

GLOBAL ACTION TO PREVENT WAR

A COALITION-BUILDING EFFORT TO STOP WAR,
GENOCIDE, & INTERNAL ARMED CONFLICT



Program Statement
2003

Global Action Contacts

Australia

Dr. Joseph A. Camilleri, School of Social Sciences, La Trobe University, Social Sciences Building, Bundoora, Victoria 3086, Australia
tel: 61-3-9479-2698, fax: 61-3-9479-1997,
e-mail: J.Camilleri@latrobe.edu.au

Dr. Stuart Rees, Centre for Peace and Conflict Studies, Mackie Building K01, University of Sydney, NSW 2006 Australia, tel: 61-2-9351-4763, fax: 61-2-9660-0862, e-mail: stuart.rees@social.usyd.edu.au

Canada

Elaine Hynes, Simons Centre for Peace and Disarmament Studies, Liu Institute for Global Issues, University of British Columbia, 6476 Marine Drive, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, tel: 604/822-3437, fax: 604/822-9261, e-mail: elaine.hynes@ubc.ca

Germany

Dr. Philipp Boos, Executive Director, IALANA—Northern Office, Wilhelm-Roser Strasse 25, 30037 Marburg, Germany, tel: 49-06421-23027, fax: 49-06421-15828, e-mail: info@ialana.de

India

Dr. Waheguru Pal Sing Sidhu, D-132, Ajay Enclave, New Delhi 110018, India, tel: 91-11-540-7210, e-mail: wpssidhu@yahoo.com

New Zealand

Alan Webb, Executive Director, IALANA Southern Hemisphere Office, 10/6 Seymour Street, St. Mary's Bay, Auckland, Aotearoa-New Zealand, tel: 64-9-360-1258, fax: 64-9-360-1259, e-mail: southernoffice@ialana.org

South Africa

Dr. Hussein Solomon, Unit for African Studies, Centre for International Political Studies, University of Pretoria, Pretoria 0002, South Africa, tel: 27-12-420-4339, fax: 27-12-420-3886, e-mail: uafs@postino.up.ac.za

United States

Amb. (ret.) Jonathan Dean, Adviser on International Security Issues, Union of Concerned Scientists, 1707 H Street NW, 6th Fl, Washington, DC 20006, tel: 202/223-6133, fax: 202/223-6162, e-mail: jdean@ucsusa.org, web: www.globalactionpw.org

Dr. Randall Caroline Forsberg, Director, Institute for Defense & Disarmament Studies, 675 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, tel: 617/354-4337, fax: 617/354-1450, e-mail: forsberg@idds.org, web: www.idds.org, www.urgentcall.org

Dr. Saul Mendlovitz, Dag Hammarskjöld Professor of International Law, Rutgers Law School, Co-Director, World Order Models Project, 123 Washington St., Newark, NJ 07102, tel: 973/353-5516, fax: 973/353-1445, web: www.globalactionpw.org

Sharon Welch, Department of Religious Studies, 221 Arts and Science Building, University of Missouri, Columbia, MO 65211, tel: 573/442-6241, fax: 573/875-0356, e-mail: sharonwelch@centurytel.net, web: globalactionpw.org

UN Working Group

Dr. John Burroughs, Director, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, 211 East 43rd St., Suite 1204, New York, NY 10017, tel: 212/818-1861, fax: 212/818-1857, e-mail: johnburroughs@lcnp.org, web: www.lcnp.org

Felicity Hill, Peace and Security Adviser, UNIFEM, tel: 212/906-6446, email: felicity.hill@undp.org

NOTE: We always welcome your comments.

Please e-mail them to comments@globalactionpw.org or send them to one of the addresses above.

Table of Contents

Preventing Violence: The Global Action Project	5
Priorities for 2003–2007	7
The Need, the Context, and the Opportunity for Change	10
The Global Action Program	15
I. To Prevent Internal War, Genocide, and Terrorism, We Must Strengthen Multilateral Means of Resolving Conflicts, Protecting Human Rights, and Preventing Armed Conflict	15
Strengthen Ways to Monitor Potential Conflicts, Warn of Escalation, Prevent Outbreaks of Armed Violence, and Foster Conflict Resolution	15
Strengthen Support for Human Rights and the Global Rule of Law	19
Strengthen Multilateral Peacekeeping Capability	21
Increase the Responsiveness and Accountability of the UN System	23
II. To Prevent International War, We Must in a Phased Process of Disarmament Reduce National Military Forces and Replace Them with Modest UN Forces	25
Phase 1. Take Initial Steps to Reduce the Risks of Major International War	26
Phase 2. Make Up to One-Third Cuts in Forces and Spending, with Deeper Cuts in Production and Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms	30
Phase 3. Trial Ban on Unilateral Military Intervention	33
Phase 4. Transfer Responsibility for Global Security from National to International Institutions	34
Phase 5. Limit National Armed Forces to Short-Range Homeland Defense	36
III. To Foster Support for National Policies of Peace and Disarmament, We Must Promote the Culture of Peace and Individual Programs for Disarmament and Conflict Reduction	37
Global Action and the Root Causes of War	37
A Plan for Action: Goals for A Global Movement	39
Summary and Overview of the Global Action Program	45
Members of the International and U.S. Steering Committees of Global Action	49

Preventing Violence: The Global Action Project

The past century was the most lethal in human history: Over 200 million people were killed in 250 wars and genocidal onslaughts, more people than were killed in warfare in the past two thousand years. (The Global Action definition of war comprehends interstate armed conflict, internal armed conflict, terrorism, and genocide.) More than six million people have died in war since the end of the Cold War, when the level of violence should have gone down. The river of human blood is still flowing, searing survivors with crippling wounds and deep personal loss, and sweeping away the painstaking work of generations of human hands and minds. Armed conflict also obstructs efforts to get at the roots of organized violence, including poverty, economic inequity, social injustice, environmental degradation, and discrimination based on race, gender, ethnicity, and religion. (See the discussion on “Root Causes of War,” pp. 36-37.)

The world’s societies and governments already know how to stop the killing. What has been missing is a program for the sustained, integrated, worldwide application of their resources and knowledge. Global Action to Prevent War provides such a program.

Global Action to Prevent War is a comprehensive project for making armed conflict increasingly rare.

The Global Action Program is divided into three main strands of activity. The first strand is an ongoing, comprehensive program of conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures, mainly non-military, that includes systematic buildup of the conflict reduction capabilities of multilateral organizations. This strand aims to reduce internal conflict of all kinds.

The second strand is a phased program of global disarmament, conventional and nuclear, accompanied by deliberate augmentation of the peacekeeping capabilities of international organizations. The objectives here are to reduce the possibility of interstate war and genocide and gradually to shift the responsibility for international security to multilateral peacekeeping and legal institutions. The third strand consists of continuing support for the culture of peace.

The Global Action program will help prevent all types of war and organized armed violence: For internal conflicts, including terrorism, which usually has local beginnings, it proposes a broad array of conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures, including non-violent measures, to be applied by the UN, regional security organizations, and international courts. For conflicts between neighboring states, it proposes force reductions, defensively-oriented changes in force structure, and confidence-building measures and constraints on force activities that are tailored to each conflict situation. To reduce the risk of war among the major powers, the program

proposes that they cooperate in preventing smaller wars and make step-by-step cuts in their conventional and nuclear forces, ultimately eliminating their capacity to attack each other with any chance of success. To combat terrorism, Global Action believes UN member states should focus on bringing individual suspects to justice before the appropriate national or international tribunals and should use military force only for this purpose or to prevent further terrorist acts. Long-term measures should focus on modern education.

Timing: We envisage the Global Action program being implemented in the next three to four decades. The disarmament component of the Global Action program is of necessity treaty-based because it represents commitments of governments to reduce their armed forces. It is divided into four phases of five to ten years each. Improvements in mechanisms for conflict prevention and peacekeeping and support for the culture of peace are an ongoing process over the life of the program and less suitable to be divided into specific phases.

The Global Action Program is a detailed program. Many people long to see a more peaceful world, but most of us realize that this cannot be achieved solely by wishing it. Some program of action is needed. And that program has to be detailed and specific. The different steps in it have to fit with one another and strengthen the whole. It is not enough to call for effective peacekeeping, the development of an international security system and disarmament without showing in practical terms how these large objectives could be achieved. For that reason, the program of Global Action to Prevent War offers not only a viable approach to preventing armed conflict, but also an inventory of some 70 specific measures or actions to implement that approach. We want the readers of this program statement to come away believing it makes a convincing case that, if the specific actions were carried out, it could mean the end of war and other large-scale armed conflict.

The Global Action program is a coalition-building platform for individuals, civil society groups, and governments everywhere. Some components of the program, such as cuts in conventional and nuclear arms or multilateral action against aggression and genocide, concern mainly governments and civil society working in combination. Other components, such as those dealing with nonviolent conflict resolution and peace education, can be implemented separately by individuals and state and local communities as well as by national governments.

The Global Action program is a work in progress. The current phase is one of strengthening and disseminating basic concepts and recruiting coalition members. Concerned individuals around the world are invited to make suggestions and report activities for inclusion on the Global Action Web site, www.globalactionpw.org. Global Action's international and US steering committees (members listed at the end of this program statement) periodically publish updated versions of the program materials. These are distributed globally to governments and organizations concerned with peace, development, women's rights, humanitarian aid, and the environment.

Global Action Working Groups are engaged in efforts to achieve the highest priority components of the Global Action program. (See below for a list of high-priority projects. A list of working groups with their members and contact information is available on our website.) The goal of this process is to support and supplement the many efforts for peace already under way by adding important elements and uniting all components in a common, integrated program. The sense of common action, in turn, will reinforce the existing projects and facilitate joint efforts.

Sustained coordinated efforts can stop the killing—and the Global Action program has the potential to mobilize and focus such efforts. This does not mean that the ambitious goals of the Global Action program can be achieved quickly. Building support for the program will take several years, and launching the first phase will take some years more. But what is important is the real prospect of profound change within a generation.

Priorities for 2003–2007

We have selected some proposals from the Global Action program that appear suitable for priority treatment over the five years from 2003 through 2007. They are listed here. Send us your own priorities.

- **Establish a corps of 50 professional mediators at the disposal of the Secretary General and the Security Council.** Today, when the Secretary-General wants to send out a conflict-preventing mediation mission to head off mounting tension, he has to identify and borrow personnel from member states. A small corps of professionals trained in conflict prevention and resolution would provide an immediate conflict avoidance resource (see item 4 of the main program below).
- **Establish a Conflict Prevention Committee in the UN General Assembly.** This open-ended committee of General Assembly members would be a less formal, more flexible conflict prevention group than the Security Council, whose work it would complement. It would not be subject to the veto and would set its own agenda. The General Assembly Conflict Prevention Committee would serve as a rapid-action conflict prevention and early warning institution. It would send teams to possible conflict sites and invite witnesses to New York. It would give the UN, the world public, and national governments and legislatures comprehensive and balanced information on the disputed issues and propose possible solutions. The General Assembly already has Charter authority to establish such a committee.
- **Establish a standing volunteer police force at the UN,** initially consisting of 4,000–6,000 men and women. A ready police force can carry out many pre-conflict and post-conflict peacekeeping tasks, including assistance to the International

Criminal Court (see below), without raising the same issues of national sovereignty with host countries as peacekeeping units from armed forces. Moreover, its establishment on an experimental basis would be cheaper and would encounter less resistance than organizing standing military forces, which could come later.

- **Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on the Role of Women in Conflict Prevention.** In 2000 the Security Council recognized the important role of women in conflict prevention, and emphasized that the full participation of women in peace processes can significantly contribute towards the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security. Over 100 recommendations have been made to the Security Council through a Secretary-General's report and an Independent Experts' Assessment to fully implement the resolution which include specific recommendations on women's role in conflict prevention. To date, however, gender has rarely been effectively incorporated in international policy making processes on peace and security. It is essential to develop early warning indicators that are sensitive to women and gender issues. There should be a greatly increased flow of information about the impact of armed conflicts on women, about gender issues in armed conflicts, and about women's role in peace efforts. Fact-finding missions should always investigate women and gender issues; and local and international women's groups and advocates should always be included in those missions.
- **Support the International Criminal Court to Hold Individual Leaders Responsible for Major Human Rights Abuses.** Promote effective implementation of the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court, making government officials individually accountable for abusive human rights treatment of their citizens when local courts fail to act, and providing a suitable international tribunal for suspected terrorists. The Treaty entered into force on July 1, 2002 and is now in the implementation stage.
- **Increase use of the International Court of Justice.** Greater use should be made of the capability of the International Court of Justice to settle disputes. To encourage greater use, all newly concluded treaties should contain a provision for compulsory referral of unresolved disputes to the Court. (See items 16 and 17 below.)
- **Strengthen the effectiveness of the Security Council to prevent armed violence through informal agreement to use the veto sparingly.** The five permanent members of the Security Council should receive concentrated pressure from other UN governments and the public to reach informal understanding among themselves to use the veto sparingly.
- **Impose a peacekeeping surcharge** on air tickets or departures in the country where flights originate, or on international financial transfers in the country of origin, **and donate the proceeds to the UN to finance conflict prevention and peacekeeping.** This procedure would not be based on UN dues, so it could not be blocked in national legislatures.

- **Deal more effectively with terrorism.** To deal on a long-term basis with extremist fundamentalist views which underlie much terrorist activity like the September 2001 attacks in the United States, we propose a well-financed UN Education Foundation offering free, modern, non-religious education for primary, secondary and university levels that would provide teaching aids for imparting knowledge and skills to empower students to make their contribution as national and world citizens. This foundation would handle financing, organization of curriculum, recruiting of teaching staff, and establishment of actual schools. (See item 14 below.)
- **Israeli-Palestinian Confrontation.** For the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation, we believe a broad international coalition consisting of the European Union, Russia, United States, the Arab countries and the UN Secretary-General should develop and energetically promote a comprehensive, detailed proposal including establishment of an independent Palestinian state conforming to the 1967 borders of Israel; both states to participate in governing Jerusalem; return or compensation for Palestinian refugees; security assurances for both sides; fully adequate peacekeeping and financing, and a major implementing role for the United Nations.
- **Oppose war in Iraq.** Global Action continues to oppose the use of armed force against Iraq as unjustified. Most accusations against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein were well-founded. Nevertheless, we consider that the threat from Iraq could have been contained and deterred without armed attack.
- **Initiate a worldwide freeze on armed forces and a 25 percent cut in production and trade of major weapons and small arms.** All UN member governments should commit themselves not to increase the overall size of their armed forces, military budgets, or arms holdings for a ten-year period while negotiations on reductions take place; and they should agree from the outset to cut both production and international transfers of both major weapons and small arms by 25 percent. To support these measures, governments should begin by publishing the data on the components of their armed forces currently requested for the UN Conventional Arms Register, the proposed small arms register, the UN report on military spending, and the CFE and OSCE exchanges of military information.
- **De-alert and make deep cuts in U.S. and Russian nuclear forces.** De-alert remaining operationally deployed U.S. and Russian nuclear forces. As a step toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons called for in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, the U.S. and Russia should go beyond their May 2002 treaty and reduce their nuclear forces, both strategic and tactical, to 1,000 total warheads each, destroying all reduced and stored warheads. All other states with nuclear weapons should implement a verified freeze on their weapons and delivery systems. Comprehensive data on nuclear weapons should be added to the UN Register now.

The Need, the Context, and the Opportunity for Change

The Need The UN and its member states are failing to prevent new outbreaks of armed conflict, and the entire world is paying huge costs for this failure. The statistics are dismaying. According to some estimates, up to 35 million people—75% of them civilians—have been killed in 170 wars since the end of World War II. Nearly forty wars are now under way, most of them inside national boundaries.¹ In addition to the tragic loss of life and limb and mourning that often lasts for many lifetimes, these conflicts breed international terrorism and they have huge economic costs.

War's damage to productive economic activity is immense. It lasts for decades, sometimes generations, multiplying the human costs of conflict. (In Lebanon—one case where hard figures are available—20 years after civil war broke out, the GDP was still only half of its previous level.) Beyond that, the forces maintained to deter or intervene in wars cost hundreds of billions of dollars per year. Together, the world's governments now spend over \$1 million a minute on the military—over \$2 billion per day.

According to one traditional view, war is a built-in defect of the human species. If this were the case, humanity would have to suffer the appalling consequences of this defect, augmented by biological, chemical, nuclear, and space weapons, for all time to come.

However, this view is fundamentally incorrect. The capability for individuals to use physical violence against each other is innate. But organized violence is learned behavior, learned from instructors, on the training ground, in the guerrilla camp, and in the staff college, and learned from social values, including extremist religious views, that are used to justify many forms of war and armed violence. The answer to problematic learned behavior is to change the pattern of learning, to modify the social values that lead to violence, and to make resort to war more difficult through improved prevention and disarmament.

The Context The Global Action program calls for strengthening international institutions for conflict prevention while sharply reducing national armed forces and shifting responsibility for deciding on the use of armed force to a reformed UN Security Council. This program is sweeping and ambitious, but it is less far-reaching than it appears. The Global Action program already has a binding legal base in international treaties. The United States and most other countries are already bound by valid

¹ For statistics on war deaths in this paper, we use the estimates of Dr. Milton Leitenberg, University of Maryland, which are larger than some others because he includes the “democide” of civilians caused by Hitler, Stalin, and Mao.

treaty obligations to disarm, to renounce armed conflict, and to delegate responsibility for use of armed force to the UN Security Council except for cases of self-defense.

Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (now signed by 188 of the 191 UN member states, all except India, Pakistan and Israel) commits states party to the treaty to disarm completely by negotiating “a treaty on general and complete disarmament under strict and effective international control,” as well as to eliminate all nuclear weapons.

Articles I and II of the 1928 Kellogg-Briand Pact obligate states party, including the United States, most European states, Russia and Japan, to renounce war and the use of armed force:

Art. I. The High Contracting Parties solemnly declare in the names of their respective peoples that they condemn recourse to war for the solution of international controversies, and renounce it as an instrument of national policy in their relations with one another.

Art. II. The High Contracting Parties agree that the settlement or solution of all disputes or conflicts of whatever nature or of whatever origin they may be, which may arise among them, shall never be sought except by pacific means.

The Kellogg-Briand Pact has no enforcement provisions and it failed to prevent World War II. No effective steps have been taken to bring about general and complete disarmament under Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty. Even on nuclear disarmament, action by the United States and Russia under Article VI has been partial and inadequate. China, France and the UK, also covered by Article VI, have done nothing to fulfill it. But the obligations for nuclear and general disarmament continue to be legally binding on the United States and most other UN member states. The current volume of Treaties in Force published by the U.S. Department of State lists the Kellogg-Briand Pact and the Non-Proliferation Treaty as still in force and legally binding on the United States and other parties. In the case of the United States, Article VI of the U.S. Constitution specifies that legally ratified treaties become binding law of the land. Other countries have similar constitutional provisions. Finally, the UN Charter, a vitally important treaty, obligates member states to delegate to the UN Security Council decisions to use armed force except in cases of self-defense.

Yes, the goals of the Global Action project described in this program statement are ambitious; but they have a basis in the existing treaty obligations of most countries to undertake far-reaching disarmament, to eliminate nuclear weapons, to renounce the use of armed force except in self defense, and to transfer to the UN Security Council the responsibility for decisions to use armed force for other purposes. The Global Action program proposes practical methods for implementing these obligations.

The Opportunity Today we have a rare opportunity to mobilize government and public support for a comprehensive approach to war prevention. For the first time in centuries, there is neither war nor imminent threat of war between major powers. Working relationships among the world's top military powers (the United States, Russia, France, Germany, Great Britain, Japan, and China), while not always cordial, have created a rare opportunity for cooperation to strengthen UN and regional conflict resolution and peacekeeping capabilities, to take action against terrorism, and to reduce global arms deployment, production, and trade.

The increase in the number of practicing (not merely formal) democracies is another favorable factor. History indicates that practicing democracies are less likely to go to war with each other and they are generally more willing to contribute to peacemaking and peacekeeping.

This opportunity could wane. Unless preventive action is taken soon, we may see renewed armed confrontation between the most heavily armed nations (the USA, Russia, and China); and other nations are poised to acquire armaments that neighboring countries may find threatening. Now, when there is no near-term risk of major war, is the time to prevent the rise of new threats.

Today, in addition to favorable circumstances, **innovative concepts for conflict avoidance**, distilled from the bitter experiences of the two world wars and the Cold War, offer powerful new tools to help prevent war. These include:

- **Confidence-building and arms control measures**, such as information exchange (transparency), mutual constraints on force deployments and activities, negotiated reductions in armed forces, and restrictions on arms holdings, production, and trade; and
- **New measures for peacekeeping**, with emphasis on pre-conflict early warning and action, including diplomatic intervention, mediation, judicial processes, and preventive deployment of armed forces, as well as post-conflict peacekeeping and peacebuilding.

So far, these approaches to preventing war have been applied separately and incompletely. None has been fully successful, and history shows that none is likely to be so if they remain separate projects, unconnected by a larger framework.

In the early 1960s, the United States and the Soviet Union proposed plans for general and complete disarmament, with national forces to be replaced by UN forces. Their ideas were too radical for the times, and they were shelved in favor of separate programs for partial arms limits and reductions. But the underlying thought was right: Disarmament must cover both nuclear and conventional (non-nuclear) arms, and multilateral institutions for peacemaking must be strengthened before countries can be expected to make far-reaching arms reductions. Thus, it is not surprising that the subsequent division of effort into separate programs has brought mixed results.

For nuclear arms, the split into separate programs has had a degree of success because the many issues into which nuclear arms control has been divided—test ban, bilateral reductions, nonproliferation, ending production of fissile material, and disposing of fissile material—are all supported by strong public rejection of nuclear weapons. For conventional forces, however, the disaggregation of disarmament into separate projects has fragmented interest, dividing support among many worthwhile measures, such as limits on arms transfers or cuts in military spending. Peacekeeping has been completely separated from efforts to reduce conflict through arms control. The few areas where there has been some progress, such as the 1990 Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe and recent efforts to ban landmines and control small arms, have been exceptional in generating public support.

Now, instead of striving for peace in fragments, it is time to bring together these diverse approaches in a unified program to prevent war. Such an approach will supplement and strengthen existing peacemaking and arms control programs by building a broader coalition of interested publics and government officials to support them. Once they are convinced that a practical program to prevent war really exists, people and governments will eagerly champion it.

The Program Step by step, Global Action would establish a comprehensive world security system comprising a well-financed UN with its own readiness forces, pro-active in conflict prevention, and a network of universal-membership regional security organizations, each with its own conflict prevention and peacekeeping capability. This strengthening of international institutions for conflict prevention and peacekeeping would be paralleled by integrated reductions in nuclear and conventional armed forces and a binding commitment not to send armed forces beyond national borders except under the auspices of the UN or one of the regional security organizations.

By significantly lowering the worldwide level of armed conflict and greatly reducing the world's largest conventional military forces, the Global Action program will create an environment more conducive to the enduring elimination of all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Neither nuclear disarmament nor far-reaching conventional disarmament can be fully implemented without the active contribution of the other. There must be parallel action on the two. Moreover, progress on verification and enforcement of controls on biological, chemical, and space weapons and on ground, air, and naval weapon delivery systems will greatly facilitate both nuclear and conventional disarmament.

When implemented, this program will make war rare, saving untold lives. At the same time, by increasing respect for human dignity and saving billions of dollars for productive uses, Global Action will contribute to the reduction of structural violence within and among nations. It will strengthen efforts to meet basic human needs, build tolerance, and protect the environment. It will foster the democratic institutions that

must ultimately replace armed force in achieving justice and meeting human needs and it will mitigate conditions that give rise to terrorism.

The Global Action project has three main components: First, an on-going program for strengthening means of preventing and resolving conflict, including a program for strengthening multilateral peacemaking institutions based on the UN and regional security institutions, second, a phased program to reduce armaments and the use of force in a series of steps which would create a global security system based on the joint efforts of the UN, regional security organizations, and individual nations; and third, support for the development of the culture of peace. The second component, focusing on disarmament, involves successive phases of change within specified time periods; the first and third components—strengthening largely nonviolent means of war-prevention and building the culture of peace—involve measures which will be pursued and sustained throughout the successive phases of the disarmament program.

A central part of the Global Action program involves persuading individual governments to make deep cuts in their armed forces and to entrust the main responsibility for assuring international security to multilateral organizations. The security of national territory will still be provided by national forces, but they will be smaller ones. This objective requires seriously conceived programs for augmenting the military capability of multilateral organizations, primarily the UN and regional security organizations. Many people are uneasy over the prospect of increasing the UN's military capability. But unless this is done in a convincing way, governments will not entrust their security to multilateral organizations and world peace will continue to depend on an unstable balance of power among heavily armed nation states. The Global Action program does, however, call for a democratized decision-making process that would prevent the emergence of an authoritarian world government convinced that its way is the only way. It also calls for the systematic reduction of armed forces of multilateral organizations as their efforts and the overall global program succeed in making armed conflict increasingly rare.

The current Global Action program is given below. To make its details clearer, we have numbered consecutively all our concrete proposals for action. Unavoidably, some of the numbers refer to ongoing processes while others to specific actions. An annex recapitulates the numbered proposals in brief, summary form.

The Global Action Program

I. To Prevent Internal War, Genocide, and Terrorism, We Must Strengthen Multilateral Means of Resolving Conflicts, Protecting Human Rights, and Preventing Armed Conflict

With the Cold War ended, the horrors of internal war, genocide, and terrorism have replaced fears of great power war and other international wars as the first priority for war prevention. To prevent and end internal wars, genocide, and other large-scale armed violence, many steps to strengthen global and regional capabilities for conflict prevention are urgently needed—and eminently feasible. Since some of the proposed procedures and institutions already exist in some form, Global Action to Prevent War does not start from zero, but builds on positive recent developments. For the most part, the steps proposed here to strengthen UN-based means of preventing internal war and genocide do not require amendment of the UN Charter—an extremely difficult process that may take many years. Once the simpler initial steps are achieved, more far-reaching steps that would require Charter amendment should be pursued.

The action agencies of the United Nations, the Security Council, the Secretary-General, and the General Assembly, along with an expanded and strengthened network of universal-membership regional security organizations, can and should take a systematic and increasingly pro-active role in preventing armed conflict. This section sets out the kinds of steps that a pro-active effort to prevent armed conflict should include.

Strengthen Ways to Monitor Potential Conflicts, Give Early Warning of Escalation, Prevent Outbreaks of Armed Violence, and Foster Conflict Resolution

1. Create Universal-Membership Regional Security Organizations (RSOs) in All Regions. The UN Secretary-General, the Security Council, and UN member states should jointly develop a program to strengthen the mediation and peacekeeping capabilities of existing universal-membership regional security organizations: the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Organization of American States (OAS), the African Union (formerly the Organization of African Unity), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). At the same time, they should systematically promote the creation of comparable new universal-membership security organizations in the Middle East, South Asia, and the East Asia-Pacific region. An effective world security system cannot emerge until the UN and a network of universal-membership regional security organizations covering all parts of the world gain in capability and form a coherent whole, coordinated within the UN system.

We posit universal membership for regional security organizations. NATO is a one-sided military alliance, but it could become a universal-membership regional

organization by opening its membership to Russia, Ukraine and other member states of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) and by cooperating fully with the OSCE.

2. **Give the RSOs Means of Preventing and Ending Armed Conflict Like Those of the UN.** The means available to the regional organizations for preventing armed conflict and terrorism should include regional means of mediation and reconciliation, regional human rights and judicial machinery, and unarmed regional monitoring and observation units as well as well-trained peacekeeping units.
3. **Adopt a Pro-Active Approach to Conflict Prevention in the Security Council.** Ongoing decisions by the UN Security Council to undertake a pro-active conflict prevention role are a necessity for effective avoidance of armed conflict and terrorism. This expanded role should become the centerpiece of an active worldwide conflict prevention program. The Council should make the commitments in planning, organization, professional staffing, and financing needed to carry it out with determination. It is not necessary to amend the Charter for this purpose.

In line with the Secretary-General's report of June 7, 2001 on "Prevention of Armed Conflict," the Security Council should institutionalize the expert level working group, composed of officials from members of the Security Council, to keep the Council, the Secretary-General, and the General Assembly informed on the emergence of potentially dangerous situations. The key to effective preventive action is constant reminders about deteriorating situations that make it difficult for busy governments to suppress awareness of these situations.

There is growing support among the permanent members of the Security Council for conflict prevention. One reason for this is that the permanent members have divergent views about military intervention, but realize that effective prevention can help them avoid situations where they will face heavy pressure from other Council and UN members to support military intervention.

A pro-active approach based on a clearly established sequence of Security Council actions should be taken to deal with on-going unresolved internal conflicts like those in Sudan, Colombia and Congo, and with other internal conflicts with a high component of terrorism. With this approach, the Security Council would invite government representatives to appear before it. The Council would point out to the governments concerned and the world public that the violence was becoming a threat to international security; and it would warn the governments of the probable future consequences of on-going violence. The Council could also advise on possible solutions and, on occasion, offer assistance in the form of expert personnel and money to carry out these solutions.

In the event this activity by the Security Council does not succeed, it would prepare the way for further Council action, including the possibility of full negative publicity, the use of emissaries to national leaders, carefully selected economic sanctions (see items below), preventive deployment of a peacekeeping force if the gov-

ernments concerned were prepared to receive it, or, as a last extreme measure, deployment of peace enforcement forces without agreement of the government concerned. The international community would be alerted at each step and prepared for the next one.

- 4. Create Permanent Centers for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution at the UN and in RSOs.** Permanent Centers for conflict early warning, armed conflict prevention, and nonviolent conflict resolution could make a major contribution to the prevention of war and genocide. The Center at the UN and comparable Centers in the Regional Security Organizations should each be staffed by a professional corps of 50-100 trained regional and mediation specialists. These specialists would collect and analyze information about potential trouble spots, including those that could lead to terrorist outbreaks, and about proven methods of conflict prevention and resolution. They would be sent out individually or in small teams to areas where conflict might develop. Their status would be protected. All UN member states would be committed to receiving them on their territory and to facilitating their stay. Small teams could stay on site for extended periods, becoming closely acquainted with local populations, working with local and foreign NGOs, trying to bring hostile groups together, proposing solutions, investigating incidents and, if helpful, making their findings publicly known. They would warn UN headquarters well in advance if there were a real prospect of armed violence. Over time, members of the corps would achieve growing international prestige and respect.

The professional specialists should be supplemented by highly qualified volunteer personnel from the world's religions, academic institutions, business and professional communities, and NGOs. Rosters of such volunteers should be kept on hand, with information on the particular skills and knowledge of individuals who are willing and able to undertake conflict-resolution missions on behalf of the UN or the Regional Security Organizations.

Today, the Secretary-General sends out small missions of this kind. Normally, they involve senior active or retired diplomatic personnel borrowed from member states on an ad hoc basis. But the Secretary-General has neither permanent professional personnel nor adequate funds to fulfill this function properly. In addition to the specialists at the conflict resolution Centers, a small group of mediation professionals should be assigned to the Permanent Court of Arbitration in the Hague, permitting the Court to undertake a pro-active conflict resolution role in disputes between national governments and other entities.

- 5. Employ Narrowly Targeted Economic Sanctions and Incentives to Help Prevent and End Armed Conflict and Human Rights Abuses.** Economic sanctions and incentives can be effective means of enforcing international law and upholding international norms of human rights, disarmament and democracy. If sanctions are to be imposed, however, they should be multilateral, ideally under the authority of the UN Security Council. They should be structured to avoid adverse

humanitarian impact on vulnerable populations within the target regime. Instead, they should be narrowly targeted against specific decision-making elites. Targeted financial sanctions, travel sanctions, specific commodity boycotts, and arms embargoes are recommended forms of targeted sanctions. Sanctions and incentives work best as elements of an overall bargaining strategy designed to achieve the negotiated resolution of conflict.

6. **Create a Conflict Prevention Committee in the UN General Assembly.** The General Assembly should establish a permanent Conflict Prevention Committee of its own. This committee would provide a more flexible, informal conflict-prevention group than the Security Council. It would not be subject to the veto and could set its own agenda by majority vote. It would work with and supplement the work of the Security Council. It would send teams of its members to potential sites of armed conflict and terrorism, hold hearings in the field and at the UN, and report on its findings to the General Assembly.
7. **Create a UN Civilian Humanitarian Aid Corps.** This unarmed rapid intervention corps should be available for use by the UN Secretary-General and the Security Council also for disaster relief. Comparable units should be attached to the Regional Security Organizations. On occasion, its personnel might work with UN standing police units, peacekeeping units and international courts.
8. **Pay UN Dues at the Start of the Fiscal Year to Ensure Full Functioning of the UN System.** Timely payment of UN dues would improve the UN's overall financial situation and help support mandated early-warning, mediation, and peacekeeping operations. Even when they are not in arrears, several countries, including the U.S., pay their dues at the end of the calendar year rather than at its beginning, with negative consequences for UN operations.
9. **Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on the Role of Women in Conflict Prevention.** In 2000 the Security Council recognized the important role of women in conflict prevention, and emphasized that the full participation of women in peace processes can significantly contribute towards the maintenance and promotion of international peace and security. Over 100 recommendations have been made to the Security Council through a Secretary-General's report and an Independent Experts' Assessment to fully implement the resolution which include specific recommendations on women's role in conflict prevention. To date, however, gender has rarely been effectively incorporated in international policy making processes on peace and security. It is essential to develop early warning indicators that are sensitive to women and gender issues. There should be a greatly increased flow of information about the impact of armed conflicts on women, about gender issues in armed conflicts, and about women's role in peace efforts. Fact-finding missions should always investigate women and gender issues; and local and international women's groups and advocates should always be included in those missions.

Strengthen Support for Human Rights and the Global Rule of Law

10. **Give Automatic Access to Human Rights Monitors.** The General Assembly should adopt a resolution, if possible unanimously, committing all member states to admit without delay and to facilitate the visits of official human rights monitors responding to complaints of violations of human rights. The resolution would have provision for referring cases of non-compliance to the Security Council. Most countries have already signed numerous human rights covenants. Many of these have provision for complaint to a monitoring commission. There is no point in pressing for additional covenants. What is needed is machinery for the implementation of existing commitments. (Action along these lines by the Security Council would be an alternative to General Assembly action.)
11. **Support the International Criminal Court to Make Individual Leaders Responsible for Major Abuses of Human Rights.** Promote effective implementation of the treaty establishing the International Criminal Court, making government officials individually accountable for abusive human rights treatment of their citizens when local courts fail to act, and providing a suitable international tribunal for suspected terrorists. The Treaty entered into force on July 1, 2002 and is now in the implementation stage.
12. **Create a Convention on Minority Rights.** The General Assembly should call for negotiations to establish an international code of minority rights for ethnic, cultural and religious minorities in treaty form, giving standing before international courts to individuals and groups representing minorities as well as to governments. The General Assembly passed a resolution on this topic in 1992, but this is not enough. An agreement with treaty status is needed. The treaty should also prohibit incitement to acts of violence against individuals, groups, or nations on ethnic, religious or cultural grounds. This provision would provide a basis for the International Criminal Court or, in extreme cases, the Security Council, to take appropriate action against the practice.
13. **Publicize Failures to Comply with Human Rights Treaties.** The annual reports of the Human Rights Commission deserve more prominence and dissemination by both governments and NGOs. Now that the International Criminal Court has been established, the Human Rights Commission and human rights NGOs should compile evidence of non-compliance with human rights obligations for major offenders and publish it on occasion, so as to obtain maximum deterrence effect from the existence of the court.
14. **Deal More Effectively with Terrorism.** As regards al Qaeda and similar groups, UN member states should focus on bringing individual terrorism suspects to justice before appropriate national or international tribunals. Military force should be used as a last resort for this purpose or to prevent further terrorist acts. To deal with

underlying causes of terrorism, there should be expanded programs to improve governance, economic development with emphasis on job creation, family planning and secular modern education, including education for girls and women.

The United Nations and member states should build on the twelve UN conventions concerned with terrorism and support the full implementation of the convention on eliminating financial aid to terrorists through close international cooperation.

To deal on a long-term basis with extremist fundamentalist views which underlie much terrorist activity, like the September 2001 attacks in the United States, we propose a well-financed UN Education Foundation offering free, modern, non-religious education for primary, secondary and university levels, that would provide teaching aids for imparting knowledge and skills to empower students to make their contribution as national and world citizens. This foundation would handle financing, organization of curriculum, recruiting of teaching staff, and establishment of actual schools.

15. **Israeli-Palestinian Confrontation.** For the Israeli-Palestinian confrontation, we believe a broad international coalition consisting of the European Union, Russia, United States, the Arab countries and the UN Secretary-General should develop and energetically promote a comprehensive, detailed proposal including establishment of an independent Palestinian state conforming to the 1967 borders of Israel; both states to participate in governing Jerusalem; return or compensation for Palestinian refugees; security assurances for both sides; peacekeeping and financing, with a major implementing role for the United Nations.
16. **Increase Use of the International Court of Justice.** Greater emphasis should be placed on empowering the International Court of Justice to settle disputes. An effective global security system requires that the declared commitment by states to the peaceful settlement of disputes should find concrete expression in compulsory adjudication and arbitration procedures. The Security Council should adopt the standard procedure of seeking the legal advice of the International Court of Justice, or the opinion of a panel of legal experts knowledgeable about the issue, as a basis for dispute settlement in areas of tension and conflict. The Security Council could call upon parties to a conflict or dispute to seek international arbitration, failing which it could itself seek legal advice for a substantive response. An on-going campaign is needed to mobilize public support and pressure for making international adjudication and arbitration a fundamental feature of the international security system. We will seek a General Assembly resolution urging this action on member state governments.
17. **Include in New Treaties a Provision for Referring Disputes to the International Court.** As a first step toward making international adjudication and arbitration a centerpiece of the international security system, all newly concluded treaties should contain a provision for compulsory referral of unresolved disputes to the International Court of Justice.

(Also relevant to this section are Item 5 on Sanctions, Item 18 on Criteria for Intervention, and Item 20 on a Standing UN Police Force.)

Strengthen Multilateral Peacekeeping Capability

18. Build International Consensus on Criteria for International Intervention within Countries to Prevent Armed Conflict and Protect Human Rights. In adopting a pro-active approach to conflict prevention, and to avoid the controversies that accompanied NATO intervention in Kosovo, the Security Council and the UN General Assembly should move step by step toward the establishment of agreed standards for outside intervention inside countries under the auspices of the UN or a regional security organization in order to prevent genocide, crimes against humanity, and other gross violations of human rights. The standards should be based on the following premises:

- Sovereignty resides in the people;
- Governments are stewards of popular sovereignty and of the welfare and rights of their people;
- Governments are accountable to their people for their conduct of this stewardship; owing to their signature on the UN Charter and to international human rights covenants, they are also accountable to the international community;
- If government neglects or abuses the stewardship of the welfare and rights of its people in an extreme way, the population is justified in opposing this and the international community has a responsibility to be prepared to intervene in some form to end the abuse or neglect. (Criteria for this “responsibility to protect” are described in the report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty, www.idrc.ca.)

The form of intervention should be decided on a case by case basis by the Security Council or regional security organizations. There is a wide spectrum of possibilities, of which those involving international armed forces represent a last resort, to be used only when other means have failed. The Secretary-General, UN member states, and international courts should insist that, except for the defense of national territory against external armed aggression, only the UN Security Council has the authority to authorize the use of armed force within a country over the objection of its government for the purpose of ending or preventing genocide, crimes against humanity, other gross violations of human rights, as well as enforcing compliance with arms control and disarmament obligations.

The existence of an international understanding of this kind would have great value not only for reaction to human rights abuses, but also for prevention and deterrence of abuses. If the Security Council is unable owing to opposition of some permanent members to agree on these criteria, they should be introduced as General Assembly resolutions so all member states will be aware of them.

With such a code in effect and with a range of implementing measures and institutions to which oppressed ethnic, religious and even political groups could have recourse, there would be far less justification for acts of armed rebellion against national authorities and less motivation for terrorist acts.

19. Make Short Term Improvements in Current UN Peacekeeping Capabilities.

Global Action supports the recommendations of the Brahimi Report of August, 2000 for changes in the organization of the UN Secretariat and addition of new officials to make peacekeeping a permanent function of the UN. Funds for these functions should be included in the UN's ordinary budget. They should not be dependent as heretofore on funding for individual peacekeeping operations.

Global Action uses the term "peacekeeping" in the broad, non-specialist sense. The more technical term used by the UN itself is "peace operations," a concept which includes conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping, and peacebuilding. In this UN definition, conflict prevention addresses the structural causes of conflict and terrorism. Peacemaking is political mediation and diplomacy designed to halt conflicts in progress. Peacekeeping is the use of military personnel to maintain cease-fires and separation of armed forces or to bring these developments about. Peacebuilding is post-conflict activity to consolidate the peace, once achieved. "Peace enforcement" is the use of military personnel under Chapter VII to deal with threats to the world peace and security.

20. Establish a Standing UN Police Force and RSO Police Forces. To further strengthen capabilities for rapid action to prevent the escalation of internal conflicts into widespread armed violence, the UN should establish, on a ten-year trial basis, a standing force of 4,000-6,000 volunteer civilian policemen and policewomen trained for preventive peacekeeping and also for disaster relief and humanitarian aid missions. This force would be available for use by the Secretary-General, the Security Council, and the International Courts. Such a force, deployed early, might have prevented mass violence in Kosovo and East Timor. It might be more acceptable than peacekeepers drawn from foreign armed forces to governments concerned about infringements on their sovereignty—and also more politically acceptable and cheaper than standing UN peacekeeping forces organized on military lines. A modest beginning for this force would be a group of fifty men and women who could work with the International Criminal Court, the International Court of Justice, or the Hague and Arusha Courts in the capacity of UN marshals as well as with normal peacekeeping forces.

21. Recognize Service in War-Prevention Units as National Service to Meet Conscription Requirements. Service in peacekeeping, political, mediation, or humanitarian aid corps, at the UN or regional level, should be recognized by national governments as an alternative to military conscription, career military service, or other required forms of national service.

(Also relevant to this section are Item 5, **Employ Targeted Sanctions and Part II, Increase Reliance on UN Peace Enforcement Capabilities.**)

Increase the Responsiveness and Accountability of the UN System

As the UN and its regional counterparts play a greater role in war prevention, it will be essential to take steps to assure widespread confidence in the impartiality of decision-making in these organizations on matters of war and peace.

22. Make the UN Security Council More Representative by Expanding Its Membership. Agreement to amend the Charter to eliminate the veto is not likely in the short term. Agreement on adding new permanent members to the Council should be easier. Several further steps could be taken in the near future to make the UN's conflict prevention institutions more representative of and accountable to the international community.

23. Reach Informal Agreement Among the Permanent Five to Use the Veto Sparingly to Enable More Effective Security Council Action Against Armed Conflict. There should be an informal voluntary agreement among the five permanent members of the Security Council to use the veto sparingly. The governments of the five permanent Council members may be motivated to informally agree to restrict their use of the veto by their desire to fend off constant pressures for total elimination of the veto, to maintain the effectiveness of the Council in peacemaking, and to maintain their own prestige as members of an effective Council.

24. Focus the Efforts of the General Assembly Committee on Security Council Reform on Further Reducing Use of the Veto. Once agreement is reached on the above measure, the General Assembly Committee on Security Council Reform should give priority to promoting the idea that the permanent members of the Security Council should agree among themselves to restrict their use of the veto to cases in which the Council is considering actions that could be deemed to infringe the territorial integrity or sovereignty of the vetoing Security Council member. This restriction is more far-reaching than that described above, but would also rest on agreement among the permanent five Council members, and therefore would not require Charter amendment.

25. Establish New Conflict Prevention Bodies Linked to the Security Council, But Not Subject to the Veto. Another way to achieve impartial action without changing the UN Charter would be for the Security Council to establish new committees or agencies to deal with specific aspects of security, replacing the veto with "super majorities" in these organizations. Similar steps could be taken by the regional security organizations. If action by the Security Council remained blocked in a particular case, the "uniting for peace" procedure used in the Korean War and the Congo peacekeeping mission could be employed.

26. Give the General Assembly President a Seat on the Security Council. For fuller accountability within the UN, the President of the General Assembly should have

a seat on the Security Council in order to report Assembly views to the Council and vice versa.

27. Establish Judicial Review of Security Council Decisions. To further enhance accountability, a practice of judicial review by the International Court of Justice over decisions of the Security Council and Regional Security Organizations is needed. Serious errors by the Security Council, like those that resulted in the massacres in Rwanda and in Srebrenica, Bosnia, must be subject to judicial oversight.

28. Create a World Parliamentary Assembly as an Advisory Chamber of the UN. Ever since the UN was established, there have been pressures to democratize it. At present, the UN General Assembly is a forum for talks among representatives of governments, with a modest secretariat staffed by international officials. Ideally, a popularly elected assembly should take precedence over the General Assembly of government representatives. But this will take time.

A desirable interim step would be the creation of a Parliamentary Assembly to advise the General Assembly, with its membership elected by individual parliaments. The number of delegates for each country might be calculated on the basis of population. Countries with populations of 50 million or less would have one delegate. Larger countries would have one delegate for every 50 million people. An early task of this assembly would be to devise a practical procedure providing for its direct election by national electorates. As a parallel measure, individual UN member states could decide to designate their permanent representative at the UN through popular election.

29. Strengthen the Advisory and Assisting Role of NGOs at the UN. Nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) have programs in several areas of peace and security, including early warning, mediation, arbitration, and the unarmed intervention of peace brigades. Such activities, which have been growing rapidly, are likely to be increasingly useful in future as NGOs become more experienced and innovative. Given the growing importance of civil society, there is a need for continuous liaison and consultation between NGOs, on the one hand, and government representatives and officials at the UN and regional security organizations, on the other.

The Secretary General has proposed a conference of NGOs working on conflict prevention. To ensure full communication, a conference of NGOs in fields listed above should be held every two years, with participation of the Secretary-General, senior Secretariat officials, members of the Security Council, and members of the General Assembly's Conflict Prevention Committee. Regional conferences of the same kind should also be held.

II. To Prevent International War, We Must in a Phased Process of Disarmament Reduce National Military Forces and Replace Them with Modest UN Forces

The main purpose of the disarmament component of the Global Action program is to make war between two nation states or between major powers increasingly unlikely through step-by-step reduction of national armed forces, especially force projection equipment that enables military operations beyond national borders. While this disarmament process goes on, the Global Action program calls for the buildup of multilateral peacemaking and peacekeeping forces so nation states will not be apprehensive over the effects of their force cuts on their national security. We believe that by cutting back national forces, which are often used in pursuit of narrow national objectives that reflect personal aims and preferences of national leaders, and by shifting the responsibility for maintaining international order to multilateral forces less likely to be motivated by aims of this kind, major interstate war will become increasingly unlikely. As war becomes more rare, the size of multilateral peacekeeping forces can also decline.

To succeed in mobilizing broad support, a program of action to prevent deadly conflict should:

- Avoid inadvertently increasing some risks of war while reducing others;
- Strengthen commitment to nonviolent conflict resolution;
- Offer substantial economic benefits; and
- Include means of overcoming domestic resistance to change rooted in inertia, ignorance, and vested interests.

The Global Action disarmament program seeks to meet these criteria. Militarily, it proposes gradual step-by-step changes, designed to avoid creating new situations of uncertainty in which the risk of war might rise. Morally, it underscores commitment to the rule of law and to peaceful dispute resolution in three ways: it further enhances institutions for war prevention; it limits accepted uses of force to deterring and defending against aggression, genocide, and other forms of organized violence; step-by-step it replaces national armed forces, which can be used in arbitrary, self-interested ways, with UN and regional forces for use in a nonpartisan way.

Economically, this program should bring major savings both to the populations of areas that are affected by armed conflict and to donors of emergency relief and reconstruction aid. In addition, by cutting the world's largest conventional armed forces and major weapon systems, which take 95 percent of world military spending, the program should release enormous resources for non-military uses. In the case of the United States, which accounts for as much as half of world military spending, initial cuts of 33% in conventional forces and weaponry could save over \$100 billion per year (out of the current annual military budget of about \$380 billion). Longer-term reductions could save \$200 billion per year.

Other countries, including both industrial countries and developing “middle powers,” would save comparable proportions of their military budgets, which in many cases are higher than their budgets for health or education. After an initial period of transition and conversion, these savings could be directed to nationally-adapted combinations of tax cuts, domestic programs for health and education, international debt relief, development aid, and special relief programs for war-torn countries. With respect to potential internal obstacles to change—employment in defense-dependent communities, profits in arms industries, jobs for veterans, the careers of military officers, and so on—a gradual process of change will facilitate a smooth transition to non-military employment and production. It will mobilize local as well as national support by ending local boom-and-bust cycles of funding for arms production, strengthen economic growth, and release a large part of government spending for other needs.

The Global Action disarmament program proposes three initial phases of change, each of which lasts 5–10 years and which lay the foundation for a fourth and fifth phase that together establish a permanent global security system.

The disarmament program of Global Action to Prevent War derives much of its strength from its integrated approach. Concerted action from civil society and world governments will be needed to gain its acceptance. A treaty structure will provide a framework for this systematic cooperation over a period of years. That is why we support a phased, treaty-based approach. However, this does not mean that all program components have to enter into effect simultaneously, nor that all of them must be treaty-based. As noted above, many components of the Global Action program can be put into effect separately and soon, allowing participants in different places to focus on the issues that are most important to them.

PHASE 1

Take Initial Steps to Reduce the Risks of Major International War

The ongoing Global Action conflict prevention program described above emphasizes efforts to strengthen global and regional institutions that provide largely non-military means of preventing and ending organized armed violence, with the goal of sharply reducing the frequency of genocide, ethnic armed conflict, internal wars, domestic terrorism and border wars. Phase 1 of the Global Action disarmament program, which would begin as soon there is agreement to do so, seeks to begin to reduce the longer-term risks of major international war through measures of confidence building and arms limitation.

A. Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Arms Production and Trade.

30. Begin Talks on Global Cuts in National Military Forces and Spending.

31. Cap Military Forces and Spending during the Talks. This worldwide freeze commitment, the first in history, will provide an important symbolic beginning for serious disarmament.

32. Conduct a Full and Open Exchange of Information on Military Forces, Spending, and Armaments. This should be institutionalized in an expanded UN Arms Register.

33. Cut Global Production and Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms by 25 Percent. Cutbacks in the international traffic in small arms will reduce the likelihood of terrorist acts and escalation of internal conflicts into mass violence. Similarly, cutbacks in the production and trade of major weapons, which will be facilitated by the freeze and planned cuts in standing armed forces, will help defuse the major regional conflicts that account for nearly three-quarters of the international arms trade.

With a freeze or no-increase commitment in effect, the need for new weapons to replace aging systems will be reduced. This is the ideal time to begin reductions in arms production and trade. In addition, with the exception of hunting or sporting weapons, there should be no arms sales to private groups or individuals; no sales to those engaged in armed conflict unless the Security Council determines that one side is the victim of aggression; no sales to nations with bad human rights records, as determined by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; and no sales to governments that spend more on their armed forces than on health or education (unless certified as exempt because they are victims of aggression).

34. Promote Democratic Oversight of Military and Security Forces. A major challenge for the international security community in the 21st century remains to organize security policy and decision-making processes that are consistent with organizing principles of good governance in democracies. Application of democratic control over the military should lead to exercising diplomatic and political options, rather than relying on military security solutions for addressing external security problems or than developing military deterrence. Institutionalization of democratic oversight of security policy-making processes by the public's elected representatives throughout the world would provide an enduring source of non-violent diplomatic and political alternatives for ensuring external security.

35. Implement Carefully Designed Confidence-Building Measures in Specific Conflict Areas. These measures should include constraints on force activities, transparency, advance information on force activity and thin-out zones in those bilateral relationships that have the potential to lead to war, such as the India-Pakistan standoff, currently the world's most dangerous border conflict.

36. **Restrict Economic Benefits from Armed Conflict.** Military aggression for territorial gain has become infrequent. But the desire to exploit important natural resources—diamonds, minerals, timber, and petroleum—is motivating political leaders to armed conflict. This development must be controlled through enhanced multilateral agreements restricting economic benefits to the warlords.
37. **Establish a Committee to Resolve Questions Concerning Verification and Elimination of the Armaments Reduced under this Program.** This committee should be patterned on similar committees in START I and II, the CFE Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention. The responsibilities of this committee will increase in later phases.

B. Move Toward the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

38. **Continue to Combat Nuclear Proliferation.** Vigorously implement the Non-Proliferation Treaty, including the conclusions of the 2000 NPT Review Conference: ratification and entry into force of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT); negotiation of a fissile material cut-off treaty; further unilateral reductions by the weapon states; increased transparency of nuclear arsenals; further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons; a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in national security policies—especially pertinent to the expanding role for nuclear weapons foreseen in the January 2002 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review; strengthening of security assurances to non-nuclear states; and participation of all NPT states in the enhanced verification regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (comprehensive safeguards agreement).
39. **Use Negotiation, not War, to Prevent Proliferation.** The use of armed force against Iraq is not justified. Most accusations against the Iraqi regime of Saddam Hussein were well-founded. Nevertheless, the threat from Iraq could have been contained and deterred without armed attack. Proliferation issues with Iran and North Korea should be resolved by negotiation backed by the Security Council.
40. **De-alert Deployed U.S. and Russian Nuclear Weapons to Reduce the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Launch.** De-alerting consists of measures to delay immediate launch.
41. **Reduce US and Russian Nuclear Forces to No More Than 1,000 Total (Strategic and Tactical) Warheads Each.** Promote irreversibility by dismantling reduced warheads and transferring their fissile material to international custody.
42. **Include the Six Remaining Nuclear Weapon States in Talks on Cuts. Seek to Cap Their Arsenals.** Widen negotiations to include all countries that now possess nuclear weapons. Like the U.S. and Russia, these countries—China, France, UK, India, Pakistan and Israel—should cap their warhead deployment and exchange full information on their warheads and delivery systems. These steps will lead to further reductions to be undertaken in Phase 2 and substantial progress toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.

- 43. Limit Missile Defenses; Block the Weaponization of Space.** Many experts continue to express doubts about the technical feasibility of national missile defense, especially under combat conditions. However, when even partially effective missile defenses are added to offensive missiles, other governments may conclude that they increase offensive capability and may as a result move to increase their own nuclear arsenals. To avoid this effect, if the U.S. or other nuclear weapon states insist on deploying national missile defenses, there should be a limit on deployed missile interceptors, as there now is on deployed U.S. and Russian offensive warheads and as there was in the ABM Treaty. In a new global ABM agreement covering all nuclear weapon states, a weapon state would be permitted to deploy missile defenses, but if so, it must accept a limit on the number of deployed interceptors in order to prevent unlimited defense weapons from augmenting offensive capability and increasing motivation for an arms race. As with the original ABM Treaty, this agreement would prohibit the weaponization of space. In the meanwhile, Global Action also opposes funding and testing of space orbiting weapons foreseen in the U.S. missile defense program; we urge international agreement to expand the 1967 Outer Space Treaty to prohibit placing any weapon in space orbit. (The present Outer Space Treaty prohibits only nuclear weapons.)
- 44. Seek an Effective Compliance Protocol for the Biological Weapons Convention.** This agreement remains without verification provisions.

C. Increase Reliance on UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Enforcement Capabilities.

While the first measures for global cuts in arms holdings, production, and acquisition are being negotiated, steps should be taken to begin the process of replacing national military forces with well trained standing forces organized by the UN or Regional Security Organizations as means of last resort for preventing, ending, and deterring armed conflict. In this area, what is needed initially is better preparation at the UN for prompt deployment of new peacekeeping operations—sufficiently rapid to prevent crises from escalation into full blown armed conflict—and more substantial commitment of national forces earmarked for UN use.

- 45. Establish New Mobile Headquarters Units at the UN and a \$500 Million Contingency Fund for Rapid Deployment of Peacekeeping Operations.** The mobile headquarters units, composed of national military personnel, and the contingency fund would permit relatively rapid response, fielding and directing peacekeeping units volunteered by national governments until a standing UN peacekeeping force is established.
- 46. Earmark National Forces for UN Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement.** In Phase I, governments will also finally implement their obligations under Articles 43 and 45 of the UN Charter to make available to the Security Council pre-designated, trained and equipped ground, air, and naval personnel, as well as ships and planes.

- 47. Establish Rapid Response Peacekeeping Brigades on Every Continent.** Regional rapid response brigades composed of national forces, comparable to the multinational Standby High Readiness Brigade (SHIRBRIG) that now exists in Europe, should be available in all regions—Africa, the Americas, Middle East, South Asia and Northeast Asia—for rapid peacekeeping missions under the auspices of the UN or Regional Security Organizations.
- 48. Take the First Steps to Establish a Standing Volunteer UN Peacekeeping Force.** Following these actions, a standing UN peacekeeping force of up to 10,000 people, initially composed of company-sized national units, subsequently of individual volunteers, would be established in addition to the UN police force (item 20 above) to permit the UN to intervene within a matter of days to prevent the escalation of a crisis to widespread armed violence or to perform the first stages of a peacekeeping mission until relieved by peacekeeping forces from member states.
- Nearly every expert study has called for the creation of a standing UN peacekeeping capability. It is time to break the veto of a few states on this issue by keeping it before governments until consensus for action on a specific plan is achieved. We expect that consensus to be achieved by Phase 2 of the Global Action Program. We support bills in the U.S. Congress that provide for establishment of a standing force of volunteers at the UN.

PHASE 2

Make Up to One-Third Cuts in Forces and Spending, with Deeper Cuts in Production and Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms

Phase 2 will continue to strengthen the means available to the international community for preventing and ending internal war and genocide. Governments will commit themselves to obligatory arbitration or submission of disputes to international courts, and the global network of universal-membership Regional Security Organizations should be fully developed. New efforts in Phase 2 will focus on reducing the risks of major regional or global war.

A. Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Production and Sale of Arms.

- 49. Conclude a Treaty on Global Cuts in Military Forces, Spending and Major Weapon Systems and Small Arms. Cut 33%, 25%, and 15% in Very Large, Large, and Smaller Forces, Respectively.** Aiming ultimately at low levels of national armaments in all parts of the world, the conventional arms reduction treaty will make proportionately larger cuts in the forces and weapon holdings and production of countries with larger armed forces. A simple but useful approach would be for countries with aggregate inventories of major weapons numbering

over 10,000 to reduce their forces by one-third, those with inventories totaling 1,000–10,000 to cut by one-quarter, and those with inventories under 1,000 to reduce by 15 percent. (Major weapon systems are combat aircraft, armed helicopters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, heavy artillery, missiles, and naval ships over 825 metric tons.) Following this approach, the United States, Russia, and China would cut by 33 percent, while 20-odd military “middle powers” (Germany, Britain, France, Italy, Greece, Turkey, Poland, and Ukraine in Europe; Japan, India, Pakistan, North and South Korea, and Taiwan in Asia; Israel, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Iraq, Iran, and Syria in the Middle East; and Brazil in South America) would cut by 25 percent. All other countries with small armed forces (about 165) would cut by 15 percent. These global cuts will be supplemented by additional confidence-building reductions and defensive-oriented restructuring in areas plagued by long-standing regional conflicts.

At this stage, with shrinking conventional forces worldwide, decreased regional tensions, and fewer internal armed conflicts, there would be greatly reduced demand for production and trade of new weapons to replace aging holdings. Moreover, reduced armaments can be used to replace permitted but unserviceable weapons, thereby further reducing the need for production and trade for replacement purposes.

- 50. Cut Worldwide Production and Trade in Major Weapons and Small Arms by a Further 50 Percent.** A 50 percent reduction in arms production, acquisition, and trade would follow on the Phase 1 armed force reduction of 25 percent. It would be paralleled by a proportionate reduction in the size of arms industries, i.e., production facilities, to accompany the global cuts in standing armed forces.

B. Move Toward the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

- 51. Reduce Remaining Nuclear Arms to No More than 100 Warheads in Each Country.** In this phase, China, Britain, and France should join the United States and Russia in negotiating reduction of their nuclear weapons arsenal to a level of 100 warheads each, with provision for internationally monitored destruction of reduced warheads. Delivery systems would also be reduced and limited. As cuts proceed, India, Pakistan, and Israel should be brought into the system of monitoring and limitation.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

- 52. Expand the UN Standing Force; Begin to Shift Peacekeeping from National Units to UN and RSO Volunteer Forces and Strengthen Those Forces.** Expand the individually-recruited, all-volunteer peacekeeping force (item 48), to create ten brigade-sized central and regional components. As this larger standing peacekeeping force comes into being, the UN and Regional Security Organizations will be

undertaking a process (to be continued in Phase 3 and completed in Phase 4) of gradual transition from earmarked national contingents to reliance on the UN's own growing all-volunteer force and to comparable units in regional security organizations. Little by little, over Phases 2-4, reliance on national military contingents for UN peacekeeping will be phased out except for very large operations.

53. **Create Functioning Military Staff Committees at the UN and in Regional Security Organizations.** Member states will also implement their obligation under Article 47 of the UN Charter to establish a functioning Military Staff Committee to provide strategic direction of these forces on orders from the Security Council, and they will also establish regional Military Staff Committees to work with regional security organizations. Working under the direction of the Security Council, the reconstituted Military Staff Committee should implement Article 26 of the UN Charter and formulate plans for worldwide and regional disarmament accompanied by strengthening of UN peacekeeping capabilities. Global Action's program for worldwide disarmament could serve as a model for this activity.
54. **Give the UN Secretary-General Limited Authority to Use UN Police or Peacekeeping Forces.** It is essential to prevent strengthened UN capability to head off incipient armed conflict from being blocked from taking action either by a threatened Security Council veto or by lack of political will among Council members. To deal with those cases where the Security Council has not acted and the Secretary-General of the UN considers that a conflict prevention emergency exists, the Secretary-General should be authorized by prior Charter amendment or Security Council decision to deploy military or police forces of limited size for conflict prevention (not for Article VII armed intervention). For the deployment to continue beyond 30 days, it would have to be confirmed by the Security Council.
55. **Conduct a Global Education Campaign to Promote Support for Timely Decisions to Use UN Conflict-Prevention Machinery.** To decrease the number of occasions where the Secretary-General might have to act on his own, an educational campaign launched by Global Action to Prevent War will promote timely decisions to use conflict-prevention measures by educating national leaders at all levels (elected officials, military officers, and civil servants) and society at large on the need to identify potential conflicts at an early stage and to take early action to prevent them from escalating into far more costly and bloody armed conflicts. Case studies and historical examples will illustrate the enormous costs in lives and money of reliance on the traditional bureaucratic viewpoint that, given enough time, most problems resolve themselves on their own.
56. **Permit the UN to Raise Its Own Funds for Conflict Prevention, Peacekeeping, and Humanitarian Aid.** Starting in Phase 2, the UN should be permitted to raise money for conflict prevention, peacekeeping, and humanitarian aid through sale of bonds and postage stamps in member states (peace stamps), to permit wide public participation and continued voluntary contributions by member states. If some

UN states are still unwilling to support this means of financing through an international treaty, then like-minded countries will continue to cooperate for a time in making voluntary contributions, perhaps raised by taxes on air tickets or airport departures.

Efforts will continue during Phase 2 to strengthen institutions for war prevention and conflict resolution, and to prevent the outbreak of civil wars, violent ethnic conflicts, terrorism, and genocide. The entire program up to this point will support a gradual shift in Phases 3 and 4 from national to multilateral means of non-military or, if necessary, military intervention to preserve or restore peace.

PHASE 3

Trial Ban on Unilateral Military Intervention

A. Reduce National Forces, Military Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

57. Begin Talks on Further Cuts in National Military Forces and Spending.

During the Phase 3 trial period, negotiations will take place on another round of cuts in conventional forces and military spending, to be implemented in Phase 4 when there is full confidence in the effectiveness of the global security system.

B. Move Toward Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

58. Immobilize Remaining Stocks of Nuclear Warheads and Delivery Systems by Placing Them in Internationally Monitored Storage on the Territory of the Owner States. By the time the Phase 3 Treaty is agreed, nuclear disarmament should have reached a point at which the small remaining stocks of nuclear warheads and delivery systems in all countries can be immobilized by being placed in internationally monitored storage on the territory of the owner state. This last step before the complete abolition of nuclear weapons, the trial “immobilization” of nuclear weapons, would parallel the Phase 3 trial transfer of responsibility for military action from national to global and regional hands (see item 60 below), preceding the permanent transfer. At the same time, the global non-proliferation regime would be tightened.

59. Severely Limit All Missiles and All Long-Range Bomber and Attack Aircraft.

This would be done through a worldwide treaty for control of missiles, aircraft, and other means of delivering weapons of mass destruction.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

60. Make a Provisional Commitment Not to Deploy National Armed Forces Beyond National Borders While Rigorously Testing the Capability of the UN and RSOs to Prevent Armed Conflict. In Phase 3, participating countries, including the major powers, will test the effectiveness of the expanded global security system by making a provisional commitment not to deploy their armed forces beyond national borders except as part of a multilateral deployment under UN or regional auspices. This commitment appears far-reaching, but it corresponds to obligations under the UN Charter restricting the use of force which member states undertook when they joined the UN. Moreover, the commitment can be revoked under conditions described below.

By the beginning of Phase 3, the UN and its regional security counterparts (which will have substantially strengthened their peacekeeping capabilities and experience in Phases 1 and 2) should be willing and able to take responsibility for keeping the peace. In other words, they should be prepared to take steps, authorized by the Secretary-General or the Security Council (or a regional counterpart), to launch rapid multilateral non-military intervention or, as a last resort, effective military action aimed at preventing or ending outbreaks of war, genocide, and other forms of deadly conflict. When considering armed intervention in internal conflicts, the Security Council will decide on a case-by-case basis whether intervention is justified, using previously agreed criteria such as the threat or occurrence of genocide, threats to international security, or far-reaching failures of governments to provide adequate stewardship of their citizens' rights, security, and welfare (see item 18 above).

At any time during Phase 3, if participating nations conclude that their security is endangered by a failure of the UN- and regionally-based global security system, they will have the right to withdraw from this agreement. Withdrawal from the non-intervention agreement will not vitiate the commitments made in previous phases. However, since Phase 2 cuts will reduce national forces by no more than a third (compared with today's levels), adequate forces for national military action to replace inadequate multilateral action will still exist.

A successful Phase 3 trial—a decade with no withdrawals or unilateral military actions by nations with large armed forces—will be a prerequisite for proceeding with Phase 4.

PHASE 4

Transfer Responsibility for Global Security from National to International Institutions

A. Reduce National Military Forces, Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

61. Make further Deep Cuts (33%, 25%, and 15%) in National Armed Forces and

Military Spending. The shifting of the responsibility for keeping the peace from individual nations to the international community will permit and require further deep cuts in national forces comparable to those made in Phase 2 (one-third, one-quarter, and 15 percent, respectively, for countries with very large, large, and small armed forces).

62. Limit Production of Both Major Weapons and Small Arms to Weapons for UN Forces and for Homeland Defense. Production of major weapons and small arms will be restricted narrowly to two areas: first, systems needed by individual nations for defense of their own national territory against threats of external armed aggression (which should be minimal under conditions described here); and second, weapons deployed by the UN and Regional Security Organizations for peacekeeping and for multilateral defense against genocide and aggression. Worldwide arms production and trade will cease except for these two purposes.

B. Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

63. Eliminate All Remaining Nuclear Weapons After Agreeing to a Stringent Verification System and Contingency Plans for Non-Compliance. Complete the actions needed to destroy remaining warheads, weapons plants and delivery systems and to establish an effective verification scheme. Conclude a treaty making possession or use of nuclear weapons an international crime.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

64. Strengthen UN and RSO Volunteer Forces. As the UN and Regional Security Organizations complete the transition from earmarked national contingents to fully-trained, well-equipped all-volunteer forces and take on full responsibility for peacekeeping worldwide while national forces are further reduced and restructured, armed forces under multilateral control will become larger than the armed force of any single country for the first time.

65. Permanently Transfer the Responsibility for Preventing Armed Conflict from Individual Nations to a Global Security System Operated by the UN and Regional Security Organizations. Following the trial run in Phase 3, a treaty of indefinite duration will be adopted in Phase 4, completing the transfer of the responsibility and capability for action to prevent and end international aggression, internal armed conflict, and genocide from individual nations to a global security system operated by a reformed UN and regional security organizations. Throughout this entire disarmament program, Global Action will actively promote the underlying concept of defensive security or defensive defense in order to increase understanding and support for this key point of our program.

Limit National Armed Forces to Short-Range Homeland Defense

As confidence in the global security system grows and military threats diminish, further changes will be desirable and should be possible. These changes, which may occur quickly or slowly, can be considered to comprise the fifth and final phase of the peace-making process.

A. Reduce National Military Forces, Spending and Production and Trade.

66. **Limit “Force-Projection” Capabilities to Relatively Small Units Maintained by the UN and Regional Peacekeeping Forces.** The shift of the responsibility for keeping the peace to the international community will also be accompanied by a qualitative restructuring of forces: Force-projection capabilities, that is, air, naval, and logistical forces that make possible military action far from national borders, will be dropped from national arsenals step by step, and limited to small units maintained by the UN and Regional Peacekeeping Forces.
67. **Convert National Armed Forces Fully to Short-Range Homeland and Non-Offensive Defense.** During this final phase, all nations will convert fully to “defensive security”. In other words, they will limit national armed forces strictly and narrowly to national territorial defense (air defense, border defense, and defense of coasts and coastal waters), leaving large-scale military intervention beyond national borders to the UN and regional security organizations.

Various aspects of the effort to build a global defensive security system are likely to be mutually reinforcing. As confidence in the global security system grows and national armed forces shrink, the multilateral forces needed to deter and defend against cross-border aggression and other forms of large-scale violence will be both smaller and more likely to succeed. At the same time, as expectations of peace grow, nations and national leaders will become more comfortable with the idea of limiting their armed forces to defense of national territory. In particular, the major military powers (especially the United States), which would give up their capabilities for large-scale military action beyond national borders, will have concluded that their security is better served by the new system than by the current system of continuous war and threats of war and they will actively support the global defensive security system.

Eventually, the world’s nations may reach a degree of commitment to peaceful conflict resolution such that the UN and regional security organizations will have only police functions: verifying adherence to defensive security limits by individual nations, and preventing the use of violence for gain or for political intimidation by nonstate actors such as terrorists and criminal syndicates.

At this point we could reasonably say that war had been abolished.

III. To Foster Support for National Policies of Peace and Disarmament, We Must Promote the Culture of Peace and Individual Programs for Disarmament and Conflict Reduction

Global Action supports and participates in activities designed to promote the culture of peace at all levels and disarmament and conflict reduction in all settings. These activities include:

- 68. Universal education at all levels on non-violent conflict prevention and resolution.**
- 69. Programs to strengthen tolerance and respect for diversity among national subgroups—ethnic, cultural and religious—and programs opposing political and religious extremism.**
- 70. Programs aimed at reducing violence, including humanitarian aid; refugee relief; economic development; economic justice; human rights; the rights of women and children; prevention of domestic and youth violence; and protection of the environment.**
- 71. Sectoral programs for arms control and disarmament, including limits or bans on nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, space weapons, conventional armaments (including missiles and aircraft), land mines, small arms, and handguns.**
- 72. Confidence-building, conflict prevention, conflict resolution and post-conflict rebuilding in specific settings, like the Near East, India-Pakistan, Sudan, and Sri Lanka.**

Global Action and the Root Causes of War

Since its inception in 1998, the Global Action program has been revised periodically in response to comments by new and old supporters. One recurrent theme of comments has been the relationship between the Global Action program and the root causes of war and other forms of armed conflict.

One issue here arises from the fact that the Global Action approach is directed to the existing structure of the international system, a structure composed primarily of national governments, international organizations, transnational businesses and civil society organizations. The Global Action program seeks to gain the active cooperation and support of these entities. Some critics believe that this approach is insufficiently radical, and that it does not provide for or aim for prior far-reaching change in these institutions which, in their view, is necessary before real progress can be made toward a durable peace. Those of us who support the Global Action program believe that the existing international system can be made to work far more effectively than it now does to reduce the level of armed conflict worldwide. We respect the views of those who believe in the need for prior radical change in the international system, but we believe that existing opportunities for improvement should be used now.

A second issue is related to the first. Some critics argue that the Global Action program should address what they believe are the root causes of war, like poverty, social and economic injustice, environmental degradation and poor governance, and that prior progress in these areas is required to lower the level of armed conflict and terrorism. Most people would agree that war itself brings aggravation of poverty, social and economic injustice, environmental degradation and poor governance. Eliminating or reducing warfare can help in coping with these afflictions. At the same time, we fully agree that these root cause challenges must be met before just and enduring peace can be achieved, and that this effort should be pursued simultaneously with efforts to cut back on armed conflict. Supporters of Global Action to Prevent War work in close coalition with those whose primary concerns involve ending poverty, inequity, environmental degradation, and poor governance, and meeting basic human needs. The Global Action program seeks to complement those programs by focusing its own resources on an effort to prevent organized armed conflict, or, if that is not possible, to reduce its incidence, scale, and duration.

We think it is feasible to do this. More often than not in human affairs, it is possible to separate violent behavior from its underlying causes or sources, and to address the behavior fairly effectively. This is done routinely in the sphere of criminal law, including domestic violence in families, through intervention by the police and courts. Similarly, on the issue of gun violence, countries like Japan, the United Kingdom, and Australia have achieved dramatic reductions in homicide rates through strict gun control measures. None of these violence-reducing programs is a substitute for action aimed at basic causes of conflict, but all of them are helpful in creating a social and economic space in which violence and injustice can be addressed more effectively and immediately.

Some degree of conflict, in the sense of diverging objectives and interests, is endemic in human society. Sometimes it has positive results. Global Action does not believe it is possible or even desirable to eradicate conflict in this sense of the word. Instead, Global Action seeks to prevent the development of conflicts of interest into armed conflict.

Concretely, as implementation of the Global Action program progresses, we believe war will become an increasingly infrequent and exceptional occurrence, instead of a daily horror. If this can be achieved, work on underlying conflicts of interest will be greatly enhanced. Meanwhile, we hope to achieve the broadest possible coalition of civil society organizations and governments to oppose war under the broad umbrella of the Global Action program. We in turn will add our weight to efforts to redress injustice, inequity, oppression, and environmental devastation. Both the International Steering Committee and the US Steering Committee of Global Action to Prevent War have established special working groups to promote linkage and cooperation with groups and programs that deal with these issues (see our Web site for a list of working groups, their members and contact information).

A Plan for Action: Goals for A Global Movement

Global Action to Prevent War sets out a comprehensive approach to war prevention, with a plan to reduce the frequency and devastation of war and the scale of preparations for war throughout the world. We expect that once implemented, the Global Action program will achieve these goals—but also that achieving broad agreement from world governments to proceed with the program could be slow and difficult, especially at the outset. That is why the Global Action program provides for a long effort, which will be sustained by a very broad coalition of organizations, individuals, and interested governments until the program wins the support of the governments of many countries, especially the United States and other heavily armed countries.

COALITION BUILDING Supporters of Global Action are still disseminating the Global Action concept and working to build a broad coalition. Those who are already committed should ask interested individuals, groups, and organizations to discuss the Global Action program in detail and give it the widest possible distribution to friends, relatives, colleagues, religious and political leaders, and others.

Global Action's first goal, to be achieved in the next years, is to establish an international coalition of groups and individuals who are sufficiently committed and influential to make Global Action known worldwide as a serious long-term enterprise with increasing visibility and momentum and to begin to promote the set of priority goals listed above.

We hope to establish name recognition and understanding of Global Action roughly equivalent to what exists today for the leading environmental and human rights organizations. Once many committed people throughout the world conclude that Global Action offers a practical and effective program to make armed conflict rare, this effort will tap into the universal desire for peace and support for Global Action will spread much more rapidly.

A key form of action in the first stage is to establish working groups that actively promote specific components of the Global Action program—or, if effective networks for specific components already exist, to promote and support their efforts.

ORGANIZATIONAL STRUCTURE In May 2000, in a meeting held at Rutgers University Law School, Global Action established an International Steering Committee comprising over thirty people from all over the world. The International Steering Committee established a list of High-Priority Projects (see pages 7–9) and Working Groups, revised in the Committee's meeting in Berlin in April 2002. Working groups bring together Global Action supporters to promote and advance individual measures of the Global Action program. They are the main vehicle for action in the project. (Committee members are listed at the end of this program document. Working Groups are listed on our website.)

Working groups were established on three near-term Global Action goals where there is no other NGO effort at this time: (1) UN mediators and Conflict Prevention Center; (2) a Conflict Prevention Committee of the General Assembly; (3) A freeze on armed forces and full transparency. There is also an active Global Action working group focused on the UN, meeting at the UN. This group seeks to promote the Global Action program with the permanent missions of member states. Several Liaison Groups were established to build a broad coalition of civil society groups already working on conflict reduction and peace. Current Liaison Groups cover nuclear disarmament, payment of UN dues, Security Council reform, UN peacekeeping and police forces, strengthening of regional security, human rights, and judicial institutions, non-offensive defense, implementation of the International Criminal Court, and expanding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Functional Working Groups were also established. The first is Government Relations. Its main task is to persuade governments to join the Global Action coalition and/or to support specific Global Action component programs. A second functional working group focuses on Partnerships, organized links with NGOs working on basic issues like poverty and human rights that are related to conflict reduction. A third functional working group will focus on fundraising. A fourth will focus on public relations and the media.

DEVELOPING GOVERNMENT SUPPORT Key government officials in several countries have already expressed serious interest in and support for the Global Action program. Global Action needs supporters who are willing and able to help circulate the program in the higher ranks of government in every country, soliciting favorable endorsement by working level officials. In addition, other near-term goals for work with governments include finding one or more friendly governments to introduce the Global Action program into the agenda of the UN General Assembly (as Costa Rica did with the Model Nuclear Weapons Abolition Convention); and persuading various government leaders to make positive public mention of Global Action in debates at the UN General Assembly and elsewhere or to support individual Global Action proposals.

Within ten years, if not sooner, it should be possible to gain widespread governmental acceptance in different parts of the world of the Global Action Phase 1 disarmament program. One important step toward this goal might be to establish a working group at the Conference on Disarmament to discuss a possible Global Action Treaty or, alternatively, to have several governments to convene a special conference on the Global Action program. Certain components of the program may be adopted by governments much sooner.

What is needed now to move the Global Action program forward is the formation of a broad, powerful coalition composed of concerned individuals from many different sectors, including private voluntary humanitarian and economic development

organizations, peace, disarmament and religious groups, businesses, political parties, environmental organizations, women's organizations, and supportive government officials. Such a coalition can bring pressure to bear on governments to acknowledge the need for a comprehensive approach like that offered by the Global Action program, and to start by taking the modest steps proposed for conflict prevention and for Phase I of the disarmament program. The next section describes how such a coalition might be created, and the kinds of action participants might take.

AN EVER-EXPANDING NETWORK-IN-FORMATION, WITH AN EVOLVING PROGRAM

The Global Action program covers the whole spectrum of issues relating to nonviolent conflict resolution, peacekeeping, demilitarization, and disarmament; but it is much more than a catalog of actions to prevent war. It is a 'living platform' that is constantly being improved, with input from new and old supporters. Organizations and individuals reading the statement for the first time are invited to send in comments and suggestions. Until all phases of the Global Action program have been implemented, Global Action will continue to be a coalition-building 'network-in-formation,' inviting the active participation of old and new supporters, and evolving from a transnational campaign to a global movement.

These features of the Global Action program facilitate independent yet mutually supportive efforts by supporters. Member organizations can keep the agendas they already have, or modify them in some way. They can choose the specific issues on which they focus and join or form working groups on these topics. Within the broad framework of the Global Action program, they can usefully focus on specific short-term goals, or work to make the overall program better understood and more widely supported, or foster broad, long-term moral and cultural change. They can work against nuclear proliferation, or against violence in children's TV programming, or for universal school education on nonviolent conflict resolution, or for prompt payment of UN dues, or for tolerance and respect among sub-national groups—and equally well identify themselves as active participants in Global Action to Prevent War. We welcome support from interested governments because we are seeking to build a worldwide coalition of governments and civil society organizations of all kinds—NGOs, religious groups, schools and universities—a still larger and longer-lived coalition than the one that achieved the Ottawa Treaty Against Anti-Personnel Landmines or the coalition that successfully promoted the International Criminal Court. Both grassroots and governmental effort for change and improvement are needed in many areas.

We have formed Working Groups on many of these topics. They are listed on our website. If you or your organization are interested, please contact the chair and tell them of your interest. If you think that a Working Group or Liaison Group that does not now exist should be established, please let us know! If you do not want to join a working group now, tell us of your interest so we can keep up with your work and put

you in touch with others who are concerned with the same issues. Organizations or individuals that work in any of these areas are urged to become members of Global Action to Prevent War. Those working in areas useful for preventing organized armed conflict but not mentioned in the Global Action plan are asked to send suggestions to the Steering Committee.

In fact, the goals of Global Action to Prevent War are sufficiently diverse that non-governmental organizations and individuals as well as governments all over the world will find useful areas for public education and national political debate. On certain issues, however, transnational mobilization is likely to be most effective. For example, a global campaign supporting the development of rapid response brigades, building on current efforts by the government of Denmark, Norway, and Netherlands and others, would be extremely useful. On issues where the Global Action program calls for steps to be codified in international treaties, national and transnational organizations might press their governments to show leadership by taking a unilateral initiative; governments might turn to NGOs to help to gain public support.

MEMBERSHIP The basic structure for creating a global movement to prevent war is provided by the network of Global Action members, a worldwide association of organizations and individuals who support the general thrust of the Global Action program. This program offers a particularly capacious umbrella for coalition-building: It allows individual and organizational members of the network to work for the diverse goals that particularly concern them while identifying themselves as part of a truly global effort.

The Global Action network welcomes organizations which relate to the Global Action program in different ways. Some groups, such as the Hague Appeal for Peace, Earth Action, or the European Conflict Platform, may resemble Global Action to Prevent War in having multi-issue campaigns. Most groups work for specific goals covered by the overall Global Action platform. This applies, for example, to Abolition 2000 (a coalition advocating the start of government talks on a plan to abolish nuclear weapons), and to the campaigns against landmines and small arms, and to efforts to cut military forces and spending, limit the arms trade, promote education and training in nonviolent conflict resolution, strengthen the UN, or increase the use of the international courts.

Organizational members of Global Action to Prevent War also include organizations and individuals involved in related efforts in fields which would benefit from the success of the Global Action program. These fields include humanitarian aid, refugee relief, economic development, human rights, the environment, economic justice, women's issues, domestic abuse and youth violence, and gun control. In addition, supporters includes businesses seeking stable markets and currencies and peaceful environments for international finance and trade, tourism, and transnational manufacturing industries.

The first step for organizations that are considering membership should be a thorough dissemination and discussion of the program among their members and, where needed, formal agreement by members or boards to endorse the general thrust of the Global Action program.

We urge members of the Global Action to Prevent War coalition to identify themselves as members in their literature, on their web sites, and on their stationery with the phrase “Member of Global Action to Prevent War” or “We support Global Action to Prevent War”—and to give a link to the Global Action website. This small step can have an enormous impact on the progress of the many goals in the Global Action program because it will bring “brand-name” recognition to the campaign, and signal the strength in the numbers of organizations and individuals supporting a pro-active approach to war prevention, with diverse, mutually-reinforcing goals.

At the same time, the Global Action coalition has the potential to bring greater public, political, and financial support to participating organizations without a significant investment of money or personnel time. The reason is that donors, politicians, and members of the public know that separate campaigns that may be too narrowly based to achieve decisive support will develop tremendous potential for success when backed by a large, diverse supporting coalition.

Organizational and individual members can choose their own degree of involvement in Global Action activities. Some members may be content to be on a mailing list and perhaps use the public areas of the Global Action web site. Others will want to be more actively involved in education or lobbying on specific components of the Global Action program (or on the program as whole). Those who are most active will become network nodes for multi-faceted Global Action activity and support.

How Global Action to Prevent War Can Support Your Efforts for Peace

The Global Action coalition will support participating organizations in two ways: it will give support and visibility to existing efforts for war-prevention and disarmament, and it will spur new initiatives that would benefit existing programs. As a member of Global Action, you can:

1. Spread information about your programs. Members can disseminate information about their goals, events, and priorities through the Global Action website.
2. Use the Global Action coalition forums to set priorities, launch initiatives, and debate issues
3. Help shape the overall Global Action program, priorities, literature, and web site: The Global Action International Steering Committee regularly reviews proposals for additions and revisions to the program and related literature. New and old supporters are welcome to submit suggestions at any time via mail, fax, or email (info@globalactionpw.org).

And How You Can Help Build Global Action to Prevent War

There are many ways in which individuals can support Global Action to Prevent War:

1. Become an individual Member.
 2. Permit us to include your name in our published Members lists.
 3. Persuade organizations of which you are a member to become Organizational Members.
 4. Join a working group on a component program of Global Action, or keep us posted on your activities on behalf of a component program.
 5. Disseminate information about Global Action to Prevent War as widely as possible in your community and among your friends, relatives, colleagues, religious and political leaders, and other contacts. Working with other supporters, use public programs, local cable TV, leafleting, petition campaigns, op-ed articles and letters to the editor, newsletters, and mailings to spread the concept.
 7. Lobby any Organizational Member with which you are affiliated to identify itself as a “Member of Global Action to Prevent War”
 8. Work to get government officials and business leaders on board and active in out-reach efforts.
 9. Help form a local, state or national Global Action chapter where you live.
 10. Reach out to organizations active on human rights, environmental affairs, or development to broaden our coalition.
-Or develop your own form of action—but act!

Summary and Overview of the Global Action Program

I. To Prevent Internal War, Genocide and Terrorism, We Must Strengthen Multilateral Means of Resolving Disputes, Protecting Human Rights, and Preventing Armed Conflict.

Strengthen Ways to Monitor Potential Conflicts, Warn of Escalation, Prevent Outbreaks of Armed Violence, and Foster Conflict Resolution.

1. Create Universal-Membership Regional Security Organizations (RSOs) in All Regions.
2. Give the RSOs Means of Preventing and Ending Armed Conflict Like Those of the UN.
3. Adopt a Pro-Active Approach to Conflict Prevention in the Security Council.
4. Create Permanent Centers for Non-Violent Conflict Resolution at the UN and in RSOs.
5. Employ Narrowly Targeted Economic Sanctions and Incentives to Help Prevent and End Armed Conflict and Human Rights Abuses.
6. Create a Conflict Prevention Committee in the UN General Assembly.
7. Create a UN Civilian Humanitarian Aid Corps.
8. Pay UN Dues at the Start of the Fiscal Year to Ensure Full Functioning of the UN System.
9. Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on the Role of Women in Conflict Prevention.

Strengthen Support for Human Rights and the Global Rule of Law

10. Give Automatic Access to Human Rights Monitors.
11. Support the International Criminal Court to Make Individual Leaders Responsible for Major Abuses of Human Rights. (See also item 5 on Sanctions, item 18 on Criteria for Intervention, and item 20 on a Standing UN Police Force.)
12. Create a Convention on Minority Rights.
13. Publicize Failures to Comply with Human Rights Treaties.
14. Deal More Effectively with Terrorism.
15. Israeli-Palestinian Confrontation.
16. Increase Use of the International Court of Justice.
17. Include in New Treaties a Provision for Referring Disputes to the International Court.

Strengthen Multilateral Peacekeeping Capability.

18. Build International Consensus on Criteria for International Intervention within Countries to Prevent Armed Conflict and Domestic Terrorism or to Protect Human Rights.
19. Make Short-Term Improvements in UN Peacekeeping Capabilities.
20. Establish a Standing UN Police Force and RSO Police Forces.
21. Recognize Service in War-Prevention Units as National Service to Meet Conscription Requirements.

(Also relevant to this section are item 5, Employ Targeted Sanctions and Part II, Increase Reliance on UN Peace Enforcement Capabilities.)

Increase the Responsiveness and Accountability of the UN System.

22. Make the UN Security Council More Representative by Expanding Its Membership.
23. Reach Informal Agreement Among the Permanent Five to Use the Veto Sparingly to Enable More Effective Security Council Action Against Armed Conflict.
24. Focus the Efforts of the General Assembly Committee on Security Council Reform on Further Reducing Use of the Veto.
25. Establish New Conflict Prevention Bodies Linked to the Security Council, But Not Subject to the Veto.
26. Give the General Assembly President a Seat on the Security Council.
27. Establish Judicial Review of Security Council Decisions.
28. Create a World Parliamentary Assembly as an Advisory Chamber of the UN.
29. Strengthen the Advisory and Assisting Role of NGOs at the UN.

II: To Prevent International War, We Must in a Phased Process of Disarmament Reduce National Military Forces and Replace Them with Modest UN Forces

Phase I. Take initial steps to reduce the risks of major international war.

A. Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Arms Production and Trade.

30. Begin Talks on Global Cuts in National Military Forces and Spending.
31. Cap Military Forces and Military Spending during the Talks.
32. Conduct a Full and Open Exchange of Information on Military Forces, Spending, and Armaments.
33. Cut Global Production and Trade of Major Weapon and Small Arms by 25 Percent.
34. Promote Democratic Oversight of Military and Security Forces.
35. Implement Carefully Designed Confidence-Building Measures in Specific Conflict Areas.
36. Restrict Economic Benefits from Armed Conflict.
37. Establish a Committee to Resolve Questions Concerning Verification and Elimination of the Armaments Reduced Under this Program.

B. Move Toward Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

38. Continue to Combat Nuclear Proliferation.
39. International Action Against Iraq Should Focus on Inspections.
40. De-Alert Deployed U.S. and Russian Nuclear Weapons to Reduce the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Launch.
41. Reduce U.S. and Russian Nuclear Forces to No More than 1,000 Total (Strategic and Tactical) Warheads Each.
42. Include the Six Remaining Nuclear Weapon States in Talks on Cuts. Seek to Cap Their Arsenals.
43. Limit Missile Defenses; Block the Weaponization of Space.
44. Seek an Effective Compliance Protocol for the Biological Weapons Convention

C. Increase Reliance on UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Enforcement Capabilities.

45. Establish New Mobile Headquarters Units at the UN and a \$500 million Contingency Fund for Rapid Deployment of Peacekeeping Operations.
46. Earmark National Forces for UN Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement.

- 47. Establish Rapid Response Peacekeeping Brigades on Every Continent.
- 48. Take the First Steps to Establish a Standing Volunteer UN Peacekeeping Force.

Phase 2. Make Up to One-Third Cuts in Forces and Spending, with Deeper Cuts in Production and Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms

A. Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Production and Sale of Arms.

- 49. Conclude a Treaty on Global Cuts in Military Forces, Spending, and Major Weapon Systems and Small Arms. Cut 33%, 25%, and 15% in Very Large, Large, and Smaller Forces, Respectively.
- 50. Cut Worldwide Production and Trade in Major Weapons and Small Arms by a Further 50 Percent.

B. Move Toward Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

- 51. Reduce Remaining Nuclear Arms to No More than 100 Warheads in Each Country.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

- 52. Expand the UN Standing Force; Begin to Shift Peacekeeping from National Units to UN and RSO Volunteer Forces and Strengthen Those Forces.
- 53. Create Functioning Military Staff Committees at the UN and in Regional Security Organizations.
- 54. Give the UN Secretary-General Limited Authority to Use UN Police or Peacekeeping Forces.
- 55. Conduct a Global Education Campaign to Promote Support for Timely Decisions to Use UN Conflict-Prevention Machinery.
- 56. Permit the UN to Raise Its Own Funds for Conflict Prevention, Peacekeeping, and Humanitarian Aid.

Phase 3. Trial Ban on Unilateral Military Intervention

A. Reduce National Forces, Military Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

- 57. Begin Talks on Further Cuts in National Military Forces and Spending.

B. Move Toward Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

- 58. Immobilize Remaining Stocks of Nuclear Warheads and Delivery Systems by Placing Them in Internationally Monitored Storage on the Territory of the Owner States.
- 59. Severely Limit All Missiles and All Long-Range Bomber and Attack Aircraft.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

- 60. Make a Provisional Commitment Not to Deploy National Armed Forces Beyond National Borders While Rigorously Testing the Capability of the UN and RSOs to Prevent Armed Conflict.

Phase 4. Transfer Responsibility for Global Security from National to International Institutions

A. Reduce National Military Forces, Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

- 61. Make Further Deep Cuts (33%, 25% and 15%) in National Armed Forces and Military Spending.
- 62. Limit Production of Both Major Weapons and Small Arms to Weapons for UN Forces and for Homeland Defense.

B. Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

63. Eliminate All Remaining Nuclear Weapons After Agreeing to a Stringent Verification System and Contingency Plans for Non-Compliance.

C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RSO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

64. Strengthen UN and RSO Volunteer Forces.
65. Permanently Transfer the Responsibility for Preventing Armed Conflict from Individual Nations to a Global Security System Operated by the UN and Regional Security Organizations.

Phase 5. Limit National Armed Forces to Short-Range Homeland Defense

A. Reduce National Military Forces, Spending and Production and Trade.

66. Limit “Force-Projection” Capabilities to Relatively Small Units Maintained by the UN and Regional Peacekeeping Forces.
67. Convert National Armed Forces Fully to Short-Range Homeland and Non-Offensive Defense.

III. To Foster Support for National Policies of Peace and Disarmament, We Must Promote the Culture of Peace and Individual Programs for Disarmament and Conflict Reduction

Given its comprehensive approach, Global Action supports and participates in activities designed to promote the culture of peace at all levels and disarmament and conflict reduction in all settings. These activities include:

68. Universal education at all levels on non-violent conflict prevention and resolution.
69. Programs to strengthen tolerance and respect for diversity among national sub-groups—ethnic, cultural and religious—and programs opposing political and religious extremism.
70. Programs aimed at reducing violence, including humanitarian aid; refugee relief; economic development; economic justice; human rights; the rights of women and children; prevention of domestic and youth violence; and protection of the environment.
71. Sectoral programs for arms control and disarmament, including limits or bans on nuclear, biological, and chemical weapons, space weapons, conventional armaments (including missiles and aircraft), land mines, small arms, and handguns.
72. Confidence-building, conflict prevention, conflict resolution, and post-conflict rebuilding in specific settings, like the Near East, India-Pakistan, Sudan and Sri Lanka.

International Steering Committee – Global Action to Prevent War

Chair: Saul Mendlovitz
Rutgers University &
World Order Models Project
Newark, New Jersey

Mariano Aguirre
Center for Peace Research
Madrid, Spain

Lois Barber
EarthAction
Amherst, Massachusetts

Walden Bello
Focus on the Global South
Quezon City, Philippines

Alejandro Bendaña
Center for International Studies
Managua, Nicaragua

Jörg Calliess
Evangelische Akademie Loccum
Loccum, Germany

Kevin Clements
International Alert
London, United Kingdom

Merav Datan
Women's International League
for Peace and Freedom
New York, NY

Charles Danquah
Global Action – Ghana
Accra, Ghana

Jonathan Dean
Union of Concerned Scientists
Washington, DC

Nick Dunlop
EarthAction
Kent, United Kingdom

Rolf Ekeus
Stockholm International Peace
Research Institute
Stockholm, Sweden

Randall Caroline Forsberg
Institute for Defense and
Disarmament Studies
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Yong Sup Han
Korean National Defense
University
Seoul, Korea

Felicity Hill
UNIFEM
United Nations Development
Program
New York, New York

Rebecca Johnson
Acronym Institute
London, United Kingdom

Richard Langhorne
Center for Global Change and
Governance
Newark, New Jersey

Patricia Lewis
United Nations Institute for
Disarmament Research
Geneva, Switzerland

Mary Louise Malig
Focus on the Global South
Quezon City, Philippines

Vincent O. Mankanju
PeaceCorps of Nigeria
Ile Ife, Nigeria

Bjørn Møller
Copenhagen Peace Research
Institute
Copenhagen, Denmark

Radmila Nakarada
Institute for European Studies
Belgrade, Yugoslavia

Ricardo Navarro
Friends of the Earth
San Salvador, El Salvador

Olara Otunnu
Special Representative
United Nations
New York, New York

William Pace
World Federalist Movement
New York, New York

Myrna Peña
Department of Disarmament
Affairs
United Nations
New York, New York

Niu Qiang
Peoples Association for Peace
and Disarmament
Beijing, China

Joseph Rotblat
Pugwash Conferences on Sci-
ence and World Affairs
London, United Kingdom

Geneviève Schméder
Conservatoire National des Arts
et Métiers
Paris, France

Vandana Shiva
Research Foundation for
Science, Technology and Nat-
ural Resource Policy
Dhera Dun, India

Ravi Singh
Centre for Pacific Asia Studies
Stockholm University
Stockholm, Sweden

Alejandro Soto
International Affairs, Facultad
de Medicina UANL
Monterrey, Mexico

Majid Tehranian
Toda Institute for Peace
Honolulu, Hawaii

Ramesh Thakur
United Nations University
Tokyo, Japan

Panayotis Tsakonas
Special Advisor to Minister of
Foreign Affairs
Athens, Greece

Carlos Vargas
Interlaw Consultores Juridicos
San Jose, Costa Rica

International Steering Committee – Global Action to Prevent War

Christopher G. Weeramantry
International Court of Justice
The Hague, Netherlands

Bo Wirmark
Christian Social Democrats
Stockholm, Sweden

U.S. Steering Committee – Global Action to Prevent War

James R. Adams
Global Action – San Francisco
San Francisco, CA

Tim Barner
Friends Committee on
National Legislation
Washington, DC

John Burroughs
Lawyers Committee on
Nuclear Policy
New York, NY

Elise Boulding
Sociologist
Needham, MA

Jerome Carlin
Carlin Family Fund
Berkeley, CA

David Cortright
Fourth Freedom Forum
Goshen, IN

Jonathan Dean
Union of Concerned Scientists
Washington, DC

Jock Forbes
World Federalist Association
of New England
Cambridge, MA

Randall Caroline Forsberg
Institute for Defense and
Disarmament Studies
Cambridge, MA

Donald S. Gann
American Friends Service
Committee
Baltimore, MD

Natalie Goldring
University of Maryland
College Park, MD

Jonathan Granoff
Global Security Institute
Bala Cynwyd, PA

Robert C. Johansen
University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, IN

Paul Joseph
Tufts University
Medford, MA

Don Kraus
Campaign for UN Reform
Washington, DC

David Krieger
Nuclear Age Peace Foundation
Santa Barbara, CA

Leonard Merrill Kurz
Kurz Family Foundation
New York, NY

Ann Lakhdir
NGO Committee on
Disarmament
New York, NY

Alfred McAlister
University of Texas-Houston
Houston, TX

Saul Mendlovitz
Rutgers University School
of Law
Newark, NJ

Robert Moore
Coalition for Peace Action,
New Jersey
Princeton, NJ

Betty Reardon
Columbia University Teachers
College
New York, NY

Laura Reed
Five College Program in Peace
and World Security Studies
Amherst, MA

Michael Renner
Worldwatch Institute
Washington, DC

Glen Harold Stassen
Peace Action National Board
Pasadena, CA

Joe Volk
Friends Committee on
National Legislation
Washington, DC

Lucy Webster
Economists Allied for Arms
Reduction
New York, NY

Bill Wickersham
University of Missouri
Columbia, MO

Jim Wurst
UN Wire, United Nations
New York, NY

Why Wait? Join Now!

The current full Global Action to Prevent War program is on the Internet at <http://www.globalactionpw.org>.

YES! Please include me in Global Action to Prevent War as:

- Individual Member *and/or*
- Organizational Member: I/we support the thrust of the program for Global Action to Prevent War.
- Mailing list only: I/we would like to be kept informed about Global Action to Prevent War.

You may include my/our name or organization name in published lists of Global Action members.

You may give my/our mailing address or e-mail address to other members of Global Action to Prevent War, who may want to propose joint activities.

My key peace concerns are:

My organization is active on the following components of the Global Action program:

Issues for which I might like to join a Global Action Working Group:

Please fill out at least your name and a mail or e-mail address. E-mail to: members@globalactionpw.org or mail or fax to a U.S. contact listed below.

Title (e.g., Ms.): Position (e.g., Director):

First Name: Last Name:

Home address

Street Address: City:

Postal Code/Zip Code: State or Province: Country:

Telephone: Country Code: City/Area Code: Telephone:

Fax: E-mail Address:

Organization address

Organization (in English):

Sub-organization (in English):

Street Address: City:

Postal Code/Zip Code: State or Province: Country:

Telephone: Country Code: City/Area Code: Telephone:

Fax: E-mail Address: Web Site:

U.S. Contacts:

Ambassador (ret.) Jonathan Dean, Adviser on International Security Issues, Union of Concerned Scientists, 1707 H Street, NW, 6th Fl., Washington, DC 20006, tel: 202/223-6133; fax: 202/223-6162, e-mail: jdean@ucsusa.org
Dr. Randall C. Forsberg, Institute for Defense and Disarmament Studies, 675 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, tel: 617/354-4337; fax: 617/354-1450, e-mail: forsberg@idds.org
Dr. Saul Mendlovitz, Dag Hammarskjöld Professor of International Law, Rutgers Law School, & Co-Director, World Order Models Project, 123 Washington St., Newark, NJ 07102, tel: 973/353-5516; fax: 973/353-1445.
Dr. John Burroughs, Lawyers Committee on Nuclear Policy, 211 East 43rd St., Suite 1204, New York, NY 10017, tel. 212/818-1861; fax: 212/818-1857, e-mail: johnburroughs@lcnp.org

