



THE NEW SCHOOL OF ATHENS 2006

Beyond the Millennium Declaration: Embracing Democracy and Good Governance

9-11 March 2006

Athens, Greece

PALLAS ATHENA

John S. Latsis Public Benefit Foundation Headquarters in Athens

ISSUE PAPER

SESSION 2: The Threat of Insecurity: Are We Meeting the Challenge?

Michael D. Intriligator

Professor of Economics, Political Science, and Public Policy, UCLA

Senior Fellow, The Milken Institute and

The Gorbachev Foundation of North America

The views expressed in this report are those of the author. Publishing material does not imply endorsement by the City of Athens or the Global Governance Group of any of the views expressed (except Press Releases.)

This report should not be distributed or quoted without the permission of the New School of Athens.



This is a joint Initiative of the City of Athens and the Global Governance Group.
The New School of Athens 2006
7, Xenofontos Str., Syntagma . GR - 105 57 Athens. Email: nsoa@otenet.gr
+30 210 3216244



Answers to Questions Posed and My Own Questions for Discussion

A brief answer to the question posed in the title of this session is that the threat of insecurity is a real one, indeed a growing one that we are not meeting. Actions must be taken on a coordinated global basis to remedy this situation.

To answer the four general questions posed to all of the conference sessions:

QUESTION 1: WHAT ARE THE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES RELATED TO THE THREAT OF INSECURITY? As was noted in the conference materials, “Peace and security are today among the top priorities for improving global governance. Some of the threats to peace and security remain the same: repression of human rights, hunger, disease and poverty-to name a few. Some others, however, have changed: Collective security no longer involves coping with the risk of war between states but rather with ‘asymmetric threats’: terrorists, paramilitary groups, and organized crime.” There are many other threats as well, both military and non-military, as discussed in Section 1 below. Any system of global governance must contain or reduce these threats in order to be effective. The current UN system of global governance has had some successes in reducing these threats but many remain, even the old ones, and to them must be added many new threats.

QUESTION 2: WHAT PROGRESS IF ANY HAS BEEN ACHIEVED IN THE LAST YEAR (2005) IN DEALING WITH THESE FUNDAMENTAL ISSUES? Some progress has been made such as a settlement of the internal war in southern Sudan via negotiation and the arrest of some prominent terrorists, but many challenges remain. These include the genocide in Darfur, another region of Sudan, and an enormous war, on the scale of a World War, which is being fought in the Democratic Republic of Congo that many people are not aware of, as it is not covered by the international media. The U.S. led wars in Iraq and Afghanistan continue with no indication of their coming to a conclusion As to the “asymmetric threats” of terrorism, paramilitary

groups, and organized crime, U.S. President George W. Bush launched a War on Terror, now referred to as a “Global War on Terror” after the 9/11 attacks on New York and Washington but it has not stopped terrorism that continues on a worldwide basis, and it has created its own challenges to security, including human rights problems and the possibility of a “Perpetual War.” As to non-military threats to security there are enormous dangers lurking in a possible avian flu pandemic and in natural disasters on the scale of the Indian Ocean tsunami, the Pakistan earthquake, and the hurricane that struck New Orleans and the U.S. Gulf Coast.

QUESTION 3: WHAT REALISTIC TARGETS CAN BE SET IN THIS AREA OF INSECURITY FOR THE NEXT FIVE YEARS, GIVEN THE ANSWERS TO THE FIRST TWO QUESTIONS? The international community must recognize these threats explicitly and work cooperatively to deal with them, possibly with a greater role for international non-governmental organizations and other international organizations as well as a major role for science in the form of 50 Manhattan Projects, both of which are discussed below.

QUESTION 4: HOW EXACTLY CAN THE NEW SCHOOL OF ATHENS (NSOA) HELP IN ACHIEVING THESE TARGETS IN THE NEXT FIVE YEARS? NSOA can help achieve these targets by proposing new approaches to these threats to global security. Two such approaches are discussed in this paper. One is a greater role in the UN system for non-governmental organizations (NGOs), particularly the international NGOs and other international organizations, both public and private. Another is the UN taking the lead in organizing scientific studies of these threats and how the world scientific community, using the models of the Manhattan Project and the Green Revolution, that might find creative new approaches to address these global security threats.

Questions for discussion BY THE EXPERT GROUP relevant to the topic of GLOBAL INSECURITY

A. Of the many various threats to global security, both military and non-military that are discussed in Section 1, which ones should have the highest priority and importance in the global system?

B. Given these threats to global security that are of the greatest priority and importance, which ones can the UN and its various agencies address? Which ones require structural changes in the UN system or other innovations for them to be properly addressed? What structural changes or other innovations should be considered to address these threats?

C. Focusing on one of the current major threats to global security, the possibility that the avian flu H5N1 strain could lead to a global pandemic, how must we prepare for this eventuality on a global basis?

D. Assuming that the suggestion of 50 Manhattan Projects is adopted, which specific projects to deal with threats to security should be the initial ones selected? Which are the priority ones?

E. How can NSOA help mitigate the threats to global security in terms of other new initiatives and new systems of global governance? What new international organizations might be developed or groupings of nations be formed so as to contain the threats to global security?

.....

The Threat of Insecurity: Are We Meeting the Challenge?

1. Sources of Insecurity: Major Threats Facing the Planet and Humanity

To understand the challenges of insecurity it is necessary to recognize explicitly the fundamental security threats that we face. These threats to global security include:

- International trans-border wars, especially an attack by one UN member state on another without the sanction of the UN Security Council, such as the invasion of Kuwait by Saddam Hussein of Iraq and the invasion of Iraq by George W. Bush of the U.S. One of the principal reasons the UN was established was precisely to prevent such wars, yet they still exist over 60 years since its founding in 1945.
- Internal or civil wars, such as the current or recent ones in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC), Sudan, Angola, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Cote d'Ivoire, among others. The biggest war being fought today in the world is probably the one in the DRC that is of a monumental scale involving many nations and millions of deaths. It has elements of both an internal war and a trans-border war since it involves both conflicts among groups within the nation and also many of its neighboring nations.
- Genocide and large-scale human rights abuses, such as in Rwanda, Bosnia, and currently in the Darfur region of Sudan as well as in the Chechnya region of Russia and in Iraq and Afghanistan under U.S. occupation.
- National and international terrorism, especially terrorist use of weapons of mass destruction, such as the release of sarin nerve gas on the Tokyo subway on March 20, 1995 by the Japanese terrorist group Aum Shinrikyo, and other major terrorist strikes. The latter include the 9/11 (September 11, 2001) al Qaeda terrorist attacks on New York and Washington; the 3/11 (March 11, 2004) terrorist attacks against Madrid, and the 7/11 (July 11, 2005) attacks against London by international terrorist groups.
- Other "asymmetric threats," including paramilitary groups and organized crime that can facilitate terrorist strikes, such as the IRA, FARC, and right-wing extremist groups in the U.S., among many others.
- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, whether nuclear, radiological,

chemical and biological, including the actual or potential acquisition of nuclear weapons by North Korea, Iran, Syria, Algeria, and other states as well as subnational and terrorist groups.

- Pandemic threats due to infectious diseases, such as the 1918-1919 flu pandemic and the possibility of a pandemic today due to the H5N1 strain of avian flu.
- Other widespread diseases, especially AIDS/HIV, tuberculosis, and malaria.
- International financial instabilities, such as the 1997-98 East Asia financial crisis that spread from Thailand to many other nations, including the Philippines, Indonesia, and even to Russia.
- Protectionism, especially the E.U. Common Agricultural Policy and U.S. subsidies for cotton and other crops that have had devastating effects on developing nations and their populations.
- Global climate change, global warming, and other environmental threats, leading to environmental degradation.
- Natural disasters, including earthquakes, floods, hurricanes, tornados, and tsunamis.
- Poverty, hunger, and malnutrition.
- Imbalance of energy supply and demand, particularly with the emergence of nations such as China and India as major demanders of energy at the same time that some energy supplies are being depleted or exhausted.
- Failed and failing states.

Some of these threats existed when the UN was created in 1945 but others are newer ones. They represent immediate and major threats to the planet as a whole and thus endanger global security. Furthermore, they are interrelated and, due to globalization, a threat to one nation or region is a threat to all, with all mutually vulnerable. Indeed, many of these threats feed on one another in a deadly cycle. A common feature of all these threats is that they cannot be addressed by one nation acting alone no matter how powerful. Rather they require international cooperation, with both increased reliance on existing but revitalized international institutions, including the UN and its affiliated bodies, and the creation of new international organizations. Many of these problems have regional or global significance

and do not respect national boundaries. They require coordinated remedial measures at the national, regional and international level involving governments, NGOs, other international organizations, and the private sector.

2. Dealing with these Threats to Security: Global Security, Human Security, and a Warning from 100 Years Ago

For a system of global governance, whether the UN or some other system to deal effectively with these fundamental threats to security, it is necessary to formulate a new approach to this subject. In the light of global interdependence it is necessary to treat security from a global perspective rather than a national one. The world so highly connected and interdependent that it is impossible to confine security to arbitrarily defined national frontiers, leading to the concept of *global security as one replacing the traditional concept of “national security,”* as discussed in my 1993 Presidential Address to the Peace Science Society (International), “Global Security after the End of the Cold War.” I defined “global security” there as the *absence of threats to the vital interests of the planet*, and I noted in my address that this new concept should replace that of “national security.” Furthermore, this concept of security must extend well beyond its traditional military dimension to treat the interrelated military, political, economic, environmental, health and other threats to the vital interests of the planet as discussed above. Now is an opportune time to reach a global consensus on these issues and the logical party to take the initiative would clearly be a revitalized UN. Third, an increasingly important mechanism to achieve the goal of global security is that of international cooperation. Finally, it will be necessary to formulate new theories and analytic frameworks for global security to replace such traditional theories of security as containment, balance of power, deterrence, and hegemonic stability.

“Human security” will be defined here as in the work and reports of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), referring, in a comparable way, to the *absence of threats to the vital interests of individual people on a worldwide basis*. In the words of the UNDP, that pioneered this concept,

human security is “freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights, safety or lives,” involving both “safety for people from violent threats, such as organized conflict, gross violations of human rights, terrorism and violent crime” and “safety from non-violent threats, such as environmental degradation, economic crises, illicit drugs, infectious diseases and natural disasters”. These two concepts of security, *global security* and *human security*, are not inconsistent. Indeed, they are both complementary and mutually reinforcing.

There has been much recent discussion of globalization, which is, of course, a reality in the current world system. (See Intriligator, 2004) It should not be forgotten, however, that the current age of globalization is just the latest manifestation of this phenomenon. The earlier period of globalization, extending over the century from the end of the Napoleonic Wars in 1815 to the outbreak of World War I in 1914 came to an end due to four blows that provide a warning of how the current age of globalization might similarly come to a catastrophic end. The first was “The Great War,” World War I; the second was the great flu pandemic of 1918-1919; the third was the Great Depression starting in 1929; and the fourth was World War II starting in Europe in 1939 and even earlier in Asia. The UN system must be prepared to deal with comparable challenges in the future, including wars, pandemics, economic depression, and other threat, calling for a rethinking and revitalization of the entire system of global governance.

Over 100 years ago the philosopher George Santayana said, in 1905, before these four blows of the twentieth century materialized, that, “Those who cannot remember the past are condemned to repeat it.” (*The Life of Reason, Volume 1*). This should be a warning about the current world system of the 21st century that could end up going the same disastrous route as that of the 20th century. We should all be pondering Santayana’s warning and consider the possible repetition of these earlier disasters and how they could be avoided through reform of the UN system. Indeed there are disquieting similarities between, say, 1913 and today, with the unprecedented threat of extreme nationalism then and that of global terrorism today and with the Spanish flu pandemic lurking then and a potential avian flu pandemic lurking today. Therefore, I consider it vital that

the UN take the global initiative on today's issues and major threats to the international system. In fact, when comparing 1913 and 2006, the presence of UN as an institution is the major difference in world affairs and the global system.

3. Restructuring the UN System to Deal with these Global Threats: The Role of International NGOs, Multinational Corporations, and other International Organizations

Having outlined the many great challenges we face in the 21st Century, I'd like to propose my own vision for how the UN can deal with these global threats by both changing the UN system and the present institutions of global governance. Focusing on the immediate and major threats and asking how we must restructure the institutions of global governance to deal with them provides an important focus for the future of the UN. Clearly some form of global cooperative action is needed to deal with these threats since no nation can deal with them on a unilateral basis. The most important institutions of such global cooperative action are precisely the UN and its affiliated agencies but they need to be rethought and strengthened.

As one important example of insecurity, there is justifiable fear of a new flu pandemic stemming from the avian flu H5N1 strain that could even surpass the 1918-1919 one that killed tens of millions of people worldwide. We must question whether the WHO and other international agencies affiliated with the UN as well as various national and multinational institutions are able to deal with this threat or alternatively whether they should be rethought or new international institutions created

My proposal is that the UN cooperate closely with major institutions at the global or regional level many of which did not exist when the UN was created and are thus not part of the Charter or, in some cases, not part of the way the UN normally functions. Among these institutions are non-governmental organizations, NGOs that play a key role in the UN system, particularly the international NGOs that are accredited to the UN. These international NGOs are action organizations with a global constituency and a global reach. As an illustration, without the involvement and active

participation of NGOs there would be no Landmines Treaty and many of the various environmental conventions and treaties would not exist. The UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan has stated in a recent BBC interview that the UN could not function without the NGOs. He said in this interview on September 15, 2005 as a follow-up to the UN summit meeting:

.....
You have no idea of how we work with Civil Society and the NGO's. They can lead and say things I cannot say. There are times when we don't like what they say or do and times when they don't like what we say or do, and there are moments when they are ahead of us. They can lead and say things that I cannot say. We cannot operate in the field without our essential partners, the NGO's.
.....

More could and should be done, however, in involving the NGOs in the operation of the UN and its various affiliates. As one example, my own NGO, Economists for Peace and Security (<http://www.epsusa.org/>) for which I am Vice Chair, regularly participates in the Disarmament Week organized every October in New York by the UN Under-Secretary General for Disarmament Affairs. This meeting provides an excellent opportunity for the UN to announce its plans in this area and to receive suggestions on new programs and initiatives by the participating NGOs. All UN agencies might follow this example and establish a regular time and place to meet with those international NGOs that are accredited to the UN.

Other major institutions should also be regularly involved in UN programs, including major international corporations, multinational banks and other financial institutions, workers' associations, and other international organizations so as to deal cooperatively with the common threats that we all face. The last would include the World Bank, the IMF, and the World Trade Organization that all operate largely independently of the UN. Some connections along these lines already exist but in a largely informal and haphazard way. Regular forums where these institutions can meet with appropriate UN agencies and officials both to receive information about their programs and to make suggestions for new initiatives should be held regularly. To some extent this is done, again in a largely informal and haphazard way, at the World Economic Forum meetings in Davos and the

World Social Forum meeting in Porto Allegre, Mumbai, and elsewhere, but the UN would be the more natural and better body to conduct this cooperative approach to solving global problems.

Another aspect of restructuring the institutions of global governance that is complementary to the involvement of other international organizations is the use of ad hoc groups of organizations and nations to focus on certain issue areas. A current example is the so-called “Quartet” of the UN, the U.S., the E.U., and Russia in the Middle East peace process. Another is the E.U.3 of France, Germany, and Great Britain that has been negotiating with Iran to suspend enrichment activities and thus attempt to limit the threat of nuclear proliferation in Iran. Yet another example is the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), a practical response to the growing challenge posed by the worldwide spread of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) and their delivery systems and related materials. PSI aims to impede illicit WMD related trade to and from states of proliferation concern and terrorist groups. U.S. President George W. Bush launched the initiative in May 2003, and core participants include Australia, Canada, France, Germany, Italy, Japan, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Russia, Singapore, Spain, the U.K. and the U.S. Under the initiative, countries commit to disrupting the illicit trade in WMD by interdicting vessels, aircraft or other modes of transport in their territory or territorial waters that are reasonably suspected of carrying suspicious cargo. For example, in October 2003, the United States, United Kingdom, Germany and Italy, acting under the auspices of the PSI, stopped an illegal cargo of centrifuge parts for uranium enrichment destined for Libya. Other examples of combinations of nations to deal with common problems are the G-8, the Asia Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC), the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), the African Union (AU), the Arab League, and similar organizations elsewhere. The UN should be working closely with these regional organizations.

Overall, the key to UN reform is its cooperation with other major world players, including NGOs, major international corporations, multinational banks, and other international organizations. The UN could also make greater use of ad hoc groups of nations to deal with specific threats. It could

also involve people on a worldwide basis through innovative use of the Internet in a form of e-government. The UN system extends well beyond its member states and UN reform should incorporate these other world players, including people on a worldwide basis.

The goals and objectives of the United Nations remain valid and as relevant today as at the time of its establishment. Through sixty years of evolution, the UN structures are more streamlined, its working methods are more effective and its various programs are better coordinated, but it is still clearly an organization built for a different era that can meet the challenges and priorities of the present, including that of security, only by modifying its practices and further strengthening its structure. With appropriate modifications and new initiatives the UN can have increased authority and a revitalized organizational structure that can deal effectively with the most pressing international challenges.

4. The Role of Science in Dealing with these Global Threats: 50 Manhattan Projects (This section is based on Alfimov et. al., November 29, 1997.)

It must be recognized that not only security but also the very survival of our civilization is threatened by dangers as great as the danger of nuclear war, such as the threats to global security noted above. These dangers keep growing despite huge sums being spent on their containment. Meanwhile, modern basic science has created revolutionary possibilities to deal with these threats, and humankind cannot afford to ignore them. Their realization requires the same spirit of responsibility, excellence, and urgency as drove the defense-oriented projects in World War II.

Huge sums are being spent worldwide in an effort to contain these dangers by the massive application of existing technologies. These efforts may prevent a part of the potential damage, but, on the whole, they are ineffective. The factors destabilizing our civilization prevail, and the scale of possible catastrophes is rapidly growing. The solution is generally believed to lie in spending ever more money when the solution is really more effective scientific cooperation on a global scale.



Currently, a massive release of radioactivity from a nuclear waste disposal site, an earthquake in the middle of a major city, a large-scale outburst of violence, and any one of a formidable array of other quite possible disasters could cause millions of casualties, render a large part of the world uninhabitable, trigger a global economic depression, and even trigger a nuclear war. In addition, each country has become vulnerable to developments in other parts of the world that are outside its control.

We know from history and common sense that basic scientific research is pivotal to coping with these threats. Indeed, since ancient times basic science has time and again rescued humanity from major threats and sustained its development by creating a springboard to entirely new technologies. Among twentieth century examples are antibiotics, transistors and integrated circuits, synthetic fibers, and the green revolution, to name just a few. Frontier research of the last years continues this tradition, discovering new possibilities to cope with many of the present dangers. In the area of disaster reduction, for example, they include neutralization of the time bomb contained in radioactive wastes; the prediction of natural disasters; geo-engineering stabilization of megacities; the control of the traffic in chemical explosives; the control of telecommunication networks; and the prediction of social, economic, and political crises. In the area of sustainable development, they include the discovery of new mineral deposits; the creation of new materials and sources of energy; the development of new forms of transportation; and the processing of waste products and their conversion into energy or other useful products.

Now is the time to launch a series of "superprojects" to explore these kinds of possibilities. Some historical examples include the research that led to the development of radar in England prior to World War II and the research that led to the building of the atomic bomb in the Manhattan Project. We now need some *50 Manhattan Projects* each focused on a specific threat and each involving an interdisciplinary group of outstanding scientists and engineers from many nations who would be provided the resources needed to accomplish their goal, as was the case in the original Manhattan Project.

Research of such significance, urgency, and difficulty would require

wide international collaboration engaging the top scientists and research facilities of many nations. Such collaboration will make feasible the goals that no country can accomplish alone even if it controls large resources. The UN should play a central role in fostering these research projects, including the creation of these new Manhattan Projects. The U.S. took the initiative of establishing the first Manhattan Project, but given the global nature of today's challenges and the need for international cooperation in their establishment it should be the UN that takes the initiative in establishing these new Manhattan Projects through bold, innovative, and responsible leadership and new initiatives.

By way of summing up, we are already engaged in the Third World War against unprecedented common threats to humanity. The war has already started, but we have not yet recognized it, and the wake-up call may involve a catastrophe on a global scale. Basic research is among the decisive factors in this war. The UN must act as a global catalyst in merging the international resources of basic science in a new type of war effort, not in a shooting war or a cold war but rather in joint defense of survival and sustainable development of our civilization and in support of global and human security. A recent example of the contribution that the scientific community could make is the recently released report, "Millennium Ecosystem Assessment: The End of Life as we Know It" that was commissioned as a four-year effort by the UN involving 21 institutional representatives, and over 1000 scientists from over 95 countries. The report gives 10 key messages, with a stark assessment of the fate of the Earth.

5. The Special Threat Posed by U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy under the Bush Doctrine

Attention should also be directed to the remarkable changes in recent years in U.S. nuclear weapons policy under the administration of President George W. Bush that affect global security and call for serious consideration worldwide. These changes were announced in 2002 in three official documents and they constitute a new doctrine, the *Bush doctrine*, ending the security system and nuclear weapons policies of the Cold War period and

creating the basis for the U.S. invasion and occupation of Iraq starting in March 2003. They represent a discontinuous sea change in the international security system that calls for discussion, debate, and analysis. The earlier bipolar world has been replaced by a proposed unipolar world with the U.S. under President Bush seeing itself as the dominant power or sole superpower. The mutual deterrence system that was part of the Cold War has been replaced by U.S. unilateral actions against possible rivals, including “regime change” as seen in Afghanistan and Iraq. Cooperative approaches to national and international security and alliance systems that had existed in the earlier epoch have been replaced by unilateral U.S. policies and actions.

These current concepts related to U.S. nuclear weapons doctrine call for a wide-ranging debate both nationally and internationally. Unfortunately, this has not happened, possibly due to the concern over the U.S. wars in Afghanistan and Iraq that were, ironically, examples of these new policies put into action. Both the new policies and their underlying goals should be subjects of intense scrutiny leading to rethinking in Washington and elsewhere.

The background to these new nuclear weapons doctrines include the end of the Cold War in 1989; the dissolution of the Soviet Union on Christmas day 1991; the Project for a New American Century (PNAC) that was established in 1997 “to promote American global leadership;” the advent of the new Bush Administration in January 2001, which included many of the PNAC individuals in major leadership positions; the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center and the Pentagon; and the ensuing declaration by the Bush administration of a “War on Terrorism” later broadened to a “Global War on Terror.” Following on the adoption of these new policies were the invasion and occupation of Afghanistan and Iraq.

The first of these documents is the U.S. *Nuclear Posture Review* (NPR) that was delivered to the U.S. Congress by the U.S. Department of Defense in January 2002. According to the NPR, “A combination of offensive and defensive, and nuclear and non-nuclear capabilities is essential to meet the deterrence requirements of the 21st century.” It is a wide-ranging analysis of

the requirements for deterrence in the 21st century. It states that it does not provide operational guidance on nuclear targeting or planning. Rather, it states that the Department of Defense continues to plan for a broad range of contingencies and unforeseen threats to the U.S. and its allies in order to deter such attacks in the first place. It does, however, refer to the "...possible use of nuclear weapons in an Arab-Israeli conflict, in a war between China and Taiwan, or in an attack from North Korea on the South." It also refers to the possible use of nuclear weapons against targets able to withstand non-nuclear attack, in retaliation for attacks by nuclear, biological, or chemical weapons, or "...in the event of surprising military developments." Thus, it calls for possible use of nuclear weapons in various contingencies, including against non-nuclear weapons states and in response to conventional weapons. According to the NPR the U.S. reserves the right to use nuclear weapons, thereby possibly breaking the long-standing taboo against their use that has existed since their first use by the U.S. against Japan in August 1945. According to this statement of U.S. policy they are to be treated like any other weapon, with no sharp distinction from non-nuclear weapons.

The second of these documents is the *National Security Strategy of the United States of America* (NSS) that was issued by the Office of the National Security Advisor to the President, Condoleezza Rice, in September 2002. It is an unclassified and open public document that is available on the White House website. According to the NSS, there are plans to ensure that no nation could rival U.S. military strength. The emphasis is on defeating rogue states and global terrorists, noting that deterrence will not work against such enemies. It proclaims the doctrine of U.S. *preemption*, where it states that the U.S. "...cannot let our enemies strike first" and gives arguments for such preemption. (Some scholars and analysts have noted, correctly, that this is not a doctrine of *preemption* but rather one of *preventive war*.) It notes that, "For centuries, international law recognized that nations need not suffer an attack before they can lawfully take action to defend themselves against forces that present an imminent danger of attack." It further states that, "The U.S. has long maintained the option of preemptive actions to counter a sufficient threat to our national security." It should be noted, however, that

the U.S. did not preempt in most of the recent wars it has fought, including the two World Wars, Korea, Vietnam, and the Gulf War. Far from there being historical precedents, this new policy represents a fundamental shift from a U.S. policy of reaction to a new policy of initiation – from wars of necessity to wars of choice. It is too early to say that this policy of preemption in the Iraq War was a success or failure, but the costs in terms of both casualties and dollar spending have been immense and much larger than expected. Indeed, this war is being seen more and more as a quagmire and likened to the Vietnam War. As to its dollar cost a careful accounting of its costs in January 2006 by Nobel Laureate economist Joseph E. Stiglitz and Linda Bilmes, former Assistant Secretary of Commerce who now teaches public finance and government budgeting at the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard, estimated its cost as much higher than previously reckoned, amounting between \$1 trillion and \$2 trillion, depending primarily on how much longer it lasts. This study provides an important analysis of the cost of Bush's preemption strategy in Iraq.

The third of these documents is the *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction* (NSWMD) that was issued by the White House in December 2002. As in the case of NSS, NSWMD is an unclassified and open public document that is available on the White House website. It notes that WMD, including nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons in the possession of states hostile to the U.S. or terrorists represents one of the greatest security challenges facing the U.S. It states that an effective strategy for countering WMD, including their use and further proliferation, is an integral component of the National Security Strategy of the U.S. It states that, as in the war on terrorism, the strategy for homeland security, and the new concept of deterrence, this new approach to WMD represents a fundamental change from the past. It affirms that the highest priority is accorded to protection of the U.S. and its allies from the threat of WMD. The three pillars it announces are *counterproliferation* to combat WMD use, *strengthened nonproliferation* to combat WMD proliferation, and *consequence management* to respond to WMD use. It discusses such policies as interdiction of WMD, new methods of deterrence with threats of overwhelming force, and defense mitigation, including the destruction of an

adversary's WMD before their use, on a first-strike attack as in the preemptive policy enunciated in NSS, as well as traditional nonproliferation approaches. It does not exclude the use of nuclear weapons to destroy facilities that could produce nuclear weapons.

By contrast to this Bush Doctrine, the concept of global security recognizes the need to create a new global system comparable to the creation of a new world system after World War II, one that would encompass not only security but also economics, politics, and other issue areas. This new global system would treat problems of security, both military and non-military, through strengthening existing international institutions or creating new global institutions. These new institutions could be built, in part, on the UN system and its components. They would involve supranational decision-making and authority, with enforcement capabilities, transparency, and accountability and with global perspectives and responses. Participation in the global decision-making process would be through close international cooperation. There would be a prohibition against preemption by any one nation, no matter how powerful, in favor of collective action. Such a system of global security should be preferred to the current system of the U.S. as a hegemonic global power.

Among the specific steps that might be taken in an agenda to foster such a system of global security are reducing world stockpiles of nuclear weapons and other WMD, especially the enormous stockpile of chemical weapons in Russia; a ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; taking nuclear weapons off hair-trigger alert and generally dealerting WMD; a reaffirmation of the moratorium against nuclear testing; international cooperation to prevent nuclear proliferation; implementation of the 13 steps program for the NPT with specific timetables for each of these steps, including an abandonment of all plans to develop new nuclear weapons; a sharing of permissive Action Link (PAL) technology with all nuclear weapons states to reduce the chance of accidental nuclear war; a U.S. renunciation of its policy of preemption and its reaffirmation of the UN Charter; and cooperative efforts against terrorism, especially the acquisition of WMD by terrorist groups.



6. The Special Threat Posed by U.S.-initiated Global War on Terror

Following the 9/11 attacks on the U.S. President George W. Bush initiated a “War on Terror” that was later broadened to a “Global War on Terror” or GWOT. Many have noted that there is no clear enemy in this war as terror is in the mind of the beholder and also that there is no clear end to such a war as the tactic of terror has existed throughout history. The German philosopher Immanuel Kant wrote the essay “Perpetual Peace” in 1795 in which he considered the possibility of such a peace if states were small and democratic, later analyzed by current political scientists as the theory of “democratic peace.” By contrast the “Global War on Terror” is one of “Perpetual War” and thus a fundamental threat to global security that must be overcome by global collective action.

7. Conclusions

Clearly there are serious threats today to global security and human security, and, equally clearly, the current UN system is not prepared to deal with these threats. At the same time, these threats can be addressed through global cooperation, and a restructuring of the UN system can create a basis for addressing them. This paper has proposed two aspects of this restructuring. The first is UN cooperation with other major world players, including NGOs, major international corporations, multinational banks, and other international organizations as well as greater use of ad hoc groups of nations to deal with specific threats. The second is the UN taking a major role in fostering scientific breakthroughs that can address these threats. It is vital that the UN take the initiative on today’s issues through a cooperative approach with NGOs and other international organizations as well as fostering scientific programs dealing with the very serious threats that we face. A serious threat to global and human security is the nuclear weapons doctrine of the current Bush Administration that must be reconsidered.

.....

REFERENCES

.....
Alfimov, M., R. Corell, V. Courtillot, V. Fortov, V. Keilis-Borok, and M. Intriligator, "Basic Science for the Survival of Humanity in the Third World War," (in Russian), *Kommersant Daily*, November 29, 1997.

Allison, Graham, *Nuclear Terrorism: The Ultimate Preventable Catastrophe*, New York: Times Books (2004).

.....
Arkin, William M., "Secret Plan Outlines the Unthinkable," *Los Angeles Times*, (March 10, 2002).

Cushman, John H., Jr., "Rattling New Sabers," *The New York Times*, (March 10, 2002).

Gaddis, John Lewis, "A Grand Strategy of Transformation," *Foreign Policy* 133 (2003): 50-57.

Gordon, Michael R., "U.S. Nuclear Plan Sees New Weapons and New Targets," *The New York Times*, (March 10, 2002).

_____, "Nuclear Arms for Deterrence or Fighting?" *The New York Times*, (March 11, 2002).

Gould, Robert M. and Patrice Sutton, "Global Security: Beyond Gated Communities and Bunker Vision," *Social Justice* 29.3 (2002): 1.

Guoliang, Gu, "Redefine Cooperative Security, Not Preemption," *The Washington Quarterly* 26.2 (2003): 135.

Heisbourg, Francois, "A Work in Progress: The Bush Doctrine and Its Consequences," *The Washington Quarterly* 26.2 (2003): 75.

Hoffman, Stanley, "The High and the Mighty: Bush's National Security Strategy and the New American Hubris," *The American Prospect* 13.24 (2003): 28.

Intriligator, Michael D., "Global Security After the End of the Cold War," *Presidential Address, Peace Science Society (International), Conflict Management and Peace Science*, 13(2) (1994), 1-11.

Intriligator, Michael D. and Abdullah Toukan, "Terrorism and Weapons of Mass Destruction," forthcoming in Peter Katona, John Sullivan, and Michael D. Intriligator, Eds, *Creating a Global Counter-Terrorism Network*, London: Taylor & Francis (2006).

Kaldor, Mary, Ed. *Global Insecurity*, Continuum International Publishing Group (2000).

Lincoln C. Chen, Sakiko Fukuda-Parr, and Ellen Seidensticker, Eds., *Human Insecurity in a Global World*, Global Equity Initiative, Harvard University (2004)

Levi, Michael A. "The Case Against New Nuclear Weapons: New Tactical Bombs Would Have Little Military Value and Would Undercut U.S. Nonproliferation Efforts," *Issues in Science and Technology*, (March, 2003).

MccGwire, Michael, "Shifting the Paradigm (Western Ideology of the Cold War)," *International Affairs* 78.1 (2002): 1.

O'Hanlon, Michael E., "The New National Security Strategy and Preemption," *Brookings Institution* (2002).

U.S. Department of Defense, *Nuclear Posture Review*, The Pentagon, (January, 2002).

Excerpts available at

<http://www.globalsecurity.org/wmd/library/policy/dod/npr.htm>

U.S. Office of the National Security Advisor, *The National Security Policy of the United States of America*, The White House, (September, 2002).

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/nsc/nss.html>

U.S. Office of the President, *National Strategy to Combat Weapons of Mass Destruction*, The White House, December 2002.

<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2002/12/WMDStrategy.pdf>

Worldwatch Institute, *State of the World 2005: Redefining Global Security*, W.W. Norton, Inc. (January 2005).