At the same time, as companies are increasingly dependent on technology, exposure to cyber risks is also increasing. If we want to prevent the problem arising due to the protection difference between financial loses and insured loses, just in the case of natural disasters and their risks, business world and the governments should invest more on studies enhancing resistance while developing cyber risk management".

2.1. Future Scenarios

By taking into account the 2018 Global Risk Report published by World Economic Forum, the world now witnesses environmental, geo-political problems on global level. This, in turn jeopardizes above mentioned democratic concepts. So it can be said that future scenarios regarding changes worldwide should have tackled carefully in order to adhere democratic principles. In the following sections after possible scenarios are explained, the reactions of most authorized international organization, UN, and its peace missions regarding the problems will be addressed.

The future scenarios the threats to global peace are as follows:

Agriculturally, infertile harvest (concurrent grain production problems) threatens the sufficiency of global food supply. Technologically, the complexity of the Internet is another problem. That's to say artificial intelligence's "weeds" become widespread and put the Internet's performance under pressure. The demise of trade is another possible risk that trade wars may erupt and international institutions may remain very weak in interfering with them. The possibility of the collapse of democracy carries another important problem especially for the sustainability of peace. Absolute depletion, that's, unmanned ships move illegal ships to the new –and much more negative in terms of sustainability- levels. Another one is financial crisis that stalemates the political interventions and triggers the chaotic environment. In here, the risk of economic problems turning into political one therefore, deepening of inequality (this can be through drugs that improve bio-engineering and cognitive capacity and deepen the gap between those who have it and those who do not). Lawless war is another possible risk regarding an environment where there is no consensus on cyber warfare rules, interstate conflicts may unexpectedly climb. Identity geopolitics -so ethnic conflicts- may be triggered due to geopolitical mobility, and the national identity struggle may become a growing source of tension on the borders. Another threat regarding globalization may show itself with 'building the walls' for cyber-attacks, protectionism and contradictions of regulations and lead to fractionalization of the Internet.

Besides all, Alison Martin, Risk Director of Zurich Insurance Group, noted that severe weather conditions once again regarded as the most important global risks in terms of both probability and impact. He said "At a time when sensitivity to other risks is also rising, environmental risks seriously threaten the foundations of our common system. Unfortunately, we observe that key trends of governments and organizations responding to climate change are for now, "too little and too late". We are not too late to build a stronger future yet, but we have to take an urgent action to get rid of the possibility of collapse."

To solve global problems in a very general way, the solutions are as follows:

* Education and training need to be increased.

* People should benefit from public services at the top level.

* Informative works should be done to increase the environmental sensitivity.

* States need to act with common mind.

* By accepting the problem, it is necessary to set a policy.

* The global problem requires a global solution, so it is necessary to act globally.

* The need of people to feel unity and solidarity must be met.

* Dialogue environments for peace and tranquility should be established.

* Comprehensive means and deterrent punishments must be initiated in the fight against terrorism.

* People should be deterred from factors that leads to bad habits and terror.

* Family institution should be looked after.

* Investments must be made to develop science and technology.

2.2. Conflict Threats as Global Risk and Security-Peace Dilemma

"When something is labeled as a security issue, should it prioritize the world as a reliable place; or is it an effort of those who are satisfied with the conjuncture of the system to eliminate the future threats to sustain this situation?" (Arıboğan, 2004: 46).

Security is an ambiguous and flexible concept. What means security for someone might easily indicate insecurity for another. Hence, security is a subjective concept which is shaped through perception. For instance, US providing security for Middle East is a factor of insecurity, or a security threat for Iran. Yet for Saudi Arabia, another Middle Eastern country, it constitutes a factor of power and a security umbrella which can shield it from, security threats that might come from other countries in the region. As is seen, a source of prosperity for some might as well be a factor of pressure and threat to others (Battistella, 2003: 437). In this respect, an otherness occurs between "those whose security and safety should be provided" and "those excluded". To sum up, security has a relative and a multi-dimensional character on the basis of the subject and the actor.

While system-level security-threat reviews are built on "partnership of problem", there may be no consensus and simultaneity at the point of value sharing and perception of some issues, and may include an actor-level subjectivity. In other words, this situation can be embodied in a question; "when something is labeled as a security issue, should it prioritize the world as a reliable place; or is it an effort of those who are satisfied with the conjuncture of the system to eliminate the future threats to sustain this situation?" (Arıboğan, 2004: 46).

These security conceptions, which emphasize the different theoretical approaches that come to the forefront with the end of the Cold War and which point to a conceptual transformation in security studies, are as follows in the literature: "common security", "mutual security", "collaborative security", "security partnership", "comprehensive security" and "global security".

In addition to the concept of collective security, the concept of national security as a function that legitimizes the actions and policies of the state has existed simultaneously. However, with the increase of interdependencies and uncertainties in the global system, new ones have been added to security actors, subjects, theories and practices. The security circle has expanded from national security to collective security, from environmental security to information security (Brauch, 2008: 14-17). While security and insecurities are being redefined, manipulation of the definition on the definition remains reserved. The actors of the global system are aware of this situation and, despite their agreement to join alliances and sign treaties on arms control, their sensitivity towards national security remains. In other words, it is possible that the nation-states take a blocking attitude towards the functioning of the processes in international organizations due to their national interests in spite of their participatory attitudes and behaviors to the international community (Bislev, 2004: 283).

In the light of the conflict and security relationship, today the conflicts are not just between states and the asymmetric conflict models has emerged. These asymmetrical conflicts, for example, the clash of states with non-state actors and with different groups within the state, are increasing today. According to Copenhagen School[2], which advocates that globalization affects societies more than states in terms of security, as seen here, it will not be possible to establish global security without considering the post-Cold War system or globalization, without including the decision-making process of societies and the level of analysis.

Based on the definition of security, social, political, economic and psychological aspects of human security are another important security area to be emphasized. People are in a state of psychological insecurity if they do not have freedom even if they live under very safe conditions. In short, there is an ontological relationship between security and freedom. From this point of view, Ken Booth, who focuses on the relationship between security and freedom, says that emancipation is, "to get rid of the physical and human restrictions that prevent people from doing things they choose freely as individuals and groups" (Mazlum, 2003: 334-335).

---

[2] Creating a milestone in conceptual security studies in the 1990s, Barry Buzan has developed a five-dimensional security scheme that examines security in terms of military security, political security, economic security, social security and environmental security.

Michael T. Klare's book, *Resource Wars: The New Landscape of Global Conflict* [3], has helped us to understand conflict areas. Despite the continuous growth of demand for natural resources across the globe, the scarcity of certain resources and the spread of competitiveness of these resources put the international system in new tensions. The first two (continuous growth of demand for natural resources and scarcity of resources across the globe) intensify competition among states to gain the right to benefit from vital resources. The third one (competition for having certain resources) creates new sources of disagreement and conflict. Moreover, each supports the unstable tendency of others. In addition, as resource consumption grows, famines are growing faster, and states are increasingly coming under pressure to address this problem at all costs. This ultimately increases states' tendency to achieve maximum control over competing resources. Thus, the risk of conflict between countries that share or demand a certain source is increasing gradually.

3. HOW DOES UNITED NATIONS REACT?

As the nature of the threats changes, methods of preserving peace are also change. Multinational approaches are being developed to deal with other threats such as terrorism, failed states and weapons of mass destruction. Many parties may take advantage from the benefits of stability at the same time. So providing stability in regions where tension poses a threat is extremely important.

In the United Nations (UN) declaration of 31 January 1992, the UN underlined the non-military dimensions of the threats to the international system such as economic, social, environmental and human rights. And later, on November 4 1998, UN General Assembly adopted a resolution to eliminate threats to peace among nations and to promote international cooperation for the solution of social, economic, cultural and humanitarian international problems and to encourage respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all and to promote collective efforts to strengthen friendly relations between nations.

UN collects its objectives in three provisos:

- Preventing wars and threats against peace,

- Establishing relations between countries,

- Ensuring international economic and social cooperation.

One of the main objectives of the UN is the establishment of international peace. Recent experiences have led UN to concentrate more heavily on efforts to build peace – that is, to strengthen and consolidate the peace climate. Experience shows that lasting peace can only be achieved through social justice, respect for human rights, good governance and a democratic process, helping countries to develop economically. No institution has international experience, competence, coordination and impartiality more than UN to achieve these goals.

The Security Council, the General Assembly and the General Secretariat play a complementary role in ensuring peace and security. The UN activities cover key areas such as conflict prevention, mediation, peacekeeping, implementation and peace building. In order for being effective of such commitments, works must be overlapping and done simultaneously. The UN Secretary-General B. Boutros Ghali's Agenda for Peace Report [4] and the UN's peacekeeping operations are important developments in the organization's resurgence (Sens, 2004; Eraydın, 1996: 22).

Again, as a result of the increase of regional wars and ethnic-conflicts, the UN has developed new methods for the establishment and protection of international peace and security, preventive diplomacy, conflict prevention, peace-making, peace enforcement and has implemented practices such as peace keeping, peace building and cooperation with other regional organizations. In addition to these activities, the UN has also focused on the new security concept, such as environmental problems, refugee and immigration problems, conventional and nuclear weapons, bio-politics, and security issues in collective security. The UN, stressing that peace and security in the globalized world depend not only on political

---

[3] The book Resource Wars: The new landscape of global conflict, by author Michael T. Klare, was published in 2001, a few months after the attacks on American soil on September 11.
[4] B. Boutros Ghali, "An Agenda for Peace: Preventive Diplomacy, Peace Keeping, Peace Building", the Security Council 31 January 1992, http://www.un.org/Docs/SG/agpeace.html

variables but also economic and social variables, emphasized this through the message that it gave in its Earth Charter initiative, stating that "without social and economic justice and without destroying poverty, peace cannot be established" (İşyar, 2008: 6).

3.1. The Organizational and Conventional Structure of UN Regarding Peacekeeping

The UN Charter is an international treaty which obliges member states to solve their problems in a peaceful way, without compromising international peace and security. These states should refrain from threatening and using force against other states. States have the right to bring the issues to the attention of the Security Council.

Security Council is the most competent body in the UN, responsible for ensuring peace and security. In accordance with the Charter, member states must accept and implement the Council's decisions. The recommendations of other UN bodies such as decisions of the Council have no binding character, but still they can influence the situation by expressing the opinion of the international community.

The UN Security Council has fifteen member states. Five of these countries are permanent members and ten are elected ones. There are permanent members who have the right to vote decisions at UN Security Council: China, France, the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (UK) and the United States of America (USA); and ten temporary member states. The rotating ten member states are determined by an election held every two years at the UN General Assembly.

When disagreements are brought to the Council, the Council usually warns the parties to resolve these disputes peacefully. The Council may take recommendations for a peaceful settlement, appoint special representatives; request the Secretary General to assume the duty of good faith; initiate an investigation and mediate.

If the dispute turns into a conflict, the Council will try to put an end to it. The Council often orders a ceasefire to prevent further hostilities. The Council may send observers or peacekeepers to the conflict zone to support the peace process. The seventh part of the Charter authorizes the Council to take the necessary measures to enforce its decisions. It may impose embargo and sanctions or introduce peacekeepers to ensure that their orders are fulfilled. In accordance with the seventh Chapter, the Council may allow member states, regional organizations or institutions to use common military force in the event of blockage of all roads, violation of peace or continuation of aggressive attitude. Again, in accordance with the seventh Chapter, the Council may establish international courts to prosecute people accused of serious violations of international human rights including genocide.

The UN Security Council Resolutions shall be adopted on the condition that it is acceptable for nine of fifteen member states and has not been rejected by any of the permanent member states of the UN Security Council.

Permanent members have the right to veto. Veto rights are not a fully democratic institution of the UN. Debates take place precisely for this right. The decisions taken out of the UN with 193 members, depend on the condition that these five permanent members' not to use their veto rights.

The UN Charter (Article 11) authorizes the General Assembly to examine the general principles of cooperation to protect international peace and security and to advise the member states and the Security Council in accordance with these principles. The Assembly is a forum that brings the parties together to solve the problems, ensuring that there is a consensus on challenging issues.

The main strategies to prevent the disputes from turning into conflict and re-emergence of conflicts are protective diplomacy, protective military deployment and protective disarmament.

Protective diplomacy means taking measures to prevent the escalation of disputes, resolving them before turning into conflict or preventing them from spreading if conflict has already occurred. Mediation can be through reconciliation or negotiation. Early warning is an important part of prevention and the UN closely monitors the political and other developments worldwide in order to identify elements that pose a threat to international peace and security.

Delegates and special representatives of the Secretary General carry out mediator role and protective diplomacy all over the world. In some troubled areas, the presence of a competent private representative may prevent the escalation of the tension. This task is mostly carried out in cooperation with regional organizations.

Elements complementing protective diplomacy are protective military force deployment and protective disarmament. The deployment of protective military force – the deployment of peacekeepers to prevent possible conflicts- aims to create a subtle line to prevent conflicts by building trust in troubled regions. Some examples of these regions are the missions carried out by UN in FYR Macedonia and Central Africa. Protective military force deployment has also been taken into account in other conflicts and is an important option.

Protective disarmament is intended to reduce the number of light weapons in conflict-prone areas. As a part of a general peace agreement in El Salvador and Mozambique, combat forces were demobilized and their weapons were collected and annihilated. Annihilation of weapons of the past prevents them from being used in future battles.

Peace making means the use of diplomatic means to ensure that the disputed parties end their hostility and find a peaceful solution to the conflict. The UN has developed a number of ways to control, resolve and address conflicts. The Security Council may recommend several ways to resolve the dispute or request Secretary General to mediate. The Secretary General may undertake certain diplomatic initiatives to support the negotiation process and ensure the continuation of its pace.

The Secretary General has an important role both personally and through representatives and research committees. Under this agreement, Secretary General may bring any issues that may threaten the maintenance of international peace and security to the attention of Security Council.

The Secretary General may act as a mediator to assist in the resolution of disputes or to implement the mission of protective diplomacy. The Secretary General's impartiality is one of the greatest values of the UN. In many cases, the Secretary General has been effective in turning threats into peace and ensuring peace agreement.

The action led by the Secretary General in 1988, at the end of the war between Iran and Iraq in 1980 is an example of it. The mediator role of the Secretary General and his representative in Afghanistan provided the basis for the 1988 treaties, which resulted in the withdrawal of Soviet troops from the country. Cambodia, Central America, the Middle East, Mozambique and Nambia demonstrate how the Secretary General has acted as a mediator in various ways.

On May 29 of 1948, the UN Security Council launched its first peacekeeping operation. During the following 60 years, the peacekeepers, also called the Blue Berets, became one of the most recognizable activities of the UN. Today, 110,000 men and women from around 120 countries are working in various parts of the world. These numbers demonstrate us the point, which the faith and demand to UN has reached. The staff working in peacekeeping force comes from many countries, big or small, rich or poor even that have been freed from the conflict-zone ones. These people coming together to protect peace also bring different cultures and experiences from their countries. Some of the peacekeepers are military personnel, while others are the civilians. Their task is gradually moving beyond observation, and they are becoming the hope of light for people.

The construction of peace for the UN denotes the efforts that include actions and programmes to support and strengthen the transition of countries and regions from state of war to peace. The peace-building process normally begins with the role of the warring parties in signing a peace agreement and the UN' role in facilitating its implementation. This includes the continuing diplomatic role of the UN to ensure that mutual negotiations are used instead of taking arms up to overcome difficulties.

It also refers to the support given to many different kinds of issues, such as the appointment of military forces as peacekeepers, the repatriation of refugees and reintegration into society, elections, disarming, demobilization or reintegration of soldiers. On the basis of the conception of peace-building, there is an effort to establish a new, legal state that has the capacity to resolve conflicts peacefully, protects the civilians and respects basic human rights.

Peace building is the action of many organizations of the UN system, including the World Bank, regional economic and other organizations, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and local citizens' groups / interest groups. The construction of peace came into prominence in the UN' operations in Kosovo, Timor-Leste (formerly East Timor), Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Mozambique, Liberia, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Sierra Leone. The most recent example of the work of the UN for the construction of inter-state peace is the UN Ethiopian and Eritrean Mission.

3.2. Critics to UN's Structure

Although, peacebuilding and peacekeeping missions of UN are effective in war thorn regions, the veto power of 5 permanent members in the Security Council causes controversies. The criticisms regarding the veto power stems from the blockage for actions from some of these permanent members in situations where the intervention is crucial for conflict. "Great powers of the Allied front, The United States, Britain and the Soviet Union (then two other major states China and France would join to these powers) after the defeating of the Axis powers expressing their declaration to establish a new international order, their preparation for the constitution and institutional structure, their call to states for an international conference at the end of the war, in order to confirm the new order in the form of a new convention and starting UN to operate. The UN was originally founded in Dumbarton Oaks and Yalta; The San Francisco Conference served to fulfill the formalities in accordance with the basic principles of international relations" (Çağıran, 2014: 459). The transaction of the five major powers to legitimize the military, economic and cultural activities has been signed by 193 members, 46 of which are being the founder.

When we examine these five countries in different criteria, we see the following tables:

First issue will be the export figures. Because the primary source of income is the exports. Based on Cia World Factbook data, China is the top of the list in export data. USA follows it. If we look at in accordance with permanent members of UN Security Council France, UK and Russia there is a considerable gap between these three and China-US duo.

Table 1: Exports Data of United Nations Permanent Members and Some Other Countries

Exports data of United Nations Permanent Members and some other countries (2017 est.)	
China	2.157 trillion $
France	551.8 billion $
United Kingdom	436.5 billion $
USA	1.576 trillion $
Russia	336.8 billion $
Canada	433 billion $
Germany	1.401 trillion $
Korea, South	577.4 billion $
Turkey	196.8 billion $

According to CIA Factbook and World Bank, here is the rate of Gross Domestic Products-GDP-per capita:

Table 2: GDP of the UN Permanent Members and Some Other Countries

GDP of the UN Permanent Members and some other countries		
	CIA World Factbook (2017 est.)	World Bank (2017)
China	16.700 $	16.760 $
France	43.800 $	43.720 $
United Kingdom	44.100 $	43.160 $
USA	59.500 $	60.200 $
Russia	27.800 $	24.890 $
Canada	48.300 $	45.750 $
Germany	50.400 $	51.760 $
Korea, South	39.400 $	38.260 $
Turkey	26.900 $	27.550 $

Here, USA has the highest GDP, then Germany, Canada, UK and France are following in order. Russia and China of permanent members have lowest GDP compared to them.

When we look military expenditures of the same states, we see this table:

Table 3: Military Expenditures

Military Expenditures – Country comparison to the World (CIA World Factbook 2016 data) Military expenditures compares spending on defense programs for the most recent year available as a percent of gross domestic product (GDP; calculated on an exchange rate basis).	
China	50th place
France	42nd place
United Kingdom	46th place
USA	25th place
Russia	8th place
Canada	114th place
Germany	98th place
Korea, South	41st place
Turkey	61st place

In here Russia has the highest military expenditure.

When SIPRI's list of companies selling the most weapons in the world is examined, it is seen that the USA is on the top 3 countries in the ranking of the countries in which these companies belong, the UK in the 4th place, and again the USA 5th and 6th, France in 10th, Russia in 14th, Germany in 26th. Turkey 76th. China is not included in this list. (SIPRI)

Table 4. The 15 States with the Highest Military Expenditure in 2017 (Database is Taken From SIPRI Fact Sheet, May 2018)

Rank						Spending as a share of GDP (%) (2)	
2017	2016(1)	Country	Spending, 2017 ($ b.)	Change, 2008–17 (%)	World share, 2017 (%)	2017	2008
1	1	USA	610	-14	35	3.1	4.2
2	2	China	[228]	110	[13]	[1.9]	[1.9]
3	4	Saudi Arabia	[69.4]	34	[4.0]	[10]	7.4
4	3	Russia	66.3	36	3.8	4.3	3.3
5	6	India	63.9	45	3.7	2.5	2.6
6	5	France	57.8	5.1	3.3	2.3	2.3
7	7	UK	47.2	−15	2.7	1.8	2.3
8	8	Japan	45.4	4.4	2.6	0.9	0.9
9	9	Germany	44.3	8.8	2.5	1.2	1.3
10	10	South Korea	39.2	29	2.3	2.6	2.6
11	13	Brazil	29.3	21	1.7	1.4	1.4
12	11	Italy	29.2	-17	1.7	1.5	1.7
13	12	Australia	27.5	33	1.6	2.0	1.8
14	14	Canada	20.6	13	1.2	1.3	1.2
15	15	Turkey	18.2	46	1.0	2.2	2.2
Total top 15			1 396	. .	80	. .	. .
World total			1 739	9.8	100	2.2	2.4

[ ] = SIPRI estimate; GDP = gross domestic product.

(1) Rankings for 2016 are based on updated military expenditure figures for 2017 in the current edition of the SIPRI Military Expenditure Database. They may therefore differ from the rankings for 2016 given in SIPRI Yearbook 2017 and in other SIPRI publications in 2017.

(2) The figures for military expenditure as a share of GDP are based on estimates of 2017 GDP from the International Monetary Fund World Economic Outlook and International Financial Statistics databases.

According to data regarding military expenditure we see USA, China and Saudi Arabia at the top of the list. Three of the permanent members of the Security Council (Russia, France, UK) following at the bottom rows.

However, these figures may not show the exact situation. Since the choice of release military expenditures is left to own decisions of countries[5], such transparency is often quite weak. So this can affect the reliability of data, but which more seriously can lead to wasteful, excessive spending and to widespread corruption, often not for real security needs.[6]

So those datas are especially for to show economic figures and military expenditures of five permanent countries of the UN Security Council. The aim of to study these figures is also relating with the transparency and accountability in military spending[7]. Such transparency is necessary for legitimacy but, its relation with security and peace is also need to be considered.

4. CONCLUSION

To summarize, this paper began with the discussions about two complementary concepts: peace and democracy. The components of liberal democracy have been linked to a peaceful environment. Hence, it paved the way for an analysis of recent global problems and its future scenarios. Conflict and potential threats are the most important problems to cope with not only for democratic states, but also for undemocratic countries or countries trying to democratize. And the practices show that in order to protect their own citizens, states can easily implement non-democratic approaches to other states. As long as this approach continues, it is not possible to ensure complete peace in the world.

To prevent or find solutions to these worldwide risks as soon as possible, works of international organizations especially the UN and its peacebuilding and peacekeeping missions are extremely important. Admittedly, to eliminate potential threats is not enough to ensure world peace, but it is crucial to avoid, at least, major conflicts. Again unfortunately, another problem arising at this point, countries, especially democratic countries, can ignore the more disadvantaged countries in order to sustain their existence and protect their citizens' welfare and prosperity. While economic and military datas shown in one of the research institutions, SIPRI, may help for accountable assessments and pushing states for transparency it is not enough for ensuring stability and order. The countries itself have to be aware of those global threats not only to peace but to themselves. Main actors of the international system states and international organizations should work in harmony to cope with these serious challenges. Today, the world has more problems, so needs more solutions.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Arıboğan, D. Ü. (2004) "Güvenliksiz Barıştan, Barışsız Güvenliğe", T. Ateş (ed.), ABD Dış Politikasında Yeni Yönelimler ve Dünya, Ankara: Ümit Yayıncılık

Aristotle, (1997) The Politics, Trans. with introduction, analysis, and notes, Peter L. Phillips Simpson as The Politics of Aristotle, Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Battistella, D. (2003) Théories des Rélations Internationales, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po

Bislev, S. (2004) "Globalization, State Transformation, and Public Security", International Political Science Review, Vol. 25, Issue 3, 281-296.

Bramsted, E. K. and Melhuish, K. J. (1978) Western liberalism: a history in documents from Locke to Croce, Longman: Michigan Üniversitesi.

---

[5] United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, "Promoting Further Openness and Transparency in Military Matters," UNODA Occasional Papers No. 20, November 2010, 1.

[6] https://www.sipri.org/research/armament-and-disarmament/arms-transfers-and-military-spending/military-expenditure (12.09.2018).

[7] https://www.sipri.org/research/armament-and-disarmament/arms-transfers-and-military-spending/military-expenditure (12.09.2018).

Brauch, H. G. (2008) "Güvenliğin Yeniden Kavramsallaştırılması: Barış, Güvenlik, Kalkınma ve Çevre Kavramsal Dörtlüsü", International Relations, Summer, Vol. 5, Issue 18, 1-47.

Çağıran, M. E. , (2014) Uluslararası Örgütler, Ankara: Turhan Bookstore.

Eraydın, Ö. (1996) "Avrupa'nın Yeni Güvenlik Düzeni ve Türkiye", Faruk Sönmezoğlu (ed.), Değişen Dünya ve Türkiye, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları.

Erdoğan, M. (1998) Liberal Toplum Liberal Siyaset, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.

Heywood, A. (2006) Siyaset, Çev. B.B. Özipek, B. Şahin, M. Yıldız, Z. Kopuzlu, B. Seçilmişoğlu, Ankara: Liberte.

Holden, B. (2007) Liberal Demokrasiyi Anlamak, Çev. Hüseyin Bal, Ankara: Liberte.

Global Risks Report 2018, https://www.weforum.org/reports/the-global-risks-report-2018

İşyar, Ö. G. (2008) "Günümüzde Uluslararası Güvenlik Stratejileri: Kavramsal Çerçeve ve Uygulama", Akademik Bakış, Vol. 2, Issue 3.

Mazlum, İ. (2003) "Çevre ve Güvenlik İlişkisine Tanımsal Bir Yaklaşım", Ayhan Kaya, Günay Göksu Özdoğan (eds.), Uluslararası İlişkilerde Sınır Tanımayan Sorunlar, İstanbul: Bağlam Yayınları

Parekh, B. (1993) "The Cultural Particularity of Liberal Democracy," D. Held (ed.), Prospects for Democracy North, South East, West, Oxford: Polity Press, 156-175.

Sartori, G. (1993) Demokrasi Teorisine Geri Dönüş, Çev. T. Karamustafaoğlu, M. Turhan, Ankara: Yetkin Basımevi.

Sens, A. G. (2004) "From Peace-Keeping to Peace-Building", Richard M. Price, Mark W. Zacher (eds.), The United Nations and Global Security, New York: Palgrave, 141-160.

SIPRI Arms Industry Database, https://www.sipri.org/databases/armsindustry

United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, 2011, "Promoting Further Openness and Transparency in Military Matters," UNODA Occasional Papers No. 20.

Yayla, A. (1992) Liberalizm, Ankara: Turhan Kitabevi.

Yayla, A. (2004) Siyaset Teorisine Giriş, Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.