Dr. Carol S. Fuller
Round Table on A New Security Framework and Transatlantic Cooperation
Seminar of European Ideas Network
July 12, 2012

A new approach to multilateral security: what works, what doesn't?

<u>Background:</u>   a few words to explain my perspective: worked on security issues on both sides of the Atlantic, both from an operational and policy aspect – inside and outside governmental and intergovernmental organizations; 27 years as a US diplomat; 7 years working on counternarcotics and law enforcement issues in the Americas; after 9/11, 5 years working on revitalization of counterterrorism strategies and programs at the OAS, first as a diplomat and then 3 years as the head of the counterterrorism committee of the Americas CICTE; then Charge d'affaires and DCM at the US Mission to the OSCE. Now a private sector consultant. My comments today reflect purely my personal perspective, not those of the USG.

A new approach to multilateral security: what works, what doesn't?

We all know that security challenges have changed dramatically in the last few decades.   We were slow to adapt to the new challenges--and by "we," I mean collectively, governments, international organizations and the public at large--and we are still in the midst of adaptation. The concept of a new security approach or framework has become the topic of the day. But there have been many changes for the good since 9/11 in particular, and we seem to be moving towards a more multidimensional and coordinated approach than ever before. My comments today are personal observations, focusing on lessons learned, especially since 9/11, as to what works and what doesn't in security cooperation. Leaving aside the issues of economic threats to security and the conflict cycle, I intend to elaborate on four main points:

1. Security challenges have shifted from intergovernmental threats against the sovereignty of nations to transnational threats by non-state actors, and the international community needs to adapt and find new paradigms of cooperation.
2. The concept of multilateralism is also evolving to a more open system and the potential adaptation of multilateral organizations should not be undervalued.
3. New partnerships of collaboration should be fostered at all levels—between governments, between International Organizations and Regional and Subregional organizations, and between governments and all relevant actors in society.
4. Communication and public diplomacy can be key to success or failure in this new environment and must be part of any new approach.

Transnational threats require a new approach

- Whereas the terrorist attacks on the Twin Towers on 9/11 and subsequent attacks in London and Madrid raised consciousness about the threat of non-state actors, it may have been Moises Naim's 2005 ground breaking book--*Illicit: How Smugglers, Traffickers, and Copycats Are Hijacking the Global Economy*--that offered a new security paradigm. As former Colombian President Cesar

Gaviria, then head of the Organization of American States, said: *"Globalization is helping traffickers and limiting the governments that are trying – and largely failing – to stop them. Naím offers a fascinating new way of looking at a problem whose scope and consequences are not well understood by politicians, journalists and the public. This book will change the way we think about globalization and the new threats that affect the way we live."* Well, it did.

- We still worry about conventional threats such as the arms race and internal threats to democracy, but we are also looking more and more for better ways to address transnational threats, such as terrorism; organized crime; arms, drugs, and human trafficking; and the frighteningly new one of cyber threats. Why have we been so slow to adapt to a new approach?

- For the most part, we have learned that unilateralism no longer works, and no single country can "go it alone." Threats have acquired a system-wide significance. Transnational threats (or TNT) are multinational and multidimensional and require a multidimensional approach; we need multilateral now, more than ever.

- As more and more governments are facing austerity measures, one argument we can make domestically is that we can leverage our taxpayers' money and get more bang for our buck if we cooperate with others in meeting the TNT challenge. The withdrawal of ISAF from Afghanistan by 2014 will be a test case since we must all recognize the danger of TNTs (narcotics, weapons, terrorists) stemming from Afghanistan.

- The international community has established a variety of broad-based normative frameworks on single security topics such as terrorism and counternarcotics, but since 9/11, the debate on TNT as an organizing concept has increased.
  - For example, the OAS adopted a Declaration on Multidimensional Security in 2003 and reorganized its units of counternarcotics, counterterrorism, and public security into a new Secretariat of Multidimensional Security in 2005.
  - The UN's Global Counter-Terrorism Strategy in 2006 led it subsequently to organize cross-cutting approaches and slowly work more and more with regional and subregional organizations.

- o Many of the EU individual strategies include cross-cutting approaches.
  - o The OSCE adopted a Declaration on Transnational Threats in 2011 and created a Secretariat of Transnational Threats earlier this year.
- In addition to a continuing emphasis by states on sovereignty and slowness to adapt to non-state actors, there still remain many obstacles to international cooperation which cause security weaknesses: reluctance of governments to share intelligence; lack of common norms, standards, legislation, communications, and networks; weak public institutions or lack of political will; a culture of corruption; and resistance to civil society participation.

Adaptation of Multilateralism to a More Open System

- As external conflicts between countries have diminished as an organizing threat, the difficulty in negotiating new collective agreements has increased. This difficulty to reach new agreements is often seen as a failure and thus tends to undermine support for multilateral institutions. But it would be dangerous to undervalue multilateralism in any new security approach. Multilateral organizations offer advantages for dealing with new security challenges, providing a forum for dialogue; identification of common values, norms and standards; and a clearing house for information and best practices. Instead, the focus should be on fostering an adaptation process and helping effective multilateralism emerge.
- First, multilaterals have the advantage to set norms, principles, and standards with practical applications for dealing with TNTs. Common values and norms may be resented by some, violated by others, but still viewed as the "gold standard" to which countries are held or to which the international community aspires. As governments change and priorities shift in the short term, others remind them of these long-term commitment documents. Words matter.
  - o For example, despite considerable resistance from certain countries, the OSCE Astana Commemorative Document of 2011 reaffirmed the 1999 OSCE Istanbul Summit Document and Moscow Document, emphasizing the principles of human rights, democracy, and conflict prevention and resolution.

- o The ground breaking OAS cyber security strategy of 2004 led the way for early hemispheric prevention and response to cyber crime, cyberthreats, terrorist use of the internet, and critical infrastructure protection.
- Second, increased coordination with regional and subregional organizations multiplies impact by building more capacity across borders and helping to create regional networks. As an example, the creation of the Counter Terrorism Interagency Task Force and the outreach of the Counter Terrorism Directorate in the wake of the 9/11 attacks not only promoted coordination among UN bodies that had never worked together on the issue, but fostered a new level of cooperation between the UN and regional and subregional organizations. At the OAS Counter Terrorism Committee CICTE, we were able to engage UN actors in our technical training programs for countries in the Americas and assist the Central American and Caribbean subregional organizations in meeting training needs.

New partnerships of collaboration

- Regional and subregional bodies have proliferated over the years, but can effectively increase outreach at a more local level than global actors—they know their audience well, understand the political dimension, and can tailor programs to the environment.
- Multilateral thematic groupings like the new Global Counter Terrorism Forum (GCTF) of 30 countries also have a role to play, if they coordinate with all other actors.
- Any security strategy needs to consider the role of the private sector in promoting peace and resolving conflict as a partner, as well as civil society organizations and NGOs. Part of that strategy needs to be a means of eliciting the support of civil society by instilling trust and communicating the need for their participation. Anti-corruption activities and building grass roots networks need to be key aspects of that strategy.
- As an example, Tourism Security has become a major OAS/CICTE program for the Americas, thanks to the original initiative in 2005 of Trinidad and Tobago working with many private sector hotels and companies. Training focuses on bringing the police together with the private sector to build confidence, form networks, and tailor training for specific local needs. In addition to Trinidad

and Tobago, Canada, Spain, Mexico, and the U.S. have been the major funders of the program. Although the concept was originally resisted by Latin countries, Mexico embraced the training wholeheartedly and Peru just hosted the first hemispheric conference on Tourism Security in June.   UNICRI has followed a similar approach in promoting Security for Major Events.

- Intergovernmental cooperation with multilaterals and the private sector offer one of the strongest examples of improved collaboration. The Canada-Americas Port Security Assistance Program (CAPSAP) at the OAS assists developing states in the Americas to effectively implement the international maritime security standards of the International Maritime Organization. Trainers from the U.S., Canada, and the private sector work with private sector companies to assess security weaknesses and train personnel to overcome them.
- Finally, multilateral bodies may increasingly serve as a public forum for debate of governments with civil society on security issues that affect it; already we are seeing participation of NGOs at multilateral meetings and in conferences and seminars where they bring their expertise and perspective.

Communication and public diplomacy are key to a new approach

- Better communication and public diplomacy to provide advocacy and information on cross-cutting issues for the public can be key to success or failure in this new environment and must be part of any new approach.
- Communication with the public tends to be poor by most states and multilateral organizations. More usage needs to be made of the tools of the information revolution to get the message out, provide information, and promote the formation of regional cooperation groups, using social media and mobilizing support.
- A recent Eurobarometer study revealed a wide divergence of opinion on what main security threats are for Europe, with economic and financial crises currently high on everyone's list, as the fear of terrorism has faded more into historical memory. The challenge for governments in both domestic and foreign policy is to find a way to also remind the public of other major security threats as public opinion wavers.

- The international community tends to concentrate security efforts on law enforcement, response, counter-terrorism, border control, and use of technology, but there is relatively little engagement in activities to promote inter-cultural dialogue. Resources for real prevention are very limited and it is precisely in this area that communication, public diplomacy and work with civil society can be the most productive.

Conclusion

- Finally, a comment on the concept of a "security community" originally promoted by Czech political scientist Karl Deutsch in 1957. This concept of a group of people who have become so integrated that "there is a real assurance that the members of that community will not fight each other physically, but will settle their disputes in some other way" was adopted by the OSCE in 2010 as a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community. What does this mean? How would it work? As EIN is considering a new approach to security, the ideas being discussed by the Initiative for a Euro-Atlantic and Eurasian Security Community (IDEAS) established in 2011by 4 think tanks and supported by Germany, Russia, Poland, and France could prove useful. They have already organized four seminars to prepare a think piece for the OSCE in the fall.

- In conclusion, we are in a continuing period of transition from the paradigms of state sovereignty and states being the only actors responsible for security to a new paradigm where states are not the only actors. All organizations must adapt to change. The new approach to security may see a shift to an interrelationship where the solutions to many security problems lie more at the global, regional, or transnational thematic level.