The world can never be at peace unless people have security in their daily lives. Future conflicts may often be within nations rather than between them—with their origins buried deep in growing socio-economic deprivation and disparities. The search for security in such a milieu lies in development, not in arms.

More generally, it will not be possible for the community of nations to achieve any of its major goals—not peace, not environmental protection, not human rights or democratization, not fertility reduction, not social integration—except in the context of sustainable development that leads to human security.

It is time for humanity to restore its perspective and redesign its agenda. The World Summit for Social Development in March 1995 comes at a time when the world will be celebrating the 50th anniversary of the United Nations—an occasion to review the achievements of the first 50 years and to define the goals for the coming decades.

A world of change

It is easy to lose perspective in today's global uncertainty. As one crisis succeeds another, policy agendas often centre on immediate issues—not the important ones.

It is essential, therefore, to step back a little and to assess the state of affairs in the 50 years since the United Nations was created. What emerges is an arresting picture of unprecedented human progress and unspeakable human misery, of humanity's advance on several fronts mixed with humanity's retreat on several others, of a breathtaking globalization of prosperity side by side with a depressing globalization of poverty. As is so common in human affairs, nothing is simple and nothing is settled for ever. The progress should reassure humankind about its capacity to engineer change, and the present scale of human deprivation should continue to challenge humankind to design a much better world order.

Humanity has advanced on several critical fronts in the past 50 years.
- Most nations have already won their freedom. And the prospects for self-determination have never looked brighter in the few remaining areas, particularly in South Africa and in the Middle East. In the past 50 years, the United Nations family has grown from 51 countries to 184.
- The world is safer today from the threat of nuclear holocaust. With the end of the cold war and the conclusion of several disarmament agreements, it is difficult to recall that so many generations since the Second World War grew up with the constant fear of a sudden, unpredictable nuclear suicide.
- The record of human development during this period is unprecedented, with the developing countries setting a pace three times faster than the industrial countries did a century ago. Rising life expectancy, falling infant mortality, increasing educational attainment and much improved nutrition are a few of the heartening indicators of this human advance.
- While nearly 70% of humanity survived in abysmal human conditions in 1960 (below a human development index of 0.4), only 32% suffered such conditions in 1992. The share of the world population enjoying fairly satisfactory human development levels (above an HDI of 0.6) increased from 25% in 1960 to 60% in 1992.
- The wealth of nations has multiplied in these 50 years. Global GDP has increased.
sevenfold—from about $3 trillion to $22 trillion. Since the world population has more than doubled—from 2.5 billion to 5.5 billion—per capita income has more than tripled.

- There have also been dramatic developments in technology. In 1927, the first transatlantic flight by Charles Lindbergh took 33 hours. Today, the Concorde can fly the Atlantic in about a tenth of that time. And most parts of the world are now immediately accessible by telephone, television or fax. Computers move more than a trillion dollars around the world’s financial markets every 24 hours.
- Human ingenuity has led to several technological innovations and breathtaking breakthroughs—from an informatics revolution to exciting space explorations, from ever-new medical frontiers to ever-greater additions to knowledge. Sometimes, human institutions have even failed to keep up with technological progress, so fast has been the pace of advance.
- Global military spending has declined significantly in the past six years, after awesome increases in the previous four decades. How intelligently this emerging peace dividend will be used is now up to policy-makers.
- Between one-half and three-quarters of the world’s people live under relatively pluralistic and democratic regimes. In 1993 alone, elections were held in 45 countries—some for the first time.

This recapitulation of human progress is admittedly selective. But it shows that it is possible—indeed mandatory—to engineer change. Today’s anxieties should not be allowed to paralyse tomorrow’s initiatives. Nor can there be complacency, since a lengthening agenda of human deprivation still awaits us.

- Despite all our technological breakthroughs, we still live in a world where a fifth of the developing world’s population goes hungry every night, a quarter lacks access to even a basic necessity like safe drinking water, and a third lives in a state of abject poverty—at such a margin of human existence that words simply fail to describe it.
- We also live in a world of disturbing contrasts—where so many go hungry, there is so much food to waste; where so many children do not live to enjoy their childhood, there are so many inessential weapons. Global military spending, despite a welcome decline, still equals the combined income of one-half of humanity each year. And the richest billion people command 60 times the income of the poorest billion.
- Poor nations and rich are afflicted by growing human distress—weakening social fabrics, rising crime rates, increasing threats to personal security, spreading narcotic drugs and a growing sense of individual isolation.
- The threats to human security are no longer just personal or local or national. They are becoming global: with drugs, AIDS, terrorism, pollution, nuclear proliferation. Global poverty and environmental problems respect no national border. Their grim consequences travel the world.
- The same speed that has helped unify the world has also brought many problems to our doorsteps with devastating suddenness. Drug dealers can launder money rapidly through many countries—in a fraction of the time it takes their victims to detoxify. And terrorists operating from a remote safe haven can destroy life on a distant continent.
- The basic question of human survival on an environmentally fragile planet has gained in urgency as well. By the middle of the next century—still in the lifetimes of today’s children—the world population may double and the world economy may quadruple. Food production must triple if people are to be adequately fed, but the resource base for sustainable agriculture is eroding. Energy must be provided, too, but even at today’s level of use, fossil fuels threaten climatic stability. The destruction of the world’s forests and the loss of biological wealth and diversity continue relentlessly.
- Several nation-states are beginning to disintegrate. While the threats to national survival may emerge from several sources—ethnic, religious, political—the underlying causes are often the lack of socio-economic progress and the limited participation of people in any such progress.

Against this background of human
achievement and human distress, we must seek a new concept of human security in the decades ahead. We must seek a new paradigm of sustainable human development that can satisfy the expanding frontiers of this human security. We must seek a new framework of development cooperation that brings humanity together through a more equitable sharing of global economic opportunities and responsibilities. And we must seek a new role for the United Nations so that it can begin to meet humanity’s agenda not only for peace but also for development.

A new concept of human security

For too long, the concept of security has been shaped by the potential for conflict between states. For too long, security has been equated with the threats to a country’s borders. For too long, nations have sought arms to protect their security.

For most people today, a feeling of insecurity arises more from worries about daily life than from the dread of a cataclysmic world event. Job security, income security, health security, environmental security, security from crime—these are the emerging concerns of human security all over the world.

This should not surprise us. The founders of the United Nations had always given equal importance to people’s security and territorial security. As far back as June 1945, the US secretary of state reported this to his government on the results of the San Francisco Conference:

The battle of peace has to be fought on two fronts. The first is the security front where victory spells freedom from fear. The second is the economic and social front where victory means freedom from want. Only victory on both fronts can assure the world of an enduring peace....No provisions that can be written into the Charter will enable the Security Council to make the world secure from war if men and women have no security in their homes and their jobs.

Several insights can help in redefining the basic concept of security:

- Human security is relevant to people everywhere, in rich nations and in poor. The threats to their security may differ—hunger and disease in poor nations and drugs and crime in rich nations—but these threats are real and growing. Some threats are indeed common to all nations—job insecurity and environmental threats, in particular.

- When the security of people is attacked in any corner of the world, all nations are likely to get involved. Famines, ethnic conflicts, social disintegration, terrorism, pollution and drug trafficking are no longer isolated events, confined within national borders. Their consequences travel the globe.

- It is less costly and more humane to meet these threats upstream rather than downstream, early rather than late. Short-term humanitarian assistance can never replace long-term development support.

Most people instinctively understand what security means. It means safety from the constant threats of hunger, disease, crime and repression. It also means protection from sudden and hurtful disruptions in the pattern of our daily lives—whether in our homes, in our jobs, in our communities or in our environment.

It is important to develop some operational indicators of human security. This Report offers various concrete proposals for an early warning system and identifies some countries already in a state of crisis—such as Afghanistan, Angola, Haiti, Iraq, Mozambique, Myanmar, Sudan and Zaire. Determined national and international actions—including both preventive and curative development—are needed to support processes of social integration.

Identifying potential crisis countries is not an indictment of these countries. It is an essential part of preventive diplomacy and preventive development. The Report mentions some of these countries only as an illustration of the potential threats to human security that can eventually lead to social disintegration. What is important for the international community is to recognize that a clear set of human security indicators, and an early warning system based on them, could help these countries avoid reaching a crisis point.

We must seek a new role for the United Nations to meet humanity’s agenda not only for peace but also for development.
There are several countries where current national and international efforts need to be reinforced to promote human security. The list of such countries extends to all world regions, and it ranges from countries in the midst of ongoing crises—such as Burundi, Georgia, Liberia, Rwanda and Tajikistan—to other countries experiencing either severe internal tensions—such as Algeria—or large regional disparities—such as Egypt, Mexico and Nigeria.

**A new paradigm of development**

To address the growing challenge of human security, a new development paradigm is needed that puts people at the centre of development, regards economic growth as a means and not an end, protects the life opportunities of future generations as well as the present generations and respects the natural systems on which all life depends.

Such a paradigm of development enables all individuals to enlarge their human capabilities to the full and to put those capabilities to their best use in all fields—economic, social, cultural and political. It also protects the options of unborn generations. It does not run down the natural resource base needed for sustaining development in the future. Nor does it destroy the richness of nature that adds so much to the richness of human life.

Sustainable human development addresses both intragenerational and intergenerational equity—enabling all generations, present and future, to make the best use of their potential capabilities. But it is not indifferent to how present opportunities are actually distributed. It would be odd if we were deeply concerned for the well-being of future—as yet unborn—generations while ignoring the plight of the poor today. Yet, in truth, neither objective today gets the priority it deserves. A major restructuring of the world’s income distribution, production and consumption patterns may therefore be a necessary precondition for any viable strategy for sustainable human development.

In the final analysis, sustainable human development is pro-people, pro-jobs and pro-nature. It gives the highest priority to poverty reduction, productive employment, social integration and environmental regeneration. It brings human numbers into balance with the coping capacities of societies and the carrying capacities of nature. It accelerates economic growth and translates it into improvements in human lives, without destroying the natural capital needed to protect the opportunities of future generations. It also recognizes that not much can be achieved without a dramatic improvement in the status of women and the opening of all economic opportunities to women. And sustainable human development empowers people—enabling them to design and participate in the processes and events that shape their lives.

**A new design of development cooperation**

The new demands of global human security require a more positive relationship among all nations of the world—leading to a new era of development cooperation. In such a design, economic partnership would be based on mutual interests, not charity; cooperation, not confrontation; equitable sharing of market opportunities, not protectionism; far-sighted internationalism, not stubborn nationalism.

Several fundamental changes will be required in the present framework of development cooperation.

First, foreign assistance must be linked to commonly agreed policy objectives—particularly to poverty reduction strategies, productive employment opportunities and the goals of sustainable human development. During the cold war period, foreign assistance was often given to strategic allies rather than in support of agreed policy objectives. Now is the time for a major restructuring of existing foreign aid allocations.

Second, a certain proportion of existing foreign assistance (equal to, say, 0.1% of the donor countries’ GNP) should be channelled to the poorest nations as a global social safety net. This should be clearly earmarked for basic human development priorities (especially basic education and primary health care), and the aim should be
to bring all poor nations up to at least a minimum threshold of human development.

Third, the concept of development cooperation should be broadened to include all flows, not just aid—especially trade, investment, technology and labour flows. Greater attention should be paid to the freer movement of non-aid flows, as these are more decisive for the future growth of the developing countries than aid flows. Aid reporting systems should also be recast to include all flows and to monitor them in a comprehensive fashion.

Fourth, new initiatives for development cooperation should be discussed, including the possibility of introducing a payment for services rendered and compensation for damages suffered. For instance, the rich nations should be prepared to pay the poor nations for certain services that are in the global interest and for which the poor countries may not have sufficient resources themselves—instituting environmental controls, regulating narcotics production and trafficking, controlling communicable diseases, destroying nuclear weapons. Industrial nations should also compensate the developing countries for economic damage they suffer from certain market barriers imposed by the industrial countries, particularly trade barriers and restrictions on migration of unskilled labour.

Fifth, a serious search should begin for new sources of international funding that do not rely entirely on the fluctuating political will of the rich nations. Global taxation may become necessary in any case to achieve the goals of global human security. Some of the promising new sources include tradable permits for global pollution, a global tax on non-renewable energy, demilitarization funds and a small transaction tax on speculative international movements of foreign exchange funds.

Sixth, a new design of development cooperation also demands a new framework of global governance. Most international institutions have weakened precisely at a time of growing global interdependence. All existing institutions need considerable strengthening and restructuring if they are to cope with the new challenges to human security—particularly the United Nations system and the Bretton Woods institutions. At the same time, a creative debate must start on the shape of global institutions required for the 21st century.

Chapter 4 offers many concrete proposals on all these aspects of a new development cooperation.

**Agenda for the Social Summit**

These are the issues the World Summit for Social Development must discuss. It must provide a new vision, a new direction—and lay a solid foundation for a new society.

There are times in the lives of nations when an entirely new vision shapes their destiny. The 1940s were such a watershed—marked by the birth of the United Nations, the launching of the Marshall Plan, the setting up of the Bretton Woods institutions, the initiation of the European Community, the negotiation of new social contracts in the industrial nations and an irresistible movement for the liberation of former colonies. A new world order emerged in the 1940s from the darkness of the Second World War.

Fifty years later, is the world getting ready for yet another profound transition? The initial signs are encouraging: the democratic transition in formerly communist societies as well as in many developing countries, the end of the cold war, a steady fall in global military expenditures, the opening up of economies, the strengthened prospects for peace in South Africa and the Middle East. The unexpected is becoming almost the commonplace.

At this propitious time, can humanity take yet another decisive step? The forthcoming Summit offers such an opportunity. Of course, it cannot resolve all the issues facing humanity. Nor can it provide the political will that national leaders alone can provide. But it can, and must, provide a new sense of direction.

The only practical way of achieving this is to focus on a small, manageable number of issues. It is in this spirit that the following six-point agenda is offered.

- A new world social charter—to establish the framework of equality of opportunity among nations and people.
• Mobilization of the peace dividend—to set concrete targets for reducing global military expenditure and for capturing the ensuing peace dividend to enhance human security.

BOX 1

A world social charter

WE THE PEOPLE OF THE WORLD SOLEMNLY PLEDGE to build a new global civil society, based on the principles of equality of opportunity, rule of law, global democratic governance and a new partnership among all nations and all people.

WE PROPOSE to build a society where the right to food is as sacrosanct as the right to vote, where the right to a basic education is as deeply enshrined as the right to a free press and where the right to development is considered one of the fundamental human rights.

WE COLLECTIVELY PLEDGE to build new foundations of human security, which ensure the security of people through development, not arms; through cooperation, not confrontation; through peace, not war. We believe that no provision in the Charter of the United Nations will ever ensure global security unless people have security in their homes, in their jobs, in their communities and in their environment.

WE ARE FULLY CONVINCED that diversity in our societies is our strength, not our weakness, and we intend to protect this diversity by ensuring non-discrimination between all our people, irrespective of gender, race, religion or ethnic origin.

WE COLLECTIVELY BELIEVE that our world cannot survive one-fourth rich and three-fourths poor, half democratic and half authoritarian, with oases of human development surrounded by deserts of human deprivation. We pledge to take all necessary actions, nationally and globally, to reverse the present trend of widening disparities within and between nations.

WE ARE CONVINCED that it is possible to overcome the worst aspects of poverty in our lifetime through collective effort. We jointly affirm that our first step towards this goal will be to design a global compact that ensures that no child goes without an education, no human being is denied primary health care or safe drinking water and all willing couples are able to determine the size of their own families.

WE ARE CONSCIOUS of our responsibility to present generations and to future generations, and we are determined to pass on to our children a rich natural heritage and an environment sustained and whole.

WE INTEND to design a pattern of development cooperation based on open global markets, not protectionism; on an equitable sharing of market opportunities, not charity; on an open policy dialogue between sovereign nations, not coercion.

WE PLEDGE our deep commitment to a new social and economic philosophy that puts people at the centre of our concerns and creates unbreakable bonds of human solidarity.

WE STRONGLY BELIEVE that the United Nations must become the principal custodian of our global human security. Towards this end, we are determined to strengthen the development role of the United Nations and to give it wide-ranging decision-making powers in the socio-economic field by establishing an Economic Security Council.

A global human development compact—

• A global human security fund—to address the common threats to global human security.
• A strengthened UN umbrella for human development—to establish a more integrated, effective and efficient UN development system.
• A UN Economic Security Council—to provide a decision-making forum at the highest level for global issues of human security.

The discussion here summarizes each of these proposals, which are discussed at length in the Report.

A world social charter

To give clear and precise expression to the emerging concept of human security, now is the time to draw up a world social charter. Just as social contracts emerged in the 1930s and 1940s at the national level—the New Deal in the United States and the Beveridge Plan for the welfare state in the United Kingdom—so the growing consensus on the new compulsions of global human security requires social contracts at the global level.

Much of the groundwork for such a charter already exists. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights—which came into force in 1976—encompassed most of the social goals, including the rights to food, health, shelter, education and work, as well as other non-material aspects of life. World leaders have come together on other occasions at international conferences and summit meetings to give concrete shape to these rights and adopt specific targets for implementation. The most comprehensive international commitments were presented in Agenda 21, adopted at the Earth Summit in 1992.

The challenge now is to translate such general statements and targets into practical action. The Social Summit should request the United Nations to draw up a concrete world social charter, to cost various goals, to set priorities and timetables for their implementation and to monitor the implementation of these goals through the new Economic Security Council proposed.
A given later. An illustrative world social charter is given in box 1.

A 20:20 compact for human development

The world social charter would encompass a broad range of human security issues in both industrial and developing countries. Its adoption should be immediately followed by a global compact for human development—whereby all nations pledge to ensure the provision of at least the very basic human development levels for all their people. Most countries can achieve these minimum levels by adjusting their existing development priorities. Some of the poorest countries, however, will require substantial international assistance, in addition to their own domestic efforts.

What should be the global targets in such a compact? The list of international commitments from which to choose is already long, but the most important targets include the following:

- Universal primary education—for girls as well as for boys.
- Adult illiteracy rates to be halved—with the female rate to be no higher than the male one.
- Primary health care for all—with special stress on the immunization of children.
- Severe malnutrition to be eliminated— and moderate malnutrition rates to be halved.
- Family planning services for all willing couples.
- Safe drinking water and sanitation for all.
- Credit for all—to ensure self-employment opportunities.

These are the very minimum targets. Much more must be done, particularly to provide sustainable livelihoods. But let the international community start with some commonly agreed and doable basic goals.

A rough estimate of the additional cost of meeting these targets over the next ten years would be $30 to $40 billion a year—a substantial sum, but easily managed by re-structuring the priorities in budgets.

Developing countries devote on average only 15% of their national budgets ($57 billion a year) to basic human development concerns. They have considerable scope for changing their budget priorities: by reducing their military spending (around $125 billion a year), by privatizing their loss-making public enterprises and by giving up some low-priority development projects. It is proposed that they earmark at least 20% of their budgets ($88 billion a year) to human priority concerns. The scope for restructuring will differ from one country to another: the target of 20% only suggests an average pattern.

Donor countries also have considerable scope for changing the allocation priorities in their aid budgets in the post-cold war era. On average, bilateral donors allocate only 7% of their aid to the various human priority concerns (basic education, primary health care, mass-coverage water supply systems and family planning services). The problem here is not so much the proportion of aid they give to the social sector (16% on average) as the distribution within the social sector. Less than one-fifth of education aid goes to primary education, and a similar proportion of aid for water supply and sanitation is earmarked for rural areas, with very little for low-cost mass-coverage programmes. If donors also lift their aid allocation for human priority goals to 20%, this would provide $12 billion a year rather than the current $4 billion. Again, the 20% target is an average, with some donors having greater scope for restructuring than others.

Such a 20:20 compact for human development would be based on a sharing of responsibility. Three-fourths of the contributions would come from the developing countries, and one-fourth from the donors. No new money is required, because the compact is based on restructuring existing budget priorities (see chapter 4).

The 20:20 compact could ensure that the essential human development agenda is met in all nations by the turn of this century. The compact would not only give new hope to the majority of humankind—it would also advance many other priority goals.

- It would help slow down population growth, as practical experience shows that human development is the most powerful contraceptive.
All nations should agree on a 3% a year reduction in military spending during 1995–2000

Capturing the peace dividend

Global military spending declined between 1987 and 1994 at an estimated average annual rate of 3.6%, yielding a cumulative peace dividend of $935 billion—$810 billion in industrial countries and $125 billion in developing countries. But it is difficult to track where these funds went. And there has been no clear link between reduced military spending and enhanced expenditure on human development. Moreover, the poorest regions of the world (especially Sub-Saharan Africa) failed to contain their military spending. Meanwhile, nations continue to compete in the short-sighted business of arms exports.

What is needed now is to continue the pressure for reduced global military spending, to ensure that the poorest regions also cut down their arms spending and to develop a firm link between reduced arms spending and increased social spending.

The next challenge for disarmament is to phase the Third World out of the cold war. This will require new alliances for peace and international and regional forums for disarmament talks. It will also require a defusing of current global tensions and a new resolve on the part of the major powers to address the basic sources of conflicts in the Third World, primarily through the United Nations.

At the same time, the major suppliers of arms must adopt a new ethic of peace, since 86% of the current arms supplies originate from the five permanent members of the Security Council. They must agree to phase out their military assistance and their military bases, regulate the shipment of sophisticated arms and eliminate subsidies to their arms exporters. Foreign assistance must also give the right signals: rather than rewarding high military spenders, as at present, donor countries should reduce allocations of official development assistance (ODA) if a recipient country insists on spending more on its armies than on the social welfare of its people.

Within this perspective, the Social Summit offers an important opportunity to turn from arms to human security. A collective effort must be made at the time of the Summit to:

- Agree on a targeted reduction in military spending for the decade 1995–2005—say, 3% a year.
- Make a clear, explicit link between reduced military spending and increased social spending.
- Persuade all nations to allocate a proportion of the potential savings to a global human security fund (discussed below)—say, 20% of the peace dividend in rich nations and 10% in poor nations.
- Mandate the United Nations to maintain a list of sophisticated weapons and technologies that should not be exported at all, except under international agreement.
- Persuade the industrial nations to close their military bases, phase out their military assistance and eliminate their subsidies to arms exporters over the next three years.
- Request the United Nations to strengthen its reporting system under the UN Register of Conventional Armaments, so that up-to-date information on arms and technology transactions is published regularly.

A global human security fund

Human security is indivisible. Famine, pollution, ethnic violence—their conse-
quences travel the globe. Yet responses are still largely national. The Social Summit should therefore consider setting up a global human security fund to finance an international response. The issues the fund could address would include drug trafficking, international terrorism, nuclear proliferation, transmissible diseases, environmental pollution, natural resource depletion, natural disasters, ethnic conflicts and refugee flows.

Separate global compacts can be negotiated in each of these areas. These compacts will deal with "global goods" and "global bads". Some good precedents are the already-concluded compacts on climate change and biodiversity and the current negotiations for a compact on desertification.

Three main sources should be tapped for such a global fund. First is the peace dividend, discussed above. A fixed proportion of the reductions in global military spending should be credited to the global human security fund—on the grounds that the basic threats to global security have not disappeared but merely taken on new forms.

The peace dividend could be substantial: an annual reduction of 3% in global military spending would yield about $460 billion from 1995 to 2000, of which around $385 billion would be in the industrial world and around $75 billion in the developing world. Not all of this would be available to a global human security fund, because already there are many claims on these savings, including the costs of conversion from military to civilian production.

But if the rich nations were to allocate only 20% of their peace dividend, as suggested, and the poor nations 10%, this would generate at least $85 billion during 1995–2000, or about $1.4 billion a year. These figures are purely illustrative. The important point is that the contributions should be automatic and shared globally. One form the fund could take is suggested by Nobel Peace Prize winner Oscar Arias (special contribution, p. 59).

A second logical source of funds for a global response to global threats is a set of fees on globally important transactions or polluting emissions. This is probably some way off, but even at this stage it is worth considering some of the more promising options, two of which are discussed in chapter 4. One is a tax on the international movements of speculative capital suggested by James Tobin, winner of the Nobel Prize for Economics (special contribution, p. 70). Tobin suggests a tax rate of 0.5% on such transactions, but even a tax of 0.05% during 1995–2000 could raise $150 billion a year. Such a tax would be largely invisible and totally non-discriminatory. Another is a global tax on energy: a tax of $1 on each barrel of oil (and its equivalent on coal) during 1995–2000 would yield around $66 billion a year.

A third major source for the fund could be official development assistance. The current target for ODA allocations by industrial countries is 0.7% of each country's GNP, twice their actual contributions. The first 0.1% of GNP contributed to ODA should be earmarked for a social safety net for poor nations (chapter 4). But the balance should be linked to specific objectives—one of which should be global human security. If donors restructured existing ODA and committed some new funds, they could provide around $20 billion a year to a global human security fund.

These three sources together could raise an annual fund of around $250 billion a year during 1995–2000, seemingly ambitious, but still only around 1% of global GDP. Can humanity do less than this for its collective survival when it has been willing until recently to spend more than 4% of global GDP on the military arsenal?

Rather than the specific forms of global taxation, it is the basic notion of designing a global response and raising some global financing that the Social Summit should focus on. What is envisaged here is neither a separate fund nor a new institution. The idea is to establish a global account to pool contributions to meet the needs of global human security.

The Social Summit should approve the basic idea of a global human security fund and give the United Nations the mandate to prepare its concrete blueprint.
It would be essential to set up an Economic Security Council

A strengthened United Nations umbrella for human development

The logical forum for the administration of this new global human security fund is the United Nations. But to cope with the increased responsibility, the UN system needs to strengthen its capabilities in the area of sustainable human development.

The development funds of the UN (UNDP, UNICEF, UNFPA, IFAD and WFP) provide substantial resources to developing countries—about $5 billion a year. The pooled resources of these UN funds are nearly as large as those of IDA (the soft-loan window of the World Bank). Moreover, these funds are providing grants, not credits, so that there is a substantial net transfer of resources to developing countries. These development funds are currently discussing how best to strengthen their overall development effort and coordinate their assistance strategies, recognizing the need for a more integrated, effective and efficient UN development system.

Three steps will be essential for the UN development funds to assume the increased responsibilities that may emerge from the Social Summit.

First, the concerned programmes of the UN need to identify common missions and complementary approaches to helping countries realize their sustainable human development goals. Major stimulus will come from the Secretary-General’s Agenda for Development and from other efforts under way to better define a common sense of purpose and some unifying themes.

Second, much closer cooperation will be necessary in the days ahead among the headquarters of these institutions, both at the headquarters and at the country level. At the same time, a more vigorous leadership from a restructured Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) will be vital.

Third, if additional resources are generated to support human development strategies—whether through the 20.20 compact or through a global human security fund, as discussed earlier—a strengthened UN development system will be in an excellent position to manage and monitor these additional resources and to assume the new responsibilities for sustainable human development. The precise institutional modalities can be determined by the restructured ECOSOC. Whatever form a strengthened UN development system takes, it must draw on the relative strengths of each development fund—and their large constituencies and complementary mandates—as well as engineer some critical institutional reforms.

An Economic Security Council

To take this process of strengthening the development mandate of the UN to its logical conclusion, it would also be essential to set up an Economic Security Council. This would be a decision-making forum at the highest level to review the threats to global human security and agree on the necessary actions. In addition to the threats listed earlier, it would consider more basic issues—such as global poverty, unemployment, food security, international migration and a new framework for sustainable human development.

The proposed Economic Security Council would need to include some of the following elements:

- A focus on sustainable human development—rather than on political and peacekeeping matters.
- A small and manageable membership—say, 11 permanent members from the main industrial and more populous developing countries, and another 11 members on a rotating basis.
- A protected voting mechanism—such as a requirement that, beyond an overall majority, all decisions should also be ratified by majorities of both the industrial and the developing countries.
- A professional secretariat—small and highly qualified, led by an outstanding person, to prepare policy options for the council’s consideration.
- Expert national delegates—the regular meetings would involve nationals with economic and financial expertise, but there would also be occasional high-level meetings of ministers of finance and planning, as well as annual sessions at the level of head of state or government.
The council would act as a watchdog over the policy direction of all international and regional institutions.

The Economic Security Council would thus consist of about 22 members meeting year-round. It would also refer some subjects to smaller negotiating groups.

Establishing an Economic Security Council will be difficult since it would require a change in the UN Charter. So, it would perhaps be more realistic to try for something less ambitious and more manageable administratively.

One possibility is to extend the mandate of the present Security Council so that it could consider not just military threats but also threats to peace from economic and social crises. This would be in line with current attempts to involve the UN not just in peacekeeping but also—as suggested in the Agenda for Peace—in actively preventing conflicts.

Another possibility is to use the ECOSOC. Currently rather unwieldy, with 54 members, it could delegate decision-making power to a smaller executive board—with, say, 15 members—that could meet in permanent session. Ministers of finance and planning could be involved for the most important development issues, and decisions could subsequently be ratified by the entire Council and by the General Assembly. Article 63 of the UN Charter contains a provision for the ECOSOC to assume such a mandate at the request of the Security Council.

These are intermediate steps, however, and the fact remains that a full-fledged Economic Security Council would be preferable to less ambitious alternatives. The council’s creation need not be such a daunting prospect if the world community agrees on the urgency of the task—and on the need for a much broader international effort. The Social Summit offers an opportunity to agree on the framework for this bold initiative.

The specific proposals for the consideration of the Social Summit are summarized in box 2 for ready reference by policy-makers. These proposals may at first sight seem to demand a great deal from the international community. But they probably are more realistic than they appear.

Let us keep reminding ourselves that the imperatives of human security are bringing people together in all parts of the world. Let us also remember that many heresies of yesterday have become the conventional wisdom of today.

### A proposed action agenda for the Social Summit

1. Approve a world social charter as a new social contract among all nations and all people.
2. Endorse a new development paradigm of sustainable human development—with economic growth centred on people and sustainable from one generation to the next.
3. Give the United Nations the mandate to draw up a comprehensive blueprint for ensuring global human security and protecting people from threats in their daily lives—poverty, unemployment, drugs, terrorism, environmental degradation and social disintegration.
4. Agree on a targeted reduction of 3% a year in global military spending for the decade 1995–2005, and direct that a certain proportion of these potential savings—say, 20% by industrial countries and 10% by developing countries—be credited to a global human security fund.
5. Approve a human development compact for the next ten years (1995–2005) whereby all nations pledge to ensure the basic human development levels for all their people, and endorse the 20:20 proposal requiring developing nations and aid donors to earmark a minimum of 20% of their budgets for human priority concerns.
6. Recommend to ECOSOC that it examine the feasibility of various forms of global taxation—especially taxes on global pollution and on speculative movements of capital—to raise adequate financing for setting up a new global fund for human security.
7. Urge the international community to strengthen the role of the United Nations in the socio-economic field and to vest more decision-making powers in the UN by establishing an Economic Security Council to manage the new dimensions of global human security.