From Collective Security to Concert: The UN, G8 and Global Security Governance

Professor John Kirton
University of Toronto
john.kirton@utoronto.ca

Paper prepared for the conference on "Security Overspill: Between Economic Integration and Social Exclusion," Centre Études Internationales et Mondialisation, Université de Québec à Montréal, Montreal, October 27-8, 2005. Draft of October 28.

Abstract

In the post–Cold War, rapidly globalizing, post-911 age, the concert-based G8 system has become, will be, and should be a more effective global security governor than the collective security-based UN system in key issues such as terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction. This is due to several factors: the G8's inclusive, interlinked agenda embracing security, economics and social cohesion; its seminal mission of open democracy, individual liberty and social advance; its interventionist (R2P-like) principles; its delivery by leaders, who alone can make the required syntheses, tradeoffs and synergies; and the equality of vulnerability among its members.

Introduction

Does the collective security–based United Nations (UN) or the concert-based Group of Eight (G8) serve as the effective centre of a global security governance in the twenty-first century? There is a tendency among analysts of international institutions, particularly those focused on or closely associated with the UN, to reject any role for the G8 in governing global security (Kuhne and Prantl 2001).[1] In this first, "rejectionist" school of thought the G8 is not considered to be a real body, as it lacks a formal founding charter, and political and geographic balance in its membership, and in contrast to the long established, legally legitimized and bureaucratically grounded United Nations Security Council (UNSC). Moreover, the G8 is not ready or willing to intervene to solve difficult security problems in many parts of the world, such as the Great Lakes region of Africa, where the UN has also been reluctant to engage. Thus any attempts by the international community or its leading members to endow the G8 with a robust security role would just dangerously divert the attention and the resources of the major member governments that belong to both the G8 and the UN where their intellectual, material and financial investments are urgently needed.

A second, reinforcement, school sees the G8 a useful supplement to the UN, particularly when and where the latter body cannot effectively act. It notes that G8 statements do not challenge the authority of the UNSC. It credits the G8 with calling for resolutions of the UNSC to deal with critical issues, if only those of particular interest to the G8 members themselves. It argues that the major powers of the G8 have an obligation, along with others, to "pick up the ball" if the UNSC leaves a vacuum. And it calls upon the G8 to solve the critical problem of resources the UN faces through the critical role of inducing its members and others to pay their dues in full and on time.

A third, last resort, school sees a much more robust role for the G8. In this view the G8 serves as the residual global security governor of last resort as gap filler in the post–Cold War world, rapidly globalizing world (Wallace 1984, Rosecrance 1990, Kirton 1989, 1993, Schwegmann 2001, Pentilla 2003, 2005, Kirton and Takase 2002, Kirton and Stefanova 2004, Fratianni et al. 2005). Its adherents make six basic points (Volmer 2001, Pleuger 2001). First, the G8's role in the military conflict in Kosovo in the spring of 1999 was a clear success, as the G8 process proved decisive in overcoming a UNSC deadlock

and paving the way for successfully ending the conflict and generating the legitimizing UNSC Resolution 1244. Second, a repeat performance is not ruled out, for G8 governments remain ready, at times and places of their own choosing, to intervene again on a similar scale, especially if the deterrent effects of the Kosovo success erode. Third, there is a new consensus that human rights, human security and humanitarian intervention are values that now take precedence over sovereignty and non-intervention, in a calculus that is the antithesis of the core constitutional principles of the UN affirmed above all in its Charter's Article 2(7). Fourth, the G8 has no intention of calling into question the primary responsibility of the UNSC, which remains free to exercise it, should it want to and be able to perform this role. But fifth, in the face of UN failure in response to old and new needs the G8 is willing to act as a catalyst and initiator, to play a more active and operational role, and to use its obvious assets in emerging areas such as conflict prevention. And sixth, beyond these functions, still "complementary" to the work of the UNSC" it is an open question whether the G8 has or should assume a new role, and perhaps even one without limits.

As disquieting as this new G8 role is to devotees of the traditional UN system, it may be that the G8 is actually assuming an ever more prominent place in the security sphere. For the G8 is slowly but steadily replacing the UN and its Security Council as the dominant institution of global security governance as the 911-inaugurated twenty-first century unfolds. It is doing so by institutionally and ideationally replacing with antithetical alternatives the core principles and practices enshrined in the UN by the self selected group of world war two victors in their punitive peace imposed in 1945. Indeed, the legacy of the G8's leadership in the war to liberate Kosovo, with Serbia/Yugoslavia itself now a functioning democracy, and its former leader Slobodan Milosovic before an international tribunal facing charges of war crimes, first showed the future model for global security governance as the twenty-first century dawned. The G8's subsequent success in combating global terrorism and the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, when juxtaposed against the UN's great failures in Iraq in 2003 and its September 2005 Summit-delivered reform program, have substantially strengthened the G8's pre-eminent place.

The G8's growing preeminence as a global security governor flows from five realities. First, the G8 was deliberately developed and designed to play a global security role, through the particular formula of serving as a democratic concert for a densely interconnected and thus deeply intervulnerable world. In contrast to the UN galaxy conceived on a collective security formula, the G8 has a comprehensive, interlinked agenda, a mission to intervene globally to promote open democracy, individual liberty and social advance, and democratically elected leaders who directly deliver its governance on the basis of what their now equally intervulnerable publics need and want back home.

Second, the G8 has been developing and demonstrating the institutional capacity to play this leadership role through policy definition, political legitimation, and operational implementation. Third, countries that are members of both bodies behave differently in the G8 than in the UNSC. Fourth, the G8 and its Group of Seven (G7) predecessor has long made a major contribution to international peace and security, across a widening domain of issues. Its step-level leap in 1999 with a Kosovo intervention was not an episodic

aberration but a foundation on which to build. And fifth, the shock of September 11th has seen the G8 take advantage of some of its readily available and politically feasible measures to strengthen its capacity to play an even more central security role.

This paper outlines each of these five forces in turn. With particular reference to the core old security areas of regional security and nuclear nonproliferation and the core new security areas of global terrorism and conflict prevention.[2] Together they demonstrate that the G8 concert is neither an irrelevance to, a reinforcement of, nor a last resort alternative to the UN but a demonstrated and desirable replacement for the UN's collective security system as the central global security governor for the twenty-first century world.

The G8 as a Global Democratic Concert

The G8 was deliberately developed and designed to serve as a global security concert. The G8's predecessor, the G7 was founded in 1975 at a gathering in Rambouillet, France, of the leaders of the United States, France, Britain, Germany, Japan and Italy, with Canada promised a place at the Summit the U.S. planned to host the following year.[3] The G8 was thus institutionally born and designed, as with the UN and UNSC P5 at San Francisco in 1945, as a self-selected group of major powers. But it was done so without the punitive peace provisions that the victors had embedded in perpetuity within the ideational and institutional architecture of the UN. Rather, the G7 was conceived and created on a very different set of principles for global security governance. It was modeled as the modern equivalent of the Concert of Europe that the G7's real founder, Dr. Henry Kissinger, had explored in his doctoral dissertation and early scholarly work (Kissinger 1964).

The G7's de facto charter, the Declaration of Rambouillet, heralded the primary political-security purpose and quite distinctive concert principles of the new institution with its forthright assertion in its opening passage: "We came together because of shared beliefs and shared responsibilities. We are each responsible for the government of an open, democratic society, dedicated to individual liberty and social advancement. Our success will strengthen, indeed is essential to, democratic societies everywhere." With these words, the G8 affirmed its fully global vision embracing the entire internal community, its concern with the internal political character of its member states, and, in an implicit rejection of Article 2(7), its right to intervene in their internal affairs in defence of democracy. In doing so the G7 was at one with the reigning values of human rights and social progress that the UN had proclaimed in its opening preamble. Yet tellingly, whereas the G7 uniquely affirmed in first place the value of openness and democracy, the UN was silent on these values. The UN chose for itself the very different purposes of preventing war, ensuring the equality of nations large and small and fostering respect for treaties and international law.

It was not only its willingness to interfere in the internal affairs of sovereign states in defence of democracy (as it did in 1976 in Italy) that distinguished the new G7 institution from the old UN (Putnam and Bayne 1987). It was also through the exceptional

concerted power, common purpose, constricted participation and political control by popularly elected leaders that were the core features of the new G7.

The G8 uniquely included as full members Japan and Germany, the second and third most powerful countries in the world and ones that that the UN, in its particularly pointed and punitive Articles 53 and 107 had defined in perpetuity as enemy aggressor states. The G8 further included Italy, Canada and later the European Union (EU). This substantially increased the G8's concerted power, internal equality and collective predominance of the global system especially when the EU expanded to 25 member countries and as the EU steadily increased its G8 position and role in the post–Cold War years. In sharp contrast, the UNSC Permanent Five (P5) left this formidable array of rising, democratic and ever more inclusive powers out, in favour of the presence of the communist People' Republic of China. In 60 years the UNSC P5 has proven incapable of adding even a single new member to its club.

The G7/G8 did have somewhat more members than the UNSC, whereas the P5 allowed for very constricted participation. This was especially so with the G7's addition of now democratic Russia in the 1990's. Yet the G8's absence of any second strata of non-permanent members (as distinct from discretionary, ad hoc outreach partners) and its reliance on soft consensus generated by the norms of the club rather than a hard veto reflecting national interests of the P5 offset the added transactions costs that having eight or nine rather than five core members brought.

Unlike the UNSC P5, the G8 members were united by a deep array of common political values, notably democracy, human rights, rule of law, and social protection. This shared social purpose was reinforced by the slow admission of Russia and subsequent G8 outreach activities, which showed that a devotion to democracy at home, rather than victor or vanquished states, or rising or declining power, was the central criteria for membership in the G8 club.

Finally, the G8's quality as a top-down institution that was the personal preserve of popularly elected leaders, operated through consensus decision making, unencumbered by an international bureaucracy and unconfined by a charter, gave it a unique authority, legitimacy and flexibility to act. At the G8 summit there was never any problem of having to refer issues back to national capital to see if ministerial colleagues or one's leader would agree. Rather it was leaders themselves who were directly present and indeed whose institution the G7/G8 personally was. At the UN, the leaders of the P5 powers meet only rarely. The leaders of the full membership meet only on an ad hoc basis every several years. In 1992 the UNSC P5 leaders did meet to define the post–Cold War order, but decided not to do so again. Nor did the leaders of the full membership, meeting in New York in September 2005, declare in their outcome document their intention to meet again.[4] In sharp contrast, in 2002, the G8 leaders at their Kananaskis Summit defined for the first time who would host their annual summit for the next full eight years in a row.

The Institutionalization of the G7/G8 as a Peace and Security System

The importance of direct political control and delivery by popularly elected leaders and by ministers (from members with parliamentary/cabinet systems of government) is seen in the robust institutional development of the G7/G8 as a political-security forum. Since its 1975 inception the G7/G8 has seen all leaders of its members always come to its annual Summit. Leaders care about the G7/G8 to a degree that they do not about the UN or UNSC or the ever increasing array of other plurilateral, institutionalized summit clubs to which they variously belong (Kirton forthcoming). Since the start they have dealt at the G7/G8 with major security issues, in the east-west relations, arms control and, very soon after, the regional security and human security domains. Their early attention focused on managing east-west relations, preventing the Communist Party from taking power in Italy, controlling western bank lending to the Soviet Union and creating an effective regime against terrorist aircraft hijacking epidemic that the venerable International Civil Aviation Organization, ensconced in the UN galaxy, was unable to prevent or stop. In 1980 and 1981, under the impetus of Italy and Canada, the G7 Summit began to regularly issue security-oriented "Political Declarations" alongside it traditional economically and socially focused ones. By 1985 the U.S., at the height of President Reagan's new Cold War ascendance, had recognized the centrality of the G7. Regan called a special inter-sessional summit in New York to secure a G7-wide mandate as he flew to the first "superpower summit" with the USSR in half a decade. It was at this superpower summit that he offered sweeping arms control proposals to begin the process that led to the Cold War's ultimate end.

The G8's decisive advantage in the direct involvement of leaders was recognized by emulation in 1992. At that time British Prime Minister John Major, as part of the post-Cold War effort to make the UN finally "function as its founders intended", proposed that the UNSC also meet at the leaders' level. At the same time, he suggested that the G7 start to meet less frequently than the annual cadence it had established during its first 16 years. Major succeeded in having the UNSC attract the leaders of its members to New York. But he failed to lure any of his fellow G7 leaders into giving up their highly valued annual encounter in the G8 club. Subsequently, the leaders of the P5 countries found the UNSC unworthy of their time. It was the leaders-driven and delivered G7, rather than the unchanging UNSC, that quickly won the competition to become the leading institution to shape the new security order for the post–Cold War world.

At the same time, the leaders were robustly developing the G7/8 as a security institution. The foreign ministers had always accompanied their leaders to the annual summit, to meet together with them and also separately there. In 1984 the G7 foreign ministers began a midyear stand-alone meeting, in a form revealingly reminiscent of NATO's former "Berlin dinner", with an informal dinner in New York on the eve of the late September opening of the United Nations General Assembly.[5] By 1998 under the leadership of John Major's successor as British prime minister, Tony Blair, the foreign ministers meeting taking place as part of the annual summit was separated from the leaders' sessions in time and space. It was moved to a week or so before the summit in a different city in the host country. The summer of 1998 also saw a special post-summit

meeting of G8 foreign ministers, to deal with the international communities' reaction to the particularly pressing issue of the Indian and Pakistani nuclear tests in May 1998.

The year 1999 saw a step-level jump in stand-alone foreign ministers meetings. It featured a May gathering to deal with Kosovo. It concluded with the first pre-arranged theme-specific ministerial meeting on the new subject of conflict prevention, held in Berlin in December 1999. Despite the desire of host Japan to continue the Berlin tradition, not all G8 members agreed that a follow-on ministerial was warranted in the year 2000. But they agreed that such a meeting should be hosted by Italy when it took the chair in 2001. By 1999 then, with stand-alone meetings in May, September and December, and the now separate but still summit-related meeting in June, G8 foreign ministers had developed the year-round, G8-based leadership and monitoring capability that their colleagues in the finance and trade field had long enjoyed.

During the 1980s, the G7/G8 added several annualized ministerial institutions in the core security sphere. The trend began with terrorism with first ministerial meeting held in Ottawa on December 12, 1995. In the twenty-first century, the shock of September 11, 2001, added bioterrorism, with the first meeting of the G7-centric Global Health Security Initiative taking place, again in Ottawa, in late 2001. Unusually for the G7 system, Canada has continuously provided the secretariat for this club.

Beneath the ministerial level, the G7/G8 has developed a formidable official-level capacity to deal with security subjects. As Appendix A shows, G8 official-level security institutions were formed at the very start, have been a large and growing portion of the total, and have expanded from the component areas of non-proliferation to terrorism, regional security and conflict prevention over the four full seven-year hosting cycles from 1975 to 2002. In the first cycle, official level institutions for the core security subjects comprised 2 of the seven created (or 29%), in the second cycle 3 of 8 (or 38%), in the third 4 of 9 (or 44%), and in the fourth cycle 11 of 25 (or 44% again). The proliferation is greater if softer security subjects such as democratization and transnational crime are added to the list.

These bodies now range across the full range of east-west relations, arms control and proliferation, regional security, human security-conflict prevention, and institutional reform domains. Moreover, from the start the G8 generated bodies — notably the London Suppliers Group on Nuclear Materials (LSG) and the Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) — that quickly expanded beyond G7 members (Legault 1993). They and the broader G8 system thereby acquired the effectiveness and legitimacy required to successfully accomplish the purposes they were established to fulfill. More recent post Cold War–created bodies include the Chemical Action Task Force of 1990, the Nuclear Safety Working Group of 1992, the Counterterrorism Experts Group of 1995, the Group on UN Reform, and the Group of Experts on Export Controls to Prevent Proliferation of Weapons of Mass Destruction. G8 leaders at their July 2000 Okinawa Summit affirmed the operation of a Conflict Prevention Officials Meeting to continue the work begun the previous year.

Differences in Members' Approaches in the UNSC and the G7/G8

Whatever the particular relationship of the UN and G8 in the field of global governance, it is clear that each international institution makes a difference by changing the expectations and behaviour of the same countries that belong to both, in distinctive and institutionally directed ways. All member governments of both the G7/G8 and UNSC P5 do emphasize the strong and deliberate effort they make to ensure a consistency of their policy as developed for and delivered in both bodies. But the different character of the two institutions generates difference of style and stress, and thus of substantive effect.

In the first instance, G7/G8 discussions are often theoretical deliberations of general policy and principles, and have only rarely focused on specific, operational military missions involving real material interests and lives. But this changed for the G8 with first Kosovo, then East Timor, and finally with the effort at Okinawa to give the Berlin meeting's agreement on seven priority areas of conflict prevention real operational effect. At the same time, as the Berlin and Okinawa meetings show, the G7/G8 retains its advantage in producing highest level discussions of, and consensus on, principles, policies and pioneering concepts such as human security and humanitarian intervention. For example, the G8 has found it easy to take up the concept of environmental security in a way the UNSC has not.

Second, and related, as leaders themselves only come to the G8, and as that body has an informal, flexible set of procedures and thus an open-ended agenda, there is always the possibility and occasionally the reality of spontaneous combustion — an attribute that the UNSC lacks. The G8's decision to take up the issue of aircraft terrorism at its 1978 Bonn Summit and apartheid in South Africa at its 1987 Venice Summit are notable examples. Leaders can and do discuss, redefine and link anything they want. They can and do make and change policy on the spot. They can instantly create new principles, such as excessive military expenditure as destructive of development and unworthy of development assistance, as they did at their Halifax Summit in 1995. Only the institutional sanctuary of the G8, and not the confines of the UNSC, allows them to do so together.

Third, the G8, unlike the UNSC, is a collectivity with a considerable sense of collective responsibility. The wide and deep array of common principles which its members share as democratic polities devoted to the rule of law, human rights, and the market economy, and the club-like atmosphere that the exclusive, personalized leaders-only dialogue foster this sense of collective responsibility. Its power can be seen in the relative ease with which newcomers, notably Russia's Yeltsin and Putin have been socialized into becoming strongly self-identified and committed members of the club. In such a way the G7/G8 helps member countries reconstruct their interests and even identities, as Russia did during the war in Kosovo (Wendt 1997). G8 summits and ministerial meetings are also interpersonal bonding exercises in a way that UNSC meetings are not. A countries' sense of collective responsibility can thus be activated and intensified, relative to its calculation of national interest, in the G8 in a way that it is not in the UN.

Finally, for the four G8 state members who are not UNSC P5 members, there is a major difference in how they approach the security agenda of the two forums. The UNSC

excluded four of Japan, Germany, Italy and Canada have an understandably strong incentive to build the G8, rather the UNSC, as the central governance forum. For in the former, they are accorded the status of full and equal members and have been from the start. In the latter, despite their rising and ranking power as the second, third, seventh and eithth most apable countries in the world, they are frozen out. In the case of Japan and Germany they are still branded as alien enemy states by a Charter that has already been amended — to address other anachronisms but not this one — three times. And after six decades since the UNSC's founding, they are still offered no realistic hope that in the world of the twenty-first century they will be upgraded or allowed in. The UNSC P5 have frozen out forever these outer four G8 members and everyone else. The G8, in contrast, has allowed P5 Russia in as a full member. In and to the outside world, it is a G8 that has shown it can and does expand to include others, rather than the UNSC that does not. It is thus the G8 that is acquiring the collective capability required to effective deliver global governance. It is also securing the legitimacy that comes with expanded representation and effectiveness. It offers hope to other ranking members of the international community, starting with China and democratic India, that they too might one day be allowed in. The persistent efforts of Japanese prime minister Keizo Obuchi to have China participate in the Japanese-hosted Okinawa Summit, and the support of 1999 host Germany's Chancellor Schroeder for China's inclusion shows this inclusive instinct is a growing G8 force (Kirton 2001b). So does the regular and expanding outreach at G8 summits, starting in 2001. The G8's advantage here is reinforced by the many ways in which it has included in its meetings most others middle and small powers, notably EU, UN, International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Bank, and World Trade Organization (WTO) members, in partial or indirect ways.

Moreover, the G8's outer four, relative to the P5, have by their own revealed preferences over 55 years followed a fundamentally different conception of how to create security in the international system. They have all renounced independent nuclear weapons. The tend to have no or very limited overseas offensive intelligence services, compulsory military service, big blue-water navies, strategic bombers, other offensive capabilities, and other attributes of the classic national security "warfare" state. In the twenty-first century, the new political leadership in Japan, with Prime Minister Obuchi, and in Germany, with Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder, along with Canada's Jean Chrétien, tended to deepen their countries' attachment to alternative, less militaristic approaches, centered on the concept of human security and conflict prevention (Kirton 2000). P5 members, with heavy traditional military sunk costs and the different values that come with them, have been slower to adapt. The shock of September 11 has strongly reinforced this resistance in the U.S., Russia, Britain and France.

The G8's Security Contribution

In part because of these distinctive features, and in part because of the G8's fundamental structure as a modern international concert rather than as a crucible of an antithetical collective security approach, the G7/G8 has proven to be increasingly effective in shaping

desired outcomes on the central security issues of the emerging world (Elrod 1976, Jervis 1987, Jervis 1992, Kupchan and Kupchan 1991, 1995). It, rather than the UN, through judicious investments of financial support and installments of increasing G7 participation, has been at the forefront of producing what might be termed "the second Russian revolution — the surprisingly non-violent transformation of the Soviet Union into a successor Russia now permanently attached to and increasingly practicing democratic and market principles. The G7/G8 has also delivered on its seminal purpose of generating a global democratic revolution, through such actions as its effective leadership in the long successful post-1987 campaign against constitutional racism in apartheid South Africa, its sanctions in response to the massacre of unarmed students in Tiananmen square in 1989, and its vigilance in regard to the preservation of democratic freedoms and human rights elsewhere (from Hong Kong to Latin America). In the field of arms control, it assisted the creation of a Convention on Anti-Personnel Landmines by encouraging, at the 1997 Denver Summit of the Eight, the new leaders of Japan, Germany, Britain, France and ultimately of Russia to shift their countries positions to support such a convention. In the realm of regional security, at Cologne in 1999, the G8 statement encouraged the resumption of talks between Greece and Turkey on Cyprus. The full, unified weight of the Group contributed a great deal to the resumption of such talks, as each of the G8 members had particular existing or attractive prospective affiliation with the parties to the dispute.

Perhaps the most clear cut and important G8 contribution to regional security came, in the lead-up to and at the 1999 Cologne Summit, in the successful conclusion of the war in Kosovo on the G7's rather than the old Russia's or its traditional affiliate Serbia's terms (Kirton, Daniels and Freytag 2001, Schwegmann 2001, Posen 2001). At a G8 Political Directors meeting in the lead-up to Cologne, Russia had stunned its G8 colleagues by declaring, after many weeks of firm opposition to their actions, both within the G8 but primarily at the UNSC, that it now wanted to work through the G8 to find a way to end the war. Simultaneously, amidst mounting frustration with the slow and partial results of the air war, G7 leaders had decided that they would, at Cologne, have their first face-to-face collective discussion about the war the G8 had initiated through an act of aggression against a sovereign state. Moreover, they would decide there to move to the next stage by authorizing the introduction through NATO of their and other NATO members' ground combat forces, in a non-permissive environment, into Kosovo itself. The deliberate intent of this diplomatic brinksmanship and compellence was to force Russia to cross the critical divide — to see if it would "hang together" with its G8 colleagues in an historic reorientation of Russian foreign policy, or if it would remain wedded to its traditional role as defender of the Serbs. In the end, the pull of G8 membership and all that came with it, along with other factors, proved decisive. The Russians on the eve of the Summit informed the Serbian authorities of their impending decision. Slobodan Milosevic immediately decided to withdraw his troops from Kosovo, rather than fight a ground war he was sure to lose, and thus risk losing the armed forces that were essential to keeping him in power in Serbia itself.

Here the role of the UNSC was limited to passing, on 10 June 1999, Resolution 1244 (1999), which merely confirmed and formally codified what the G8 had already decided. There was no ambiguity as to where the real locus of decision and authority lay.

For the UNSC Resolution had appended to it as Annex I the "Statement by the Chairman on the conclusion of the meeting of the G8 Foreign Ministers held at Petersberg Centre on 6 May 1999."

It was this defining case that unified the G7 and then the G8 in their determination to act again, at their own discretion, should similar circumstances arise. In their calculus, an authorizing UNSC resolution to provide retroactive legitimation for their activities was a useful consequence of, rather than a critical cause of, or even an important consideration in, their own willingness to inject their ground forces to successfully liberate Kosovo from the Serbian armed forces and the genocide they were virtually certain to bring. This G8 leadership, investment and the outcome stands in sharp contrast to the action of the UN in the Great Lakes region of Africa a few years before, where close to a million innocent civilians were slaughtered in a conscious genocide as UN forces and their political leadership proved unable or unwilling to intervene.[6] It provides an even sharper contrast with the UN record during the past decade in neighboring Bosnia. Here the UN, by declaring some place "safe havens" and then standing idly by while the innocent civilians who had thus sought sanctuary were slaughtered, was more directly responsible for fostering the very outcome it had wished to avoid.[7] It is against these massive failures of the UN-centered system of global security, and the genocidal horrors that a reliance on UN leadership has bred, that G8 leaders considered and concluded that a move toward a G8-centered alternative, after its proven performance in Kosovo, might be a more effective replacement for the old institution and its defining ideas.

Increasingly, the G8 is giving up on its earlier role as a supportive reformer of the UN in the security field. Its great but only partly successfully effort to reform the UN system at the Halifax Summit of 1995, held on the 50th anniversary of the UN's founding, was its last serious attempt. Afterward it made few efforts to address the core issues, starting with Security Council reform. It is striking how, on the 60th anniversary, at the Gleneagles Summit held two months before the historic Millennium Development Review Summit of the UN in New York on September 14-16, the G8 leaders paid virtually no attention to UN reform in the security field. This was despite the comprehensive year-long reform effort in the lead-up led by Kofi Annan. Since 1995 — and well before the specific shock of 911 — the G8 had devoted its energies not to reforming a failing UN but to developing a security governance capacity of its own.

During this period, the UN has increasingly adapted to support the leadership of the G8 in the security field. As noted above, the great change came over Kosovo in 1999, when the UNSC, in Resolution 1244, suddenly changed its position to explicitly endorse exactly what the G7 had decided shortly before. Subsequently, the Outcome Document of the UN's 2005 World Summit directly noted the G8 on three occasions and in each case offered its support. It welcomed the sport of the G8 in support of African development and in doubling aid, endorsed the G8's debt cancellation initiative, and, in the area of regional security, welcomed "the proposal from Group of Eight Countries to provide support for African peacekeeping" (UNGA 2005: 21). The UN thus deferred to the G8's leadership in the field of peacekeeping, a security domain that the UN had long led on and had once pioneered. More broadly, the Outcome Document also saw the UN finally adopt in varying degrees the core G8 values of democracy, environmental protection (as a "respect

for nature”), and the interventionist responsibility to protect, in striking contrast to a UN Charter that remains silent on or fundamentally opposed to these values.

Despite these adaptations, the UN, even when meeting at the Summit level with a comprehensive agenda allowing interlinkages and tradeoffs, has clearly failed what Annan called its one great chance to change into an effective centre of global security governance for the twenty-first century world. On nuclear non-proliferation, where the G8 had been very active since its start in 1975, the outcome document remained silent, despite the failure of the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) review conference the previous year. On terrorism, the G8’s second institutionalized core security subject, the Outcome document showed the UN was able to agree only on a one-sentence statement in the second half of the Outcome document, stating terrorism was strongly condemned in all its forms. But the UN Summit proved unable to convert the sentiment into a comprehensive convention. And a high-level conference to formulate an international response to terrorism, in the outcome document declared in a polite admission of failure, “could be considered” at best.

More generally, at the core of the system, the UN Summit failed completely to reform the Security Council. It called for, but did not commit to or accomplish, the end of its constitutional treatment of Japan and Germany as alien, enemy, aggressor states (encoded in Charter Articles 53, 77 and 107). Most tellingly, it began (in paragraph 2) by affirming its commitment to and strict respect for the principles of the Charter. And to show that its faith in Article 2 (7) remained intact, it declared at the start in paragraph five its belief in the primary principal of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states. Institutionally and ideationally, the UN in 2005 remains wedded to the Wesphalian formulae of 1945 and 1648 to as the foundation for producing effective security governance for a much changed twenty-first century world.

Conclusion: Strengthening the G8 System to Support International Peace and Security

Proposals for Strengthening

If it is the G8 and not the UNSC that is looked to for such leadership in the twenty-first century world, what steps can be taken to strengthen the G8’s capacity to deliver? In considering such steps, four criteria are central. Firstly, they must avoid all of those features of the UNSC alternative that has led this institution to fail. Secondly, they must build upon the G8’s central structural advantages, grounded in the concert model, of concerted power, constricted participation, common purpose and political control by popularly elected leaders. Thirdly, they must yield an institution able to successfully manage the full range of peace and security challenges on a global basis, from the classic arms control-proliferation, through regional security and democratic governance interventions, to the growing agenda of human security, conflict prevention and humanitarian intervention that will acquire increasing force in the coming years. Here, they must integrally link these political and security issues to the economic and transnational domains of the Summits agenda, and thereby take advantage of the leaders-

driven G8's capacity for issue linkage and large package deals (Putnam and Bayne 1987). Similarly, they must be able to act globally on a linked basis, including taking preventative action within polities from all global regions, if only as a way of building a deterrent and incentive structure and normative floor for global security everywhere. And fourthly, they must build a system in which not only the permanently UNSC non-P5 dispossessed countries of Japan, Germany, Italy and Canada feel comfortable, but also one in which the P5 members of the U.S. and Britain, and, above all, psychologically fragile and often invaded and defeated France and Russia, feel fully at home.

The first step in strengthening the system is to make the Russians full members of all G8 ministerial institutions to which they do not at present belong equally or at all. The most security-specific body is the Global Health Security Initiative, which since the start has joined the G7 countries with Mexico but not Russia. Another is the G7 finance ministers meeting, where since 911 the issue of terrorist finance has assumed pride of place. The second step is to move from the two-day annual G7/G8 summits of recent years, back to the three-day long summits of an earlier cycle. This move would give the leaders time to fully engage on the expanding array of peace and security topics the world will breed. A related move is to tighten and clarify the relationship between the pre-Summit G8 foreign ministers meeting and the Summit itself, in part by bringing them closer together in space and time, along the lines of Cologne in 1999 rather than Miyazaki-Okinawa in 2000. A further move is to strengthen the year-round ministerial level capacity of the G8 foreign ministers, by institutionalizing a December or January meeting (co-hosted by the outgoing and incoming chairs) as a start. Another move is to involve departments responsible for national defence, at both the official and ministerial level, by having them join foreign ministers and their officials for ad hoc, subject-specific G8 or G8-plus gatherings, or at a regularly scheduled foreign ministry sessions. Despite this impressive institutional development, there remain obvious lacunae in the G7/G8's capacity to address the most military aspects of international security. The 1990-1 Gulf War did catalyze meetings of G7 Policy Planning Staffs from their foreign ministries, and bred calls for the members' military chiefs of staff to meet. But neither the latter nor their defence ministers have yet come together "at seven" or "at eight". This absence has become ever more of an anomaly, as now about half of the cabinet ministers or secretaries in member governments meet in G7/G8 forums (Kirton 1999, Hajnal 1999). Ministers responsible for national defence remain similarly uninvolved on a direct basis in the UN and its UNSC. So do their uniformed military officials, given the failure of the UN Charter–created Military Staff Committee ever to meet. Finally, it would be useful to encourage leaders to repeat the 1985 precedent, and hold inter-sessional summits on central timely security issues. This core feature of classic concert diplomacy would have the added advantage, in a period of rising public protests at fixed piece, long scheduled summit and ministerial meetings, of allowing leaders to return to the earlier age of more tranquil summitry when they were free to focus on the issues at hand rather than the at times distracting masses of some prospectively violent protestors outside.

A third and more difficult step is to consider how to associate more countries more closely with the work of the G8 in the peace and security field. Here the instinctive UN-centric answer is to look to admitting China — the one P5 member not in the G8 — as a

full G8 member, and to create a G8 equivalent of the non-permanent members of the Security Council as a more representative secondary stratum. Despite the now proven performance of the G20 finance ministers forum founded in 1999, such instincts are, on the whole, misleading. Empirically, as a concert that is slow to admit members, in part because (unlike the League of Nations) from it no members will ever be expelled, the G8 is very cautious in its addition of full members. The most real recent initiative, by the Japanese host, was a wise offer of partial participation (a post-summit meeting with the G8) rather than full membership. It was also an offer, again wisely, extended equally and simultaneously to India and other Asian countries as well. Subsequent G8 summit outreach has followed a similar pattern. Reciprocally, it is unlikely that the current China, with the memory of the Russia of the 1990s vivid, will accept anything less than full membership all at once and ideally by themselves. More generally, the concerted power, constricted participation, common purpose and political control by popularly elected leaders that are the core causes of G8 effectiveness suggest that the admission of new members should be done only very selectively and slowly, through partial participation of various kinds. They further suggest that democratic India rather than currently non-democratic China should be the first country in the queue. Full membership, with all its advantages, for India would be an appropriate reward for a decision by India to renounce nuclear weapons and join the non-proliferation regimes as a non nuclear weapons state.

A fourth move is to associate, not individual countries, but international institutions, to provide the broader resources, representativeness and the legitimacy, based on criteria other than effectiveness, that the G8 could benefit from in its enlarged peace and security role. A careful look at the G8's on-the-whole successful experience with the EU as a substantial if incomplete member, and its post-Summit dialogues with major multilateral organizations suggests that these approaches provide a foundation on which to build, especially in the conflict prevention field (Kirton 2004). Associating other leader-led regional organizations with global visions such as the Asia Pacific Economic Co-operation forum, plurilateral institutions of global scope such as the Commonwealth and la Francophonie (which would help quell British and French anxieties) and holding more regular post-summit dialogues with more of the world's major multilateral organizations could be a useful direction in which to move. If a formula can be found to offset the G8's propensity toward Eurocentricity, the Organization for Co-operation and Security in Europe and NATO might also warrant inclusion. The Summit of the America's process in the western hemisphere might also be relevant, particularly if one were to begin this process of expansion by reinforcing the G8's democratic character through adding plurilateral, leader-led institutions composed entirely of democratic states.

A fifth step could be for the foreign ministers to emulate the recent move of their finance ministers colleagues, by creating a peace and security equivalent of the G20 (Kirton 2001c, 2001d). Such a body would have the G8 at the core, and a dozen or so additional country and international institutional members. The individual countries would, on functional grounds, and perhaps in keeping with the value of democratic reinforcement, be different than those in the existing G20. Unlike the UNSC, in this political-security G20 all members would be full equals as permanent members. Moreover, it would be their capacity to contribute, more than their territorial regional

representativeness — a feature of diminishing relevance in an era of intensifying globalization — that would matter. The additional members would consist entirely of the world's ranking middlepowers — the emerging polities (rather than economies) of the new world. The experience of those non-G8 members who have served effectively and responsibly with G7 members from the start in such clubs as the London Suppliers Group, the Missile Technology Control Regime etc would provide a proven pool from which to recruit the robust and responsible powers needed to generate a G8-centered peace and security system with the desired results. On this foundation, a leaders level G20, or 20, could usefully emerge alongside the G8 to assist with global security governance in a more broadly and densely interlinked world (Kirton 2005).

Prospects for Building a New System

Are such movements possible from a G8 that is a consensus-oriented club in which the consent or at least acquiescence of co-founder France, newest member Russia, and each of the others is usually required for major moves to take place? Will not some G8 and P5 dual members join the understandable reluctance of China to assist in any move to build the G8, inevitably at the expense of an idealized or reformed UNSC, as the central global peace and security forum? A review of the interests and incentives, and existing and evolving attitudes of each G8 member provides grounds for cautious optimism here.

Beginning with the easiest case, it is clear that Canada long ago gave up on any hope that the UNSC and its P5 could be reformed to meet the requirements of the modern world. This judgment is well signaled in Canada's current approach to Security Council reform, which seeks to diminish the use of the veto and the special privileges of the existing P5 powers, rather than to expand their numbers and thus create more paralyzing veto points. Canada, the country which pioneered the move to give the G7 a formal peace and security agenda, notably at the first summit it hosted in 1981, thus looks first to the G8. It does so not primarily as a tactic to spur the UN to undertake the type of reforms it has proven incapable of accomplishing in the past.

Italy too has largely given up on the prospects of a reformed UN that will recognize its new, rather than World World Two, identity and place in the world. This is evidenced by its veto of any proposal to seriously discuss UNSC reform at the Okinawa G8 Summit. The failure even to consider it for a permanent UNSC seat in the 2004-5 UN reform effort has strengthened its preferance for the G8. The case of Kosovo was compelling for an Italy that offered the critical Aviano air base as a willing front line and thus otherwise insecure state.

Similarly Japan is evolving rapidly toward a G8-centric view. This is despite its greater attachment to multilateralism, and thus the UN and its peacekeeping and arms control instruments, and while always wary of the attitude of neighbouring China, One sign is the emphasis it placed on real action on conflict prevention at its foreign ministers and leaders meetings it hosted in 2000. Indeed, Japan effectively gave up on the UN as the central security forum when Chancellor Schroeder and Prime Minister Obuchi publicly called in 1999 for China to become more associated with the G8. The passage in the Okinawa Summit communiqué, stating that the G8 remained "convinced that reforms of

the United Nations, including the Security Council, are indispensable," had an aura of ritual restatement and resignation rather than one of action oriented potency to it. If they are taken seriously and literally, it is now clear following the 2005 UN Summit that the UN has failed, and that Japan is now fully committed to pursuing the alternative path.

Germany, despite the constraints of its EU and NATO membership, is in advance of Japan in this regard. Germany is a country still close to memories of the realized European holocaust. Like Italy it is a front-line state and a full participant, and it is an author as G8 host in 1999 in the great breakthrough of the triumph in Kosovo (Pleuger 2001, Volmer 2001).

Among the dual members, there is less resistance to a shift than one might think. The United States of George W. Bush lacks any real commitment to a revived UN. Bush's positions as a Presidential candidate showed a real interest in expanding the G8 institutions, and his early positions and behaviour as president confirmed this instinct. Among his cabinet secretaries, initial skepticism about the G7/G8 system was confined to his Treasury Secretary Paul O'Neil, and was rapidly replaced by solid and co-operative US participation in the G7 finance ministers forum. Subsequent moves by the United Nations, such as the expulsion of the United States from the United Nations Human Rights Commission, further the tendency of the Bush administration to look toward the G8. Despite the poor treatment the G8 accorded George Bush at his first summit in 2001, he has proven to be an effective G8 performer and system builder, above all at the Sea Island he hosted in 2005 (Fratianni et al. 2005).

Britain, with its declining relative capability position since the starting point of 1945, is anxious to cling to the permanent veto status it enjoys in the especially exclusive, legally anchored UNSC. But as Birmingham 1998 and above all Gleneagles 2005 showed, its current prime minister is a sufficiently accomplished G8 Summit practitioner, and his fellow governors and citizens confident of their countries' centuries long ability to do well in whatever global institutions they are involved in, that Britain is willing to give a G8-led system, especially after Kosovo, a chance.

Russia is a more complicated case. With more of a relative capability decline than Britain and none of Britain's historic self confidence in its international institutional prowess, Russia instinctively wants to cling to the position conferred on it, and the comforting memories of its real power, in the UNSC in the world of 1945. But it has now experienced the brutal realization during the spring of 1999 on the road to Kosovo that the threat of its P5 veto proved worthless in influencing its new G8 partners in their determination to prevent the sort of genocide that the UN, by its charter and actions, so easily allowed. The great transformation in interests and identity it underwent over Kosovo, its willingness to remain in the G8 and take its partners criticism over Russian behaviour in Chechnya, and its desire for the complete across-the-board status its G8 membership conveys, rather than the older single instrument military strength its UNSC P5 membership reflects, encourages it to make the move.

France thus remains the last holdout and largest challenge. Indeed France fears that the G8's new dynamic, expansive and ever more operational process on conflict prevention will come to constitute the *de facto* creation of a parallel Security Council and one that will quickly come, through its proven performance, to eclipse the original where

French positions and formal prerogatives are much more secure. Despite its credible claim to be a co-founder of the G7, of the European Union and of la Francophonie, France's confidence in its ability to exercise influence through international institutions remains historically far more fragile than that of its British peers.

But even France is in the midst of a rapid redefinition of what security now requires and thus potentially of what centre of global security governance is best designed to meet the needs of the new age. It was only a few short years ago that France engaged in actions, which some labelled "state terrorism," that resulted in the death of individuals associated with a civil society organization dedicated to environmental protection, in the jurisdiction of a small democratic member of the Commonwealth. Such actions were done in defence of France's unilateral right to conduct atmospheric nuclear tests to maintain the quality and credibility of an independent nuclear weapons capacity aimed potentially "à toutes azimuths." Such a course of action and calculus of security, and the Gaullist ghost that grounded it, France has now abandoned for good. That its new approach is enduring is evidenced, inter alia, by its acceptance of the Convention on Antipersonnel Landmines. As a polity it may well be somewhat behind its European neighbour Germany and its fellow la Francophonie member Canada, in according primary value to environmental protection and enhancement in its approach to shaping international order. But it has become enough of an environmentalist, as well as a leader in humanitarian intervention to prevent genocide, to understand that a UN Charter that accords no value at all to the global ecosystem, and affirms the overriding principle of non interference in the internal affairs of a sovereign state, is the antithesis of the what is required as a foundation for constructing a new international security architecture for the twenty-first century world. Despite its defiant demand that the G8 not become institutionalized as a global *directoire*, the record shows that since France has hosted G8 summits in an age of globalization, it has created official-level G8 security institutions alongside with its partner states.

References

Elrod, Richard (1976), "The Concert of Europe: A Fresh Look at an International System," *World Politics* 28.

Fratianni, Michele, John Kirton, Alan Rugman and Paolo Savona, eds. (2005), *New Perspectives on Global Governance: Why America Needs the G8* (Ashgate, Aldershot).

Hajnal, Peter (1999), *The G7/G8 System: Evolution, Role, Documentation* (Ashgate, Aldershot).

Jervis, Robert (1992), "A Political Science Perspective on the Balance of Power and the Concert," *American Historical Review* Vol. 97, No. 3 (June).

Jervis, Robert (1985), "From Balance to Concert: A Study of International Security Co-operation," *World Politics* 38 (October 1985): 58-79.

Kirton, John (forthcoming), "East Asian Summitry and Regional Community Creation," in Kenji Takita, eds., *The Road to East Asian Community (*Chuo University Press: Tokyo), in press.

Kirton, John (2004), "Co-operation Between the EU and G8 in Conflict Prevention," in Jan Wouters and Vincent Kronenberger, eds., *Conflict Prevention: Is the European Union Ready?* (TMC Asser Press, 2004).

Kirton, John (2005), "Toward Multilateral Reform: The G20's Contribution," in John English, Ramesh Thakur and Andrew Cooper, eds. *Reforming Multilateral Institutions from the Top: A Leaders 20 Summit (*United Nations University Press, Tokyo, 2005), pp. 141-168.

Kirton, John (2002), "The G8, the United Nations, and Global Security Governance," in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds. *New Directions in Global Political Governance: The G8 and International Order in the twenty-First Century (*Ashgate: Aldershot).

Kirton, John (2001a), "The G8 — Heading for a Major Role in International Peace and Security?" in Winrich Kuhne with Jochen Prantl, eds, *The Security Council and the G8 in the New* Millennium (Berlin, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Poltiik), pp. 73-82

Kirton, John (2001b), "The G7/8 and China: Toward a Closer Association," in *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century (*Ashagte: Aldershot), pp. 189-222.

Kirton, John (2001c), "The G20: Representativeness, Effectiveness and Leadership in Global Governance," in *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century (*Ashagte: Aldershot), pp. 143-172.

Kirton, John (2001d), "Guiding Global Economic Governance: The G20, the G7 and the International Monetary Fund at Century's Dawn," in John Kirton and George von Furstenberg, eds., *New Directions in Global Economic Governance: Managing Globalisation in the Twenty-First century (*Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 143-167.

Kirton, John (2000), "Creating "Peace and Human Security: The G8 and Okinawa Summit Contribution," Paper presented at Soka University, Japan, May 26, 2000.

Kirton, John (1999), "Explaining G8 Effectiveness," in Michael Hodges, John Kirton and Joseph Daniels, *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Ashgate, Aldershot), pp. 45-68.

Kirton, John (1993), "The Seven-Power Summit as a New Security Institution," in David Dewitt, David Haglund and John Kirton, eds., *Building a New Global Order: Emerging Trends in International* Security (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 335-357.

Kirton, John (1989), "Contemporary Concert Diplomacy: The Seven-Power Summit and the Management of International Order," Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the International Studies Association, London, 1989.

Kirton, John, Joseph Daniels and Andreas Freytag (2001), "The G8's Contribution to Twenty-First Century Governance," in *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century (*Ashgate, Aldershot), pp.283-306.

Kirton, John and Radoslava Stefanova, eds. (2004), *The G8, the United Nations, and Conflict Prevention (*Ashgate: Aldershot).

Kirton, John and Junichi Takase, eds. (2002), *New Directions in Global Political Governance: The G8 and International Order in the twenty-First Century (*Ashgate: Aldershot).

Kissinger, Henry (1964), *A World Restored: Casterleagh, Metternich and the Restoration of Peace: 1812-1822,*

Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan (1991), "Concerts, Collective Security, and the Future of Europe," *International Security* 16 (Summer): 114-161.

Kupchan, Charles and Clifford Kupchan (1995), "The Promise of Collective Security," *International Security* 20 (Summer): 52-61.

Legault, Albert (1993), "The MTCR," in David Dewitt, David Haglund and John Kirton, eds., *Building a New Global Order: Emerging Trends in International* Security (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 335-357.

Penttila, Risto (2005), "Advancing American Security Interests Through the G8," in Michele Fratianni, John Kirton, Alan Rugman and Paolo Savona, eds., *New Perspectives on Global Governance: Why America Needs the G8* (Ashgate: Aldershot), pp. 83-105

Penttila, Risto (2003), *The Role of the G8 in International Peace and Security,* Adelphi Paper 355 (Oxford University Press: New York).

Pleuger, Gunther (2001), The G8 — Heading for a Major Role in International peace and Security?" in Winrich Kuhne with Jochen Prantl, eds, *The Security Council and the G8 in the New* Millennium (Berlin, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Poltiik), pp. 83-86.

Putnam and Bayne (1987, *Hanging Together: Cooperation and Conflict in the Seven-Power Summits* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Rosecrance, Richard, "A New Concert of Powers", *Foreign Affairs* 71 (Spring 1990):

Schwegmann, Christoph (2001), “Modern Concert Diplomacy: The Contact Group and the G7/8 in Crisis Management,” in *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century (*Ashagte: Aldershot), pp. 189-222.

United Nations General Assembly (2005), *2005 World Summit Outcome,* 20 September 2005.

Volmer, Ludger (2001), “Opening Statement,” in Winrich Kuhne with Jochen Prantl, ed.s (2001), *The Security Council and the G8 in the New* Millennium (Berlin, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Poltiik), pp. 15-20

Wallace, William (1984), “Political Issues at the Summits: A New Concert of Powers,” in Cesare Merlini (ed.), *Economic Summits and Western Decisionmaking* (St. Martin’s Press, London).

Wendt, Alexander (1997), *Social Theory of International Politics* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Winrich Kuhne with Jochen Prantl, eds (2001), *The Security Council and the G8 in the New Millennium* (Berlin, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Poltiik), pp. 73-82.

Appendix A: List of G8 official-Level Bodies, by date of creation

First Cycle (5)
1975 London Nuclear Suppliers Group (1975-present)
1977 International Nuclear Fuel Cycle Evaluation Group (1977-1980)
1979 High Level Group on Energy Conservation (oil reduction) and Alternative Energy (1979-1985)
1979 International Energy Technology Group (1979-1980)
1980 International Team to Promote Collaboration on Specific Projects on Energy Technology (1980-****)

Second Cycle (8)
1982 Working Group on Technology, Growth and Employment (1982-1986)
1982 Representatives to control exports of strategic goods (1982-*)***
1982 Procedures for multilateral surveillance of economic performance (1982-1996)
1985 Expert Group on Desertification and Dry Zone Grains (to report to Foreign Ministers) (1985)
1985 Expert Group on Environmental Measurement (1985-1987, then taken up by UNEP until present)
1986 Group of Experts on Terrorism (1986-present)
1987 Missile Technology Control Regime (MTCR) (1987-present)
1987 International Ethics Committee on AIDS (1987-1989)

Third Cycle (9)
1989 Financial Action Task Force (FATF) (with others, secretariat from OECD) (1989-present)
1990 Chemical Action Task Force (1990-1992)
1990 Task Force to Study the State of the Soviet Economy (1990-1991)
1990 Gulf Crisis Financial Coordination Group (1990-1991)
1992 Nuclear Safety Working Group (NSWG) (1992-present)
1993 Support Implementation Group (SIG) (1993-1997)
1993 G8 Non-Proliferation Experts Group (NPEG) (1993-present)
1995 G7/P8 Senior Experts Group on Transnational Organized Crime (Lyon Group), (1995-present)
1995 GIP National Coordinators (1995-1999)

Fourth Cycle (25)
1996 Group of Experts on Nuclear Safety and Security (1996-1997)
1996 Group of Experts on Standardizing and Simplifying Customs Procedures (1996-2000)
1996 G8 Lyon Group Law Enforcement Group on Environmental Crime (1996-****)
1997 Expert Group on Financial Crime (1997-1999)
1997 Subgroup on High Tech Crime (of the Lyon Group) (1997-present)
1997 Officials Group on Forests (1997-2002)
1999 Working Group on Kosovo (1999-2001)
1999 South Eastern Europe Regional Table and Working Tables (1999-present)

1999 Financial Stability Forum (1999-present)
1999 Enhanced HIPC Initiative (1999-present)
1999 G-20 Finance Ministers (1999-present)
2000 Conflict Prevention Officials Meeting (CPOM) (2000-2001)
2000 Renewable Energy Task Force (2000-2001)
2000 Digital Opportunities Task Force (Dot-Force) (2000-2001)
2000 Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Malaria and Tuberculosis (2000-present)
2001 G8 Task Force on Education (2001-2002)
2001 Personal Representatives for Africa (APR) (2001-2003)
2002 Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction (2002-present)
2002 G8 Global Partnership Senior Officials Group (GPSOG) (2002-present)
2002 G8 Nuclear Safety and Security Group (2002-present)
2002 G8 Experts on Transport Security (2002-present)
2002 Global Health Security Action Group (2002-present)
2002 Global Health Security Action Group (GHSAG) Laboratory Network (2002-present)
2002 Technical Working Group on Influenza Pandemic (2002-present)
2002 Working Group on Chemical Events (2002-2003)

Fifth Cycle (20)
2003 High Level Working Group on Biometrics (2003-2004)
2003 Counter-Terrorism Action Group
2003 Radio-Active Sources Working Group
2003 Senior Officials for Science and Technology for Sustainable Development
2003 G8 Enlarged Dialogue Meeting
2004 Global Partnership Working Group (GPWG)
2004 Global HIV Vaccine Enterprise
2004 Microfinance Consultative Group
2004 Best Practises Microfinance Training Centre
2004 Democracy Assistance Dialogue
2004 Task Force on Investment
2004 G8 Expert-Level Meetings on Peace Support in Africa
2004 Friends of the Convention on Corruption
2004 G8 Accelerated Response Teams on Corruption
2004 International Partnership for a Hydrogen Economy (IPHE)
2004 IPHE Implementation-Liaison Committee
2004 Carbon Sequestration Leadership Forum (CSLF)
2004 Renewable Energy and Energy Efficiency Partnership (REEEP)
2004 Generation IV International Forum (GIF)
2004 Global Earth Observation System of Systems (GEOSS)

Notes

[1] Parts of this paper were previously published as John Kirton, "The G8 – Heading for a Major Role in International peace and Security?" in Winrich Kuhne with Jochen Prantl, ed.s (2001), *The Security Council and the G8 in the New* Millennium (Berlin, Stiftung Wissenschaft und Poltiik), pp. 73-82, and in John Kirton, "The G8, the United Nations, and Global Security Governance," in John Kirton and Junichi Takase, eds. (2002), *New Directions in Global Political Governance: The G8 and International Order in the twenty-First Century (*Ashgate: Aldershot).

[2] The areas of east-west relations and the democratization and human rights (as in South Africa and Hong Kong) are treated as secondary, as they do not involve outsiders' use of military force.

[3] The two other founding moments of the G8 also show its security-centric focus from the start. One was the lunch of the Berlin Dinner Four leaders at the British Embassy in Heksinki on July 31, 1975 on the margins of a CSCE Summit. The second was the first founding meeting in 1975 of the London Nuclear Suppliers Club, a gathering of seven countries, including Canada and the Soviet Union from the start.

[4] They ended this silence after having declared at the start of the document the value of he UN summits and conferences.

[5] The 1999 G8 dinner was largely taken up by a stock-taking of the still delicate situation in East Timor.

[6] Most notably in the genocide in Rwanda in 1994.

[7] The key episode came in July 1995 with the Serb slaughter of Muslims in the UN-declared "safe zone" of Srebrenica in eastern Bosnia. More routine failures of UN peacekeeping include the failed mission in Somalia in 1993, where 18 U.S. soldiers were slaughtered, and, more recently, in Sierra Leone, where the UN peacekeepers were kidnapped by the rebels they were seeking to protect the civilian population against.