



Strategic Cooperation:

Global Challenges, 21st Century Tools.



A peace and security agenda for the President and the 111th Congress.

2201 Broadway, Suite 321, Oakland, CA 94612 • www.peaceactionwest.org



Table of Contents

Introduction – pg. 4

1. Diplomacy with Iran – Direct negotiations with Iran should be quickly undertaken to address their uranium enrichment program, as well as to capitalize on their shared interests with the United States, such as stabilizing Iraq and Afghanistan. – pg. 6

2. Towards a Nuclear Weapons Free World – A number of factors, including a growing nuclear club, combine to give new urgency to the call for concrete actions toward a world without nuclear weapons. – pg. 10

3. Responsibly Ending the War in Iraq – The war in Iraq has taxed America’s resources while not serving its security interests. The war must be responsibly brought to an end, which means a complete withdrawal with no residual force, along with a new comprehensive strategy that addresses political, diplomatic, and humanitarian concerns to bring about stability in Iraq. – pg. 14

4. The War in Afghanistan and Better Approaches to Ending Terrorism – Instead of the counterproductive “War on Terror,” the US should invest its resources in a comprehensive new counterterrorism strategy based on a diversity of tactics with a concrete history of success. – pg. 16

5. Preventing Nuclear Terrorism – Preventing a nuclear terrorist attack is possible if the US moves quickly to lead the international community in addressing this threat, increase coordination between agencies in the US, and prioritize high levels of funding to threat reduction programs. – pg. 20

6. Prohibiting Torture, Restoring Human Rights – The use of torture, indefinite detention, and extraordinary rendition does not improve America’s security, has damaged the reputation of the US in the international community and has fueled terrorist recruitment. – pg. 22

7. Diplomacy and the Global Energy Economy: A New Frontier – Peace, affordable energy, a healthy environment, and a strong economy all require new energy strategies grounded in greater international cooperation. – pg. 26

8. The Conventional Weapons Threat: Control the Illegal Arms Trade and Ban Cluster Bombs – The US has a moral imperative, as well as an urgent security need, to work cooperatively with the international community to stop the havoc brought about by these dangerous conventional weapons. – pg. 30

9. Rebalancing Security Spending for 21st Century Challenges – The tools of high-tech war fighting no longer meet American’s security needs. A close look at current military spending reveals a need to bring spending more in line with today’s security needs. – pg. 34

Peace Action West, formerly Sane/FREEZE, is the largest and oldest grass-roots peace advocacy organization in the country, with more than 50,000 supporters. Since 1957, we have been advocating for foreign policies that reflect the highest American values. Throughout our decades of working with members of Congress, we have provided our nation's policy leaders with up to date information on evolving security challenges and proactive, pragmatic solutions to improve US and global security.

Contributors:

Jon Rainwater, *Executive Director*

Rebecca Griffin, *Political Director*

Cara Bautista, *Deputy Political Director*

Reva Patwardhan, *Communications Director*



Introduction

Stopping terrorism. Preventing nuclear attack. Protecting and conserving finite sources of energy.

These are the perennial security concerns that have shaped and will continue to shape American foreign policy for the foreseeable future. However, in the last thirty years the landscape in which we address these concerns has changed dramatically, and the election of a new president and Congress brings an opportunity to accordingly redefine American engagement with the world. The heavy US reliance on the blunt instrument of military force has generated new instability and conflict, and today Americans face a more dangerous world than a decade ago. US security is tightly woven with that of our allies as well as some of our antagonists, and in this interconnected world, we need to use the right tools.

America's new political leadership carries a mandate for a new approach to foreign policy. President Obama achieved an astounding victory with an anti-war and pro-diplomacy platform. In addition, the global response to the US elections revealed public attitudes of hope and readiness to work together to address our shared problems. This historic moment requires quick action to chart a new course. To that end, we present this comprehensive policy agenda, *Strategic Cooperation: Global Challenges, 21st Century Tools*.

Enemies of the past, such as the USSR, either no longer exist or don't pose an imminent threat. Our main security threats don't come from nations with clear borders. Current US security strategy has not kept pace with this shifting landscape. Our security interests lie in promoting global stability and cooperation, something that can't be done with military force.

In order to make the US and the world more secure, we must work to both resolve conflict peacefully and to ameliorate the political and economic conditions that feed conflict. This approach requires a comprehensive view of security strategy rather than relying solely on military dominance. We need to be investing more in the civilian aspects of national security, such as diplomacy, making international institutions and agreements work better, foreign assistance, and economic reconstruction and development.

The global challenges we face call for no small shifts, but fundamental changes from a foreign policy defined by military aggression. The last eight years have taken the approach to its furthest extreme, and we've seen the disastrous consequences. Despite going deeply into debt to fund the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, "America's margin of safety is shrinking," according to the *Report of the Commission on the Prevention of WMD Proliferation and Terrorism*, released in December 2008. Further, below are key points from within this policy agenda:

From *The War in Afghanistan and Better Approaches to Terrorism*

In the six years following the invasion of Afghanistan, Al Qaeda was involved in more terrorist attacks than it had been in the previous six years, not counting attacks in Iraq and Afghanistan.

According to the bipartisan Terrorism Index of 2008, 71 percent of the more than 100 top US foreign policy experts surveyed believe a terrorist attack on the scale of 9/11 is “likely or certain within the next decade.”

From *Toward a Nuclear Weapons Free World*

The worldwide “nuclear club” is growing. North Korea announced in 2003 its intention to withdraw from the cornerstone Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and in October 2006 conducted an underground nuclear test. India, Pakistan, and Israel remain outside of the NPT.

The American public consistently supports a more cooperative approach to national security. The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA) released a study in August of 2007 that showed that Americans strongly favor greater emphasis on international cooperation, “wherein the US is quite attentive to the views of other countries, not just US interests.”¹ That report showed strong majorities favoring the US working with the UN and supporting international law. In November of 2007, PIPA released another study showing that “large majorities of Americans and Russians favor taking nuclear weapons off high alert, sharply cutting the numbers of nuclear weapons, banning the production of weapons-grade nuclear material, and once advanced methods of international verification are established undertaking the complete elimination of nuclear weapons.”²

What we need today is a return to the brand of creative and pragmatic American leadership that has succeeded before. Noteworthy examples include America’s role in founding the United Nations as well as its advocacy for international agreements that analysts believe have prevented a boom in nuclear proliferation.

In *Strategic Cooperation: Global Challenges, 21st Century Tools*, we present nine foreign policy priorities for Congress and the president. Our aim is to outline a better set of tools — practical steps the US can take to work in concert with the world towards greater collective security.

Footnotes

1. *US Role in the World*, August 3, 2007, The Program on International Policy Attitudes (PIPA)
2. *Americans and Russians on Nuclear Weapons and the Future of Disarmament*, November 9, 2007, PIPA.



Diplomacy with Iran

"Few countries were as helpful to the United States in its early involvement in Afghanistan as Iran. Yet after the fall of the Taliban, the US failed to capitalize on the possibilities of that strategic relationship. Now coalition and Afghan troops are losing ground against the same insurgents they confronted in 2001, in a war that the United States is unlikely to win unless it rethinks its relationship with Iran."

- Lawrence J. Korb, Former assistant secretary of defense in the Reagan administration and senior fellow at the Center for American Progress, and Laura Conley, special assistant at the Center for American Progress.

In their final months, the Bush administration tacked tentatively towards diplomacy with Iran, though they ultimately failed to adopt the robust approach needed to repair the relationship. Congress and the new president must make Iran a top priority, and quickly set the right tone for getting US-Iran relations on the right track.

Concerns about Iran's nuclear program have often overshadowed the need for a new approach to the overall US-Iran relationship. For the United States, the goal of diplomacy should go beyond convincing the Iranians to forgo nuclear weapons, and should address our common security concerns. Iran is a dominant political player that has shown again and again its potential to be potently helpful as well as deeply undermining to US security interests in the region. Negotiations with Iran should emphasize their shared strategic interests with the United States, such as stabilizing Iraq and Afghanistan.

In addition, the United States needs a more effective strategy to work with Iran on nuclear nonproliferation issues. The Bush administration's approach was counterproductive. The findings of the *2007 National Intelligence Estimate on Iran*², representing the consensus view of all 16 American intelligence agencies, reported that Iran's nuclear weapons program has been on hold since 2003 and that the decision to freeze the program was based on a cost-benefit approach that took into account political, economic and military costs. In spite of that, hawks in the Bush administration pushed behind the scenes to attack Iran militarily. The US pursued several rounds of UN sanctions against Iran and Congress considered unilateral sanctions legislation without seeing changes in Iran's behavior or any improvements in the relationship.³ The Bush administration eliminated direct diplomacy as an option and insisted that Iran cease uranium enrichment as a precondition to opening negotiations. Iran has continued uranium enrichment as the US has continued its policy of isolation, and the pitched rhetoric has made

public support for uranium enrichment inside Iran a matter of national pride.

The new president will need a sophisticated strategy based on a real understanding of Iran's national culture and political system. The Bush administration's saber-rattling approach made it easier, not harder, for hardliners inside Iran to ratchet up their anti-American rhetoric. Conversely, soon after the 2008 elections, some inside Iran expressed careful hope that the incoming president would embrace diplomacy in a way that would help moderates who have argued for normalized relations with the US for years.

It was those Iranian moderates who argued for and won Iranian support for the US effort in Afghanistan. Their voices were marginalized when, soon after Iran's assistance in Afghanistan, President Bush included Iran in his "Axis of Evil," and started insisting that Iran's uranium enrichment program was for clandestine nuclear weapons development.⁴

In a *New York Times* Opinion Editorial, Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, who worked in the National Security Council under the Bush administration, outline a possible framework for broad, productive negotiations with Iran. They propose that the US would need to clarify that it does not seek to overthrow the current regime, pledge to stop unilateral sanctions if Iran holds up its end of the bargain, normalize relations and remove Iran from the list of countries that sponsor terrorism. In exchange, Iran would need to address proliferation risks from its nuclear program, allow intrusive inspections, support a just and lasting settlement between Israel and Palestine, and stop providing military training and supplies to terrorist organizations.⁵

The arrival of a new administration in the US offers an opportunity for a new beginning with Iran. We can achieve a strategic, working relationship with Iran in the next few years, if we start now.

The new president and Congress should:

1. Pursue wide-ranging, direct negotiations without preconditions with Iran. Former US secretaries of state Colin Powell, Madeleine Albright, Warren Christopher, James Baker and Henry Kissinger all favor negotiating with Iran to address its nuclear program.⁶

The US can quickly set a constructive tone with Iran with early concrete steps, such as appointing a special envoy to Iran and opening an interests section. After roughly 30 years without diplomatic relations, the US needs to send a clear message that it is interested in productive engagement, and lay the groundwork for higher-level talks in the future. Talks should cover a wide range of issues, including US-Iranian cooperation in stabilizing Iraq and Afghanistan, security assurances by the US, and the future of Iran's uranium enrichment program.

2. Refrain from hostile rhetoric and saber-rattling. The Bush administration's use of hostile rhetoric paired with incidents like the misunderstanding in the Strait of Hormuz between Iranian speedboats and US warships teetered dangerously towards a direct military confrontation, and strengthened President Ahmadinejad's political standing inside Iran. The new administration should make a clean break in tone and posture from the Bush approach.

3. Announce that the US does not seek regime change in Iran. With the threat of overt military action on the table, negotiations between the US and Iran are less likely to succeed from the beginning. In addition, the Iranian government views the US-funded “democracy promotion” program in Iran as an American attempt to incite a “velvet revolution.”⁷ Pro-democracy reformists and human rights activists note that the Iranian people are best positioned to create change, and threats of regime change by the US hurt their cause as reformists are made the targets of government crack-downs.⁸ The US can make it clear that it seeks a change in the behavior of Iran, rather than a change in leadership.

Footnotes

1. “The Contributions of Iran,” *The Boston Globe*, October 24, 2008
2. “U.S. Says Iran Ended Atomic Arms Work,” *New York Times*, Dec 3, 2007
3. *Joint Experts’ Statement on Iran*, November 2008
4. “Iran, N. Korea still part of ‘axis of evil’-W.House,” *Reuters*, July 21, 2008
5. “How to Defuse Iran,” *New York Times*, Flynt Leverett and Hillary Mann Leverett, December 11, 2007
6. “Five former U.S. state secretaries urge Iran talks,” *Reuters*, September 16, 2008
7. “An Exercise in Futility: State Department ‘Democracy Promotion’ Funding for Iran,” The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, April 22, 2008.
8. “Shirin Ebadi: Don’t Attack Iran,” *The Nation*, April 29, 2008.



Toward a Nuclear Weapons Free World

“Reassertion of the vision of a world free of nuclear weapons and practical measures toward achieving that goal would be, and would be perceived as, a bold initiative consistent with America’s moral heritage. The effort could have a profoundly positive impact on the security of future generations. Without the bold vision, the actions will not be perceived as fair or urgent. Without the actions, the vision will not be perceived as realistic or possible.”

- Former Senator Sam Nunn, former Secretary of Defense William Perry, former Secretary of State George P. Shultz, and former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger

A number of factors are combining to give new urgency to the call for concrete actions toward a world without nuclear weapons. For the last eight years, the Bush administration has reiterated an aggressive nuclear posture that fails to address our modern security challenges, undermines nuclear nonproliferation efforts, and is out of step with international nonproliferation sentiment. The 2002 Nuclear Posture Review (NPR) took US nuclear policy in the wrong direction. Abandoning the idea that the only role of the US nuclear arsenal was to deter, the NPR put forward the possibility of preemptive nuclear strikes against other countries, some of which do not possess nuclear weapons of their own.² In support of this posture, the Bush administration proposed plans for a greatly refurbished nuclear stockpile and infrastructure. It advocated for new and “more usable” nuclear weapons, which Congress repeatedly blocked. Yet the security threats currently facing the US, such as nuclear terrorism, are not addressed by maintaining a large nuclear arsenal.

The worldwide “nuclear club” is growing. North Korea announced in 2003 its intention to withdraw from the cornerstone Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT), and in October 2006 conducted an underground nuclear test. India, Pakistan, and Israel remain outside of the NPT. Decisive action needs to be taken to strengthen the nonproliferation regime.³

Voices from across the political spectrum state that the goal of a world without nuclear weapons is both critical to global security and achievable. Yet it is unlikely to happen without US leadership. Many non-nuclear states feel that the nuclear weapons states have failed to fulfill their obligations to work toward disarmament under the NPT. Over-

all, a failure to take proactive steps toward disarmament undermines the key international relationships that are critical to the United States' long-term security.

Former Manhattan Project scientist and presidential Science Policy Adviser Wolfgang Panofsky wrote, "An effective nuclear policy would take into account the limited present-day need for a nuclear arsenal as well as the military and political dangers associated with maintaining a massive stockpile.... Given that the risks posed by nuclear weapons far outweigh their benefits in today's world, the United States should lead a worldwide campaign to de-emphasize their role in international relations."⁴

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Immediately resume talks with Russia for deep, verifiable reductions in US and Russian nuclear weapons stockpiles.** The Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START) with Russia, which established a system to verifiably reduce both US and Russian arsenals, is set to expire in December 2009 with nothing to replace it. The usefulness of the US nuclear arsenal is increasingly in question in the post-Cold War world. Enemies of the past, such as the USSR, either no longer exist or do not pose an imminent threat. Maintaining a large stockpile is dangerous and expensive. The US and Russia should make deep, verifiable, and irreversible reductions to their nuclear weapons stockpiles as a first step towards eventual global elimination.
- 2. Commit to ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty (CTBT).** By banning the testing necessary for new nuclear weapons development, the CTBT is a critical component of nuclear nonproliferation. More than 180 nations have signed the CTBT and 148 have ratified it, banning all forms of nuclear weapons testing⁵ and creating a monitoring system to effectively verify compliance.⁶ The US has observed a moratorium on nuclear weapons testing since 1992 and is one of nine key states that must ratify the treaty for it to enter into force.
- 3. Create a new US nuclear posture that reflects post-Cold War realities and commits to a "no first-use" policy for nuclear weapons.** A new nuclear posture should instead center on a long-term plan for global disarmament.
- 4. Stop the development of new nuclear weapons such as the Reliable Replacement Warhead.** The creation of new nuclear weapons could spur a new arms race and sends the wrong message to the international community, further undermining the nonproliferation regime.
- 5. Unilaterally de-alert US nuclear weapons.** The high alert status of US nuclear weapons is a relic of the Cold War and creates the risk of accidental or unauthorized launches. In 1995, the US and Russia narrowly avoided nuclear war when Russian radar mistakenly identified a US research rocket as a nuclear launch.⁷ In 1991, President George H. W. Bush unilaterally took hundreds of nuclear weapons off of high alert. President Gorbachev soon followed his example.⁸ The new president can change deployment practices to allow nuclear launches in days instead of minutes.
- 6. Ban the production of fissile material through a Fissile Material Cutoff Treaty (FMCT).** Capping the production of highly enriched uranium and plutonium would



set a real-world limit on potential nuclear development around the globe. A FMCT would bring countries that have not yet signed the NPT into the international non-proliferation framework.

7. Demonstrate US leadership on global nuclear disarmament by creating a plan to achieve that goal. The concrete, intermediate steps listed above are crucial to making progress toward a safer world. However, outlining the grander vision of a nuclear weapons free world will clarify the end goal that the world can work toward and ensure that all steps taken contribute to reaching it. UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon recently circulated an example of a plan for global disarmament, the Model Nuclear Weapons Convention, to UN member states.⁹

Footnotes

1. "A World Free of Nuclear Weapons," *Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2007
2. "U.S. Nuclear Arms Stance Modified by Policy Study," *Washington Post*, Walter Pincus, March 23, 2002
3. "The NPT at 35: A Crisis of Compliance or a Crisis of Confidence?," Joshua Williams and Jon Wolfsthal
4. "Nuclear Insecurity," *Foreign Affairs*, September/October 2007
5. Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty Organization, www.ctbto.org
6. "The Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty: Effectively Verifiable," *Arms Control Today*, October 2008.
7. "Cold-War Doctrines Refuse to Die," *Washington Post*, March 15, 1998
8. "U.S. Nuclear Weapons Policy at the End of the Century: Lost Opportunities and New Dangers," *Foreign Policy in Focus*, V4 No 25, September 1999.
9. "Model Nuclear Weapons Convention," United Nations Official Document (UN Doc A/62/650), April 2007.



Responsibly Ending the War in Iraq

"There is no military solution to a problem like that in Iraq."

– General David Petraeus, Commander, US Central Command, Former Commanding General, Multinational Force Iraq, March 2007

"Every soldier who has served in Iraq knows the 'Man on the Moon' dilemma. 'You Americans can put a man on the moon, but you can't give me electricity I had under Saddam.' And then the conspiracy theorists kick in."

– General Paul Eaton (ret.), Former Security Transition Commanding General, Iraq, December 2007

Despite modest security gains from the surge strategy in Iraq, it has not met its stated goals of creating progress on political reconciliation and rebuilding. After the loss of more than 4,200 American lives, an estimated 655,000 Iraqi lives¹, and more than \$600 billion, the situation in Iraq is still tenuous, and the Iraqi people view the American occupation negatively. Nearly six years after the US invasion, Iraqi electricity production meets half of demand, and only 30 percent of Iraqis today feel they have enough electricity.² Iraqis are compelled to turn to political and religious organizations such as Moqtada al-Sadr's Mahdi Army for aid not provided by the US and Iraqi governments or the UN.³ The Iraqi government continues to be fractious and unproductive, and is still not widely seen as legitimate. The US must develop a new comprehensive strategy that addresses political, diplomatic, and humanitarian concerns to bring about stability in Iraq.

There is a steadily building consensus that the US needs this new strategy. President Barack Obama won an overwhelming victory in November's election after running on a clear promise to end the war. In an AP/Gfk poll shortly after the election, 78 percent of Americans said removing US troops from Iraq by 2010 should be an important or top priority.⁴ The Iraqi government sent a clear signal in negotiations in late 2008 over a bilateral agreement with the US that it wanted a hard and fast deadline for withdrawal of US troops.⁵ The US government has a mandate, and an imperative for the well being of our economy and security, to implement a comprehensive strategy to end the war in Iraq.

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Set a timeline for withdrawal of all US troops and private contractors.** A military presence is not going to help achieve the necessary political progress in Iraq. Setting a clear timeline for withdrawal will build greater trust with the Iraqi people and government and send a message that they must move forward on political reconciliation. Removing the military presence will also free up financial resources for domestic and security needs.
- 2. Carry out a complete withdrawal of troops, without leaving behind a provocative and counterproductive residual force.** A residual force in Iraq, which analysts say could be more than 35,000 troops,⁶ is what military adviser Stephen Biddle calls “the worst of both worlds.”⁷ The reduced number of troops would not be able to avoid combat, and would continue the perception of occupation that is causing increased violence. If the Iraqi people request international peacekeeping forces, the US should assist in coordinating that effort.
- 3. Engage in a robust diplomatic effort with regional stakeholders to help stabilize Iraq.** Iran, Syria and other states in the region have a shared interest in maintaining stability in Iraq. The US must recognize the influence of these countries. Without their cooperation, securing Iraq’s borders and stabilizing Iraq will be extremely difficult, if not impossible.
- 4. Increase humanitarian aid to address Iraq’s refugee crisis.** According to a May 2007 UN Briefing on the humanitarian crisis in Iraq, “2 million Iraqis are now estimated to have fled the country and nearly 1.9 million are estimated to be internally displaced persons (IDPs).”⁸ The US should increase assistance for displaced persons in and outside of Iraq and help resettle refugees.
- 5. Support Iraqi-led reconstruction and economic revitalization efforts.** The lack of basic services in Iraq, along with rampant unemployment, increases resentment against the United States and contributes to instability. Rather than squandering \$12 billion a month on a failed military strategy, the US should lead an international donor effort to contribute to reconstruction and economic projects. The US cannot continue to waste taxpayer dollars paying private contractors for wasteful items like monogrammed towels⁹; we must encourage investment in projects that are carried out by the Iraqi people.
- 6. Respect Iraq’s sovereignty by relinquishing control of Iraq’s resources and removing all military bases.** A critical piece of bringing stability and cooperative engagement between the US and Iraq is respect for Iraq’s status as a sovereign nation. The US must pledge that it has no intention to control Iraq’s valuable oil resources, and will not maintain a permanent or indefinite military presence.

Footnotes

1. “Study Claims Iraq’s ‘Excess’ Death Toll Has Reached 655,000,” David Brown, Washington Post, October 11, 2006
2. “Iraqis measure progress with flip of switch,” International Herald Tribune, November 14, 2008
3. “Iraq’s Biggest Aid Agency? Muqtada al-Sadr & Co.,” Ned Colt, MS-NBC, April 16, 2008
4. AP-GfK Poll, November 6-10, 2008
5. “New Iraq pact rules out US troops past 2011,” AP, November 10, 2008
6. “Many Troops Would Stay in Iraq if Democrat Wins,” Yochi Dreazen, Wall Street Journal, February 9, 2008
7. “Iraq: Go Deep or Get Out,” Stephen Biddle, Washington Post, July 11, 2007
8. “UN Humanitarian Briefing on the Crisis in Iraq,” May 2, 2007
9. “Appropriators skewer Army over contracting abuse,” Otto Kreisher, Congress Daily, February 27, 2008



The War in Afghanistan and Better Approaches to Ending Terrorism

“After September 11, 2001, increases in annual US Department of Defense spending dwarfed increases in spending for all other departments critical to counterterrorism combined (US Department of Justice, US Department of State, and US Department of Homeland Security) by five to one, even when the costs of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq were excluded.”

– **From the 2008 Rand Corporation report, “How Terrorist Groups End: Lessons for Countering al Qa’ida.”**

“As we ask our military to become the leading edge of our international engagement, we are putting a security face on that engagement. However benign and well-intended our forces, for other nations and peoples this can create a backlash against our policies and our presence. In the end, leading with our military chin could have the effect of endangering, rather than increasing, American security.”

– **Gordon Adams, Woodrow Wilson International Center, Testimony to the Senate Budget Committee, February 6, 2007**

On September 20th, 2001, in a speech to a joint session of Congress, President George W. Bush declared the beginning of a “Global War on Terror.” The speech was followed by the invasion of Afghanistan in October. Seven years later, the “War on Terror” has proven to be a counterproductive framework for addressing the threat of terrorism; it has in fact undermined long-term US security. In waging this war, the Bush administration has diverted resources and attention from more tested strategies that succeed in reducing terrorism.

The “War on Terror” has not reduced Al Qaeda’s influence or activity. In the six years following the invasion of Afghanistan, Al Qaeda was involved in more terrorist attacks than it had been in the previous six years, not counting attacks in Iraq and Afghanistan.¹

US casualties are increasing, with American troops dying in Afghanistan in 2008 than in any previous year.² According to the bipartisan Terrorism Index of 2008, 71 percent of the more than 100 top US foreign policy experts surveyed believe a terrorist attack on the scale of 9/11 is “likely or certain within the next decade.”³ Continued US air strikes and their resulting civilian casualties have increased tensions between the US and Afghan governments. The severity of the attacks and the ensuing anger compelled Defense Secretary Robert Gates to travel to Kabul and apologize.⁴

During the last seven years, the Bush administration has disproportionately focused on the blunt instrument of military force in lieu of more effective tools for combating terrorism. According to a RAND Corporation report, since 1968, only seven percent of all terrorist groups that have ended were taken down by military force. In contrast, 40 percent of those groups were defeated through police and intelligence work, and 43 percent gave up terrorism as they were integrated into the political process.⁵ The framework of the “Global War on Terror” has set up unrealistic expectations of a military victory against non-state actors, and the apportioning of counterterrorism resources has reflected that flawed approach.

Increasing troop levels in Afghanistan would be a continuation of the deeply misguided strategy that failed under President Bush. In order to make the world safer from terrorism, the US needs to fundamentally redefine the problem, and invest its resources in a comprehensive new counterterrorism strategy based on a diversity of tactics with a concrete history of success.

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Replace the “Global War on Terror” framework with a counterterrorism strategy based on proven methods.** Terrorists are criminals, not armies at war with the United States, and the Bush administration’s war footing has obscured more pragmatic approaches and fed anti-American sentiment. Our new political leadership should set aside the ideologically charged rhetoric of the “War on Terror,” and instead adopt the pragmatic language, and tactics, of “counterterrorism.”
- 2. Focus resources on policing and intelligence.** Targeted police work, including the use of human intelligence, has proved to be one of the most effective methods for combating terrorism. This could include work by US intelligence agencies as well as cooperation with foreign intelligence agencies and police. Local police are more likely than US troops to have a permanent presence in key areas and understand the local threat environment.
- 3. Engage in robust diplomacy with stakeholders in the region.** In 2001, Iran cooperated with the US following the invasion of Afghanistan and contributed millions of dollars in reconstruction funds.⁶ Iran is an influential regional power and has a shared interest in stabilizing Afghanistan. The US should work closely with Iran and other stakeholders such as Pakistan, India, and Russia.
- 4. Support negotiations with elements of the Taliban.** Afghan President Hamid Karzai has expressed interest in pursuing diplomatic negotiations with elements of the Taliban willing to accept the sovereignty of the Afghan government. The US should follow through on Defense Secretary Robert Gates’ stated support for the concept. As



Gates noted in October of 2008, “At the end of the day, that’s how most wars end... That’s ultimately the exit strategy for all of us.”⁷

- 5. Strengthen and deploy non-military aid and engagement.** The US should strengthen foreign policy tools other than military force, particularly in the State Department. As Defense Secretary Robert Gates noted, “There is a need for a dramatic increase in spending on the civilian instruments of national security—diplomacy, strategic communications, foreign assistance, civic action, and economic reconstruction and development.”⁸ Non-military assistance will be instrumental in securing the cooperation of local civilian populations, which will be critical in building an effective counterterrorism strategy. Greater economic opportunity will also help alleviate grievances that make terrorist recruitment easier.
- 6. Reduce the US military footprint in Afghanistan with the goal of complete withdrawal of US troops.** Blunt military force is ineffective in eradicating terrorist groups; it merely causes them to relocate. The heavy reliance on military force, especially air strikes, also alienates the local population and undermines political reconciliation. The US should work with the international community to build the Afghan police and military, and arrange for non-US peacekeeping forces if necessary.
- 7. Develop a comprehensive plan for cooperation with Pakistan on counterterrorism and development.** Pakistan is an integral partner in fighting terrorism and stabilizing Afghanistan, and is caught in a complex web of regional issues and security concerns. US policy has been over reliant on military aid, sending unaccountable funds without clear progress.⁹ The US should use political, economic and diplomatic tools to work effectively with Pakistan. In addition, the US should cease cross-border raids into Pakistan without the permission of the Pakistani government. Retired Army Major General Mahmud Ali Durrani, a key player in Pakistan’s national security and former ambassador to the US, said of the raids, “It is doing exactly the opposite of what you are trying to do. We are trying to separate the good guys from the bad guys, trying to separate the tribes from the militants.¹⁰ We made it abundantly clear that this [attack] was pushing them together and creating sympathy for the militants.” The US must build trust with the Pakistani people and government and use funds effectively for development and targeted counterterrorism efforts.

Footnotes

1. "How Terrorist Groups End: Lessons for Countering al Qa'ida," Seth G. Jones and Martin C. Libicki, Rand Corporation, 2008, p.110
2. "2008 Marks Deadliest Year for U.S. Troops in Afghanistan," CNN.com, September 11, 2008
3. "The Terrorism Index 2008," *Foreign Policy Magazine* and the Center for American Progress, *Foreign Policy Magazine*, September/October 2008
4. "U.S. vows to back off if fighters use Afghan civilians as cover," CNN.com, November 9, 2008
5. "How Terrorist Groups End: Lessons for Countering al Qa'ida," Seth G. Jones and Martin C. Libicki, Rand Corporation, 2008, p.110
6. "The Contributions of Iran," Lawrence J. Korb and Laura Conley, *The Boston Globe*, October 24, 2008
7. "Gates: U.S. would support Afghan peace talks with Taliban," Mike Mount, CNN, October 10, 2008
8. "Partnership for Progress: Advancing a New Strategy for Prosperity and Stability in Pakistan and the Region," Caroline Wadhams, Brian Katulis, Lawrence Korb, and Colin Cookman; Center for American Progress, November 2008
9. Ibid.
10. "No Predators Please," Ron Moreau, *Newsweek*, November 7, 2008



Preventing Nuclear Terrorism

“The complexities of producing nuclear bomb materials from scratch are beyond the plausible capabilities of terrorist groups. Hence, if all the stockpiles produced by states can be reliably kept out of terrorist hands, nuclear terrorism can be reliably prevented. But once nuclear material has been stolen, it could be anywhere, and all the subsequent layers of defense, unfortunately, are variations on looking for needles in haystacks.”¹

- Matthew Bunn, “Securing the Bomb 2008”

Preventing a nuclear terrorist attack is possible if the US moves quickly to take all necessary steps. There has been no evidence that a terrorist group has already acquired the material necessary for a nuclear attack. The US already has in place several successful programs that have made real progress towards securing nuclear weapons and material. However, much more can and should be done to prevent a nuclear terrorist attack. The US can lead the international community in addressing this threat, increase coordination between agencies in the US, and prioritize high levels of funding to threat reduction programs.

Nuclear material such as highly enriched uranium (HEU) remains vulnerable in more than forty countries, sometimes secured with “little more than a night watchman and a chain-link fence.”² In 2006, a Russian man traveled to Georgia to sell weapons-grade highly enriched uranium to a Georgian agent posing as a buyer.³ Theft and smuggling of nuclear material, especially in the former Soviet Union, is one of the most probable ways for terrorist groups to acquire the material needed for a nuclear weapon.

However, strict security measures in the US are also not foolproof. In April 2008, a government-run exercise where mock terrorists succeeded in gaining access to special nuclear material at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory illustrated one scenario where terrorists could detonate a “dirty bomb” or improvise a crude nuclear device.⁴ The Project on Government Oversight reports that this lab “poses the most significant security threat of any such facility in the US. Roughly seven million people live within a fifty mile radius of the Livermore Lab, which has approximately one ton of weapons-grade and weapons-quantity of plutonium and highly enriched uranium.”⁵

The proliferation of nuclear weapons and nuclear technology to more countries has expanded the number of targets for possible theft by terrorists. The August 2008 resigna-

tion of President Pervez Musharraf of Pakistan – home to A.Q. Khan’s former nuclear network and a hiding place of Al Qaeda – quickly brought the security of Pakistan’s nuclear arsenal into question amidst the political transition to a new leader.⁶ The 9/11 Commission Report states that “al Qaeda has tried to acquire or make nuclear weapons for at least ten years” and their efforts continue.⁷

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Appoint a high level White House official to oversee efforts to prevent nuclear terrorism.** Lack of coordination between agencies is one of the biggest roadblocks to progress. The 9/11 Commission Act created a White House Coordinator for the Prevention of Weapons of Mass Destruction Proliferation and Terrorism, but that position has remained unfilled.⁸ Appointing a high level official to this type of position would ensure oversight, coordination between the White House and different departments, and a sustained effort towards carrying out a comprehensive plan to eliminate the threat of nuclear weapons.
- 2. Prioritize adequate funding and resources for programs dealing with nuclear security.** Additional funding and adequate personnel would allow current efforts to proceed more quickly and expand to take advantage of new opportunities. Currently, the “entire budget for all programs to prevent nuclear terrorism comes to less than one-quarter of one percent of the defense budget.”⁹ An investment at the level of about one percent of annual US defense spending would greatly reduce the risk of nuclear theft and bring about a high level of security.¹⁰
- 3. Fully fund the Global Threat Reduction Initiative.** Recognizing the danger posed by insufficient security measures at about 140 research reactors worldwide that use HEU, the US launched the Global Threat Reduction Initiative in 2004. This program helps to increase site security and remove HEU to more secure locations.¹¹ GTRI addresses the global threat in countries around the world, and an estimated increase of an additional \$200 million beyond the FY 2009 budget request would allow GTRI to expand quickly to address new risks.¹²
- 4. Fully fund the Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program.** Cooperation between the US and Russia is critical to eliminating the threat of nuclear terrorism. The Nunn-Lugar Cooperative Threat Reduction Program addresses the threat of loose nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons in the former Soviet Union, and has achieved the deactivation of 7,298 strategic nuclear warheads, the destruction of 724 intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs), upgraded security at seventeen nuclear weapons storage sites, and more. The program has also helped to re-employ 58,000 former weapons scientists in peaceful work so that they are less likely to pursue weapons research for other countries.¹³
- 5. Strengthen UN Security Council Resolution 1540.** This 2004 resolution attempts to set global standards for nuclear security. By clarifying standards and enforcement and specifying how states should meet their obligations to fulfill it, a stronger system to prevent nuclear terrorism can be established.

Footnotes

1. “Securing the Bomb 2008,” Matthew Bunn, Project on Managing the Atom, Harvard University, and Nuclear Threat Initiative, November 2008
2. Ibid.
3. “Smuggler’s Plot Highlights Fear Over Uranium,” *New York Times*, January 25, 2007
4. “Security Flaws Exposed at Nuke Lab,” *Time Magazine*, May 12, 2008
5. “U.S. Nuclear Weapons Complex: Livermore Homes and Plutonium Make Bad Neighbors”, Project on Government Oversight, March 17, 2008
6. “In Musharraf’s Wake, U.S. Faces Political Disarray”, *New York Times*, August 18, 2008
7. “9/11 Commission Report,” The National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, July 22, 2004, pg. 380
8. “Time to Name a Coordinator for WMD Proliferation,” Kingston Reif, The Center for Arms Control and Non-Proliferation, June 26, 2008.
9. Bunn, “Securing the Bomb 2008,” pg. 115.
10. Ibid, pg. 180.
11. “Thwarting Terrorists: More to be Done,” *Washington Post*, September 26, 2007
12. Bunn, “Securing the Bomb 2008,” pg. 119.
13. “Nunn-Lugar Update September 2008,” lugar.senate.gov/press, September 2008



Prohibiting Torture, Restoring Human Rights

“Just a couple of weeks ago I visited our troops in Afghanistan. While I was there I spoke to a senior intelligence officer who told me that treating detainees harshly is actually an impediment – a ‘roadblock’ to use that officer’s word – to getting intelligence from them....Here’s why, he said – al Qaeda and Taliban terrorists are taught to expect Americans to abuse them. They’re recruited based on false propaganda that says the United States is out to destroy Islam. Treating detainees harshly only reinforces their distorted view and increases their resistance to cooperate. The abuse at Abu Ghraib was a potent recruiting tool for al Qaeda and handed al Qaeda a propaganda weapon they could use to peddle their violent ideology.”

– Sen. Carl Levin, Senate Armed Services Committee Hearing: *The Origins of Aggressive Interrogation Techniques*, June 17, 2008.

“I know the counter-argument well -- that we need the rough stuff for the truly hard cases, such as battle-hardened core leaders of al-Qaeda, not just run-of-the-mill Iraqi insurgents. But that’s not always true: We turned several hard cases, including some foreign fighters, by using our new techniques. A few of them never abandoned the jihadist cause but still gave up critical information. One actually told me, ‘I thought you would torture me, and when you didn’t, I decided that everything I was told about Americans was wrong. That’s why I decided to cooperate.’

– Matthew Alexander, (pseudonym) a lead interrogator who was assigned to a Special Operations task force in Iraq in 2006.

President Bush unequivocally stated, “This government does not torture people.”¹ The illegality of torture has broad and long-standing recognition and is laid out in Common Article III of the Geneva Conventions, accepted by 194 countries, including the US. However, in the name of the “War on Terror,” the Bush administration systematically undermined the internationally accepted prohibition on torture by authorizing its use against detainees. The use of torture, indefinite detention, and extraordinary rendition does not improve America’s security, has damaged the reputation of the US in the international community and has fueled terrorist recruitment.

The Bush administration broke important national and international laws by authorizing the use of torture, putting our own troops at risk. A 2002 memo signed by former Secretary of Defense Donald Rumsfeld authorized harsh interrogation methods for prisoners at Guantánamo Bay.² A February 7, 2002 memo signed by President Bush declared that “alleged al Qaida or Taliban members wouldn’t be considered prisoners of war and, further, that they wouldn’t be granted protection under Common Article Three,” a part of the Geneva Conventions that sets “the minimum standard for conduct in any conflict, whether internal or international.”³

These documents paved the way for the shocking abuse of prisoners that occurred in Afghanistan, Abu Ghraib, and Guantánamo under US supervision. Inhumane treatment of detainees included “isolating people for long periods of time, using stress positions, exploiting fear of dogs, and implementing sleep and light deprivation.”⁴ Newly disclosed memos show that the Bush administration in 2003 and 2004 approved the CIA’s use of interrogation techniques that included torture, such as waterboarding.⁵ In addition, at Guantánamo, military officials routinely denied detainees access to monitors from the International Red Cross.⁶ It is estimated that 250 detainees are still at Guantánamo and some have been held for six years without being formally charged with a crime.⁷

Torture does not improve our security. Intelligence experts note that torture is unnecessary and counterproductive to gathering intelligence as physical and mental abuses can harden prisoners or lead to worthless information.⁸ “You don’t learn anything if you torture people,” says Arthur Hulnick, a 35-year veteran of the CIA and military intelligence who supervised the questioning of North Korean defectors.⁹ An interrogator who uses the pseudonym Matthew Alexander prohibited the use of torture when he led an interrogations team assigned to a Special Operations task force in Iraq. Instead, they adhered to the US Army Field Manual and used methods “based on building rapport with suspects, showing cultural understanding and using good old-fashioned brainpower to tease out information”⁸ that achieved results. Their work led to learning the location of Al Qaeda leader Abu Musab al-Zarqawi in Iraq.⁹

The abuses at Abu Ghraib came to light five years ago. However, their memory, along with the ongoing abuses at Guantánamo, still defines America’s reputation in many parts of the world, especially the Middle East.

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Immediately announce the intention to close Guantánamo and set a date for completion.** Closing Guantánamo would signal respect for human rights and a return to the rule of law. Doing so would improve US relations with the rest of the world and help affirm US commitment to the prohibition on torture. At a roundtable discussion of bipartisan advice to the next administration, five former Secretaries of State called for closing Guantánamo.¹⁰
- 2. Issue an executive order to ban torture and cruel treatment, as defined by international law.** The abuse and harsh interrogation of detainees in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Guantánamo were not isolated incidents conducted by a few wayward individuals. All orders, memoranda and legal opinions authorizing cruel treatment or secret detention should be rescinded. A report by the bipartisan Leadership Group on



US-Muslim Engagement states that a US commitment to the prohibition of all forms of torture is one of the first steps that should be taken to help restore US-Muslim relations and undercut support for extremism.¹¹

3. Restore habeas corpus and basic criminal justice rights. The global “War on Terror” was used to justify eliminating detainees’ rights under the Geneva Conventions. In June 2008, the US Supreme Court ruled that detainees have the right to habeas corpus, a long-standing legal principle in the US Constitution.¹² The new president and Congress should act in accordance with this ruling.

4. Create an independent commission to investigate detentions and interrogations by the US government during the “War on Terror.” We need to understand the extent and impact of abuses in order to make informed decisions in the future. Recommendations on how to avoid abuse and cruel treatment should be quickly implemented.

5. End the use of extraordinary renditions. The transfer of detainees, terrorism suspects, and others to countries where they may be tortured or receive ill treatment undermines international law prohibiting torture.

Footnotes

1. "Bush Says Interrogation Methods Aren't Torture," *New York Times*, October 6, 2007
2. "Documents Helped Sow Abuse, Army Report Finds," *Washington Post*, August 30, 2004.
3. "Day 4: Easing of laws that led to detainee abuse hatched in secret," *mcclatchydc.com*, June 18, 2008.
4. "Documents Helped Sow Abuse, Army Report Finds," *Washington Post*, August 30, 2004.
5. "CIA Tactics Endorsed In Secret Memos," *Washington Post*, October 15, 2008
6. "Red Cross Monitors Barred From Guantánamo," *New York Times*, November 16, 2007
7. "Bin Laden aide gets life sentence at Guantánamo trial," *Agence France-Presse*, November 3, 2008
8. "I'm Still Tortured by What I Saw in Iraq," *Washington Post*, November 30, 2008.
9. "Lessons from Abu Ghraib," *Christian Science Monitor*, May 5, 2004.
10. "Former secretaries of State: Close Guantánamo", *Atlanta Journal-Constitution*, March 27, 2008.
11. "Changing Course – A New Direction for U.S. Relations with the Muslim World," Leadership Group on U.S.-Muslim Engagement, September 2008, pp. 76-77
12. "Guantánamo prisoners can appeal," *International Herald Tribune*, June 13, 2008



Diplomacy and the Global Energy Economy: A New Frontier

“Without including costs of war, NPP research estimates that approximately \$100 billion of the military budget is spent to fulfill the mission of securing access to energy in fiscal year 2009. If we include three-fourths of the spending on the Iraq War, the figure doubles. Without war, securing energy access accounts for about 20 percent of the Department of Defense budget.”

– From “The Military Cost of Securing Energy,” a report by the National Priorities Project.

In today’s globalized world, our country’s greatest challenges are inextricably woven together. Peace, affordable energy, a healthy environment, and a strong economy all require new energy strategies grounded in greater international cooperation.

America’s new energy strategy needs two broad and coequal initiatives. First we need an Apollo Project-like push for a steep ramp up of energy efficiency and renewable energy at home. But a new national energy economy isn’t enough. Like it or not, far-flung fossil fuels are in our short-term future. Competition for energy resources will grow as countries like China and India address their growing needs. We will also need a bold diplomatic initiative that shares the Apollo Project’s vision and ambition. Competition for dwindling resources and the threat of climate change demand global strategic cooperation the likes of which we’ve never seen before.

The current approach to US energy security and international relations is embodied in the Carter Doctrine. In January of 1980, Jimmy Carter shared his doctrine with the public in his last State of the Union speech:

“Let our position be absolutely clear: An attempt by any outside force to gain control of the Persian Gulf region will be regarded as an assault on the vital interests of the United States of America and such an assault will be repelled by any means necessary, including military force.”¹

The Carter Doctrine spawned the Rapid Deployment Joint Task Force (RDJTF), which Ronald Reagan elevated to the US Central Command (CENTCOM) in 1983. This command has been particularly expensive in terms of US blood and treasure. This is where Americans have fought and died. The peacetime cost of the US military presence in the Persian Gulf is approximately \$50 billion annually, or roughly 10% of the military budget. Add the cost of recruiting, training, and equipping the forces and costs rise to \$150 to \$200 billion.²

The doctrine of military might to protect fossil fuels has expanded to include deploying other US forces. This includes European Command (which is training local soldiers to protect the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan pipeline in Georgia) and a newly minted AFRICOM whose creation explicitly relates to oil in places like Nigeria, Sudan, Libya and Angola.³ If one adds the cost of these other operations you start to see just how expensive the Carter Doctrine is. What could be accomplished by investing these funds in clean energy sources?

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Pass the President's plans on energy and climate change into law.** Implement a cap-and-trade program to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 80 percent by 2050, invest \$150 billion over the next ten years to build a clean energy future, and increase the share of our electricity we get from renewable sources to 25 percent by 2025.
- 2. Replace the Carter Doctrine with a more comprehensive approach that emphasizes strategic cooperation and multilateral institutions to ensure energy stability worldwide.**
- 3. Implement and expand the policy coordination mandated as part of the *Energy Diplomacy and Security Act*.**⁴ The State Department's Coordinator for International Energy Affairs, working with the Secretary of State, should increase the priority the department puts on energy diplomacy.
- 4. Create a new international energy organization to coordinate global energy strategy.** This organization would have a broader mandate than the International Energy Agency and would include leadership from developing countries as well as mechanisms to bridge the divide between producing and consuming countries. The goal should be to replace the militarization of energy policy with the rule of law to ensure access to supply.
- 5. Work with the wealthiest countries to fund global efforts to develop clean energy and promote technology sharing that can tackle global warming and encourage sustainable development.**
- 6. Increase bilateral strategic cooperation with large energy consumer nations like China and India on the issues of climate change, renewable energy, strategic petroleum reserves and collective energy security.**
- 7. Increase stability in countries with significant energy resources by marshalling humanitarian and development aid towards areas to alleviate poverty and protect the environment.**



8. Begin to reduce the military footprint and expense of the old approach with a redeployment of troops from Iraq, while making sure that Iraqi oil is controlled by Iraqis. This can increase US security by reducing the widespread perception that the US invaded Iraq to control Iraq's oil and by reducing the stress on our military.

9. Increase US standing in the Middle East and therefore improve national security by further reducing our large, seemingly permanent military presence in the region. This presence underpins a narrative of neo-colonialism that is put forth both by adversaries like Al-Qaeda as well as at times by allies in the region.

Footnotes

1. Jimmy Carter, State of the Union Address, January 23, 1980.
2. M.A. Delucci and James Murphy, "U.S. Military Expenditures to Protect the Use of Persian Gulf Oil for Motor Vehicles," Energy Policy
3. Gabe Scheinmann, AFRICOM: A New American Military Command,
4. PolicyWatch #1259, The Washington Institute for Near East Policy.
5. This legislation was quietly folded into the 2007 Energy bill.



The Conventional Weapons Threat: Control the Illegal Arms Trade and Ban Cluster Bombs

There is currently one firearm in circulation for every ten people on the planet.¹

The United States is one of a number of countries that has stockpiled, produced and used cluster munitions, including nearly 13,000 cluster munitions containing an estimated 1.8 to 2 million submunitions, in the first three weeks of major combat in Iraq.²

According to Senators Dianne Feinstein and Patrick Leahy, “During the 1991 Gulf War, U.S. cluster munitions caused more U.S. troop casualties than any single Iraqi weapon system, killing 22 U.S. servicemen.”³

Despite the grave threat they pose to human rights and security, concerns about conventional weapons too often fly under the radar of the international community. The vast, largely unregulated flow of small arms and light weapons—weapons that can be operated by one person or a small group—is an incredibly destructive force in the lives of civilians and endangers US soldiers in conflict zones. Unexploded cluster bombs, which often look like toys to unsuspecting children, have maimed and killed thousands of civilians and contribute to anger and resentment against the nations who deploy these weapons in battle, including the United States. The US has a moral imperative, as well as an urgent security need, to work cooperatively with the international community to stop the havoc brought about by these dangerous conventional weapons.

Illustrating the scope of the threat from the illegal arms trade, former UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan aptly stated, “The death toll from small arms dwarfs that of all other weapons systems... In terms of the carnage they cause, small arms, indeed, could well be described as ‘weapons of mass destruction.’”⁴ On average, small arms and light weap-

ons kill 300,000 people worldwide every year, primarily civilians.⁵ Many more “die, are injured, abused, forcibly displaced and bereaved as a result of armed violence.”⁶

The vast flow of small arms and light weapons contributes to global instability and fuels conflict. While conflict can exist without these weapons, the easy access and volume of weapons increases risk in unstable regions. The lack of sufficient export controls also endangers US soldiers in conflict zones. Over ten million small arms and light weapons were collected during the Taliban’s rise to power in Afghanistan. This accumulation of arms helped that state become a refuge for terrorists and a threat to US national security interests.⁷ In 2007, the Government Accountability Office reported that the Defense Department “...cannot fully account for at least 190,000 weapons reported as issued to Iraqi forces.”⁸

Like the illegal arms trade, the use of cluster bombs endangers civilians, especially children, and poses serious human rights concerns. Cluster bombs are indiscriminate weapons that rain small “bomblets” on targeted areas. Combat statistics indicate that between 10 and 40 percent of the bomblets fail to explode, becoming de facto landmines.⁹ The bomblets often explode at a later time when stepped on or picked up by unsuspecting civilians. Delegates at a major conference on cluster bombs in early 2008 estimated that four out of ten people killed or injured by cluster bombs are children.¹⁰ Despite the clear danger to innocent civilians, some countries still claim that cluster bombs have a necessary military purpose, and they were used in recent conflicts such as the Iraq war and the conflict between Israel and Lebanon. The US did not attend the international conference to finalize language in a treaty banning cluster bombs, and its current policy is that cluster bombs have a necessary military utility. The US made attempts to include loopholes in the treaty that would undermine efforts to decrease the threat from cluster bombs.¹¹

The US government has taken some positive steps to address the threat of conventional weapons in recent years. The Fiscal Year 2008 budget included a provision prohibiting the sale or transfer of cluster bombs with a failure rate higher than one percent.¹² The Bush administration has increased funding for programs designed to destroy stockpiles of conventional weapons. These initiatives are important, but 2009 offers opportunities to expand programs and work more actively with the international community to reduce the threat from small arms and light weapons.

The new president and Congress should:

- 1. Work with the UN to develop an International Arms Trade Treaty.** Many nations and regions have placed restrictions on the trade in small arms and light weapons. However, the globalized nature of the weapons trade means loopholes can be exploited if restrictions are not consistent throughout the entire international community.¹³ In 2006, 153 governments voted at the UN to begin work on a global Arms Trade Treaty. The US should take an active role in designing and implementing this agreement.¹⁴
- 2. Fund programs to destroy surplus and obsolete weapons.** Small arms and light weapons remain a continuous threat because of their longevity. Destruction programs keep weapons out of circulation, prevent misuse, and can raise political awareness.¹⁵ Since 2001, the US government has assisted in the destruction of more than one million small arms.¹⁶ Stockpile destruction is a low-cost, high-impact program,



and the US should increase funding to meet global demand for assistance.

3. Sign the Convention on Cluster Munitions. This treaty was completed in May 2008 and has the support of more than 100 nations, including the United Kingdom and most of the United States' other NATO allies.¹⁷ The treaty bans all types of cluster munitions and provides assistance to victims of cluster bombs and to clean up affected areas.¹⁸ The United States, along with Russia, China, India, Brazil, Pakistan and Israel, did not attend the conference and has not indicated an intention to sign the treaty. The human rights concerns around the use of cluster bombs outweigh any potential military utility, and the US should support the global ban.

Footnotes

1. "Gun Point," Christopher Hayes, The American Prospect, November 21, 2003
2. "Timeline of Cluster Munition Use," Fact Sheet, Human Rights Watch, 2008
3. "New Treaty Should Prompt New Administration to Review U.S. Policy on Cluster Munitions," Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Patrick Leahy, The Hill's Congress Blog, December 3, 2008
4. "We the Peoples: the role of the UN in the 21st Century," Millennium Report to the United Nations General Assembly
5. "Gun violence: A global epidemic," Fact Sheet, International Action Network on Small Arms
6. "Arms Without Borders: Why a globalised trade needs global controls," Control Arms Campaign, October 2006
7. "Senators Feinstein, Leahy, Akaka Introduce Bill to Curb International Small Arms Sales," Sen. Dianne Feinstein, July 13, 2004.
8. "2009 National Security Briefing Book," Peace and Security Initiative, November 2008
9. "Children are Forty Percent of Cluster Bomb Casualties," TV 3 News, New Zealand, February 19, 2008
10. Ibid.
11. "US: Efforts to Weaken Cluster Ban Treaty," Human Rights Watch, <http://www.hrw.org/en/news/2008/05/21/us-efforts-weaken-cluster-ban-treaty>
12. "US Senate Passes FY08 Budget bill with Iraq Money," Richard Cowan, Reuters, December 18, 2007
13. "Arms Without Borders: Why a globalised trade needs global controls," Control Arms Campaign, October 2006
14. "Voices from Around the World: The People's Consultation 2007- Global Report," Control Arms Campaign, 2007
15. "Small Arms Collection, Destruction, and Stockpile Protection," Federation of American Scientists, 2003
16. "2009 National Security Briefing Book," Peace and Security Initiative, November 2008
17. "Cluster Weapons: Scourge of Civilians," Human Rights Watch, September 23, 2008
18. "Cluster Bomb Treaty Breaks New Ground," Human Rights Watch, May 29, 2008



Rebalancing Security Spending for 21st Century Challenges

"The [Bush] White House, which basically let the Defense Department call the budgetary shots, vastly underfunded efforts by the State Department, the Justice Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development to train civilian police forces, build functioning judicial systems and provide basic development services to those war-torn countries..."

"If President-elect Obama wants to reverse this trend, he must...turn Gates's speeches on the need to promote soft power into reality with a massive transfer of funds from the Pentagon to the State Department, the Justice Department and USAID."

- Thomas A. Schweich, formerly ambassador for counter-narcotics in Afghanistan and deputy assistant secretary of state for international law enforcement affairs during the Bush administration.

In November 2008, shortly after winning the election, President-elect Obama committed to making budget review a centerpiece of his policymaking. Obama said, "A nation's budget reflects its values and priorities." What does our nation's security spending say about our values and priorities? Military spending – not even including the cost of wars in Afghanistan and Iraq – has increased by 60% since 2001. The increase in Department of Defense (DOD) funding *including* the Afghanistan and Iraq wars in the decade separating 1998 and 2008 is a staggering 90%.¹

A close look at this spending reveals a country that puts a very high priority on high-tech weapons systems and the capacity to fight major conventional wars. The budget reveals that those military programs are heavily funded (or valued) while our diplomatic corps and effective homeland security programs are woefully underfunded. Are the tools of high-tech war-fighting the most effective for actually keeping Americans safe in the 21st century? Or are we funding the strategies of yesterday instead of the strategies that

can bring our country real security in today's world?

Two forces are calling for significant reform and budget review for military spending. The first is the nation's current economic challenge and a federal budget under great pressure. The second is the recognition that an emphasis on Cold War-style military hardware and strategies may not be the savviest, most effective approach to the task of keeping Americans safe in the post-Cold War era.

Even the Pentagon's own internal oversight body, the Defense Business Board, has pointed out that defense spending is "not sustainable" and that in the midst of the nation's economic downturn, wasteful weapons systems and expenses must be eliminated.² Perhaps more importantly, there is a growing recognition that security spending across the federal budget is woefully out of balance. As Secretary of Defense Robert Gates put it in 2007: "Funding for non-military foreign affairs programs... remains disproportionately small relative to what we spend on the military. Consider that this year's budget for the Department of Defense—not counting operations in Iraq and Afghanistan—is nearly half a trillion dollars. The total foreign affairs budget request for the State Department is \$36 billion ... [T]here is a need for a dramatic increase in spending on the civilian instruments of national security."³

In order to rebalance security spending we also need to recognize that an overreliance on military force has had non-economic costs. Using military tools when other less costly and less bellicose tools are more appropriate has backfired. Terrorism around the world has increased. Anti-Americanism is at an all time high. Countries such as Russia and China have responded to our focus on military tools with their own military build-ups. The wars in Afghanistan and Iraq have been a recruitment pretext for our adversaries and have led to a perception of the US as a bellicose nation who seeks to control and occupy other countries. We do need to increase the emphasis on diplomacy, intelligence, and preventive tools, but we also need to recognize that US military tools have a narrow utility that should truly only be used as a "last resort".

The new President and Congress should:

- 1. Rebalance security spending** by reducing funding for major war-fighting while increasing funding for essential defensive (e.g. homeland security) and preventative (e.g. international aid) programs.
- 2. Realize immediate savings of 10% to 15%** of the military budget by eliminating outmoded cold war era weapons systems that are not needed to defend the country from the threats we currently face.⁴
- 3. Increase funding to protect against the greatest threat to US residents:** nuclear terrorism.
- 4. Increase funding for US contributions to international institutions** that underpin collective security efforts (e.g the United Nations, International Atomic Energy Agency, the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty Organization, and U.N. peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations.)
- 5. Increase funding for the diplomatic corps** to make up for shortfalls in staffing that



harm US diplomatic efforts.

6. Increase funding for carefully targeted homeland security needs (e.g. port security, rail security, first responders, health and disease preparedness, nuclear plant security).

7. Create specific venues to evaluate the current national security budget process and look at potential reforms for security spending. Mechanisms could include a *Select Committee on National Security and International Affairs* and/or a *Commission on Budgeting for National Security and International Affairs*.⁵

8. Reexamine current DOD planning that bases spending on the capacity to fight more than one large-scale conventional war backed up by a global military footprint that includes 860 bases and installations and 200,000 overseas military personnel. Does that force structure make Americans safer or does it lead to strategic overreach, such as with the Iraq war? Could those resources be put to better use in the current security environment?

Footnotes

1. Forceful Engagement, Carl Conetta Project on Defense Alternatives, December 2008. Pg. 11.

2. "Pentagon board says cuts essential", Bryan Bender, Boston Globe, Nov. 10, 2008

3. Lecture at Kansas State University, Robert Gates, Secretary of Defense, November 26, 2007. <http://www.defenselink.mil/speeches/speech.aspx?speechid=1199>

4. Examples of current programs that could be cut can be found in A Unified Security Budget, Report of the Task Force on for the United States, FY 2009. Institute for Policy Studies, September 2008. Pg. 3.

5. These specific recommendations are from Report of the Task Force on for the United States, FY 2009A Unified Security Budget. pg. 19.



www.peaceactionwest.org

A peace and security agenda for the President and the 111th Congress.