I would like to begin by recalling a few words that seem to be very popular on the lecture circuit these days. The counsel is brief but profound: "if we want to globalise democracy, we must also democratise globalisation."

This is an important theme, for it bears directly on one of the world's most difficult challenges -- specifically, how to ensure that the representative segments of society can participate meaningfully in the search for solutions to chronic global problems. This is a subject that should be of particular interest to private foundations that seek to strengthen international peace and security. One of the most important contributions that foundations and philanthropists can make in achieving such progress is by promoting -- in any way they can -- this democratic dimension of globalization, particularly as it applies to efforts to eliminate nuclear, biological, and chemical arms -- that is, weapons of mass destruction (WMD). It applies equally to efforts to improve controls over the production, sale, and use of a wide range of conventional arms.

Not that long ago, communicating and traveling across vast oceans and entire continents presented challenges that only a few intrepid adventurers could attempt. Yet today, millions of people around the globe engage in such activities every day. In his speech upon receiving his Nobel Peace Prize, Secretary-General Kofi Annan spoke of the "butterfly effect" -- whereby in some subtle ways the mere beat of a butterfly's wings on one side of the planet can lead to
significant changes in the weather across the globe.

The globalization of such effects is in no way limited just to the weather. The events of 9/11 show a darker side of this phenomenon, how chronic hatred - aggravated, if not in some cases even caused by underdevelopment and incubated in failed or neglected states - can combine with specialized scientific knowledge to jeopardize the security of all. In short, conflicts have become more contagious and can spread like deadly viruses or wildfires literally around the world. A thriving illicit market in small arms and light weapons feeds such conflicts, and became last year the subject of a major international conference at the United Nations. Add the ingredient of WMD, and the global stakes of ostensibly local or regional armed conflicts are easily apparent to all.

Yet globalization is much more than just a tidal wave of new threats. It is a great opportunity for the spread of good ideas, of trade and of prosperity. It is also a great challenge for good governance and democratic control and accountability. Perhaps it is an inevitable sign of our times that the United States -- the world's only military and economic superpower, and one of the greatest engines of globalization -- would also be one of the world's oldest and largest democracies. In a sense, it is now becoming a giant laboratory to test the resiliency of democracy to the new forces of globalization. The work in this laboratory is very important to the rest of the world to observe, for if globalization becomes a process wholly outside of democratic control in the mightiest of nations, how can the weakest hope to confront this challenge?

Efforts from civil society to promote creative responses to the security challenges of globalization do not spring from thin air. They are the result of concrete decisions made both inside and outside of government by fallible human beings. Often leaders who make key policy decisions are non-specialists. They must rely heavily upon the advice of experts who are often working with limited knowledge and even less public accountability. One of the most formidable challenges over the years ahead will be to ensure that leaders of the great powers, particularly in the United States, will use their vast powers wisely, in the interests of promoting a concept of human security that leaves no region, no country, indeed no person behind.

Because of the horrific effects of WMD, all who are concerned about human security must pay especially close attention to the twin inseparable challenges of disarmament and non-proliferation. It is indisputable that there is emerging in the world a global norm against the very existence of WMD. Chemical and biological weapons have already been outlawed by multilateral treaties (the CWC and BWC), while the nuclear-weapon states have committed themselves both under the NPT and in related undertakings to eliminate their nuclear arsenals, a commitment they described as "unequivocal" in a declaration issued at the time of the 2000 NPT Review Conference. Similarly binding commitments relate to halting the global spread of such weapons. In light of such obligations, it should come as no surprise to find the elimination of all WMD identified as a key goal of the Millennium Declaration, adopted at the United Nations in the year 2000 by the largest-ever gathering of heads of state and government.
Yet the barriers that leaders face in implementing these commitments are considerable. Some of the barriers are bureaucratic and psychological -- there are institutional forces that work either to perpetuate existing weapons programmes, or to inspire the continued pursuit of them. Some of these forces are economic in orientation -- weapons contractors, having invested billions in the capacity to produce WMD or their related delivery systems, are more likely than not to view disarmament as a threat to their livelihoods - a perception disproved by post Cold War experiences in defence conversion.

Other institutional obstacles include -- the military services that resist disarmament while seeking to acquire new weapons systems, ranging from increasingly-sophisticated conventional arms to new WMD; the specialized laboratories that perform weapons-related research and development; and the legislators in whose districts weapons components are made. This "weapons complex" is further sustained by the entertainment industry, which too often glorifies violence and propagates the myth that security is simply a function of firepower and megatonnage. The news media also serves this complex through its imbalanced coverage of foreign weapons threats, relative to the considerable progress that has already been made in eliminating such threats. Sadly, even some religious leaders have been known to provide new rationales to preserve and enhance national capabilities to build and/or use some of the world's deadliest weaponry.

In such an environment, one should perhaps not be overly surprised to see the emergence or perpetuation of military doctrines that call for preventive wars or preemptive military strikes -- attack options that do not exclude the possible use of nuclear weapons, even against states that do not have them. This problem of the "first-use" of nuclear weapons has been with us for a while, and is a doctrine that both NATO and the Russian Federation have adopted. Of all the five nuclear-weapon states, only China has categorically renounced the doctrine of first-use of nuclear weapons or their use against non-nuclear weapon states.

As global security threats continue to grow, how are the voices of democratic control and accountability throughout society to overcome such formidable institutional and political challenges? President Dwight Eisenhower evidently worried a lot about this problem, for it was a theme featured in his 1961 farewell address to the nation. Most people remember this speech by a phrase he used -- the "military-industrial complex" - to label many of the institutional forces I have just described. Yet his speech was not just intended to frighten, but to inspire. He mentioned that the best resource for meeting this challenge was, in his words, "an alert and knowledgeable citizenry."

Yet in a political culture where such vast wealth is concentrated in the hands of those who benefit from the perpetuation of weapons programmes that should not exist at all under international legal commitments, how can even those segments of society who are "alert and knowledgeable" work to defeat such formidable obstacles to disarmament and non-proliferation?

Philanthropy may not provide all the answers to this question, but who can doubt the vital
contributions of philanthropic institutions in encouraging the discovery and implementation of enlightened public policies? The weapons complex itself has little need for nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), since it already controls ample means of influencing policy: it has plenty of money, access, specialized knowledge, and domestic political power. The weapons complex is quite adept at exploiting the public sector to produce private benefits, and has documented this competence time and again.

There is, however, no institutional "disarmament complex" nor any research and development to overcome the obstacles facing those who seek to eliminate WMD and global proliferation threats, or to curb the manufacture and trade in conventional arms. Groups that seek to promote public goods cannot expect much help from institutional systems that view weapons threats as occasions for making money. Instead, individuals and groups who work for disarmament and non-proliferation must appeal to the enlightened self-interest of societies as a whole. They seek to influence policy makers, but also the general public. They bring knowledge to power, but they also bring knowledge about the misuse of power to citizens everywhere.

Examples of such activities are easy to find in the area of consumer affairs, where -- based on solid research findings -- citizen campaigns on behalf of safe automobiles and, somewhat earlier, regulation of the pharmaceutical and meat-packing industries led to significant changes of policy that benefited everyone in society, including even the meat packers, drug producers, and automobile manufacturers themselves who, as citizens, also eat, require medications, and commute to work.

A similar challenge faces those who work on behalf of disarmament and non-proliferation goals. By exposing not just the dangers posed by certain weapons systems, but by fostering a spirit of hope in a more co-operative and interdependent future for all, they are following a similar path to that followed by their colleagues in the field of public interest advocacy.

Here is where private foundations can have their greatest impact: they must touch both the hearts and minds of the general public and its leaders. The discovery of radioactive materials in mother's milk following the atmospheric nuclear tests of the 1950's and early 1960's, led to a global citizens' movement that culminated in the Partial Test Ban Treaty. A similar grassroots effort has not only placed landmines on the international disarmament agenda, but has contributed enormously to the evolution of international law against the very existence of such weapons, most notably through such instruments as the Mine Ban Convention and the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons. Just as citizen environmental groups have accomplished so much in cleaning the air and water we share, so are groups that advocate disarmament and non-proliferation working daily to clean the international security environment.

The global public interest community, however, faces another daunting challenge: to sustain sources of financial support, it must constantly document specific impacts of its work. Yet this can be extremely difficult to do, given that the benefits of such global norms as disarmament and non-proliferation flow to all and are difficult to measure in dollars or at times even in terms of
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discrete causes and effects.

At a time when the mass public is distracted by other day-to-day pursuits, and governments are preoccupied with other priorities, it becomes more essential than ever for individuals and NGOs to persist in all their valiant efforts on behalf of disarmament and non-proliferation. They are essential because they serve as bridges -- they link government with the people and they work to promote multilateral cooperation across national borders. These are absolutely vital roles to play. I can say without hesitation that the UN's Department of Disarmament Affairs depends extensively upon the support it receives from civil society, most of which is backed by private foundations. Although only a small number of the hundreds of NGOs that are accredited at the United Nations work specifically in the field of disarmament and non-proliferation, they do enormously important work in providing useful information to UN Permanent Missions, in advising the media on matters relating to ongoing deliberations at the UN, and in conveying the interests and concerns of their constituencies to all who work on such issues in the UN system.

I am impressed not just with the passion of NGO efforts in the field of disarmament but also with the quality of the work of this community. They undertake research that simply is not performed in government -- or, lamentably, even in academia, which remains more focused on theoretical approaches or policy work on security topics other than disarmament. Without invidiously singling out the efforts of any one group, I can say that the public interest community is responsible for some of the best work on the "rule of law" as it applies to disarmament. Some of the best publicly-available databases on this subject are maintained by NGOs, many of which are freely accessible through carefully-maintained, user-friendly web sites. Increasingly, I am seeing some familiar faces from the NGO community appearing on the media -- which in time will only further help to bring new insights to broader publics.

This community is, in short, engaging in a process of "democratising" how the world addresses one of its most difficult global security challenges. By helping individuals and groups who work on disarmament to make a difference, their funders are themselves making a difference and deserve full credit for the progress that has already been achieved.

Last April, Nobel Peace Laureate Jody Williams addressed a UN disarmament conference in Beijing and said, "If we want to live in a world with a meaningful agenda for disarmament in this century, civil society, like-minded governments, international agencies and the United Nations must forge a partnership to ensure that our 'idealistic' vision becomes the new reality."

I would like to amend her statement only slightly by underscoring once again the important role played by private foundations and philanthropists in enabling such a process of partnership and engagement to occur. I call upon philanthropists everywhere to help keep the flame of disarmament lit. This is an extraordinarily wise investment that future generations will never forget.