

PREVENTING ARMED
VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project
Program Statement 2008-2010



This is the 2008-2010 Global Action to Prevent War 'Program Statement.' Many have contributed their time and effort to its development, most notably Ambassador Jonathan Dean who authored most of the text that follows. We are grateful to Waverly de Bruijn, Saul Mendlovitz, Kavitha Suthanthiraraj, Rens Twijnstra, Robert Zuber and members of the GAPW U.S. and International Steering Committees for their many contributions. Thank you also to John Burroughs and Michael Spies from the Lawyers' Committee on Nuclear Policy, Jim Wurst from Middle Powers Initiative, Rhianna Tyson from Global Security Institute and Ray Acheson from WILF's Reaching Critical Will Project for their input. Special appreciation is given to Vanessa de Bruijn for her layout and design work.

Table of Contents

Preventing Armed Violence and Ending War: The Global Action to Prevent War Project.....	1
The Need, the Context and the Opportunity for Change.....	6
Program Summary.....	13
Program Priorities 2008-2010.....	14
The Global Action Program	
I. Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism	
Introduction.....	19
A. Prevention and Resolution Mechanisms.....	20
B. Global Rule of Law	26
C. Multilateral Peacekeeping.....	31
D. UN Responsiveness and Accountability.....	34
II. Preventing International War Through Disarmament	
Introduction.....	38
Phase 1	40
Phase 2.....	51
Phase 3.....	55
Phase 4.....	58
Phase 5.....	60
III. Building a Culture of Peace.....	62
The Root Causes of War.....	65
A Plan for Action: Goals for a Global Movement.....	66
Annex: The Condensed Global Action Program Points.....	71

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

Large-scale violence of the past century is well documented: over 200 million people were killed in 250 wars and genocidal onslaughts. At the same time, humanity now faces a remarkable and unprecedented situation: war between the great powers is increasingly unthinkable. Yet world military expenditures continue to rise, consuming nearly a trillion dollars a year, most of which has no plausible relevance to security. This spending constitutes, in the words of Dwight D. Eisenhower, a massive “theft from those who are hungry and are not fed, those who are cold and are not clothed.”

As the threat of cross-border wars between major powers has subsided, genocides and internal armed conflict continue to cut down lives, sweep away the painstaking work of human hands and minds, and sear survivors with crippling wounds and deep personal loss. Although the number of conflicts and overall rate of war deaths have declined since World War II, there has recently been massive loss of life in Darfur, in the Eastern Congo, in South Lebanon, and in other parts of the world. Such crises require more effective systems of violence prevention and peacekeeping, not the continued maintenance of expensive and obsolete military institutions and armaments.

Preparation for conflict, let alone conflict itself, obstructs efforts to get at the roots of structural violence, including poverty, economic inequity, social injustice, environmental degradation, and discrimination based on race, gender, ethnicity, and religion. That is why Global Action to Prevent War (Global Action, GAPW) deliberately focuses its resources and energy on efforts to remove these obstructions through preventing, constraining and ultimately eliminating armed conflict. We know that controlling and eliminating armed violence is only one aspect of creating and sustaining an enduring peace, and we support many groups and programs combating poverty, social and economic injustice, and environmental degradation. At the same time, we believe that concentrating our finite resources on preventing armed violence enhances the effectiveness of our contribution to the goals and objectives of the movement towards a just peace worldwide. (See the discussion on “The Root Causes of War,” pp. 65.) ●●●

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

Global Action to Prevent War is a comprehensive project for making armed conflict increasingly rare. The program is divided into three main strands of activity:

I The first component 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 the UN and other multilateral organizations. This component aims to reduce internal conflict of all kinds.



II The second component is a phased program of global disarmament, both conventional and nuclear, accompanied by the deliberate and systematic augmentation of the peacekeeping capabilities of regional and international organizations. The objectives here are to reduce the possibility of interstate war, genocide and internal armed conflict and gradually to shift the responsibility for international security to multilateral peacekeeping and other institutions under international law.



III We recognize that measures for the prevention of war cannot be effective without practical activities initiated by neighborhoods and communities worldwide. Consequently, the third component of the GAPW program consists of ongoing support for what has become known as the 'culture of peace.' Here, we join with partners worldwide to prevent armed conflict by breaking the cycles of violence and hatred, and of religious and racial prejudice, that often fuel armed conflict, genocide, and crimes against humanity.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

Implementation of the GAPW program will help to reduce armed conflict and organized armed violence: For internal conflicts, including acts of terrorism, which usually have local beginnings, we propose a broad array of conflict prevention and conflict resolution measures to be undertaken by the UN, by regional cooperation and security organizations (ROs), by international courts, and by local organizations and schools.

Regarding terrorism, radical Islamist extremism that advocates violence (including deliberate murder of civilians) on a global scale is the ideological core of much present terrorist activity, even though it represents the viewpoint of only a tiny fraction of all Muslims, most of whom reject armed violence of any kind. GAPW believes that combating this kind of terrorism should be conducted as a police action against criminals, not as a war. The main emphasis should be placed on closing off the flow of new recruits through addressing the political grievances that mobilize many to join their ranks – among them, corrupt and ineffective national governments, injustice for Palestinian people, and the continuing occupation of Iraq – as well as by de-legitimizing extremist ideology and providing economic justice, jobs and free secular education for young people of both sexes. The use of intimidation and violence by states consolidating power or oppressing dissent must also be labeled and addressed as ‘state terrorism.’ (See step 16 “Deal More Effectively with Terrorism” in the Global Action Program below, page 30.)

To prevent conflicts between neighboring states, GAPW proposes force reductions, defensively-oriented shifts in force structures, 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, we propose deliberately increasing their cooperation in preventing smaller wars while making step-by-step cuts in their own

conventional and nuclear forces, ultimately eliminating their capacity to attack each other with any chance of success.

Timing: We envisage implementing the GAPW program over the next **three to four decades**, divided into four phases of five to ten years each. The measures included within the disarmament component of the Global Action program are by necessity treaty-based as they represent commitments of governments to reduce their armed forces. However, improvements in UN and regional mechanisms for conflict prevention and peacekeeping as well as diverse activities to promote a culture of peace are ongoing processes over the life of the program and are less suited to be divided into specific phases.

The Global Action program provides both an overall strategy and a detailed plan of action with 68 individual steps and measures. Many people long to see a more peaceful world, but most of us realize that this cannot be achieved merely by wishing it. Some program of action is needed, and that program has to be detailed and specific. The different steps advocated by GAPW fit with one another and strengthen the whole. It is not enough to call for effective peacekeeping, for the development of an international security system, or for disarmament without showing in practical terms how these large objectives can be achieved, and achieved together.

For that reason, the Program Statement of Global Action to Prevent War offers not only an integrated approach to preventing armed conflict, but also an inventory of detailed measures or actions to implement that approach. We understand that implementing these measures requires constant sensitivity to changing dynamics within the

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

OVERVIEW

international security regime as well as within Member States. At the same time, we must pay close attention to a multiplicity of global economic, military, and political actors all competing for center stage. The reason for this level of detail—and the test of this Program Statement—is that we want readers to come away convinced that, if the proposed actions were carried out, this could in fact help in mitigating war and other large-scale armed conflict.

The Global Action program to prevent, constrain, and, ultimately to eliminate armed conflict is ambitious. Aided by technological innovation in weapons and weapon platforms, the entire international system has become progressively militarized since the age of colonial expansion. But we also recognize that substantial progress towards durable peace has been made over the past two hundred years since the victor governments of the Napoleonic Wars deliberately cooperated to keep the post-war peace, and since civil society organizations dedicated to combating war first emerged. The resulting interaction between government and civil society has provided the impetus for an increasing flow of global and regional measures to constrain armed violence, including treaties restricting military armaments and activities, structures to help prevent conflict, and the development of international peacekeeping operations.

By the early years of the 21st century, these measures had resulted in a sharp decrease in the number of armed conflicts, including both internal and interstate wars, and in war dead. Cooperative interaction between civil society and governments to control armed violence has found increasingly effective institutional expression in the United Nations, the Eu-

ropean Community, and many other multilateral institutions. This has led in turn to the gradual emergence of a global security system. There is every indication that the process of building this global security system will continue—unevenly, but in the same positive direction—until success is achieved. In spite of daily reports of armed violence, the long-term outlook is positive. Colleagues and partners of Global Action to Prevent War and supporters of the measures we propose are on the winning side. We are not futilely beating at the waves of an endless river of human tragedy. Instead, we are making an enduring contribution to an increasingly effective process of constraining armed violence.

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

The GAPW program is a work in progress. The current phase is one of strengthening and disseminating basic concepts and strategies and developing partnerships with groups conducting peace and security-related activities worldwide.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

Concerned individuals around the world are invited to make suggestions for policy or action, take part in the steps outlined herein, and report local activities for inclusion on the GAPW website:

www.globalactionpw.org.

The GAPW secretariat and international and national steering committees periodically publish updated versions of relevant program materials to help us accomplish our goals together. GAPW seeks to achieve its highest priority program components through both informal and structured working groups composed of individuals, organizations, members of national governments and representatives to the UN.

The goal of this process is to support and supplement the many efforts for peace already under way by adding important policy

and capacity elements and helping to unite all components in a common, integrated program.

Our communications and policy networks can reinforce existing projects and facilitate joint efforts.

Sustained, coordinated efforts can stop the killing—and the GAPW program has the potential to mobilize and focus such efforts. This does not mean that the ambitious goals stated in this Program Statement can be achieved quickly. Building support for the program has already taken several years, and achieving the objectives of the first program phase will take some years more. But what is important is the real prospect of profound change within a generation to which the strategies and activities of GAPW and our many partners point.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

The Need

Impelled by both civil society and governmental pressures, the UN has made many important improvements in conflict prevention capacity. Peacekeeping has been reorganized and more efficiently structured, though problems in training, deployment and troop conduct persist. A new Human Rights Council has been formed to take human rights forward into the 21st century, replacing the controversial Human Rights Commission (although the early phases of the Council's work were also criticized as biased). The General Assembly has approved the evolving norm of the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which establishes standards for international response in instances where states are failing or civilians are subject to widespread violence and abuse. However, R2P has no implementation tools at present and the Security Council has been slow to apply the concept to the ongoing crisis in Darfur. A new post-conflict Peacebuilding Commission has already begun to tackle the sensitive matter of assuring that ceasefires are transformed into enduring peace, with more success to report in its pilot efforts in Sierra Leone than in Burundi.

Despite these important steps, the UN and its Member States are still failing to prevent many new outbreaks of armed conflict. Tens of millions, most of them civilians, have been killed in wars and armed conflicts since the end of World War II. In the last decade alone, between seventeen and twenty eight armed conflicts were waged at any one time, almost all of them inside national boundaries. In addition to the tragic loss of life and the vengeful hatred that often lasts for many lifetimes and fuels additional violence, these conflicts breed international terrorism and have huge economic costs.

Efforts during the 2005 General Assembly Summit to agree on provisions covering nuclear weapons were a disappointing failure. Participants could not agree whether to give priority to nuclear disarmament or to non-proliferation and consequently could not even agree on a single sentence to be included in the final report. The Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament, moreover, has not reached a single substantive decision since 1996. The disarmament obligation contained in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty is not being implemented. In fact, the five Nuclear Weapon States recognized in the Treaty are actively violating its provisions by modernizing their arsenals.

War's damage to productive economic activity is immense, lasting for decades, sometimes generations, and greatly multiplying the human costs of conflict. Beyond that, force levels maintained worldwide 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.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

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

Global Action to Prevent War rejects this assumption. The capacity for individuals to inflict physical violence on each other is probably innate. However, so too is our capacity for cooperation and reconciliation. Organized violence is, in our view, largely learned behavior. It is learned from instructors, on the training ground, in the guerrilla camp, and in the staff college. It is reinforced in the media, in schools, and in congregations with extremist religious views and values 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 the resort to war more difficult through improved conflict prevention and disarmament measures.



NEED, CONTEXT AND OPPORTUNITY

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

The Context

The GAPW program calls for strengthening international institutions for conflict prevention while sharply reducing national armed forces and shifting responsibility for decisions regarding the deployment of armed forces to a reformed UN Security Council. At the heart of our program is a strategy which is straightforward, but which, once carried out, would change the dynamics of the international security system. The GAPW strategy is to build up multilateral capacity to keep the peace while simultaneously building down national armed forces until a point is reached where national forces are capable only of defending their own territory and cannot go beyond it. Multilateral forces are built up until they are large and capable enough to keep the peace among states and also within them if a reformed Security Council so decides. Once implemented, this strategy would virtually eliminate the possibility of interstate war while also creating an effective conflict-prevention structure to limit internal conflicts.

The specific steps Global Action proposes for the build-down of national forces include: Two-thirds reduction of the armed forces of the major powers, with proportionately smaller reductions for smaller powers; the elimination and prohibition of nuclear weapons, including their delivery systems; the end of arms production and arms transfers except for the limited amount needed for defense within national borders and for multilateral forces; elimination of force projection equipment—large aircraft and ships—for national armed forces; and a formal commitment by all UN Member States not to use armed force except for self defense within national borders or for peace enforcement as ordered by the Security Council. This comprehensive commitment would be for a designated trial period to test the capacity of multilateral forces to keep the peace.

The buildup of multilateral peacekeeping capability includes the strengthening of regional cooperation and security organizations and their establishment in regions which do not now have them. Ideally, this process would precede the negotiated build-down of national forces described in the previous paragraph. In our program, the membership of the Security Council would become more representative. We suggest ten new Permanent Members without veto. Except for cases involving their own national territory, the five permanent Council members with a veto would commit themselves to suspend the use of the veto for a five year trial period to test the capacity of the reformed Council. A standing volunteer, rapid-deployment UN Emergency Peacekeeping Service (UNEPS) would be established (approximately 15,000 personnel) and subsequently expanded until it could deal with all plausible contingencies. There would be rapid response peacekeeping units in every region as well. Functioning military staffs at the UN and in regional cooperation and security centers would train and direct these forces.

Under our program, in order to forestall the excessive growth of UN-based authority, there would be judicial review of Security Council decisions

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

by the International Court of Justice triggered by a vote of at least one-third of the members of the General Assembly. A UN Parliamentary Assembly would also be created, whose duties would include assuring civilian control over UN and regional peacekeeping forces. The international court system would be strengthened and states would commit themselves to accept its jurisdiction.

The result of these measures would be an effective multilateral authority responsible for worldwide security, but not mandated to exercise authority on economic, financial or social issues. This is not a plan for world government, but for world security.

This Global Action Program suggests strategies for carrying out the essential elements of the commitment to general and complete disarmament contained in the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty. It would at the same time gradually transform the present international system, shifting decision-making on international security issues away from the big powers to a responsible, accountable and renewable body in which larger states still participated, but without the dominant authority they now possess. The rule of law would be enhanced. The objective, step-by-step, is to end war and all forms of armed conflict by building an effective and democratically controlled global security system.

This objective is the organizing core of the Global Action to Prevent War project and the peace and security proposals advanced by GAPW in collaboration with partners and colleagues worldwide working to bring them about.

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 United Nations the responsibility for decisions to use armed force for other purposes.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

The Opportunity

Today, all those interested in peace and security issues 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 and economic powers (the United States, Russia, Brazil, France, Germany, Great Britain, India, Japan, and China), while not always cordial, have created an opportunity for cooperation to strengthen UN and regional conflict prevention 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 peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations.

The current opportunity to remake the international security system could wane. Unless bold, preventive action is taken soon, we could see renewed armed confrontation between the most heavily armed nations. Moreover, the number of nuclear powers is rising and new nations are poised to seek out and acquire nuclear and other armaments that neighboring countries will find highly threatening. While there is no near-term risk of a major world war, now is the time to deal with current threats and prevent the rise of new ones.

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

- Confidence-building and arms control measures, such as information exchanges (transparency), mutual constraints on force deployments and activities, negotiated reductions in armed forces, and restrictions on arms holdings, production, and trade.
- 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 strategies.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project



NEED, CONTEXT AND OPPORTUNITY

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 conceptual framework.

In the early 1960s, the United States and the Soviet Union each proposed plans for general and complete disarmament, with national forces to be replaced by UN forces. Those ideas were too radical for the times, and they were eventually shelved in favor of separate programs for limited arms controls 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.

The comprehensive approach we advocate would 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 exists that can actually prevent war, people and governments will eagerly champion it.

Once enacted, the GAPW program 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 cooperation and 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 deep global reductions in national nuclear and conventional armed forces and a binding commitment not to send armed forces beyond national borders except under the authority of the UN or as mandated by the relevant regional cooperation and security organization.

By significantly lowering the worldwide level of armed conflict and greatly reducing the size of the world's largest conventional military forces, the GAPW program will help to create an environment more conducive to the final elimination of all nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons. Nuclear disarmament and far-reaching conventional disarmament, which must be promoted simultaneously and independently, facilitate one another. Progress on both types of disarmament would be greatly enhanced by verification and enforcement of controls, particularly on biological, chemical, nuclear and space-based weapons and on ground, air, and naval weapon delivery systems.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

NEED, CONTEXT AND OPPORTUNITY

When implemented, this program will make war increasingly rare, saving untold lives. At the same time, by increasing respect for human dignity and saving billions of dollars for productive uses, GAPW can contribute to the reduction of structural violence within and among nations, strengthening efforts to meet basic human needs, build tolerance, and protect the environment. This changed military, economic, and cultural context will foster the democratic institutions that must ultimately replace armed force in achieving justice, meeting human needs, and mitigating conditions that give rise to terrorism and other armed violence.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project Program Summary

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 UN and regional cooperation and security institutions; second, a phased program to reduce armaments and the use of force through a series of steps that would create a global security system based on the joint efforts of the UN, regional security organizations, with active participation of NGOs, and individual national governments; and third, ongoing support for the development of a 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 GAPW 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 through national

forces, but they will be smaller in size. This objective requires serious, sustained programs for progressively augmenting the military capability of multilateral organizations, primarily the UN and regional cooperation and security organizations.

Some people are uneasy over the prospect of increasing the UN's military capability. Unless we accomplish this in a manner that inspires confidence, 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, with a few big states calling the tune in accordance with shifting perceptions of their national interests instead of the interest of the world community. The Global Action Program calls for a democratized decision-making process, with judicial safeguards against the emergence of authoritarian trends. It also calls for the eventual systematic reduction of the peacekeeping forces of multilateral organizations as their efforts and the overall global program succeed in making armed conflict increasingly rare.



The GAPW program is described in detail below. To guide our own activity, we have selected some measures from the Program Statement that we believe deserve priority treatment at least through 2010. They are listed here. We encourage other individuals and organizations to join us in addressing these priorities or to select other points of emphasis from our Program Statement. Either way, we hope that you will communicate with us about steps you and your organization are taking to bring about an end to war. We also welcome links to additional organizations working on one or more of the peace and disarmament activities listed below.

Priority 1

Strengthen the UN's Ability to Respond Quickly and Effectively to Massive Loss of Life by Establishing an Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS). Despite the need at times to move quickly to prevent genocide, ethnic cleansing, and crimes against humanity, the United Nations has no reliable rapid response capacity that can address the early stages of severe human rights violations and potentially save thousands of lives. Global Action to Prevent War, along with a number of other international organizations, is working to help the UN fill this gap. We have proposed the creation of a standing, individually recruited, gender sensitive, integrated, rapidly deployable United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS) to provide effective, prevention-based response to genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and natural disasters. UNEPS would be designed to deploy within 48 hours of authorization to stabilize a potentially dangerous emergency situation. While a UNEPS deployment is under way, the UN would gain more time both to pursue political solutions and to find the necessary resources and personnel needed to organize a longer-term and more permanent operation as needed. However, we believe that a timely UNEPS deployment could manage many crises entirely, thus reducing the need for expensive, lengthy, complementary peacekeeping operations.

UNEPS would initially consist of 15,000-18,000 civilian, police, and military professionals expertly trained on genocide and conflict prevention. The service would have mobile field headquarters and would act preventively, stopping a conflict before it escalates into a full-scale humanitarian disaster. Because the Service would be individually recruited from citizens worldwide, the effectiveness of UNEPS would not be impacted by the unwillingness of Member States to deploy portions of their own armed forces in times of crisis. The prolonged delays typical of the current process of force generation for UN Peacekeeping operations would be avoided, and the chance that a conflict would escalate to uncontrollable levels would be significantly reduced.



Priority 2

Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. In 2000, the Security Council recognized the important role of women in conflict prevention through Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, emphasizing 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 includes specific recommendations on the role of women in conflict prevention. In June 2008 the Security Council took further steps to recognize the impact of armed conflict on women with the adoption of Resolution 1820 on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

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 an increased flow of information about the impact of armed conflicts on women, about general issues in armed conflicts, and the role of women in peace efforts. Fact-finding missions should always investigate gendered consequences of the situation to understand how women are being impacted; and women's groups and advocates should always be consulted and engaged in those missions.

As a member of the NGO Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security, GAPW is part of a highly focused effort to effectively implement gender mainstreaming, make space for the election of women to leadership roles at the United Nations, in national-level work, conduct research and make policy that incorporates gender into its analysis. GAPW advocates for the creation of a Security Council mechanism for monitoring the implementation of Resolution 1325. This mechanism could take the form of the SC Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict, established through Resolution 1612 (2005) or become an operational focal point on Women, Peace and Security and Sexual and Gender-Based Violence.

Priority 3

Negotiate Deep Cuts in Conventional (Non-Nuclear) Forces and in Conventional Arms Production through a Global UN Conference. This is a major priority in the GAPW program. Deep cuts in conventional forces and in arms production will move toward demilitarization of the international system, decrease the possibility of interstate and internal armed conflict, and move toward fulfilling Global Action's aim of building down national forces while building up multilateral peacekeeping forces.

The aim of the proposed global conference will be to promote fulfillment of Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty calling for general and complete disarmament. The main objectives should be to agree:

- To a comprehensive exchange of data on armed forces, including current levels of military personnel, budgets, arms holdings and arms production
- Not to increase the levels of national armed forces covered in the data exchange while reduction negotiations continue, or, if a majority of participants so decide, for a fixed period of ten years
- To cut production of major weapons
- Adopt a mutually acceptable method of reducing armed forces

Our priorities within this area are the aforementioned first and second steps – conducting a comprehensive data exchange and freezing the current level of forces. Details are below, beginning with step 27.

The UN Disarmament Commission has been trying for many years to gain agreement to convene a conference of this kind, but has been blocked by the nuclear weapon states. It is time to move forward on this task.



Priority 4

Prevent Collapse of the Non-Proliferation Regime. Current threats to the Non-Proliferation regime are the byproduct of many factors, including 1) moves by the North Korean and Iranian governments to develop nuclear capabilities; 2) the nuclear weapons policy of the U.S. administration which proclaims readiness to use nuclear weapons for a wide range of purposes including prevention and preemption, refuses to sign the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty, and is intent on undermining negotiation of a treaty to end production of fissile material for weapons and 3) continuation of high alert status of nuclear weapons by the U.S. and Russia that increase the risk of accidental or unauthorized U.S. and Russian launch. These factors create increasing threats of use and proliferation of nuclear weapons. While addressing these threats, we must continue to insist that non-proliferation and disarmament obligations be directly linked at all times. The most urgent actions that we recommend are designed to both reduce the dangers of current arsenals and strengthen the non-proliferation regime:

- De-alert U.S. and Russian arsenals
- Nullify strategies and policies that increase the possibility that nuclear weapons will be used
- Ratify the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty
- Negotiate a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty
- Negotiate transparency, openness and full scope safeguards of all nuclear facilities by Iran while permitting peaceful use of nuclear energy
- Dismantle North Korean nuclear capability

This approach emphasizes that containment, not war, is the proper strategy for dealing with attempts to break out of non-proliferation obligations. Containment is flexible, permitting shifts from negotiations to sanctions, and advocating the use of force only if force is used by the would-be violators.

Reader's Note

As a matter of urgency, GAPW joins with partners in peace worldwide in urging an end to the War in Iraq.

Specifically, we call for a maximum two-year deadline to be established for the orderly withdrawal of all US forces and military bases. At the same time, we call for an expanded UN presence in Iraq including the following elements: a robust UN transitional force; a major regional conference of Iraq's neighbors to contribute to the stabilization of both the current Shia government and the region as a whole; the facilitation of both expanded power-sharing discussions and the fair and equitable distribution of national oil revenues.

Moreover, we support recent efforts within the UN and among the major powers to restart the peace process leading to an independent Palestinian State conforming to the 1967 borders of Israel. This would include both states participating in the governance of Jerusalem; the return or compensation for Palestinian refugees; and security assurances and the demilitarization of both sides. All of this will be implemented in part through peacekeeping and development financing with a major implementing role

played by the United Nations.

Furthermore, continued and increasing incidences of crimes against humanity are being committed in the Darfur region of Sudan, the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Sri Lanka, Myanmar (Burma) and elsewhere. These must be resolved through collective international action including new tools to enhance collective security and an expanded commitment to political engagement. These major conflicts cannot be ignored. GAPW along with the broadest possible coalition of organizations and individuals must exert pressure on UN Member States to stop the violence and build a more enduring peace.

This concludes the current list of GAPW priorities. The revised 2008-2010 GAPW program is laid out in the pages that follow. 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 at the end of this statement restates the numbered proposals in brief, summary form.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

The Global Action Program

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

Introduction

With the Cold War ended, the horrors of internal war, genocide, and terrorism have to some extent replaced fears of great power war and other international wars as a priority for international conflict prevention. Many steps to strengthen global and regional capabilities to prevent and end internal wars, genocide, and other large-scale armed violence have already taken place. Others are urgently needed, and eminently feasible. Since some of the proposed policies and institutions already exist in some form, Global Action to Prevent War's own work builds on a host of positive recent developments.

The main bodies 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 cooperation and 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.

For the most part, the steps proposed here to strengthen the UN's ability to prevent internal war and genocide do not require amendment of the UN Charter—an extremely difficult process that could take many years. Once the more immediate initial steps outlined below are achieved, more far-reaching steps that would require Charter amendment should be pursued.

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

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

1



Create Democratic, Universal-Membership Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations (ROs) in All Regions, Tasked with the Prevention and Resolution of Conflict. The UN Secretary-General, the Security Council, and UN Member States should jointly develop a program to complement and strengthen the mediation and peacekeeping capabilities of existing regional cooperation and security organizations such as the European Union (EU), the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE), the Organization of American States (OAS), the African Union (AU), and the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN). Measures such as the AU's Mechanism for Conflict Prevention, Management and Resolution have made strides in broadening this capacity. At the same time, the international community should systematically promote the creation of new universal-membership ROs 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 regional cooperation and security organizations covering all parts of the world expand their capacity, especially in the rapid deployment area, and form a coherent whole, coordinated within the UN system.

ROs will be most valuable when they have the means of preventing and ending armed conflict as a complement to expanded UN capacities. The means available to the organizations for preventing armed conflict and terrorism within their region should include methods of mediation and reconciliation, human rights and judicial machinery, and unarmed monitoring and observation units, as well as well-trained peacekeeping units. Present and future regional organizations should also be open to membership by all countries in the region, excluding none, with oversight from a directly elected UN Parliamentary Assembly. (See step 24, "Create a World Parliamentary Assembly.")

2



Adopt a Pro-Active Approach to Conflict Prevention in the Security Council. Ongoing decisions by the Council to undertake a pro-active conflict prevention role are a necessity for effective avoidance of armed conflict and terrorism. The Security Council acknowledged this role with the adoption of Resolution 1366 (2001) which "Expresses its determination to pursue the objective of prevention of armed conflict as an integral part of its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security." Additionally, the adoption of the "Responsibility to Protect" principle at the World Summit in 2005 further codified this preventive focus (See step 9 "Promote Active Application of the Responsibility to Protect Principle—Build it into an Accepted Principle of International Law," page 26). While there have been instances where members of the Permanent

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

Five exercised their veto rights when unwilling to intervene in an early or timely fashion, there is growing acceptance among the permanent members of the need for conflict prevention. This is due in part to the realization that effective prevention can help avoid situations where the P5 will face heavy pressure from other Member States and from public opinion to support expensive, longer-term peacekeeping operations or other military intervention measures, which they often oppose even more stringently.

The key to effective preventive action is timely, reliable and insistent-ly repeated information about deteriorating situations that make it difficult for busy governments to suppress awareness of these situations and turn to other issues. The UN has made new commitments in planning, organization, and professional staffing, such as the Security Council Ad-Hoc Working Group on Conflict Prevention and Resolution in Africa, and Special Advisers to the Secretary-General on both the Prevention of Genocide and Mass Atrocities, and the Responsibility to Protect. These high-level positions will hopefully help ensure that the Council is briefed regularly on the emergence of potentially dangerous or deteriorating situations. Additionally, the Security Council would invite government representatives to appear before it, reinforcing to the governments concerned and the world public at large the degree to which violence was becoming a threat to international security, and would warn the governments of the probable future consequences of ongoing violence. The Council could also advise on possible solutions and, on occasion, offer assistance in the form of expert personnel and financial resources to carry out these solutions. The Council has ample authority for these actions in the United Nations Charter under Chapter VI: The Pacific Settlement of Disputes.

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 step 5 “Employ Narrowly Targeted Economic Sanctions and Incentives to Help Prevent and End Armed Conflict and Human Rights Abuses,” page 24) preventive deployment of a UN Emergency Peace Service (See step 18 “Move Toward Establishing a United Nations Emergency Peace Service,” page 32) or other more robust peacekeeping operations if the governments concerned were prepared to receive it (Chapter VI). As a last extreme measure, there could be deployment of peace enforcement forces without agreement of the government concerned (Chapter VII).

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

3

Promote the UN Peacebuilding Commission. The newly established UN Peacebuilding Commission (PBC) was convened on June 23, 2006. It is the most recent specialized body to be added to the UN repertoire as a result of the 2005 UN World Summit and following ongoing pressure on member state governments from civil society. The PBC is an unusual UN agency; it is an intergovernmental advisory body created by concurrent resolutions of the Security Council and the General Assembly. Its main task is to focus the attention and resources of the international community and all relevant actors, including international financial institutions, diverse UN agencies and relevant ROs on rebuilding societies and states weakened by armed conflict and to prevent them from relapsing into violence, as was the case of Congo and Timor-Leste. A small Peacebuilding Support Office (PBSO) has been established in the UN Secretariat to assist the work of the PBC and advise the Secretary-General on how to equip the UN system with effective peacebuilding capabilities. A modest Peacebuilding Fund (PBF) (currently \$2.5 million, with some multi-year donations) provides critical short-term support and rapid-disbursement to address peacebuilding gaps. The PBC Organizational Committee, which provides policy direction, is composed of 31 UN Member States.

The PBC decided to limit itself initially to two specific cases, Sierra Leone and Burundi. In December 2007, it expanded its focus to include a third country, Guinea-Bissau and could expand this number further. The PBC can also make general comments and recommendations on UN post-conflict activities through its Working Group on Lessons Learned and through the PBSO's Best Practices section.

The PBC's added value lies in its potential to draft an Integrated Peacebuilding Strategy (IPBS) for a specific post-conflict country. The guiding principles of the Strategy are the national ownership of the peacebuilding process; maintaining flexible and accessible working methods to consult with all relevant actors on the ground (including civil society, especially women's organizations and the private sector); and refraining from duplicating existing strategies already in place. After its first year of operation, although no IPBSs were finalized due to disagreement about integrating monitoring and tracking mechanisms, the Commission has made considerable progress, especially in Sierra Leone.

Owing in part to the belief of some Member States that explicit Commission involvement in conflict prevention could open the door to interference in the internal affairs of Member States, the Peacebuilding Commission is not authorized to engage in conflict prevention at times when a fragile state that has already been ravaged teeters on the brink of destructive conflict. However, since preventing a state already ravaged by conflict from relapsing into conflict is in practice conflict prevention, the

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

Commission does have the potential to develop into a useful and effective UN conflict prevention mechanism over time.

Global Action will join other NGOs in closely following and supporting the Peacebuilding Commission, advocating for more inclusive and accessible Civil Society engagement both at the international level and in the field, and reaffirming the need for comprehensive peacebuilding-specific indicators in IPBS monitoring mechanisms.

4



Create Permanent Centers for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution at the UN and in Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. Permanent Centers for conflict, early warning, prevention, and nonviolent conflict resolution could make a major contribution to the prevention of armed conflict and genocide. A Center for Nonviolent Conflict Prevention and Resolution (CNCPR) at the UN and comparable Centers housed in Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations should each be staffed by a professional corps of trained regional and mediation specialists. These career specialists with diplomatic status would collect and analyze information about potential trouble spots, including those that could lead to terrorist outbreaks, and employ proven methods of conflict prevention and resolution. Specialists would be sent out individually or in small teams to areas where conflict might develop, 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 real prospects of armed violence. All UN Member States would commit themselves to receiving specialists on their territory and to facilitating their stay. Over time, members of the corps would achieve growing international prestige, respect and influence.

The professional specialists should be supplemented by highly qualified volunteer personnel, resourced perhaps from participants in the UN Volunteers Program, and representatives drawn from the world's religions, academic institutions, business and professional communities, and NGOs. Updated rosters of 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 Cooperation and Security Organizations.

In addition, 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.

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

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. Sanctions should be structured to avoid adverse humanitarian impact on vulnerable populations living within the target regime. Instead, they should be narrowly targeted “smart sanctions” directed 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. The Security Council should utilize their Informal Working Group on General Issues on Sanctions and the Sanctions Committee under Resolution 1267 to determine how to promote the effective enforcement of targeted sanctions, such as through implementation under domestic law and stronger reporting guidelines.

6 ●●●

Strengthen Emphasis on Conflict Prevention in the UN General Assembly. In order to enhance General Assembly Resolution 337 on the Prevention of Armed Conflict (2003), 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 is available through the Security Council. The committee work would not be subject to the veto and could set its own agenda by majority vote, supplementing 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 and Security Council. It would be particularly appropriate to share findings with the General Assembly’s First Committee on Disarmament and International Security. It might not be possible to avoid completely some degree of competition between this General Assembly committee and the Security Council, but at this stage, where the Security Council is often reluctant to act, the competition might be helpful.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

7 ●●●

Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security. In 2000, the Security Council recognized the important role of women in conflict prevention through Resolution 1325 on Women, Peace and Security, emphasizing 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 includes specific recommendations on the role of women in conflict prevention. In June 2008 the Security Council took further steps to recognize the impact of armed conflict on women with the adoption of Resolution 1820 on Sexual Violence in Conflict.

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 an increased flow of information about the impact of armed conflicts on women, about general issues in armed conflicts, and the role of women in peace efforts. Fact-finding missions should always investigate gendered consequences of the situation to understand how women are being impacted; and women's groups and advocates should always be consulted and engaged in those missions.

As a member of the NGO Working Group on Women, Peace, and Security, GAPW is part of a focused effort to effectively implement gender mainstreaming, make space for the election of women to leadership roles at the United Nations and in national-level work, and conduct research and make policy that incorporates gender into its analysis. GAPW advocates for the creation of a Security Council mechanism for monitoring the implementation of Resolution 1325. This mechanism could take the form of the SC Working Group on Children and Armed Conflict, established through Resolution 1612 (2005) or become operational as a focal point on Women, Peace and Security and Sexual and Gender-Based Violence.

8 ●●●

Establish Cabinet-Level Departments or Ministries of Peace in the Governments of Each UN Member State. We support the campaign for establishing a Department or Ministry of Peace in governments worldwide with basic functions to foster a culture of peace domestically; to facilitate peaceful conflict resolution, prevention of violence, the promotion of justice, human security, and democratic principles to expand human rights; to research, articulate and help bring about non-violent solutions to conflicts at all levels, domestic and international; and to provide resources for training in peace-building and conflict transformation to governments and people everywhere. To this end, we applaud the creation of a Department of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace in the Solomon Islands and the Ministry for Peace and Reconstruction in Nepal.

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

Strengthen Support for Human Security, Human Rights and the Global Rule of Law

9



Promote Active Application of the Responsibility to Protect Concept – Build It into an Implemented Principle of International Law. Inclusion of the Responsibility to Protect concept in the epoch-making Resolution 60/1 of the 2005 UN World Summit marked an important success for dedicated Civil Society organizations and proponents of human rights, who developed this idea through painstaking study and years of difficult promotion. Support for this resolution was obtained by a consensus vote of all members of the General Assembly, including all five permanent members of the Security Council. This resolution's description of violence and human rights abuses against civilians and its definition of the corrective actions which should be taken by the international community is the most important advance in international protection of human rights in many decades.

Put briefly, the Responsibility to Protect (R2P) concept starts from the premise that each government has the responsibility to support and protect its civilian populations. If that government is unwilling or unable to do so, the international community has the responsibility of fulfilling this obligation. The report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (ICISS), which developed the concept and principles of R2P, describes a graduated series of measures, ending with the use of force, which the international community, through the Security Council, could draw on in fulfilling its responsibilities to civilian protection. As R2P becomes standard international practice, it will have a powerful effect in preventing large-scale or systematic domestic abuses and domestic conflict and in deterring tyrants from resorting to state terrorism. If the Security Council is unable or unwilling owing to opposition of some permanent members to invoke R2P, the issue should be introduced to the General Assembly via the Uniting for Peace procedure (Resolution 377). This requires a 2/3 majority vote, in order to send a strong signal to the Security Council urging them to take action. If these routes do not yield results, the matter of intervention should be taken up by Regional Organizations for consideration.

The failure of the Security Council to apply the Responsibility to Protect principle to Darfur and Zimbabwe was disappointing to many and pointed to the vulnerabilities of the concept – both the lack of will of the Security Council to implement R2P and the lack of appropriate tools with which to do so.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

GAPW fully supports the governments and civil society coalitions working to further develop and deepen support for R2P. The UNEPS proposal is being designed as a concrete tool to help the UN honor its obligations to civilian protection under Responsibility to Protect.

10



Promote Universal Understanding and Respect for the Principle of Human Security. In its Human Development Report of 1994, the United Nations Development Programme defined the concept of 'Human Security' as a change of focus from the traditional notions of state and inter-state security with primary importance placed on the integrity of territorial borders to that of human security, primarily concerned with protecting human life and enhancing human dignity. This focus was solidified when the Independent Commission on Human Security presented their report to the Secretary-General on May 1, 2003. Since then, civil society organizations including Global Action to Prevent War have advocated that this conceptual shift become normative for local and national governments as well as in every area of the UN system.

11



Ensure Automatic Access for Human Rights Monitors. The General Assembly should adopt a resolution committing all Member States to admit without delay and facilitate the visits of official human rights monitors responding to formal complaints of violations of human rights. Currently, visits by these monitors are frequently blocked or delayed by the refusal of a state to grant them appropriate visas. Our proposed resolution would have provisions for referring cases of non-compliance to the Security Council. Most countries have already signed numerous human rights covenants. Many of these have provisions for lodging complaints to one or more monitoring agencies. What is needed is more effective machinery for the implementation of existing commitments. (Action along these lines by the Security Council would be an alternative to General Assembly action.)

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

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 it standing before international courts such as the European Court of Human Rights to individuals and groups representing minorities. The General Assembly passed a resolution covering this topic in 1992, but this is not enough. A new agreement with formal treaty status is needed, as recognized by the Working Group on Minorities in its recommendation that “consideration be given to supporting a study on the utility and advisability of an international convention on the rights of persons belonging to minorities.” The treaty, which could be modeled after the Council of Europe Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (FCNM), 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 action by the International Criminal Court or, in extreme cases, the Security Council, against these violent practices.

13



Ensure that all States Uphold Human Rights, and Publicize State Failures to Comply with Human Rights Treaties. The UN Human Rights Council was established in 2006 to replace the Human Rights Commission, and is now a body subsidiary to the General Assembly rather than to the Economic and Social Council. In its first year, the Human Rights Council failed to take action to address human rights crises in countries such as Burma, Colombia, Somalia, Turkmenistan, and Zimbabwe; ended the mandates of human rights experts on Belarus and Cuba; rolled back its consideration of the deteriorating situations in Iran and Uzbekistan; and focused disproportionate time and energy on Israel’s human rights record while failing to look comprehensively at the Middle East, including at the responsibilities and roles of Palestinian authorities and armed groups.

Despite this mediocre record, proponents of human rights should work to strengthen the positive steps the Council has taken, such as undertaking universal periodic reviews to assess all states’ fulfillment of human rights obligations and commitments. GAPW urges the Human Rights Council to employ rigorous and fixed standards in this review process, regardless of the power or persuasions of the state under review. Furthermore, GAPW urges Member States to invest the political capital and resources necessary to bolster the staff of Geneva missions which are currently ill-equipped to deal with the demanding workload of the Council.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism



14 ●●●

The reports of the UN High Commissioner on Human Rights and the Special Rapporteurs on human rights abuses and related thematic issues deserve more prominence and attention by both governments and NGOs. Now that the International Criminal Court has been established, the Human Rights Council and human rights NGOs should compile evidence of non-compliance with human rights obligations for major offenders and publish their findings regularly so as to obtain maximum publicity and deterrence effect.

Support the Work of 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 (ICC), 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 focused on suspected terrorists. The ICC Treaty entered into force on July 1, 2002 and opened its first case in November, 2006 against a Congolese insurgent leader accused of recruiting child soldiers and using them in combat. Global Action urges those states which have not yet done so to become signatories to and subsequently ratify the Rome Statute.

15 ●●●

Increase Use of the International Court of Justice. Greater emphasis should be placed on empowering the International Court of Justice to settle inter-state disputes. An effective global security system with emphasis on the rule of law 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 a standard procedure of seeking the legal advice of the International Court of Justice, or the opinion of a panel of legal experts approved by the ICJ, as a basis for dispute settlement in areas of tension and conflict. The Security Council could also 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 ongoing campaign is needed to mobilize public support and pressure for making international adjudication and arbitration a fundamental feature of the international security system. As a first step, all newly concluded treaties should contain a provision for compulsory referral of unresolved disputes to the International Court of Justice. The UN Secre-

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

tary-General should periodically canvas Member State governments and urge them to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. The Secretary General should also address this subject at summit meetings of the General Assembly attended by heads of state with the objective of gradually increasing the number of Member States willing to accept compulsory Court jurisdiction.

16 ●●●

Deal More Effectively with Terrorism. Combating terrorism should, as the General Assembly's Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy has defined it, be focused on underlying causes such as youth unemployment, poverty and lack of education; facilitating and promoting the global rule of law; and apprehending perpetrators of terrorism through concerted police action. It is vital to stress that combating terrorism can not be equated to participation in a "war." To call the act of terrorism and counter-terrorism "war," and to call terrorists "jihadis," gives undeserved credit and status to terrorists as heroes of "anti-American" and "anti-Western" resistance. Furthermore, it confers excessive power on governments, justifying limitations of civil rights and maltreatment of alleged terrorist prisoners.

Instead, terrorists should be pursued through police activity as criminals and brought to trial. At the same time, a concentrated, deliberate effort should be made to address the political grievances and root causes that mobilize terror activity, as well as to delegitimize terrorist ideology through the energetic dissemination of moderate views and the promotion of a culture of peace through inter-faith dialogues. There should also be expanded programs for job creation and secular modern education, including education for girls and women.



Strengthen Multilateral Peacekeeping Capability

17



Make Short-Term Improvements in Current UN Peacekeeping Capabilities. Improving and expanding the permanent UN peacekeeping structure is a core element of the Global Action to Prevent War Program. In August, 2006, the Security Council drastically increased the operational burden on the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO) when it adopted resolutions creating peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, Timor-Leste, and Darfur. This represents the fourth major surge in UN peacekeeping since the end of the Cold War, and it brings complex challenges. As of mid-2007, there were 18 UN peace operations in the field with over 100,000 personnel, and a pending AU-UN Hybrid Operation in Darfur composed of almost 20,000 troops, 6,000 police and 5,000 civilians. Annual costs for 2007 were close to \$7 billion and rising. The added costs of peacekeeping continue to pose difficulties for DPKO because the funding of peacekeeping is still on a separate, ad hoc-basis and not included (as we believe it should be) in the regular UN budget as an on-going item. This funding practice greatly increases the possibility of shortfalls in paying for peacekeeping operations and compromises other efforts to ensure that the UN has at its disposal sufficient numbers of properly trained personnel to help meet a growing demand for peacekeepers.

Additionally, Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon undertook a process of DPKO restructuring in his early months in office. His proposal, introduced in February 2007, breaks DPKO into two departments: the Department of Peacekeeping Operations (tasked with policy planning and strategic management of operations) and the Department of Field Support (tasked with logistical planning and practical ground considerations). This restructuring will take concerted effort and resources, and should ultimately provide a more effective structure for supporting peacekeeping operations.

The UN is still working to build up a permanent cadre of civilian peacekeeper operators, planners and managers toward the goal of 2,500 personnel approved by the General Assembly for the Department of Peacekeeping Operations. This cadre would provide UN peacekeeping with a readily available pool of professional and technical experts essential to any field operation from logistics support to public information. Under-Secretary-General Jean-Marie Guehenno stated that, should this cadre come to fruition, "it will constitute the most important single step to creating a professional and effective management capacity in UN peacekeeping." But in 2006, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations still had only 12 full-time professional planners to operate all its field missions. Other management personnel are borrowed

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

from Member States on a temporary basis.

Another shortage in peacekeeping personnel is in civilian police. The 2005 General Assembly authorized a standing police capacity for the UN, but has, up to early 2007, authorized only 25 personnel for this purpose. Organizations like the Stimson Center have put forward proposals to bolster police standing capacity. Global Action is a proponent of standing, rapid response capacities, and continues to promote their expansion (see below).

The UN and its Member States should also endeavor to eliminate cases of misconduct, including sexual exploitation and abuse of women, by UN peacekeepers. While Conduct and Discipline Teams designed to cope with misdeeds by UN peacekeepers (drugs, juvenile prostitution, etc.) are in place at DPKO Headquarters and within many field operations, 2007 saw cases of sexual abuse by peacekeepers in Cote d'Ivoire and elsewhere, and allegations of widespread smuggling of arms and gold by peacekeepers in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Global Action urges DPKO to undertake more stringent rules and regulations, such as those included in the March 2005 report "A comprehensive strategy to eliminate future sexual exploitation and abuse in United Nations peacekeeping operations," written by Jordan's then Permanent Representative to the United Nations, Prince Zeid.

The peacekeeping priorities for Member States, as GAPW sees them, are to (1) place peacekeeping funding within the regular UN budget, (2) adopt fiscal practices to help ensure that states' peacekeeping contributions are paid in full and on time, (3) provide funds and political support for expanding the number of permanent police and operations planners, (4) create screening, training and monitoring standards to prevent the sexual exploitation and abuse of women by UN peacekeepers and (5) apply principles within Resolution 1325 on women, peace and security to DPKO.

18



Strengthen the UN's Ability to Respond Quickly and Effectively to Massive Loss of Life by Establishing an Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS). Despite the frequent need to move quickly to prevent genocide, 'ethnic cleansing,' and crimes against humanity, the United Nations has no reliable, integrated, rapid response capacity that would allow it to move promptly and effectively to save many lives. GAPW, along with a number of other international organizations, is working to help the UN fill this gap. We are refining a proposal to create a standing, individually recruited, gender sensitive, integrated, rapidly deployable United Nations Emergency Peace

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

Service (UNEPS) to provide effective, prevention-based response to genocide, ethnic cleansing, crimes against humanity and other humanitarian disasters. UNEPS would be designed to deploy within 48 hours of authorization to stabilize a potentially dangerous emergency situation. While a UNEPS deployment is taking place on the ground, the UN would gain more time to find the necessary resources and personnel needed to organize a longer-term and more permanent operation as needed. However, we believe that a timely UNEPS deployment could manage many crises entirely, thus reducing the need for expensive, lengthy, complementary peacekeeping operations.

UNEPS would consist of 15,000-18,000 civilian, police, and military professionals expertly trained on genocide and conflict prevention. The service would have mobile field headquarters and would act preventively, stopping a conflict before it escalates into a full-scale humanitarian disaster. Because UNEPS would be individually recruited from citizens worldwide, it would not be impacted by the unwillingness of Member States to deploy portions of their own armed forces in times of crisis. Thus, prolonged delays typical of the current process of force generation for UN Peacekeeping operations would be avoided, and the possibility that an unattended conflict would escalate to uncontrollable levels would be significantly reduced. In keeping with the creation of standing services such as the cadre of civilian peacekeepers and a standing police capacity, Member States should begin discussions immediately on the establishment of a UN Emergency Peace Service.

19 ●●●

Recognize Service in Conflict Prevention Units as National Service to Meet Conscription Requirements. Service in peacekeeping operations, political mediation, or humanitarian aid programs 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. This recognition would allow nationals of Member States to contribute to the promotion of international peace and security as an option which substitutes for national military service, thereby easing the shortfall of UN and regional personnel in these fields as well as promoting global understanding, multilateral security and a more interconnected world.

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

Increase the Responsiveness and Accountability of the UN System

20



Make the UN Security Council More Representative by Expanding Its Membership. GAPW supports expanding Security Council membership to make it more representative of and accountable to the international community as a feasible first step in UN Security Council reform. At the last World Summit (2005), there was agreement among Member States to reform the Security Council in order to make it more transparent and accountable, with equitable regional representation. Discussion on Security Council reform reopened in mid-2006 with a two-day debate in the General Assembly, but ended without consensus. In February 2007, the President of the General Assembly established five tracks for consultations on reform: membership, veto power, regional representation, the size of an enlarged Security Council, and the working methods of the Council and its relationship with the General Assembly. Current proposals place expanded membership at around 25, with new permanent and non-permanent members from all regions. It is uncertain when agreement to act on this issue will be reached in the General Assembly and Security Council. Disagreement within both bodies has blocked progress for several years.

To resolve the impasse, Global Action urges that Permanent Council Members take the lead in proposing ten new Permanent Members without veto: Three seats for Africa, to include the Arab countries of the Middle East (three possibilities might be South Africa, Nigeria and Egypt); four seats for Asia (possibly India, Pakistan, Indonesia and Japan); and three seats for Latin America (possibly Brazil, Mexico, and Argentina). When the ten new permanent seats are added to the present count of five permanent seats and ten non-permanent seats (for smaller and medium-sized countries), total membership of the new Council would be 25.



Reach Informal Agreement Among the Permanent Five Members to use the Veto Sparingly to Enable More Timely and Effective Security Council Action Against Armed Conflict. Thanks to repeated efforts by non-permanent members, Security Council working procedures have been modified to emphasize transparency and to bolster the power of the non-permanent members in relation to permanent members. On at least one occasion (Zimbabwe, July, 2005), the United Kingdom and seven non-permanent members succeeded in placing an item on the Council agenda by a procedural vote which could not be vetoed. The situation as regards the Security Council veto power of the Permanent Five is that: (1) the Permanent Five will not relinquish the veto permanently; (2) despite this, majority opinion among other UN members strongly favors complete elimination of the veto; (3) new Permanent Members will be very reluctant to dispense with veto power for themselves if the Permanent Five are to continue having unlimited veto rights; (4) with 15 large states as Permanent Council members, global interests will be better protected and the stabilizing role of the Permanent Five no longer as important as it has been; and (5) some relaxation of veto rights would improve prospects for action regarding peacekeeping and the Responsibility to Protect.

Global Action proposes that the Permanent Five Council members should reach agreement among themselves to restrict their use of the veto for a trial period of five years to only those issues affecting their own territory. This agreement would not be a charter change, which seems unlikely, but an internal agreement among the Five which can be renewed, modified or revoked by them at any time. The restricted, conditional nature of this change, the desire of the Permanent Five to ward off continuing pressures for the complete elimination of the veto, and their desire to maintain the effectiveness of the Council and their own prestige as members of an effective Council, may bring about voluntary agreement to this restriction. Especially since the achievement of consensus on the Responsibility to Protect, GAPW believes that the five permanent members should not have the power unilaterally to stop action when it is clearly necessary to save lives. As the Secretary-General's 2004 High Level Panel Report "A more Secure World: Our Shared Responsibility," states, "We also ask the permanent members, in their individual capacities, to pledge themselves to refrain from the use of the veto in cases of genocide and large-scale human rights abuses."

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. If action by the Security Council remained blocked in a particular case, the "Uniting for Peace" procedure used within the General Assembly with regards to the Korean War and the Congo peacekeeping mission could also be employed.

Preventing Internal Armed Conflict, Genocide and Terrorism

22



Give the General Assembly President a Permanent Seat on the Security Council. For more accountability within the UN, the President of the General Assembly should have a non-voting seat on the Security Council in order to report the views and concerns of the Assembly to the Council and vice versa.

23



Establish Judicial Review of Security Council Decisions. To further enhance accountability, the option of judicial review by the International Court of Justice over decisions of the Security Council and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations is needed. Such a review would be requested by at least a one-third vote of the General Assembly. Serious errors by the Security Council such as those that permitted the massacres in Rwanda and in Srebrenica must be subject to judicial oversight.

24



Create a World Parliamentary Assembly as an Advisory Chamber of the UN. Ever since the UN was established, there have been pressures to democratize its functions and decisions. At present, the UN General Assembly is a forum for talks among appointed representatives of governments with a modest secretariat staffed by international officials. Ideally, a popularly elected assembly should command a higher profile than the current General Assembly. This is the type of arrangement that the European Union turned to in order to increase public support for and public authority over European matters. Achieving a more representative body at the UN is a step that GAPW believes must be taken.

A first step towards this would be the creation of a Parliamentary Assembly to advise the General Assembly, with its membership elected by national 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 eventual direct election by national electorates. In some respects, the observer status granted to the Inter-Parliamentary Union by the General Assembly in 2003 (A/RES/57/32) represents a step in this direction. As a parallel measure, individual UN Member States could decide to elect rather than appoint their country's permanent representative at the UN.

25 ●●●

Strengthen the Advisory and Support Role of NGOs at the UN. Interaction and collaboration between governments and civil society has been the motor of the emerging global security system. This process should be encouraged by giving non-governmental organizations (NGOs) enhanced standing at the UN as well as protection from political pressure in member countries. The Economic and Social Council should develop for General Assembly approval an international covenant to this effect. NGOs have expertise in a range of areas pertinent to peace and security, including early warning, mediation, arbitration, peace education, publicizing human rights violations, promoting nuclear disarmament, and the unarmed intervention of peace brigades. Such activities, which have been growing rapidly, are likely to be increasingly useful in the 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 both the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations on the other.

A productive conference of NGOs working on conflict prevention proposed by the Secretary-General was convened by the Global Partnership for the Prevention of Armed Conflict (GPPAC) at the UN in July 2005. To ensure effective communication and cooperation, a conference of this kind should be held every five years. Regional conferences focused on the same issues should also be held.

26 ●●●

Ensure Adequate and Timely Funding to Maintain Full Functioning of the UN System. Timely payment of UN dues would improve the UN's planning and general 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.

A number of proposals have been made for ensuring regular income for the UN above and beyond assessed contributions of Member States. The UN should also be permitted to raise money for conflict prevention, peacekeeping, and humanitarian aid through sale of bonds and postage stamps (peace stamps) in Member States as one means of encouraging public participation. As proposed by Nobel Laureate James Tobin, the UN could receive a fee of one one-hundredth of one percent of international financial transactions, which could allow the UN to receive a steady stream of income from this source to carry out its vital activities. Until states agree to support this type of UN financing via international treaty, like-minded countries should continue to cooperate in making voluntary contributions, perhaps raised by taxes on air tickets or airport departures.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Preventing International War, Reducing the Production and Flow of Arms, and Beginning the Process of Transition to a More Democratic International System.

Introduction

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, to drastically reduce the flow of arms that fuel internal wars, and to continue the transition away from the domination of international politics by traditional western powers. We advocate a program of "step-by-step" reduction of national forces, especially larger forces and force projection equipment that enables aggressive military operations beyond national borders. To create confidence in this process, these reductions should be preceded by the build-up of Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations and their multilateral peacemaking and peacekeeping forces.

We believe that by cutting back national forces, which are often used in pursuit of narrow national objectives that reflect the aims and preferences of national leadership, 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 and large countries will be less able to exert military influence on each other and on smaller states.

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;
- Highlight the substantial economic benefits from disarmament; and
- Include means of overcoming domestic resistance to change rooted in inertia, ignorance, and vested interests.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

The Global Action disarmament program seeks to meet these criteria. Militarily, it proposes gradual step-by-step changes in the international security system 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 by enhancing institutions for war prevention and by limiting accepted uses of force to deterring and defending against aggression, genocide, and other forms of organized violence. Step-by-step, GAPW would replace national armed forces, which can be used in arbitrary, self-interested ways, with UN and regional forces for use in a nonpartisan manner.

Economically, this program promises major financial savings both to the populations of areas that are affected by armed conflict and to donors of emergency relief and reconstruction aid. By cutting the world's largest conventional armed forces and major weapon systems, which absorb 95 percent of world military spending, the program will release enormous resources that can be used to create the social and material conditions to make war even less likely.

For example, 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 over \$400 billion). Longer-term reductions could save \$200 billion per year from the U.S. defense budget. Other countries, including both industrial countries and developing 'middle powers,' would save comparable amounts from their military budgets, which in some 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 countries facing humanitarian disasters.

With respect to potential internal obstacles to change, including concern over decreased employment in defense-dependent communities, and decreased profits from arms industries and military-related careers, a gradual shift from military to non-military employment will allow governments and communities time to organize a smooth and relatively painless transition to non-military employment and production. Local and national support will be won through increased economic growth and additional funding streams made available to meet civilian needs.

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-based approach will provide a framework for building systematic cooperation over a period of years. However, not all program components have to enter into effect simultaneously, nor must they all 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.

Unlike the other two main program components, the Global Action disarmament program proposes phases of change, each of which lasts 5-10 years and all of which lay the foundation for a fourth and fifth phase that together can establish a permanent global security system.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 1

Take Initial Steps to Reduce the Risks of Major International War, Curb the Acquisition and Transfer of Arms that Fuel Internal Wars, and Shift the Current International Balance of Power to a More Equitable Basis

The GAPW conflict prevention program described earlier (measures 1-26) 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 seeks to reduce the longer-term risks of major international war and domination of international affairs by major military powers through measures of confidence-building and arms limitation.

Phase 1: Part A. Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Arms Acquisition and Trade.

27 ●●●

Convene a Global UN Conference on Reducing Conventional Forces. This conference will seek to make progress toward fulfillment of Article VI of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (a process currently being initiated by the Middle Powers Initiative). The first objective of the conference will be to agree on a comprehensive exchange of data on current levels of military personnel, budgets, arms holdings, and arms production. This information will be exchanged with other participants covering the following categories: combat aircraft, armed helicopters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, heavy artillery, missiles, naval ships over 825 metric tons, as well as small arms.

All these categories of armaments should be included in an expanded United Nations Register of Conventional Arms (UNROCA). The first steps for doing so include adoption of recommendations in the 2006 Group of Governmental Experts report, "Continuing Operation of the United Nations Register of Conventional Arms and its Further Development," which advocates expanded reporting in a number of categories.

Military force size and expenditures should be recorded in the United Nations Instrument for Reporting Military Expenditures, which has



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament



been in existence since 1981. Though used increasingly by Member States since its operationalization, no more than 82 Member States have submitted reports on their military expenditures in any one year.

The second objective of the conference will be to agree not to increase military personnel budgets, arms production or arms holdings while reduction negotiations are in progress, or for a fixed period of ten years if that is preferable to a majority of participants.

The third objective of the conference will be to agree on a 25 percent cut in the production and transfer of major weapons and small arms.

The final objective is to conclude a treaty on Global Cuts in Military Forces, Military Spending, Major Weapons Systems and Small Arms. Aiming ultimately at inspiring 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.

If conference participants are unable to agree on the global cuts described above, an alternative option is to negotiate force reductions in the regions of (1) South and Central America, (2) North America, (3) Europe including Russia, (4) Northern Africa, (5) Southern Africa, (6) Mideast, (7) South Asia to include India, Indonesia and Pakistan, and (8) North-east Asia, to include China, Japan and North and South Korea. Reductions would then be based on geographic area and population.

Negotiate Measures to Reduce the Illicit Global Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms. Until agreement on a broader treaty is reached, provisional reductions in the international traffic in small arms will reduce both the likelihood of terrorist acts and the potential for internal conflict escalating into mass violence.

Reflecting the desires of a large number of Member States, the UN has been making gradual progress toward an arms trade treaty. In October, 2006, the First Committee adopted a resolution entitled "Toward an Arms Trade Treaty: Establishing Common International Standards for the Import, Export and Transfer of Conventional Arms." The resolution asks the Secretary-General to seek the views of Member States and of experts



on the feasibility, scope and parameters of a possible treaty establishing common international standards for importing, exporting and transferring conventional weapons. Progress toward such a treaty will be slow, but it would represent a major step towards the reduction goals that GAPW seeks. Efforts underway to mark and register weapons and ammunition during production should also be strongly supported, as this will help the international community to trace the origin and path of weapons in cases where they have been obtained illegally.

In addition, we support a ban on sales of assault rifles or fully automatic machine guns to private groups or individuals; on sales to those engaged in armed conflict unless the Security Council determines that one side is the victim of aggression; on sales to nations with bad human rights records as determined by the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights; and on 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).

29 ●●●

Promote International Agreements to Ban Weapons Which are Excessively Indiscriminate and Injurious to Civilians. Though indiscriminate weapons of war are prohibited by customary international law and many weapons of this kind are included in the "Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects," the international community continues to witness the horrific effects of weapons such as cluster munitions on civilians. Through the Cluster Munitions Coalition, civil society pushed for a ban on cluster munitions which took root in February 2007 when the Norwegian Government launched the 'Oslo Process.' At a May 2008 Summit in Dublin, 109 nations reached agreement on a treaty that bans the sale, acquisition and use of cluster bombs. GAPW urges remaining Member States including the U.S. to join this process towards the elimination of cluster munitions. We also urge all states to sign and ratify the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons and its Optional Protocol V on Explosive Remnants of War.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

30



Establish a Multilateral Committee to Monitor Verification and Elimination of all Armaments Reduced through this Disarmament Program. This proposed committee should be patterned on similar committees established as part of START I and II, the CFE Treaty, and the Chemical Weapons Convention, as well as the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), which verifies steps taken under the NPT. The responsibilities of this committee will increase in later phases of this disarmament program.

31



End the Permanent Stationing of Military Forces on the Territories of other Countries. There are currently over 1,000 military bases worldwide on which foreign forces are stationed. Those military bases not under the auspices of the United Nations should be withdrawn and closed, thereby building confidence among states, decreasing reliance on military means to ending conflict, and saving many millions of dollars which could be redirected into social programs and human needs. No Bases, the international network for the abolition of foreign military bases, held an international conference in Ecuador in March 2007 which led to an agreement between the government of Ecuador and the United States for the withdrawal of the US base in 2009. GAPW supports these and other efforts to re-establish territorial integrity in military affairs as a prelude to establishing smaller, non-aggressive national forces.

32



Promote Democratic Oversight of Government and Privatized Military and Security Forces. A major challenge for the international security community in the 21st century is to organize security policy and decision-making processes that are more consistent with democratic principles of good governance. The application of democratic control over the military should lead to increased use of diplomatic and political options to resolve conflict, rather than relying on military-based security solutions or developing military deterrence. Institutionalization of democratic oversight of security policy-making processes by the public's elected representatives throughout the world could provide an enduring source of nonviolent diplomatic and political alternatives for ensuring security.

Democratic oversight is also becoming more complex in an age of privatized military and security corporations (See also point 33, "Restrict the Economic Benefits that can be Gained from Armed Conflict," page 44). Defense CEOs are not elected, therefore not accountable to the citizens of any country. Stronger oversight of a growing number of private security firms, such as the Truman Committee created during World War II, is needed.



33 ●●●

Restrict the Economic Benefits that can be Gained from Armed Conflict. Military aggression for territorial gain has become less frequent. But the desire to exploit valuable natural resources – diamonds, minerals, timber, petroleum, and increasingly, water – remains an important motive for external aggression and internal armed conflict. Enhanced multilateral agreements restricting the economic benefits from practices that contribute to the destabilization of states, as well as international collaboration to crack down on political warlords whose governments and economies survive by allying with criminal exploitation of local men, women and children, are needed. In reaching out to transnational corporations, the United Nations Global Compact should expand its terms of reference to include war and armed conflict, and adopt more stringent measures to ensure meaningful reform.

Furthermore, new ways to profit from armed conflict such as private paramilitary corporations are emerging. Twenty thousand private military personnel are active in Iraq. This is a growing industry, with some estimating annual contracts in the \$10-\$20 billion range and others citing numbers as high as \$100 billion. “Defense CEOs” reap major benefits from war, including 44 times higher pay (on average) than a military general with 20 years of experience. Such economic gain from war and armed conflict should be exposed and curtailed.

34 ●●●

Implement Individually Designed, Confidence-Building Measures in Specific Conflict Areas. These measures should include agreed-upon constraints on force activities, transparency, advance information on force activity, and ‘thin-out zones’ for those challenging bilateral relationships that have the potential to lead to war, such as the India-Pakistan standoff.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 1: Part B. Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

35 ●●●

Convene a World Summit on Nuclear Disarmament. To provide renewed impetus for nuclear disarmament, GAPW supports proposals that have been made by the New Agenda Coalition, former Secretary-General Kofi Annan, and the Weapons of Mass Destruction Commission led by Hans Blix on convening a dedicated global summit on Nuclear Disarmament. The objective would be to include the states that currently stand outside of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty in creating a Nuclear Weapons Convention which would create a framework for implementing subsequent steps towards general nuclear disarmament. International civil society organizations have already come together to draft an extensive and well-researched Model Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Testing, Production, Stockpiling, Transfer, Use and Threat of Use of Nuclear Weapons and on their Elimination, which should be drawn upon as a resource by governments and UN agencies.

36 ●●●

Continue Measures to Combat Nuclear Proliferation and Advance Disarmament. Vigorously implement the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty, including the key conclusions of the 2008 NPT Review Conference: the ratification and entry into force of the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty (CTBT); the negotiation of a Fissile Material Cut-Off Treaty (FMCT); further unilateral reductions by the nuclear weapon states; increased transparency of nuclear arsenals; further reduction of non-strategic nuclear weapons; and a diminishing role for nuclear weapons in national security policies (especially pertinent to the expanding role for nuclear weapons foreseen in the 2002 U.S. Nuclear Posture Review). GAPW urges the international community to strengthen security assurances to non-nuclear weapon states and encourage participation of all NPT states in the enhanced verification regime of the International Atomic Energy Agency (both the Comprehensive Safeguards agreement and Additional Protocol).

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

37 ●●●

De-alert Deployed U.S. and Russian Nuclear Weapons to Reduce the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Launch. De-alerting, as a first step to eliminate accidental nuclear catastrophe, consists of measures to delay an immediate (or pre-emptive) launch, for example, by separating and separately storing nuclear warheads and delivery systems. This would be backed by U.S. and Russian pledges of “no first use” in an offensive or pre-emptive manner, and should be facilitated by the creation of a joint commission to undertake this goal.

38 ●●●

Reduce US and Russian Nuclear Forces to No More Than 1,000 Total (Strategic and Tactical) Warheads Each. Promote irreversibility by dismantling decommissioned and reserve warheads and disposing of their fissile material or bringing such material under international custody.

39 ●●●

Include the Remaining Nuclear Weapon States in Talks on Capping or Cutting Their Arsenal. Broaden negotiations to include all countries that now possess nuclear arsenals. As with the U.S. and Russia, countries recognized as nuclear weapon states in the NPT – China, France, and the UK – should cap their warhead deployment and exchange full information on their warheads and delivery systems. Similarly, India, Pakistan, Israel and North Korea should undertake the same obligations under negotiated auspices. These steps will lead to negotiated reductions by all nuclear weapon states to be undertaken in Phase 2 of this program and substantial progress toward the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

40



Institute a Global System to Control Uranium Reactor Fuel. In the 1980s, Iraq secretly developed the capacity to produce low enriched uranium nuclear reactor fuel and to enrich it further into explosive material for nuclear weapons, evading IAEA inspection as it did so. In the 1990s, North Korea carried out a similar process although it was caught by the IAEA, and Libya set out on the same route using equipment and information sold to it by the Pakistani nuclear trafficker Dr. A.Q. Khan. These events have led to the conclusion that it is dangerous to permit individual governments to develop their own capacity to enrich uranium as reactor fuel, even though Article IV of the Non-Proliferation Treaty assures them of their right to do so. The United States and other permanent members of the Security Council are seeking to develop an international agreement whereby they would provide those governments which have not developed the capacity for enriching uranium and which commit themselves not to do so, with an assured supply of reactor fuel at reasonable prices. Fuel-supplying countries would also commit themselves to removing the spent reactor fuel which contains plutonium, another fissionable material for nuclear weapons.

There are many problems with this concept, among them assuring a supply of nuclear reactor fuel at reasonable prices and without political conditions from supplier countries like the USA which are not universally trusted. The International Atomic Energy Agency does enjoy widespread trust and could function as a supplier but would have to create or take over enrichment facilities of its own. GAPW supports restricting the right to enrich uranium and to supply other states to officials of the IAEA, but progress on this complicated issue is slow and is likely to remain so.

41



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 these 'defensive deployments' increase offensive capability and may, as a result, respond by increasing their own offensive arsenals. To avoid this outcome, a new global Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) agreement covering all nuclear weapons-capable states should be concluded. Under it, a weapon state could, if it insisted, be permitted to deploy ground-based missile defenses. However if it did so, it must also accept an overall collective limit on the number of ground-based defensive interceptors and offensive weapons it deploys in order to prevent unlimited defense weapons from appearing to augment offensive capability, thereby increasing the motivation for a new arms race. As with the original

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament



ABM Treaty, this agreement would serve to prohibit the weaponization of outer space.

In the meantime, GAPW also opposes the development, testing, and deployment of weapons operating through or from space, such as those foreseen in the U.S. missile defense program, and is concerned about the use of space for global positioning units that would have the capability to direct and activate weapons from outer space. GAPW along with our partners at Global Security Institute, urge international agreement to expand the 1967 Outer Space Treaty to prohibit placing any weapon in space orbit (it presently prohibits only nuclear weapons), and to keep space for peaceful purposes.

42 ●●●

Seek Universal Adherence to a More Effective Verification and Compliance Protocol for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC). The BTWC is a multilateral treaty with broad consensus that provides an international standard by which biological weapons activities can be judged. However, since negotiations on a verification protocol were halted in 2001 by the withdrawal of support by the United States, this agreement remains without verification provisions. GAPW urges states to conclude negotiations on a verification mechanism and to achieve universal adherence to the Convention.

43 ●●●

Break the Impasse in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament. While we have recently witnessed more meetings, papers and interventions at the Geneva-based Conference on Disarmament (CD) than have taken place in recent years, little concrete progress has been made. The unwillingness of Member States to reach a compromise on key provisions remains the biggest setback. In order to open the CD for productive negotiation, the current requirement for consensus in all decisions, originally introduced by the United States for its own tactical convenience, should be dropped. Procedural issues, including establishing the agenda, should be decided by simple majority. Substantive votes on treaty provisions would be by two-thirds majority. Final votes on completed treaty texts would be by consensus. These changes would assist in the restoration of the status of the Conference on Disarmament as the premier multilateral negotiating venue for disarmament issues.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 1: Part C. Enhance UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

While the first measures towards global cuts in arms holdings, production, and trade are being negotiated, initial steps should be taken to replace national military forces with well trained standing units organized by the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations, as a means for preventing, ending, and deterring armed conflict. What is needed initially in this area is better preparation at the UN and in ROs for prompt deployment of new peacekeeping operations and more substantial commitment by Member States to provide national forces earmarked for complementary UN peacekeeping operations.

This first phase of the disarmament process should see the conclusion of actions to establish a UN Emergency Peace Service and the commencement of planning to expand UNEPS to twice its original size of 15,000 personnel. In addition, we advocate the following steps to be undertaken in the first disarmament phase of this program.

44



Establish Two Rapidly Deployable Command and Control Headquarters Units at the UN and Increase the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund to Ensure Rapid Deployment of Peacekeeping Operations. At this point in the program, the UN would have made numerous organizational changes to improve effectiveness of its peacekeeping operations. To build on these improvements, there is need for rapidly deployable peacekeeping management teams that can survey a potential peacekeeping situation on site, recommend the size and configuration of required peacekeeping forces, and be prepared to provide logistical support for a supplemental peacekeeping force recruited from Member States (these teams are not new personnel but a new organization of permanent staff). The UN should also increase the level of available funds in the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund to at least \$500 million in order better respond to increased peacekeeping responsibilities. The two rapidly deployable headquarters units and an increased Reserve Fund would permit the UN to rapidly and effectively act to quell conflicts and save lives by funding, fielding and directing peacekeeping units that can respond in the early stages of violence.



45



Earmark National Forces for UN Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement. With over 100,000 peacekeepers required in 2007 alone, the Security Council should begin to look seriously at alternatives to the current process that requires DPKO to laboriously scrape together the personnel needed for new operations. Numerous expert studies have called for the creation of a standing rapid reaction UN peacekeeping capability. It is time to break the veto power of a few states on this issue by keeping this proposal before governments until consensus for action on a specific plan is achieved.

In this phase, governments should 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 aircraft for peacekeeping operations. If the list of acceptable standby forces volunteered by Member States for current or pending peacekeeping operations is inadequate, the Security Council, advised by the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, should ask Member States to choose from the following courses of action until satisfactory results are achieved: (1) a compulsory quota system under Articles 43 and 45 of the UN Charter. Under this approach, the Security Council would issue quota calls to Member States with specific dates for readiness and unit requirements; (2) moving to establish a standing UN peacekeeping force composed of volunteers and based on an expanded model of the United Nations Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS); (3) a renewed call for Member States to volunteer the services of peacekeeping personnel under the UN Standby Arrangements System. This call would have a sixty-day time limit. If it is unsuccessful, Member States would revert to options 1 and 2 above.

46



Establish Rapid Response Peacekeeping Units on Every Continent. Regional rapid response brigades composed of national forces, comparable to the EU Battlegroup model, should be available in all regions to be used for rapid peacekeeping missions under the auspices of the UN or Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. In individual Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations where conditions are favorable for this initiative, volunteers should be individually recruited to form units based on the UNEPS model.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 2

Complete Up to One-Third Cuts in Force Size and Spending, Together with Deeper Cuts in Production and Trade of Conventional Weapons and Small Arms, and Further Steps Towards Nuclear Disarmament.

Phase 2 will continue to strengthen the means 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 Cooperation and Security Organizations should be fully developed. New efforts in Phase 2 will focus on reducing the risks of major regional or global war.

Phase 2: Part A. Reduce National Armed Forces, and Military Budgets.

47 ●●●

Conclude a Treaty on Mandatory Global Cuts in Military Forces, Military Spending, Production and National Holdings of Major Weapon Systems and Small Arms. Aiming ultimately to achieve low levels of national armaments in all parts of the world, a treaty on conventional arms, military forces and spending reductions will make large but proportionate cuts based on the current size of a country's armed forces. A simplified 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 and with corresponding cuts in the level of their military personnel and defense budgets. Major weapon systems include combat aircraft, armed helicopters, tanks, armored personnel carriers, heavy artillery, missiles, and naval ships over 825 metric tons. Common definitions for these weapon categories will have been established in the data exchange.

Following this approach, the United States, Russia, and China would cut their holdings 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

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

small armed forces (about 165) would cut by 15 percent. We recognize that some inequities may arise from application of this standardized approach, but it should be kept in mind that UN and multilateral peacekeeping forces are being considerably increased in this phase and will provide an additional margin of security to Member States. Moreover, as explained in step 27, participants in the UN Conference on Reducing Conventional Forces, under whose auspices this negotiation would be held, will be free to adopt different reduction benchmarks. These global cuts will be supplemented by additional confidence-building reductions and defensive-oriented restructuring in geographic areas plagued by longstanding 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 military holdings. Moreover, armaments cut from arsenals can be used to substitute for other permitted but unserviceable weapons, thereby further reducing the need for production and trade for replacement purposes.

48 ●●●

Cut Worldwide Production and Trade in Major Weapons and Small Arms by a Further 50 Percent. A 50 percent reduction in arms production and trade would follow on the Phase 1 cut of 25 percent in these categories (negotiated within the Global UN Conference on Reducing Conventional Forces, step 27). These reductions would be paralleled by a proportionate reduction in the size of arms production facilities.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 2: Part B. Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

49 ●●●

Reduce Remaining Nuclear Arms to No More than 100 Warheads Per Country. In this phase, nuclear weapon states should negotiate reduction of their nuclear weapon arsenals to a level of 100 warheads per country, with provision for internationally monitored destruction of decommissioned warheads. Delivery systems would also be reduced and limited. As discussed earlier, India, Pakistan, and Israel should also be brought into the system of monitoring and limitation, and should be subject to the same cuts of no more than 100 warheads per country.

Phase 2: Part C. Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

50 ●●●

Expand the UNEPS Standing Force; Begin to Shift Peacekeeping from National Units to UN and RO Volunteer Forces and Strengthen Those Forces. Expand the individually-recruited, all-volunteer UN peacekeeping force to create ten brigade-sized central and regional components. As this larger standing peacekeeping force comes into service, the UN and Regional Cooperation and 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 managed by Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. Little by little, over Phases 2-4, reliance on national military contingents for UN peacekeeping will be phased out except for the largest operations.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

51



Create Functioning Military Staff Committees at the UN and in Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. Member States should also implement their obligation under Article 47 of the UN Charter to reconstitute a functioning Military Staff Committee to provide strategic direction of these forces on orders from the Security Council. Member States should establish regional Military Staff Committees to work with Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. Working under the direction of the Security Council, the reconstituted UN Military Staff Committee should implement Article 26 of the UN Charter by formulating plans for worldwide and regional disarmament accompanied by strengthening of UN peacekeeping capabilities. GAPW's program for worldwide disarmament could serve as a model for this activity.

52



Give the UN Secretary-General Limited Authority to Deploy UN Police or Peacekeeping Forces. It is essential to prevent the UN from being blocked in deploying its enhanced capability to head off incipient armed conflict or genocide, either by a threatened Security Council member's 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 an emerging conflict situation exists, the Secretary-General should be empowered, by prior Charter amendment or Security Council decision, to authorize the use of military or police forces of limited size as a fact-finding mission to report on potential conflict situations or for the prevention of imminent conflict. For the deployment to continue beyond 30 days, it would have to be confirmed by the Security Council. This option should be used as a last resort. To decrease the number of occasions where the Secretary-General might feel compelled to act unilaterally, the Security Council and government leaders at all levels (elected officials, military officers, and civil servants) should be educated on the 'Responsibility to Protect' principle (see step 9) and the importance of making timely decisions to use conflict-prevention measures to avoid the high human cost associated with a reluctance to act promptly.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 3

The Disarmament and Security Efforts Advocated in Phases 1 and 2 of this Plan will have Strengthened Institutions for War Prevention and Conflict Prevention.

In Phases 3 and 4, there will be a gradual shift from national to multilateral means of non-military and military intervention, backed by a trial ban on unilateral military intervention.

Phase 3: Part A. Reduce National Forces, Military Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

53



Begin Talks on Further Cuts in National Arms Holdings, Military Forces and Spending. During the Phase 3 trial ban on unilateral military action described below, negotiations will take place on another round of cuts in conventional forces and military spending, to be implemented in Phase 4 at a point when there is full confidence in the effectiveness of the new global security system (see earlier steps 27 and 47).

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament



Phase 3: Part B. Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

54 ●●●

Immobilize Remaining Stocks of Nuclear Warheads and Delivery Systems. By the end of this phase, nuclear disarmament should reach 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, which would precede the permanent transfer of that responsibility (see point 59 below).

55 ●●●

Dramatically Limit All Missiles, Long-Range Bombers, Attack Aircraft and Other Major Delivery Vehicles. This would be done through a worldwide treaty for control of missiles, aircraft, and other means that are capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction across national boundaries.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

56



Phase 3: Part C. Increase Confidence in and Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

Make a Provisional Commitment Not to Deploy National Armed Forces Beyond National Borders While Rigorously Testing the Capability of the UN and ROs to Prevent or Respond to Armed Conflict. In Phase 3, Member States 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 RO auspices. This commitment appears far-reaching, but it corresponds to obligations restricting the use of force under the UN Charter 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 cooperation and security counterparts will have substantially strengthened their peacekeeping skills and capabilities, and thus 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 Security Council or Secretary-General (in rare situations) 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 under the concept of the Responsibility to Protect.

At any time during this provisional commitment to non-intervention, if a participating nation concludes that its security is endangered by a failure of the UN and the regionally-based global security system, it will have the right to withdraw from the agreement of non-deployment of national forces beyond national borders. Withdrawal from the non-intervention agreement will not vitiate the commitments made in previous phases of the disarmament process. However, since Phase 2 cuts will reduce national forces by no more than a third (compared with today's high levels), adequate forces for national military defense will still exist.

A successful Phase 3 trial commitment to non-intervention for at least a decade, with no Member State withdrawals or unilateral military actions beyond national borders by Member States, will be a prerequisite for proceeding with Phase 4 and the final transfer to the UN and regional organizations of authority for military intervention.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament



Phase 4

Transfer Responsibility for Global Security from National to International Institutions.

Phase 4: Part A. Reduce National Military Forces, Spending and Arms Production and Trade.

57



Make Further Deep Cuts in National Arms Holdings, Armed Forces and Military Spending. The shift 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 in scope to those made in Phase 1 (one-third, one-quarter, and 15 percent, respectively, for countries with very large, large and small armed forces).

58



Limit Production of Both Major Weapons and Small Arms to Weapons Needed for UN Forces, Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations, and for Non-Offensive National Defense. Production of major weapons and small arms will be restricted narrowly to two areas: first, to those systems needed by individual nations for defense of their own national territory against threats of external armed aggression (the requirements for this should be minimal by this stage); and second, to weapons deployed by the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations for peacekeeping and for multilateral defense against genocide and aggression. World-wide arms production and trade will cease except for these two purposes.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

Phase 4: Part B. Complete the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

59



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

Phase 4: Part C. Increased Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

60



Further Strengthen UN and RO Peacekeeping Capacity. As the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations complete the transition from earmarked national contingents to fully-trained, well-equipped individually recruited forces and take on full responsibility for peacekeeping worldwide, national forces will be further reduced and restructured. In this phase, for the first time, armed forces under multilateral control will become larger than the armed force of any single nation.

61



Permanently Transfer the Responsibility for Preventing Armed Conflict from Individual Nations to a Global Security System Operated by the UN in Association With Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. Following the trial run in Phase 3 (see step 56, “Make a Provisional Commitment Not to Deploy National Armed Forces Beyond National Borders While Rigorously Testing the Capability of the UN and ROs to Prevent or Respond to Armed Conflict”), 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 and strengthened UN in association with Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations. (Throughout this entire disarmament program, GAPW and other NGOs will actively promote the underlying concept of defensive security—or non-offensive national defense—in order to increase understanding and support for this key point of our program.)

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament



Phase 5

Limit National Armed Forces to Short-Range National Defense.

As confidence in the global security system grows and military threats diminish, further changes, which may occur quickly or slowly, can be considered to comprise the fifth and final phase of the peacemaking process.

Phase 5: Part A. End Offensive National Military Forces and Most Production and Trade of Weapons.

62



Limit "Force Projection" Capabilities to Relatively Small Units Maintained by the UN and Regional Peacekeeping Organizations. The shift of the responsibility for keeping the peace to the international community will be accompanied by a qualitative restructuring of forces: force-projection capabilities including air, naval, and logistical forces that make possible military action far from national borders, have been dropped from national arsenals, step by step, and limited to small units maintained by the UN and regional peacekeeping forces.

63



Fully Convert National Armed Forces 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 military intervention beyond national borders to the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations.

Various aspects of the effort to build a global defensive security system will be designed to be mutually reinforcing. As confidence in the global security system grows and national armed forces shrink, the multi-lateral forces needed to deter and defend against cross-border aggression and other forms of large-scale violence can be smaller but with a higher likelihood of success. At the same time, as expectations of peace grow, nations and national leaders will become more confident in limiting their armed forces to the defense of national territory.



THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Preventing International War Through Disarmament

In particular, the major military powers, especially the United States, which would give up their capabilities for military action beyond national borders, will at this point have concluded that their own security is more assured through this new system than by the current system of continuous war and threats of war, and they will actively support the new global security system.

Eventually, the world's nations may reach a degree of commitment to peaceful conflict resolution such that the UN and Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations will need to provide only police functions, verify adherence to defensive security limits by individual nations, and prevent the use of violence for gain or for political intimidation by non-state actors such as terrorists and criminal syndicates.

At this point, we could reasonably say that war will have finally been abolished.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Building a Culture of Peace

III

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

Introduction

Throughout the phased steps undertaken in the disarmament section of the program, and while progress is being made on early warning, strengthening conflict prevention and peace-building processes and universalizing the rule of law, intensive and widespread efforts need to be placed on promoting a culture of peace. If violence and hatred continue to be passed from generation to generation, if people cannot safely breathe the air, feed their families or find meaningful work, if peoples of different nationalities, ethnicities, races, and faiths cannot become more respectful and tolerant of one another, much of what is achieved in international negotiations will fail to quell individual and collective violence, including terrorism. This part of the Global Action to Prevent War Program endeavors to highlight a few of the broader action categories that we endorse for building a culture of peace. We recognize and are grateful for the many innovative ways that individuals and civil society organizations worldwide are changing the culture and climate of intolerance, competition and hatred to one of cooperation, equity and understanding.

64



Strengthen Education for Non-Violent Conflict Prevention and Resolution.

We propose development of a well-financed UN Education Foundation to facilitate free, modern, non-religious education for primary, secondary and university levels for imparting knowledge and skills to empower students to make their contribution as national and world citizens. This foundation would assist with financing, organization of curriculum, recruiting of teaching staff, and establishment of actual schools in collaboration with locally respected educational leaders. These schools are intended to take the place of inadequate school systems and schools promoting extremist political and religious programs.

Conflict prevention centers should be housed on university campuses, thereby providing a low-cost venue while bringing prestige to the participating institution. Such centers would educate students to help build a global norm of tolerance and pluralism while fostering inter-faith dialogue and conflict resolution skills.

65



Foster Local, National and Regional Programs to Strengthen Tolerance and Respect for Diversity among Ethnic, Cultural and Religious Groups While Opposing Political and Religious Extremism. Cross-cultural dialogues between faith leaders; young people communicating, playing sports, or arranging joint field trips with those from diverse political and religious communities; the publication of newspapers and newsletters with moderate, rather than extreme religious views on society and current events; these are just a few of the many activities and programs that can promote a more tolerant and understanding perspective. GAPW encourages innovative ways of bringing groups together to share views and ideas and engage in common practices that will produce a safer world for all.

66



Implement Programs Aimed at Reducing Community and National Violence, Including Humanitarian Aid; Refugee Relief; Economic Development; Economic Justice; Human Rights, Including the Rights of Women and Children; Prevention of Domestic and Youth Violence; and Protection of the Environment. Recognizing that societies that promote peace are more likely to place emphasis on the welfare and wellbeing of their people, GAPW supports and encourages a myriad of programs that enforce economic and social equity and thus help prevent outbreaks of conflict. Local programs on non-violence help communities become more hospitable and less threatening for residents and can provide successful models for conflict prevention and resolution to share with other communities as well.

THE GLOBAL ACTION PROGRAM

Building a Culture of Peace

67



Develop Awareness-Raising Programs by NGOs and Community Organizations That Build Ongoing Support for Arms Control and Disarmament Measures as Well as Conflict Prevention Initiatives. Such programs can be aimed at members of government and leaders of civil society and regular citizens, and can include workshops, documentary films, trainings and resources which reinforce why implementation of individual or collective measures are so vital. An example of such activity is the three month-long educational voyage on the “Peace Boat,” which is both an organization and a chartered cruise ship that takes individuals on board and educates them on the importance of nuclear disarmament. Another example is the training conducted by Global Action to Prevent War as part of the NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security in countries such as Kazakhstan on how to implement Security Council Resolution 1325 nationally. Without popular support and understanding from civil society and governments, negotiating conflict prevention and disarmament measures will be much more difficult. The diverse and creative program activities of NGOs worldwide are doing much to build this support.

68



Establish Truth and Reconciliation Commissions during Post-Conflict Periods. Experience has shown that one way to effectively reduce levels of post-conflict hatred and violence, including threats of retributive violence against members of the “perpetrating group,” is to form and conduct a reconciliation or ‘truth’ commission. The creation of such a forum is valuable because it allows for victims to non-violently confront those who committed acts against them or their group, and for perpetrators to confess the specifics of their wrongdoing, apologize for their actions and seek forgiveness. Such commissions often occur parallel to and not instead of trials for criminal behavior, but can serve a more culturally transformative role as their goal is more about restoring peace than punishing abuse.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

The Root Causes of War

Since its inception in 1998, the Global Action Program Statement and our program priorities have been revised periodically in response to comments by both critics and supporters. One recurrent theme of the comments has been the degree to which our work addresses the root causes of war and other forms of armed conflict.

We recognize that the GAPW 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 potential partners to reduce the severity and duration of war, with the long-term goal of eventual elimination of the war system. Some critics believe that this approach is insufficiently radical because it does not seek the deeper far-reaching change in these institutions which, in their view, is necessary before real progress can be made toward a durable and lasting peace.

We respect these viewpoints. However, those of us who support the GAPW 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 believe that existing opportunities and structures for promoting that improvement should be put to use now.

A second concern is related to the first. Some critics argue that the GAPW program should address more directly what they believe are the root causes of war, such as poverty, social and economic injustice, environmental degradation and poor governance, and that prior progress in these areas is required before one can hope to successfully lower the level of armed conflict and terrorism.

We fully agree that these root cause challenges must be addressed before just and enduring peace can be achieved and that these efforts should be pursued simultaneously with efforts to cut back on armed conflict. Most people, in fact, would agree that war itself aggravates conditions of poverty, social and economic injustice, environmental degradation and poor governance. Eliminating or reducing warfare can help in coping with these afflictions. Supporters of Global Action to Prevent War continue to work in close coalition with those whose primary concerns involve ending poverty, inequity, environmental degradation, poor governance, and addressing these basic human needs. The Global Action program seeks to complement these programs by focusing its own resources on the 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 successfully. More often than not in human affairs, it is possible to separate violent behavior from its underlying causes or sources and to address the negative behavior fairly effectively without resolving underlying causes. 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 program is a substitute for action aimed at resolving 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 effectively and more immediately.

Concretely, as implementation of our program priorities progresses, we believe war will become an increasingly infrequent, even an exceptional occurrence. If this can be achieved, we feel certain that other important work focused on underlying causes will

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

be greatly enhanced. Thus, we seek to achieve the broadest possible coalition of civil society organizations and governments to bring war to an end under the broad umbrella of this GAPW program.

A Plan for Action: Goals for a Global Movement

Global Action to Prevent War has set 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, our program will achieve these goals. But we also understand 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 anticipates long-term advocacy and negotiation which will be sustained by a broad coalition of organizations, individuals, and interested governments until a complete disarmament and security 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 to Prevent War promote the Program Statement's recommendations and work towards building a broad-based coalition of groups and individuals sufficiently committed and influential to help provide visibility and momentum to this serious, phased, long-term enterprise. Those who are already working on a particular issue relating to peace and security are encouraged to showcase their activities within broader efforts identified in this Program Statement to shed the world and its people from the scourge of war and armed

conflict. Once people throughout the world see that Global Action offers a practical and effective program to make armed conflict rare, this conclusion will tap into the universal desire for peace, and support for Global Action's vision of the world without war will rapidly spread.

A key form of action that we encourage has been to establish or participate in working groups or networks that actively promote specific components or steps of the Global Action program. GAPW has established working groups on both the establishment of a UN Emergency Peace Service and the reduction of national holdings of conventional weapons and the trade in small arms and light weapons. We are also an active member of the NGO Working Group on Women, Peace and Security, which works towards the implementation of SC Resolution 1325. Global Action is also involved in direct monitoring and participation at the UN (the General Assembly's First Committee on Disarmament and International Security, in particular). If you would like to become more involved in any of these activities, or help us create a new working group, or inform us about your own work to end war, please contact us at:
coordinator@globalactionpw.org.

DEVELOPING GOVERNMENT SUPPORT

Global Action to Prevent War has established organizational partners and affiliated centers in a number of countries whose work includes advocating for implementation of the GAPW Program Statement, either issue by issue or in its entirety, by their governments. Furthermore, key governmental officials in several countries have already expressed serious interest in and support for the GAPW program. GAPW is constantly seeking new

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

supporters who are willing and able to help circulate the program in the higher ranks of government in every country, soliciting discussion, comments, and recommendations for further action on specific program steps and securing official endorsement. In addition, other near-term goals 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 Convention); and persuading various governmental leaders to make positive public mention of the GAPW program or its specific proposals in debates at the UN General Assembly and elsewhere.

Within ten years—if not sooner—it should be possible to gain widespread and active acceptance by governments of Phase 1 of the GAPW disarmament program. One important step toward this goal might be to establish a working group at the Conference on Disarmament to discuss GAPW recommendations or, alternatively, have several governments convene a special conference focused on the Global Action program. Certain components of the program are already being pursued by specific governments.

What is most needed now to move the GAPW program forward is the activation of broad, powerful coalitions 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 governmental officials. Such a coalition can bring pressure to bear on governments to acknowledge the need for a comprehensive approach like that offered by the GAPW program, and to start taking

modest steps as proposed in Phase 1 of our disarmament program. The next section describes how such a coalition might be created, and the kinds of actions participants might choose to take.

AN EXPANDING NETWORK WITH AN EVOLVING PROGRAM

The Global Action program covers a wide 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 existing supporters. Organizational leaders and other individuals reading the Program Statement for the first time are invited to send in comments and suggestions on any of the points listed. Until all phases of the GAPW program have been implemented, we will continue as a coalition-building network, inviting the active participation of diverse supporters, and evolving from a transnational campaign to a truly global movement.

These features of the Global Action program facilitate independent yet mutually reinforcing efforts by supporters. Member organizations can keep the agendas they already are mandated to pursue, or they can modify those mandates in some way to reflect a deeper or different understanding of global security needs. They can choose specific security issues on which to focus and join or form working groups on these topics. Within the broad framework of the GAPW network, they can also work to 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

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

non-violent conflict resolution, or for prompt payment of UN dues, or for tolerance and respect among sub-national groups. These and other activities can all be linked with other partners in the Global Action to Prevent War network. 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 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.

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 much to inspire public education and national political debate. On certain issues, transnational mobilization is likely to be most effective. For example, a global campaign supporting the development of regional rapid response peacekeeping brigades, building on current efforts by the governments of Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands and the African Union, is already taking shape. On issues where GAPW calls for steps to be codified in international treaties, both national and transnational organizations might press

relevant governments to show leadership. Governments in turn might look to NGOs to help gain both conceptual clarity and public support.

MEMBERSHIP

This phased strategy and structure for creating a global movement to prevent war is provided by the worldwide network of GAPW members and partners. This network offers a particularly capacious umbrella for coalition-building, encouraging 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 may resemble Global Action to Prevent War in having multi-issue campaigns. Other 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), as well as to 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 or strengthen the UN.

Organizations that would like to affiliate with GAPW are encouraged to hold a general discussion on the Program Statement among their members and, where possible, secure formal agreement by members or boards to endorse the goals and principles of our multi-phased program.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project



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

The Global Action coalition supports participating organizations in two ways: by giving support and visibility to existing efforts for war-prevention and disarmament, and spurring new initiatives that can enhance existing programs. As a member of Global Action, you can:

1. Spread information about your programs to other organizations. We will help disseminate information about your goals, events, activities and priorities through the Global Action website (www.globalactionpw.org) and other venues.
2. Use GAPW working groups and forums to set priorities, launch initiatives, and debate issues.
3. Investigate the possibility of having our New York based Staff monitor UN meetings of interest and report on their outcomes, thereby assisting individuals and NGOs in other parts of the world to obtain timely and specific information on key UN-related issues.
4. Help shape the overall Global Action program, priorities, literature, and web site to make it more relevant to your own organization's interests and priorities. The Global Action International Steering Committee regularly reviews proposals for additions and revisions to our general program. You are welcome to submit suggestions at any time (or tell us your success stories) via email to coordinator@globalactionpw.org.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

How You Can Help Build Global Action to Prevent War

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

1. Become an individual supporter.
2. Permit us to include you on our mailing lists.
3. Persuade organizations of which you are a member to become organizational supporters of the GAPW program.
4. Join a GAPW working group or keep us posted on your activities and successes on behalf of one or more of our program components.
5. Disseminate information about the priorities of 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 events, television programs, leafleting, petition campaigns, op-ed articles and letters to the editor, newsletters, and mailings to spread the need for phased disarmament and war prevention.
7. Strive to get governmental officials and business leaders behind efforts to promote disarmament and war prevention.
8. Help form a local, state or national GAPW chapter where you live.
9. Reach out to organizations active on human rights, environmental affairs, or development to broaden the coalition concerned with peace and security issues.
10. Check our website www.globalactionpw.org (with extensive links to partner sites) for action-alerts on particular issues, local events and other news.

The form of action is up to you. We ask only that you act!

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project



Annex: The Condensed Global Action Program Points

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

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

1. Create Democratic, Universal-Membership Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations (ROs) in All Regions, tasked with the Prevention and Resolution of Conflict.
2. Adopt a Pro-Active Approach to Conflict Prevention in the Security Council.
3. Promote the UN Peacebuilding Commission.
4. Create Permanent Centers for Nonviolent Conflict Resolution at the UN and in Regional Organizations.
5. Employ Narrowly Targeted Economic Sanctions and Incentives to Help Prevent and End Armed Conflict and Human Rights Abuses.
6. Strengthen Emphasis on Conflict Prevention in the UN General Assembly.
7. Implement Security Council Resolution 1325 on the Women, Peace, and Security.
8. Establish Cabinet-Level Departments or Ministries of Peace in the Governments of Each UN Member State.

Strengthen Support for Human Security, Human Rights and the Global Rule of Law.

9. Promote Active Application of the Responsibility to Protect Concept – Build It into an Implemented Principle of International Law.
10. Promote Universal Understanding and Respect for the Principle of Human Security.
11. Ensure Automatic Access for Human Rights Monitors.
12. Create a Convention on Minority Rights.
13. Ensure that all States Uphold Human Rights, and Publicize State Failures to Comply with

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

Human Rights Treaties.

14. Support the Work of the International Criminal Court to Make Individual Leaders Responsible for Major Abuses of Human Rights.

15. Increase Use of the International Court of Justice.

16. Deal More Effectively with Terrorism.

Strengthen Multilateral Peacekeeping Capability

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

18. Strengthen the UN's Ability to Respond Quickly and Effectively to Massive Loss of Life by Establishing an Emergency Peace Service (UNEPS).

19. Recognize Service in Conflict Prevention Units as National Service to Meet Conscription Requirements.

Increase the Responsiveness and Accountability of the UN System

20. Make the UN Security Council More Representative by Expanding Its Membership.

21. Reach Informal Agreement Among the Permanent Five to use the Veto Sparingly to Enable More Timely and Effective Security Council Action Against Armed Conflict.

22. Give the General Assembly President a Permanent Seat on the Security Council.

23. Establish Judicial Review of Security Council Decisions.

24. Create a World Parliamentary Assembly as an Advisory Chamber of the UN.

25. Strengthen the Advisory and Support the Role of NGOs at the UN.

26. Ensure Adequate and Timely Funding to Maintain Full Functioning of the UN System.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

Preventing International War, Reducing the Production and Flow of Arms, and Beginning the Process of Transition to a More Democratic International System

Phase 1

Take Initial Steps to Reduce the Risks of Major International War, Curb the Acquisition and Transfer of Arms that Fuel Internal Wars, and Shift the Current International Balance of Power to a More Equitable Basis.

Phase 1: Part A

Reduce National Armed Forces, Military Budgets, and Arms Acquisition and Trade.

27. Convene a Global UN Conference on Reducing Conventional Forces.

28. Negotiate Measures to Reduce the Illicit Global Trade of Major Weapons and Small Arms

29. Promote International Agreements to Ban Weapons which are Excessively Indiscriminate and Injurious to Civilians.

30. Establish a Multilateral Committee to Monitor Verification and Elimination of all Armaments Reduced through this Disarmament Program.

31. End the Permanent Stationing of Military Forces on the Territories of other Countries.

32. Promote Democratic Oversight of Government and Privatized Military and Security Forces.

33. Restrict the Economic Benefits that can be Gained from Armed Conflict.

34. Implement Individually Designed, Confidence-Building Measures in Specific Conflict Areas.

Phase 1: Part B

Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

35. Convene a World Summit on Nuclear Disarmament.

36. Continue Measures to Combat Nuclear Proliferation and Advance Disarmament.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

37. De-alert Deployed U.S. and Russian Nuclear Weapons to Reduce the Risk of Accidental or Unauthorized Launch.

38. Reduce US and Russian Nuclear Forces to No More Than 1,000 Total (Strategic and Tactical) Warheads Each.

39. Include the Remaining Nuclear Weapon States in Talks on Capping or Cutting Their Arsenals.

40. Institute a Global System to Control Uranium Reactor Fuel.

41. Limit Missile Defenses; Block the Weaponization of Space.

42. Seek Universal Adherence to a more Effective Verification and Compliance Protocol for the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention (BTWC).

43. Break the Impasse in the Geneva Conference on Disarmament.

Phase 1: Part C

Enhance UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

44. Establish Two Rapidly Deployable Command and Control Headquarters Units at the UN and Increase the Peacekeeping Reserve Fund to Ensure Rapid Deployment of Peacekeeping Operations.

45. Earmark National Forces for UN Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement.

46. Establish Rapid Response Peacekeeping Units on Every Continent.

Phase 2

Complete Up to One-Third Cuts in Force Size and Spending, Together with Deeper Cuts in Production and Trade of Conventional Weapons and Small Arms, and Further Steps Towards Nuclear Disarmament.

Phase 2: Part A

Reduce National Armed Forces and Military Budgets.

47. Conclude a Treaty on Mandatory Global Cuts in Military Forces, Military Spending, Production and National Holdings of Major Weapon Systems and Small Arms.

48. Cut Worldwide Production and Trade in Major Weapons and Small Arms by a Further 50 Percent.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project

Phase 2: Part B

Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

49. Reduce Remaining Nuclear Arms to No More than 100 Warheads Per Country.

Phase 2: Part C

Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

50. Expand the UN Standing Force; Begin to Shift Peacekeeping from National Units to UN and RO Volunteer Forces and Strengthen Those Forces.

51. Create Functioning Military Staff Committees at the UN and in Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations.

52. Give the UN Secretary-General Limited Authority to Deploy UN Police or Peacekeeping Forces.

Phase 3

The Disarmament and Security Efforts Advocated in Phases 1 and 2 of this Plan will have Strengthened Institutions for War Prevention and Conflict Prevention.

Phase 3: Part A

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

53. Begin Talks on Further Cuts in National Arms Holdings, Military Forces and Spending.

Phase 3: Part B

Move Towards the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

54. Immobilize Remaining Stocks of Nuclear Warheads and Delivery Systems.

55. Dramatically Limit All Missiles, Long-Range Bombers, Attack Aircraft and Other Major Delivery Vehicles.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action To Prevent War Project

ANNEX

Phase 3: Part C

Increase Confidence in and Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

56. Make a Provisional Commitment Not to Deploy National Armed Forces Beyond National Borders While Rigorously Testing the Capability of the UN and ROs to Prevent or Respond to Armed Conflict.

Phase 4

Transfer Responsibility for Global Security from National to International Institutions.

Phase 4: Part A

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

57. Make Further Deep Cuts in National Arms Holdings, Armed Forces and Military Spending.

58. Limit Production of Both Major Weapons and Small Arms to Weapons Needed for UN Forces, Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations, and for Non-Offensive National Defense.

Phase 4: Part B

Complete the Elimination of Nuclear Weapons.

59. Eliminate All Remaining Nuclear Weapons after Agreeing to a Stringent Verification System including Contingency Plans for Non-Compliance.

Phase 4: Part C

Increase Reliance on Enhanced UN and RO Peacekeeping and Peace Enforcement Capabilities.

PREVENTING ARMED VIOLENCE AND ENDING WAR

The Global Action to Prevent War Project



60. Further Strengthen UN and RO Peacekeeping Capacity.

61. Permanently Transfer the Responsibility for Preventing Armed Conflict from Individual Nations to a Global Security System Operated by the UN in Association With Regional Cooperation and Security Organizations.

Phase 5

Limit National Armed Forces to Short-Range National Defense.

Phase 5: Part A

End Offensive National Military Forces and Most Production and Trade of Weapons.

62. Limit “Force Projection” Capabilities to Relatively Small Units Maintained by the UN and Regional Peacekeeping Organizations.

63. Fully Convert National Armed Forces to Short-Range Homeland and Non-Offensive Defense.

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

64. Strengthen Education for Non-Violent Conflict Prevention and Resolution.

65. Foster Local, National and Regional Programs to Strengthen Tolerance and Respect for Diversity among Ethnic, Cultural and Religious Groups While Opposing Political and Religious Extremism.

66. Implement Programs Aimed at Reducing Community and National Violence, Including Humanitarian Aid; Refugee Relief; Economic Development; Economic Justice; Human Rights, Including the Rights of Women and Children; Prevention of Domestic and Youth Violence; and Protection of the Environment.

67. Develop Awareness-Raising Programs by NGOs and Community Organizations that Build Ongoing Support for Arms Control and Disarmament Measures as well as Conflict Prevention Initiatives.

68. Establish Truth and Reconciliation Commissions during Post-Conflict Periods.

