DEBATE

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

Thank you, Yury. You have both added to my list of things to have nightmares about, particularly the idea of a cyber attack that could release radioactive gas or the Bhopal incident that you mentioned as well. You have also added to my list of questions and I have a number of them for you, but I would really like to engage the audience in a conversation with our two distinguished guests on these very important topics.

Meir SHEETRIT, Member of the Israeli Knesset for the Kadima Party

I have two questions, one for Mr Narayanan, the other for Mr Fedotov. Mr Narayanan, you mentioned the possibility of a cyber war against a nuclear plant and you asked how we could protect against it. Is there an option to stop using computers to control the nuclear plant so that it cannot be attacked through cyberspace? If the plant is completely disconnected from computers and managed in the way it used to be prior to computer controls, then that might prevent anyone from taking action against it through cyberspace. Is that possible?

The second question is for Mr Fedotov. The fact is the world has failed in its fight against drugs trafficking. From time to time governments have succeeded in catching some of the criminals and intercepting various amounts of different kinds of drugs, but overall the world has failed in this fight. Do you believe, and people have already spoken about this idea, that it would make a difference if drugs were legalised and supplied to people at a low price? If someone wants to use harmful drugs, like people already do with cigarettes, then that is up to them.

This idea makes the supposition that all countries in the world, since we are speaking about world governance, would make drugs legal and cheap. This would end the crime associated with drugs because, at present, one of the big incentives for pushers and criminals is the big gap between the price they pay for the drugs and the price they collect from the users. If drugs are free, for example, then all of that trade is dead. In a way it will also help to drastically reduce crime levels because many of the drug users who are addicts are stealing money to buy drugs. Is any strategy like this on the table?

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

Yury, would you like to start in reverse order.

Yury FEDOTOV, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

Thank you. That is my favourite question. First of all, as the executive director of UNODC I have to abide by the collective will of the member states. There are three drug control conventions and we are acting as guardians of these conventions and we are acting within the framework of these conventions. Should member states decide to change these conventions, that would be another story, but they are very reluctant to do that.

We have this situation in Bolivia where they are seeking to legalise the chewing of coca leaves and that has inspired Bolivia and it intends to rejoin the convention on 2 January, the second day after it is technically out of the 1961 convention. There is a great international debate and a lot of diplomatic efforts around this. It means it is not easy, but that is the legal part of the story.

The substantive part is that unfortunately, sir, drugs are not cigarettes. First of all, even if people said yes to the legalisation of some of the so-called soft drugs, in the real life people rarely stop at this stage. They move on to the stronger drugs such as heroin and synthetic drugs.

Secondly, we can, as you say, hope to kill the criminal business, but do not forget that we would kill many, many people as well. Today 100,000 people die every year from the opium produced in Afghanistan. It is much more than the losses of the international forces in Afghanistan in 10 years. If you legalise drugs you will have another 100,000 deaths, if the logic is that one is willing to let all of them die, but that is not humane.

Sadly, nowadays, the criminal business is intertwined with so many different things that the legalisation of drugs will not stop it. They will continue their criminal activities in other ways, in other forms. I think that unless there is a change of mind in the international community the position of UNODC is not going to change, but also I think that legalisation would not help to fight the scourge of drugs and crime.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

That helps us to understand that from your viewpoint, but I wonder if I could push you a little bit more on our friend's basic suggestion about legalisation. There is increasing support for such an idea as regards marijuana in the United States from establishment figures like George Schultz and others, very much making the same argument. I understand that you are required to follow the rules and regulations, but I wonder if you could give us some insight into your own thinking as to whether that is a viable path.

Yury FEDOTOV, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

I will give you another example. In Afghanistan, the production of cannabis and hashish, which is not marijuana of course, it is much stronger, but it is still another sort of cannabis product, the trafficking is being done by the same criminal groups that smuggle heroin and opium. Secondly, it is very hard to stop taking drugs. When we go through the statistics, based on research and analysis where we have deployed a lot of resources to examine the situation in many countries, and these statistics have been confirmed by the latest world drug report, the trend is that people are not stopping at using soft drugs. Some of them are, but others are mixing, experimenting and using harder and harder drugs until they die. That is why we should be very careful about the legalisation of drugs and we should be considering the health implications.

The Human Right Convention are health-focused conventions. They protect the right of people to health and they are quite relevant today. The fact that we have failed, and I am not quite sure that we have failed, as I said we had some successes, local ones not global ones, but we need to do more to address the demand in drugs. That is certain.

M.K. NARAYANAN, Former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister, Governor of West Bengal of India

If I understood your question correctly I thought you were saying what if you stopped using computers in the management of a reactor. I do not think that we have ever considered that but I everything in a nuclear reactor is stand-alone. The computers are not linked to the outside world.

I bring a security perspective to this issue and I think the major threat we face is from within the system. I do not think, for the foreseeable future, you are going to see terrorist groups from outside the system being able to get in. There is a massive effort which is going on to secure, at one level, fissile material. There are at least two groups we are aware of who are capable of producing a crude nuclear device if they can procure the fissile material. That is the first thing that nations who have a certain storage capability for nuclear fissile material are trying to defend. The way to breach that and there are several layers of security, but the breach can come from somebody within the system and that is one of the nightmare scenarios.

The second thing is that we have several computers that are operating for each of the functions that are required. They have very fine-tuned requirements, back-up systems, and so on. The point is once again that the best method, not best from our point of view obviously, is if you can reduce the number of coolants into a reactor so that the temperatures go up and then the whole thing goes up. Somebody who knows how to handle this can then introduce a cyber virus into the system, a malware of some kind. Both are in a sense therefore largely dependent on who the people in the system are.

They are not necessarily terrorists, but you have a lot of people who have different ideologies. There are a number of people who, I am sorry to say, are in these very, very rarefied atmosphere and their equilibrium is not always ... I know, President Robinson is here and I do not want to use any language that will violate human rights! You work in a very cloistered atmosphere and people do go through tensions of various kinds. They are extremely brilliant people with extraordinary minds and small things can turn them off. One of the things we are always worried about is that in these institutions you need to keep close track of the attitudes of people. It is these people we are most concerned about, people who have penetrated the system ideologically or otherwise, or persons who have mental health problems.

I think, as of now, with all the scenarios we have examined, the possibility of a total outside group being able to access a reactor or do the things we are talking about, well, it seems that what they are now trying to do is to raise the capacity of the radiological weapons. That is much more readily available and the panic level, although not of the same order, would be fairly considerable.

Coming back to the subject, on terrorism we need to be careful as to how we monitor those within the system rather than those who are outside the system, because you can always introduce a virus like the stuff that was mentioned. It is a question of constantly being aware of the possibility and dealing with the situation appropriate to the deed.

Mary ROBINSON, Former President of Ireland, President of the Mary Robinson Foundation

I would like to thank both panellists for their very informed presentations and I agree with the Chair that they are quite scary. I think the reason is that the context is security and crime, but the theme is development and security and I know, Chair, that you have been trying to introduce that. I would actually like to broaden it further. I recall a very famous report of Secretary-General Kofi Annan during reform of the UN when he linked security, development and human rights. He said, 'There is no development without security, no security without development and neither security nor development without human rights'. I think it is a very relevant component to emphasise the link with development and the link with the values and particularly human rights.

I took part in an Eminent Report of the International Commission of Jurists looking at counter-terrorism, particularly post 9/11 and the way in which counter-terrorism measures were eroding human rights and therefore losing the moral high ground. They were being self-defeating by causing greater anger and concern in populations rather than reinforcing the values of human rights.

I remember the Club of Madrid in a major conference on terrorism the year after the bombing in Spain, the Club of Madrid being a club of exalted has-beens like myself, former heads of state and government. It concluded that the way to counter terrorism is to emphasise the values of development and access to development, but also the important values of human rights.

I just wondered if the panellists will respond as to whether they agree with Kofi Annan that you have to link security, development and human rights to be effective in response.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

It is an excellent point. I think you could even make the argument that provision of all essential human rights is a good definition of development.

M.K. NARAYANAN, Former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister, Governor of West Bengal of India

I think we took classical terrorism, and that is where development went off the radar, and I am sorry for that mistake. We have a movement in India, which I think many of you are aware of, and it has various names: left-wing extremism on one level, Maoism on the other, or Naxalite as the case may be. It is a classic example where there is link between development and terrorism or insurgency. It is a movement which exists in about 10 to 12 states in our country. I would not say it is threatening in the sense that it threatens the entire fabric of society, but is greatly worrying in many ways. It is a combination of lack of development, perception of alienation, a kind of neglect, and of course violence and counter-violence. I think it is a classic example of what President Robinson was trying to say. One feeds on the other.

It is mostly the poorest of the poor who are the main recruiting pools for this. The strength of these movements are in the tribal and other areas where development is not as advanced as it should be. It is also the area of exploitation to some extent and even more of perceptions of deprivation and exploitation, and therefore there is violence and strong countermeasures which in turn leads to the same problem. It is one of the major challenges we have on the internal security front in our country. I spent 40 years on that. I believe we are trying to be as responsible as possible, but I know that we have not been quite successful in conveying that to them. It is quite clear that we are not able to undertake development in areas where there is violence, and where there is violence there is therefore a lack of development. It is a classic 'chicken and egg' situation that we face.

I recognise what you have said. It also, therefore, translates into a human rights issue because if you do not have development they are neglected and if they are neglected then it means they lose out on the advances of civilisation.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

The distinguished junior statesman over here.

Walter STADTLER, President Emeritus and Senior Advisor, National Defense University Foundation

I am particularly concerned about the vulnerability of electronic networks. I am less concerned about those owned by governments because those tend to be hardened. I am thinking of power networks and the like which really, through natural causes, have already experienced a lot of problems. I would imagine that most of these are owned by the private sector which in some cases has been really remiss in hardening those networks and this clearly is something that is really known to those who do not have goodwill through particular governments or groupings or whatnot. My impression is that countries in Europe are a little more advanced in hardening their facilities, but my impression is that in countries like the United States, my own, is that very largely these are unhardened.

My question to the panel really is: Is this true or a generally correct view? If it is, what can we do to encourage the private sector to do so, because if we are talking about security, I would think that we ought to protect, if not necessarily for our ourselves, but for future generations as well.

Cullen HENDRIX, Research associate at the Peterson Institute for International Economics

The Indus River Treaty is held up as being one of the world's exemplars in terms of a water sharing agreement that has worked to facilitate cooperative management and use of the Indus River under circumstances where most of our theory as international relations scholars would suggest that it would not be affected.

I was wondering if you could comment on how climate change and the potential for reduced snowpack in the mountain systems that feed into this river might complicate the security relationship between India and Pakistan and this has obviously also has effects for development considering the prevalence of irrigation-fed agriculture in the region.

Pierre MOREL, EU Special Representative for Central Asia and for the crisis in Georgia

I would like to stress the importance of the statement by Mr Fedotov because UNODC is not a well-known enough agency. It gives excellent reports; if you go on the Internet you will find the monthly reports on the crisis situation around drug trafficking. The figures he has given are just appalling. It means, and the Guinea-Bissau example he has given shows that, we have crime attacks right now which we do not have a precise answer for.

The date of 2014 given for Afghanistan is a major one. I think that where we should focus our attention in this period is on chemical precursors. You cannot have heroin production in Afghanistan without chemical precursors - 12 units for one unit of heroin. In fact, you have a mass import to Afghanistan from all kinds of countries, including the industrial ones. This is an international network. If you have global governance today, then it is crime global governance. They are successful in doing that because they bypass the law and the realisation of this is not strong enough. Yes, we have been learning to face terrorist attacks. We have been learning to face cyber attacks. We are not efficient enough against criminal attacks and I use the example of chemical precursors. We can do much better in a matter of months and years. Thank you.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

Yes, thank you for that contribution that anchors us once again in the subject of global governance. The last question right here.

Jean Paul GUEVARA, Head of the Graduate Program in "Public Policy and International Relations of the European Union", Catholic University "San Pablo", La Paz, Bolivia

Thank you. I have a question for Mr Fedotov. What is the annual budget of your office? What is the budget of the special agencies that fight against drug trafficking in the world? As far as I know, Plan Colombia had a budget of USD8 billion for 10 years, so at least in terms of numbers we have failed.

It is difficult to compare or link the poor peasants that live in my country who produce coca leaves to these huge numbers and these criminal cartels. Also, I do not know how we can punish these poor people who have the culture of the coca-chewing, just because some other people produce cocaine from the coca leaf. I think this is a matter of human rights and also a matter of the marketplace. I do not know if you take these issues into account. Thank you.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

We have about four minutes, so you each get two minutes to sum up. Yury, do you want to start?

Yury FEDOTOV, Executive Director of the United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime (UNODC)

I would like to thank Ambassador Morel for his question and indeed chemical precursors is a very important aspect of the problem. Recently, we launched a new regional programme for Afghanistan and neighbouring countries here in Vienna and a significant part of this programme is aimed to meet this challenge of illicit smuggling of chemical precursors into Afghanistan.

I would like to thank the distinguished representative from Bolivia for his question about the budget. It is a very good question and you have heard the figures. My budget is approximately USD 4 million including voluntary contributions which form 90% of the UNODC budget. It is very small compared to those figures; it could be around USD 500 million. If you look at the regular budget, the UN spends less than 1% of the overall UN budget on fighting drugs crime. That is a fact of life.

As far as coca leaves are concerned, I fully understand the traditions in Bolivia and the provisions of the constitution of the country, but we are concerned about the Pandora Box effect of this step. This is why we are discussing possible ways out with the Bolivian government because is important is that the government is committed to the implementation of the convention. I am hopeful that we can resolve this matter one way or another.

One important point is that I fully agree with what Mary Robinson said about human rights. It was a statement rather than a question and I fully subscribe to that statement. We are trying our best to strengthen human rights through our programmes and projects in different parts of the world. This includes drug control and treatment, providing support to the victims of drug addiction, helping them to recover, but also addressing the issues as human trafficking and modern day slavery. It is all about human rights. We also want to improve the penitentiary system in many countries and we will continue to do that, but I am sorry, drug use is not a human right. It is against the convention. It is against the law. While we are not going to punish people for that, we need a campaign to raise awareness and show very clearly that drug addicts are not criminals, they are victims. They need to be treated with dignity and have their rights respected. However, at the same time drug addiction should not be considered a decent way of life. Thank you.

M.K. NARAYANAN, Former National Security Advisor to the Prime Minister, Governor of West Bengal of India

On the first question about critical national infrastructure, I thank you for the question. It has become very important for nations to decide which are items of critical national infrastructure and which need to be hardened for this purpose. I think countries now have, my impression is that the United States also has because we have borrowed quite a lot of that from the US, apart from Europe, we have agencies which look after critical national infrastructure whether they are in the private domain or the official public domain. I think a whole series of protocols have been created for this purpose. We have not really tested them as yet and hopefully we will never have to, but it is true, it is very, very critical. Occasionally, entire networks and airports and others have been struck and crippled for a short duration.

Every nation needs an agency to look after the critical national infrastructure. It requires a whole paraphernalia of control rooms, etc, so that you can work around it. I will not go into the details here, but it is fundamental, it is important and I think it is as important as anything one can think of and I do hope that every nation will take this to heart.

On the second issue, I agree that the Indus Water Treaty is probably one of the most enduring treaties that we have had. It is strained perhaps a little bit at the edges because now people are less willing to acknowledge, even when the

arbiter decides on a particular policy, but as the glaciers start melting we are facing a whole lot of new problems. People are trying to turn around rivers for instance. We have an issue with China regarding the Brahmaputra River. There is a bend in the Tibetan plateau and most of the water now flows into the Brahmaputra in India, but if there was a sort of realignment we would face a whole series of problems. I think Mr Montbrial is right, water is going to be one of the major issues in the second half of the 21st century and this is an issue we will have to deal with.

At the moment, this Indus Water Treaty has this sanctity of an international convention and an international protocol. When there are differences we go by the protocol that has been laid down. It has been very successful to date. For newer ones, I am not sure if we will be able to achieve the same protocol. The world is becoming much less accommodating in these matters and the pressures of local communities, as was mentioned by, I think, Mr Steven, means that populism has grown so strong that it is becoming difficult for democratic leaders to take positions which are in the greater national or international good. That is a problem there and I will leave it at that. Thank you.

Jim HOAGLAND, Associate Editor, Chief Foreign Correspondent of the *Washington Post*

I want to thank both of you. I would like to end where I started. Snoopy applies here as well because he is essentially a historical optimist in predicting that he will be able to tie everything together. Even though you deal, or perhaps because you deal, with such grim topics, both of you are historical optimists who believe we can prevail even though we have a long and difficult road ahead but it is time to start.

I want to thank you both and I want to thank the audience for a really excellent contribution.