A Day In The Future

Accelerating Solutions to Security Threats

Leland Russell and Greg Austin

FEBRUARY 2008

We live in a world of new and evolving threats, threats that could not have been anticipated when the UN was founded in 1945 – threats like nuclear terrorism, and State collapse from the witch's brew of poverty, disease and civil war.

**Report of the
UN Secretary General's
High-Level Panel
on Threats, Challenges and Change,
December 2004**

THE THREATS WE FACE

The security environment of the future will be shaped by transnational threats evolving from wars, violent extremism, natural disasters, pandemics, and unaddressed systemic problems—including poverty, organized crime, and environmental degradation. Technology will remain a force-multiplier for violent extremists, not only for higher levels of lethality, but for propaganda dissemination. Real-time, global communication will exacerbate the psychological impact of potential threats and the aftermath of incidents.

The confluence of these circumstances will cause rising international anxiety and insecurity about physical well-being, prosperity, and even the sustainability of human existence. This will in turn feed an intensifying backlash against "modernity" and the pace of social and technological change, based on fears—both real and imagined.

In this environment, the preservation of our common security—whether military, economic, social, or environmental—is becoming increasingly more difficult and complex. Consider, for example, the potential security implications of the energy challenge resulting from the projected one-third increase in the global population over the next 40 years, as portrayed by the CEO of Royal Dutch Shell plc, Jeroen van der Veer:

> *Energy use in 2050 may be twice as high as it is today or*
> *higher still. The main causes are population growth, from six*
> *to more than nine billion, and higher levels of prosperity.*

The challenge this scenario poses is daunting, as Indian Prime Minister, Dr Manmohan Singh, noted in addressing the Millennium Review Summit in 2005, when he referred to the intensifying need for "managing political, economic and social change in an environment of rising expectations and growing disparities." The complexity is caused in part by the fact that the projected prosperity of the future will not be equally shared among developed and developing countries. Yet, it is the developing countries—those least able to respond to rising disparities and economic pressures—where the bulk of the projected three billion population increase will occur.

The challenge is compounded by climate change. In 2007, the UN panel on Climate Change reported that the people of developing countries will bear the brunt of its negative and unavoidable effects: "those in the weakest economic position are often the most vulnerable to climate change."

Another reason security will become increasingly more difficult and complex is the willingness of violent extremists and terrorists to leverage the newest technologies. "Micro actors are now capable of having a macro impact," says Ambassador Henry A. Crumpton, an EWI Distinguished Fellow:

> *While there has always been assassination, terrorism, and insurgencies, today a handful of operatives or even an individual with the right technology or weapon can cause extraordinary death and destruction to a degree that we have never seen before. We think of, in the worst case, an individual operative with a radiological or nuclear weapon, or perhaps a tiny pathogen that has been genetically engineered and released into society somewhere.*

Unfortunately, the potential for a micro actor to wreak macro havoc is a trend that is just beginning and will likely accelerate. It is one of the downsides of technology and globalization that any discontented group can plot and plan on one side of the world and act with devastating effect on the other side in a matter of days or hours and, in cyberspace, within seconds.

The foregoing are just a few of the priority concerns of the international security community. Given the magnitude of the challenges, in December 2004, the UN Secretary General's High Level Panel warned of the "limits of self protection" particularly in the face of rising extremism and the threat of mass-casualty terrorist attacks:

> *In today's world, a threat to one is a threat to all. Globalization means that a major terrorist attack anywhere in the industrial world would have devastating consequences for the well-being of millions in the developing world. Any one of 700 million international airline passengers every year can be an unwitting carrier of a deadly infectious disease. And the erosion of State capacity anywhere in the world weakens the protection of every State against transnational threats such as terrorism and organized crime. Every State requires international cooperation to make it secure.*

Are we moving quickly enough to successfully combat these nascent threats? In many instances, worthy goals are being set, but they are not being achieved with sufficient velocity. As Prime Minister Singh noted in 2005: "the

international community is generous in setting goals, but parsimonious in pursuing them."

The Status Quo Is Not An Option

A prominent global business leader, Jack Welch, has cautioned, "Face reality as it is, not as it was or as you wish it would be." The hard reality of security is that we are witnessing the dawn of a dynamic, multi-threat environment that has never before existed. In this environment, the security challenge is no longer a stream of single point threats. Rather, it has become a raging river of interdependent, often ambiguous signals that require fast, smart analysis, rapid and robust action plans, and well-orchestrated, cross-boundary responses.

Another hard reality is that the tempo of change and interdependence is accelerating exponentially and many of the governmental structures and political process paradigms that worked in the past are outdated. As a result, individual states cannot act unilaterally to ensure their homeland security. In fact, global and regional security challenges cannot be adequately addressed by states working together at the intergovernmental level. Even the major powers and the United Nations system acting in perfect harmony could not provide the scale and speed of response required.

There exists, however, untapped potential for breakthrough solutions. We live in an opportunity-rich world. Innovations in health science, information technology, materials, marketing, consumer products, investments, transportation, energy—the whole range of human endeavors—are not only accelerating; they have created a cornucopia of new possibilities for large-scale knowledge sharing and collective action.

But opportunity is only half of the story. The fast-forward pace of technology, the rapid blurring of geographic and competitive boundaries and the instantaneous mobility of knowledge and capital spawn new challenges. Threats and opportunities are no longer predictable in time, place, or specifics. Disruptive innovations, appearing at increasing speeds, can suddenly undermine fundamental assumptions.

In this radically different world, a world in which security circumstances can change in the twinkling of an electronic eye, what does it take to maintain security or prosperity?

In the private sector, innovative leaders have asked and answered that question. They have been able to dramatically compress the time required for strategic thinking, planning, and implementation by leveraging technology and adopting rapid-cycle processes. They have eliminated 'silo' thinking and fostered collaboration across geographic and functional boundaries. They are becoming globally integrated.

In a recent *Foreign Affairs* article, Samuel J. Palmisano, Chairman of the Board and Chief Executive Officer of IBM Corporation, points out that the spread of shared technologies and standards is creating an unprecedented opportunity for collaboration, not just within each sector of society, but across them all. He believes that, in this particular realm, business can learn something from government:

> *One promising trend toward greater global stability is the growth of horizontal, intergovernmental networks among the world's regulators and legislators. Built on shared professional standards and relationships among cross-national communities of experts, these networks are interesting analogues to new forms of organizing work in business, such as globally integrated supply chains, commercial "ecosystems," and open-source communities.*

Many intergovernmental and multilateral organizations have made significant strides in collaborating to bring political, technical and other resources to bear on urgent issues. For the most part, however, the real-time nature of today's environment and the need for dramatically *accelerated action* has not reached the tipping point in the public sector.

Most governmental leaders are well aware of, for example, the unprecedented, growing security threats posed by new technologies, such as nanotech, biotech, robotics, and quantum computing. It is common knowledge that violent extremists are actively pursuing innovative ways to use some of these new technologies. Yet, there is no smartly conceived, high-velocity, collective effort underway to counteract the inevitable consequences of this increasingly dangerous trend.

Given these and many other hard realities, accepting the status quo or delaying action on the obvious challenges is no longer a reasonable option. Where do we begin?

The EastWest Institute has identified three potential areas for *accelerating solutions to security threats*:

- ❑ Strategic Collaboration
- ❑ Cross-Boundary Leadership
- ❑ 'Think and Do' Networks.

STRATEGIC COLLABORATION

The global system is in a period of fundamental transformation—the final shape of which we cannot possibly predict—but which leading powers, business leaders and the most capable NGOs can help mould to produce positive outcomes. That will, however, require all involved to have the discipline and commitment to more aligned, more robust *Strategic Collaboration*.

The value of Strategic Collaboration to address security threats is a well-established principle of international relations. Its precursor was an early diplomatic art form, including both the formation of alliances and the use by kings and princes of private emissaries as substitutes for their formally appointed plenipotentiaries.

In recent times, *Track II processes* have been used to engage major and developing powers to improve communications, build trust and confidence, and often prevent conflict. Track II meetings have been convened by non-officials—social activists, retired military and government officials, public figures, and scholars (from NGO's like EWI)—when governments were willing to explore ways to resolve existing or potential conflict and express their intentions, but did not wish to express a formal position.

The next generation of Track II diplomatic effort will have to work for the establishment of *standing Track II processes* as a normal and effective mechanism for resolving security disputes or easing tensions among the major powers. We also need to build similar mechanisms to ease tensions in regional or localized conflicts, especially by stimulating the emergence of new, standing patterns of regional collaboration and trust-building.

In addition to building upon collaboration models that have worked well in the past, such as Track II, it is important 'think outside-the-box', to create new forms of Strategic Collaboration that are more dynamic and cross-boundary. We need a combination of *bubble-up and top-down, cross-sector collaboration*

that mixes the perspectives and priorities of those concerned with economics, politics, military affairs, science and technology, sociology and religion. This kind of multi-disciplinary approach is essential to understanding and addressing the nuances of the underlying forces that are challenging security.

The very process of aggregating and transcending the best thinking from a wide variety of disciplines and geographies will provide a second, equally important benefit: *mobilizing people and resources for accelerated action.* By involving larger numbers of thinkers in the process, more people learn, the agreed solutions have more credibility, and there is a larger brain trust to draw insights from (the Collective IQ). It also increases the potential for tapping the enormous resource power of non-state, as well as state actors.

The work of the UN Secretary General's High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges, and Change can be a common starting point for new efforts at accelerating Strategic Collaboration. There are significant gaps between what the Panel identified as urgent and what the world leaders in the 2005 summit could agree on. Many ideas and fields of activity were merely set aside. To name a few still demanding attention were recommendations on WMD controls, on preventing violent conflict, on cooperation between the UN and regional organizations, on guidelines for the use of force, on sanctions, and the high profile issue of Security Council enlargement.

Given that three years have passed, it is time to step back and objectively assess what has and has not occurred since 2005. There are some fundamental questions:

- ❑ What are the gaps in existing policy response?
- ❑ What are the major barriers to effective action?
- ❑ What mechanisms would enhance collaboration?
- ❑ Which additional actors need to be engaged?
- ❑ How do we create a greater sense of urgency?

Many world leaders recognize the need to accelerate results (See Appendix 1) and there appears to be a new 'window of opportunity' opening for Strategic Collaboration. In our discussions in world capitals in the past year, we have been told time and again that there is now the prospect for significant movement in specific key areas where world leaders could not reach agreement in 2005.

However, 'windows of opportunity', by definition, are typically short and they always close. When that occurs, the problems do not go away. They compound and often become more radical and extreme than what existed before.

One of the fundamental problems is that well-intended leaders—practising what they believe is effective leadership on behalf of their constituencies—often become roadblocks to the collaborative decisions and coordinated actions that are essential to advancing our common security. To meet our urgent challenges more quickly and more effectively, another kind of leadership is needed, leadership that focuses on removing roadblocks and accelerating the pace of change.

CROSS-BOUNDARY LEADERSHIP

"Leaders who can traverse boundaries have always been vital to civilization," says Mark Gerzon, an EWI Distinguished Fellow, "but today the need for this kind of leadership capacity is even more urgent and widespread." In his book, *Leading Through Conflict*, Gerzon explains why we need to lead for good of the whole, rather than advocate for a single constituency.

> *Leading as if the world stops at the edge of one's tribe, religion, nation, or corporation has become impractical, and often impossible. We cannot manage a whole company, a whole community—and certainly not a whole planet—with leaders who identify only with one part. We need boundary-crossing leaders who can help the parts work together to strengthen the whole.*

Cross-Boundary Leaders have the capacity to accomplish two things that are difficult, if not impossible, for a 'silo' leader. They can transcend the traditional barriers between organizations, sectors, and geographies and build a shared course of action and commonality of purpose; they can find ways to engage and leverage all available knowledge and resources for optimal impact and results.

Cross-Boundary Leaders do not necessarily derive their influence from their positional power. Rather, they influence what happens within their own and other organizations through sincere respect and trust building, deep interpersonal engagement and seeking common ground on critical issues. They are creative and empathetic people with the social intelligence and

sensitivity needed to bridge divides and inspire multiple constituencies to collaborate on solving complex problems.

Cross-Boundary Leaders can be found around the world, leading groups from ad hoc neighborhood associations to well-funded NGOs to government bodies. They confront a wide variety of issues like violent extremism, conflict prevention, poverty, social justice, climate change, land mines and even loss of indigenous cultures. Most of these leaders go unrecognized by the media, but a few can be found in the Nobel Peace Prize archives.

Nelson Mandela, following his release from prison in 1990, became a Cross-Boundary Leader when he moved to a policy of reconciliation and negotiation that helped lead the transition to multi-racial democracy in South Africa. Since the end of apartheid, he has been widely praised, even by former opponents.

Aung San Suu Kyi has become an international symbol of heroic and peaceful resistance in the face of oppression. In 1991 she was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her efforts to bring democracy to Burma. At the presentation, the Chairman of the Nobel Peace Prize Committee, Francis Sejested, called her "an outstanding example of the power of the powerless". She is currently under detention, with the Myanmar government repeatedly extending her detention.

Kim Dae-jung is a former South Korean president and the 2000 Nobel Peace Prize recipient. He is the first Nobel laureate from Korea. He has been called the "Nelson Mandela of Asia" for his long-standing opposition to authoritarian rule, and his inauguration marked the first time in Korean history that the ruling party peacefully transferred power to a democratically elected opposition.

Shirin Ebadi is an Iranian lawyer, human rights activist and founder of Children's Rights Support Association in Iran. On October 10, 2003, Ebadi was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize for her significant and pioneering efforts for democracy and human rights, especially women's and children's rights. She is the first Iranian, the first Shia and the first Muslim woman to receive the prize.

In 2004, Dr. Wangari Muta Maathai, an environmental and political activist, became the first African woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize. She has served as inspiration for many in the fight for democratic rights and has especially encouraged women to better their situation. Maathai founded the Green Belt Movement, a grassroots environmental non-governmental

organization, which has now planted over 30 million trees across Kenya to prevent soil erosion. She has come to be affectionately called "Tree Woman" or "The Tree Mother of Africa."

Al Gore, Jr., the former forty-fifth Vice President of the United States and a prominent environmental activist, was awarded the 2007 Nobel Peace Prize (together with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) for his "efforts to build up and disseminate greater knowledge about man-made climate change, and to lay the foundations for the measures that are needed to counteract such change." Gore was one of the first U.S. politicians to grasp the seriousness of climate change and to call for a reduction in emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouses gases. "Humankind has suddenly entered into a brand new relationship with the planet Earth. The world's forests are being destroyed; an enormous hole is opening in the ozone layer. Living species are dying at an unprecedented rate."

In 1990, Mikhail Gorbachev won the Nobel Peace Prize for helping to end the Cold War. His critical collaborator in that process was the 40th president of the United States, Ronald Reagan. In his book, *Reagan and Gorbachev: How the Cold War Ended*, Jack F. Matlock Jr. describes the approach Reagan took to prepare for the historic meeting in Geneva in November 1985, which is quintessential Cross-Boundary Leadership.

> *Shortly before setting off for Geneva, Reagan dictated a long memo of his own, laying out his assessment of the man he was about to meet. The Reagan game plan was to look for areas of common interest, be candid about points of contention and support Gorbachev's reforms while (in Matlock's paraphrase) "avoiding any demand for 'regime change.'" He cautioned the members of his administration not to rub Gorbachev's nose in any concessions he might make. Above all, Reagan wanted to establish a relationship with his Soviet counterpart that would make it easier to manage conflicts lest they escalate to thermonuclear war—an imperative for every American president since Eisenhower.*

Reagan's understanding of how to advance political compromise of the most profound kind in private talks was matched with an equally astute sense of how to use public statements and the mass media to mobilize change and carry conservative constituencies with him:

> *"General Secretary Gorbachev, if you seek peace, if you seek prosperity for the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, if you seek liberalization: Come here to this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, open this gate! Mr. Gorbachev, tear down this wall!" (June 12, 1987)*

What do all the foregoing Cross-Boundary Leaders have in common? With bold vision and enormous will power, they channel their energy and the energies of others into achieving what is in the best interests of the whole, sometimes at great personal cost. They embrace the full complexity of the challenges they have chosen to tackle with humility, honestly and passion. They rise above the "us versus them" mentality, the knee-jerk primordial responses that derail the trust and creative collaboration needed to achieve shared success.

Imagine the impact of a critical mass of such Cross-Boundary Leaders working at all levels within governments, NGOs, civil society and the private sector—global public servants reaching across boundaries to other leaders who may differ profoundly on issues, but are willing to engage in the search for common ground for the common good.

'THINK AND DO' NETWORKS

Accelerating solutions to security threats will require entrepreneurial 'thinking and doing' on a worldwide level. We believe that this can best be accomplished through a loosely linked constellation of issue-focused 'Think and Do' Networks comprised of Cross-Boundary Leaders.

The primary purpose of these networks will be to influence the outcomes in ways that make our planet a better and safer place. To accomplish this, they will deliver fast, smart analysis, rapid and robust action planning, and high-velocity, collaborative implementation. To optimize impact and results, these networks will work in alignment with states, intergovernmental bodies and other major partners. In short, the idea is to have many small boats in the water (networks) moving in the same general direction as the larger ships (states and intergovernmental bodies).

To promote dialogue, test new ideas and develop and/or facilitate creative win-win solutions, the key actors in the networks need to be thought leaders with the capacity to frame and shape the strategic issues and policy choices.

In specific subject areas of threat, this thought leadership will be more visible than in others.

In the field of climate change policy, for example, the challenges and potential responses have already been spelled out with relative clarity in formats that have authority and credibility because of their apolitical nature. Moreover, there is an existing network on climate change coordinated at the global level through the UN Panel on Climate Change, which has published numerous authoritative studies with wide appeal.

By contrast, networks on issues like weapons of mass destruction and preventive diplomacy tend to be fragmented and somewhat politicized. Some policy issues, such as UN Security Council reform, do not depend on new arguments being put forward, as much as by achieving the necessary new levels of political consensus for change.

Creative and energetic online communities offer a practical solution for bringing geographically dispersed people together on these kinds of issues. Such communities are forming across the globe to address common social, business, and political interests. Typically, members share information, contacts, ideas, and create action agendas. Don Tapscot, author of *Wikinomics*, explains:

> *In the past few years, traditional collaboration—in a meeting room, a conference call, even a convention center—has been superseded by virtual collaboration on an astronomical scale.*
>
> *Today, encyclopedias, jetliners, operating systems, mutual funds, and many other items are being created by virtual teams numbering in the thousands or even millions. Smart firms are harnessing collective capability and genius to spur innovation, growth and success.*

Online communities will provide a much needed nexus for the security field, which will have multiple benefits:

- ❑ Contributors can extend their reach and broaden their influence through real-time, cross-boundary dialogue and feedback loops;
- ❑ The act of exchanging ideas across geographic and cultural divides will help build the trust needed for effective collaboration;
- ❑ The cumulative impact over time could bring new sense of global community and a tipping point for innovation and change.

In implementing this vision of *'Think and Do' Networks*, we face one significant obstacle. "Thinking" is more often than not pursued without a strong commitment to "Doing". This is particularly visible in the climate change area and nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament.

Studies show that in the United States for example, "Americans are already predisposed to view climate change as a significant risk," but "what is lacking is a sense of urgency, public leadership and political will" (Anthony Leiserowitz 2007). In 2005, Kofi Annan was critical of world leaders for their slowness to act on key issues: ""But let us be frank … We have not yet achieved the sweeping and fundamental reform that I and many others believe is required. Our biggest challenge, and our biggest failing, is on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament."

The main conclusion to be drawn here, as Professor Daniel Adam Rotfeld, a former foreign minister of Poland observed 2006, is that "we need a mechanism of reform that owes more to popular legitimacy than to states". This conclusion can also be drawn from the experience of rapid mobilization of states by the NGO sector, working with like-minded governments, in the cases of the land mines ban (Ottawa process), the establishment of the International Criminal Court and the Convention on Small Arms and Light Weapons.

The experience of establishing the International Criminal Court, as summarized by Dr Moreton Bergsmo, one of its principal advocates, was that the core requirements for effective "Doing" and rapid change at the global level include:

- ❑ NGO mobilisation and unity
- ❑ Competent, well-informed specialists in those NGOs
- ❑ Sufficient transparency in the multilateral process for NGOs to know what was going on (monitor, expose, lobby)
- ❑ A few principled states, especially Germany in this case, to protect the integrity of the idea during the political bargaining
- ❑ Adequate great power acceptance to provide hard political legitimacy (France and UK)
- ❑ Established laboratories (existing international criminal tribunals like those for the former Yugoslavia and Rwanda) to show that the project was feasible.

We believe there are two additional requirements of paramount importance. First, there must be a relationship of trust and privileged access between the NGO leaders and their government counterparts. Second, key media must be mobilized for mass communications to support the effort to build what Rotfeld calls the "popular legitimacy" of the particular cause.

THINK ABOUT TOMORROW ─ BE ACCOUNTABLE FOR SHAPING IT

The future is not an optional event. Everyone will attend. The question before us now is whether or not we will choose to shape the future or be shaped by it. The challenge is enormous, but the costs of inaction are so great that we must act now with urgency and a shared vision, one which we believe can be achieved through Strategic Collaborations, Cross-Boundary Leadership and a constellation of 'Think and Do' Networks.

The worldwide NGO community can and must play a leading role, and work with committed states and international organizations for more rapid elimination or mitigation of security threats. Together, we can begin to build worldwide momentum for accelerating security solutions using the basic building blocks of accountability among key actors (states, business, community groups, individuals). The transparent development of new action agendas and progress reviews on prior commitments will be a fundamental part of that accountability.

Each year, parliaments should demand—and the key actors should provide—an accounting of progress toward agreed upon goals. Above all, the velocity of results must be an important metric in that reporting. Did we move fast enough? If not, what are the obstacles we must address to accelerate action?

Appendix 1: World Leaders Call for Accelerated Solutions at First Worldwide Summit on Security, 2005

_____

Former Secretary General of the UN, Kofi Annan
- "But let us be frank … We have not <u>yet </u>achieved the sweeping and fundamental reform that I and many others believe is required. Our biggest challenge, and our biggest failing, is on nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament."
- "There is no escaping the fact that the challenges of our time must be met by action – and today, more than ever, action must be collective if it is to be effective."

Prime Minister of India, Dr Manmohan Singh:
- "We welcomed the fact that advances in science and technology had made it possible as never before in human history to mount a frontal attack on global poverty, ignorance and disease. We had confidence in mobilizing but five years later, we find that the international community is generous in setting goals, but parsimonious in pursuing them."
- "Failure [in achieving the MDGs] will only make our task in the future much more difficult and much more costly."
- "We need collective thinking and coordinated action to deal with the challenge of ensuring energy security, even while we address the consequences of climate change."
- "The world community must muster the courage to harness the potential of globalization for the benefit of humankind."

Permanent Representative of China to the UN, Ambassador Wang Guangya:
- "The Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) are still achievable but only if we break with business as usual and dramatically accelerate and scale up action now."

State Councillor of China, Tang Jiaxuan:
- "We should work together to turn the consensus reached at the Millennium Summit into actions."

Permanent Representative of Japan to the UN, Ambassador Kenzo Oshima

- Quote of Former Prime Minister of Japan, Junichiro Koizumi: "I would like to call upon the distinguished delegates of this body to work together and take a bold step towards the creation of "A New United Nations for the New Era"."
- "The agenda of international development is broader than the MDGs, but the MDGs must figure as the most pressing priority, and Japan is strongly committed to contributing to their realization, working with other bilateral and multilateral donors and development partners, within the United Nations and outside it."

Permanent Representative of Pakistan to the UN, Ambassador Munir Akrum:

- "Let us choose the course of wisdom. Let us not seek partisan solutions and impose arbitrary deadlines. Let us unite for consensus. Let us make a real effort to create a United Nations that responds to the interests and aspirations of all the peoples of the world."

Prime Minister of Turkey, Recep Tayyip Erdogan

- "Without losing further time, we must jointly seek ways to globalize peace instead of war, prosperity instead of poverty, conscience instead of greed and rights and freedoms instead of oppression and violence."

Permanent Representative of the Republic of Indonesia to the UN, Ambassador Rezlan Ishar Jenie:

- "Achieving internationally agreed goals, including those contained in the Millennium Declaration, demands that we commit ourselves to creating a conducive environment at national and international levels that would pull together the necessary financial resources to pursue such a commitment."
- "Thus, we believe the MDGs should not be treated as the full embodiment of development which incorporates much wider issues, such as the systemic inequality in the international financial architecture and the use of tariffs to frustrate the will of developing countries to engage in international trade."
- "These commitments were made in good faith and must be honored by implementation."

Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Iraq, Mohammed Said Al-Sahaf:

- "The risk we face today is the exploitation by the industrialized countries of scientific and technological progress for political purposes."
- "The wave of capitalistic globalization sweeping our world today has widened, and continues to widen, the gap between the rich and the poor in the world."
- "A dynamic partnership between the countries of the north and the south is fundamentally opposed to the logic of domination and unilateral power and to the transformation of science and technology into political tools for the subjugation of others."

Permanent Representative of Israel to the UN, Ambassador Dan Gillerman:

- "There is much, beyond this, that the UN still needs to do in its efforts to fight terrorists, and confront the regimes that aid or tolerate them."
- "There is sometimes a tendency in large institutions to focus on process rather than substance. The United Nations is no exception in this regard. For us to take full advantage of the moment, and to realize the core recommendations embodied in the Secretary General's report, we must not confuse paper with progress."