Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development
Centre canadien pour le développement de la politique étrangère

125 Sussex Dr. Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0G2

CANADA'S COMMITMENT TO WORLD PEACE

CCFPD Policy Options Paper by

The Group of 78
Ottawa, Ontario
2000

6002.7E

ISBN: E2-411/2000E-IN
0-662-30871-9

Tel.: (613) 944-8278
Internet address: http://www.cfp-pec.gc.ca Fax: (613) 944-0687

Canada's Commitment to World Peace

Report of the Annual Policy Conference of

The Group of 78

September 29 - October 1, 2000
Ottawa, Canada

Conference Chair: **Ross Francis**

The United Nations General Assembly proclaimed the Year 2000 as *International year for the Culture of Peace* and the decade as a whole *International decade for a Culture of Peace and Non-Violence for the Children of the World.*

"Exclusion in all its forms has a potential for violence."
Élisabeth Barot, *Patience and the Long Term*

"The conclusion was that Canada has not promoted women's equality and does not take seriously the links between gender, poverty, health and the environment, between violence and inequality, between democratic participation and good decision-making."
Janis Alton, *The Road to Peace Building: Revolutions in Progress*

"Addressing the roots of insecurities means reducing the contradictions between our human security agenda and the government's more dominant foreign policy interest: the pursuit of wealth for Canadians within a global market that by its nature creates or exacerbates insecurities."
Ann Denholm Crosby, *Canada's Human Security Agenda: The Least We Could Do*

Editor: **Ann Young**, Conference Rapporteur
Production Editors: **Nancy Drozd** and **Tim Creery**
French translation: **Jean-Claude Bourgie**

Published by:

The Group of 78
206 – 145 Spruce St.
Ottawa, ON K1R 6P1

Tel: 613-230-0860
Fax: 613-563-0017
E-mail: group78@web.ca
Web site: http://www.hri.ca/partners/g78

Extra copies of this report may be obtained for $10 each from the G78 at the above address

ISBN 0-9692856-9-8

Other publications by the Group of 78 include:

- A Foreign Policy for the 80s *(pamphlet), 1984*
- To Combine Our Efforts *(pamphlet), 1985*
- Canada and the World: National Interest and Global Responsibility, *56 pages, 1985*
- Canada and Africa: A Common Cause, *44 pages, 1986*
- Canada and Common Security: the Assertion of Sanity, *88 pages, 1987*
- Canada and Her Neighbours in a Changing World *(conference report), 1989*
- Canada in the Americas: Agenda for the 90s *(conference report), 65 pages, 1990*
- Beyond Sovereignty: The Future of the Nation State, *44 pages, 1991*
- The Movement of Peoples: A View from the South, *177 pages, 1992*
- Pacific Regional Cooperation in a New Global Context: Challenges and Opportunities for Canada *(conference report), 1994*
- 'Failed States'; How Might the UN and Canada Help? *(conference summary report), 1995*
- 'Arms and the Man'; Threats to Peace at the End of the Century *(conference summary report) 1996*
- Canada's Defence Policy "A Realistic and Meaningful Mandate for the Canadian Armed Forces (conference report), *45 pages, 1997*
- Human Rights: How Can Canada Make a Difference? *(conference report), 37 pages, 1998*
- Globalization and Its Discontents *(conference report), 54 pages, 1999*

Canada's Commitment to World Peace

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments

The Group of 78 sincerely thanks the speakers, panelists and resource persons who elaborated the theme of *Canada's Commitment to World Peace* and elicited lively and thoughtful responses from those attending the annual policy conference. Brief biographical notes are given in the introduction.

Once again the G78 is most grateful for the financial support provided by a generous grant from the John Holmes Fund, administered by the Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development located in the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. We are also most grateful for a translation grant from the Department of Canadian Heritage which has made possible the appearance of the full report on the Conference in French as well as English.

Attendance at the conference was about 50 to 60, augmented by the joint dinner with Physicians for Global Survival. We would like to thank the many people, chiefly G78 members, who helped to organize and run the conference.

Ross Francis was chair of the conference, chair of the organizing committee, and also brought together the background papers. He was assisted in the preparation of the conference by Janis Alton, a member of the G78 board of directors. Past co-chair Marion Dewar presided in Ottawa, finding new accommodation for the conference at the Embassy West Hotel, when the usual venue at Econiche House in the Gatineau turned out not to be available. Past co-chair Tim Creery prepared the conference issue of *Newslink/InfoLien*, and past co-chair Debbie Grisdale assisted with the Ottawa arrangements.

Former executive secretary Aicha Bah, and during her month's absence, former executive secretary Dee Welch, carried the administrative burden, assisted by treasurer Nancy Drozd, who was also production editor for the newsletter.

Assisting Ross Francis, a number of G78 members kept the conference going as moderators of panels and discussion groups: Joanna Miller, John Graham, Ken Williamson, Samantha Nutt, and Debbie Grisdale.

The reporting of the conference was in the capable hands of Ann Young, with three assistant rapporteurs: Rob Judge, a PhD student in political science and teacher at Carleton University, and Kasia Borowska, and Renee Martyna, students at Carleton's Norman Paterson School of International Affairs. Ann Young was also editor of this report on the proceedings.

We are grateful to them all for making this year's conference a great success.

Dr. James Christie and Dr. Élisabeth Barot
Co-Chairs, The Group of 78

Introduction: Speakers and Topics

The priorities of the Group of 78 from its beginnings in 1981 have been the removal of the nuclear threat, the peaceful settlement of disputes, and a more equitable economic order in the world. The Group's founding policy statement said: "These objectives require a new emphasis in our foreign policy based on the recognition that national security depends on an international effort to maintain an equitable and stable international order."

This year's theme for the annual policy conference, *Canada's Commitment to World Peace*, took us back to the requisites for a peaceful world – for "an equitable and stable international order" – and examined them in the light of today's challenges.

Principal speakers

The keynote speech for the conference, "Creating a culture of peace," was delivered by **Dr. Mary-Wynne Ashford**, a physician and educator who is co-president of the International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War. Dr. Ashford was a family doctor and a hospice physician for 11 years before returning to university – Simon Fraser University, Vancouver – to pursue a PhD researching violence-prevention programs. Making her home in Victoria, B.C., where she has returned to clinical medicine in the field of paliative care after five years as a university teacher, Dr. Ashford is a writer and lecturer who has spoken on disarmament issues in Europe, Russia, Japan, India, Pakistan, Australia, the United States, and Canada.

To consider the politics of a culture of peace, the G78 turned to a long-time member, **Senator Douglas Roche**, author, parliamentarian, and diplomat. Doug Roche began his career in journalism and became the founding editor of the *Western Catholic Reporter* (1965-72)**.** From 1972 until his retirement in 1984**,** he was a Progressive Conservative MP from an Edmonton riding, specializing in international development and disarmament. In1984 he was appointed Canada's ambassador for disarmament and held the post until 1989, when he was appointed visiting professor at the University of Alberta, where he teaches "War or Peace in the 21st Century". He was appointed to the Senate in 1998. He is a prolific author of books and articles on development and disarmament.

This year's G78 policy conference included a special joint event with Physicians for Global Survival (PGS): a presentation dinner at which **Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll, jr.** (USN, Ret.), vice-president of the Centre for Defence Information in Washington, D.C., received the Tom Perry Peace Achievement Award of the PGS. He addressed the gathering on "Cooperation or Confrontation?". A naval aviator, Admiral Carroll rose to command an amphibious assault ship and later an aircraft carrier, USS Midway, during the Vietnam War. He served as commander of the carrier striking force of the U.S. Sixth Fleet in the Mediterranean and held senior administrative and planning posts. He writes and speaks on the need for rational military programs.

Panels

Causes of Conflict and Violence. **Dr. Élisabeth Barot**, co-chair of the Group of 78, organizes conferences and consultations throughout Canada on human rights, the social sciences, and the status of women and youth as a program officer for the Canadian Commission for UNESCO. Fluent in French, Spanish and English, Dr. Barot wrote on the birth of federalism in Spain for her PhD thesis from the University of Pau, France, and has a long career in university education and international development.

The New Diplomacy: Peace Building. **Janis Alton** is a member of the board of Voice of Women for Peace, Science for Peace, and the Group of 78. She is a long-time activist in the domestic and international peace movement, emphasizing the participation of women. **Ann Denholm Crosby** is an associate professor of political science at York University and author of *Dilemmas in Defence Decision-Making: Constructing Canada`s Role in NORAD, 1958-96* (International Political Economy Series; MacMillan Press in Britain, St. Martin`s Press in the United States).

Discussion Groups

Each discussion group was assisted by resource persons with expertise in the subject under discussion. The moderators of each group were members of the G78. Brief biographical notes on the resource persons follow.

Kosovo: Looking for a Way Out **John Fraser**, a member of the Group of 78, was Canadian ambassador to Yugoslavia**.** **Michael Borish** is president of his own consulting firm, focusing on business and financial problems in developing, emerging, and transition markets since the late 1980s, including ex-communist countries in central and eastern Europe. The moderator was **John Graham**.

Control of Small Arms: Applying the Lessons of the Crusade against Anti-personnel Land Mines **Peggy Mason,** a lawyer by profession, succeeded Douglas Roche as Canadian ambassador for disarmament and is now advisor to the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT) on small arms and weapons control. She is also chairperson of the UN Group of Governmental Experts Study on brokering and related activities of the manufacture and trade of small arms and light weapons. The moderator was **Ken Williamson**.

War-affected Children **Senator Landon Pearson**, author of *Children of Glasnost*, which gave rare insight into growing up in the Soviet Union in a time of transition, is particularly remembered for her work as vice-chairperson of the Canadian Commission for the International Year of the Child and as editor of the Commission's report, *For Canada's Children: National Agenda for Action*, in 1979. She has been adviser on children's rights to the minister of foreign affairs. The moderator was **Samantha Nutt.**

Executive Summary

Participants in this year's Group of 78 Policy Conference carried out a critical review of the ways in which Canada's commitment to world peace has broadened over the past decade. The concepts of human security and soft power have found expression in policies and programs; women have achieved a more prominent role in policy making. At the same time, Canada has fallen far short of its professed goals in foreign aid. Conference participants offered many suggestions for strengthening Canada's commitment to world peace in the years to come.

Keynote speech

Dr. Mary-Wynne Ashford looked for the attributes of a culture of peace in communities that have refused either to fight or submit to tyranny. In recent times, the lessons of Gandhi's non-violent campaign against British rule in India have been applied in the Philippines. There, the Church urged the people into the streets to prevent the army from acting on the orders of the dictator Ferdinand Marcos; the people took to the streets and stayed there. Marcos fled. Even under the new regime, areas of civil war continued but were restrained when peasant communities persuaded the army on one side, guerillas on the other, to respect Zones of Peace. The same method was taken to Colombia where, despite terrible setbacks, some 28 Zones of Peace persist. Dr. Ashford also gave examples of clinging to peace in the midst of war from the Tibetan exile community in India, the Kosevo Hospital in Sarajevo and nonviolent communities bringing together Israelis and Palestinians.

Representatives of fifty award-winning communities brought together by the United Nations put their fingers on the keys to success: such attributes as altriuism, a sense of human dignity and worth, pride in doing things for themselves. The communities described their codes of decency, equality, and respect for life and the individual, and their rejection of raw power, threats, and greed. Most stressed spiritual strength and religious or cultural traditions as sources of resilience, perseverance and hope. Other aspects were respect for nature, a common vision of social justice, community ownership of programs, participation, and shared power. A legitimate economic base was essential to long-term success.

What can outsiders do? Dr. Ashford said a demonstration of concern gives those working for reform a sense of solidarity to dispel feelings of hopelessness. Outside help can support educational programs in moral values and participatory democracy. It can also support the necessary structures of Zones of Peace, including a justice system, and contribute to communications needs.

The Politics of a Culture of Peace

Senator Douglas Roche took as his theme the 20-year policy thrust of the Group of 78 as contrasted with the new militarist and anti-internationalist foreign policy of the Canadian Alliance party. He noted that the kind of policies put forward by the G78 in 1981 – to eliminate nuclear weapons, to achieve greater economic equity among nations, and to strengthen the

United Nations system – had become part of the mainstream of global security policy in recent years. By contrast, the Alliance's foreign policy document *Canada and the Millennium* holds that Canada's international credibility has been "shamefully squandered during the past 30 years" and that Canadian foreign policy is "now composed of little more than fashionable catch phrases such as 'soft power' and 'human security'". The Alliance would increase defence spending by taking money away from foreign aid, and would apply the additional money to strengthening NATO since the UN had proven ineffectual. The Alliance also held that the government had done "incalculable damage" to the national interest because of its "fascination" with eliminating nuclear weapons. It held that Canada should support the American initiative for a ballistic missile defence system.

Senator Roche noted that in recent years Canadian foreign aid spending had been cut by a much greater percentage than defence. "NATO's military spending is already greater than the rest of the world combined," he noted. The world's wars were being fought mostly in poor countries. The effectiveness of the UN is indicated by the fact that it has brought about 172 peaceful settlements of regional conflicts since 1945. The Alliance is going against both the weight of world opinion and the commitments of the world's nations in dismissing the elimination of nuclear weapons.

Cooperation or Confrontation?

Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll, jr. (USN-Ret) said there is a growing isolation of the United States stemming from "an acute case of national hubris**".** His country was attempting to impose leadership through confrontation rather than exercise it through constructive cooperation with other nations. "Unfortunately, the U.S. Congress and the Executive seem determined to make military power the primary instrument of U.S. foreign policy." The whole world was divided into U.S. military commands in an aggressive posture called "forward presence", which was in fact no more than gun boat diplomacy. The United States under President Clinton had reneged on its commitment to abolish nuclear weapons and affirmed that nuclear weapons would remain a cornerstone of U.S. security indefinitely. Determination to proceed with national missile defence would violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty.

Admiral Carroll urged the U.S. to turn from confrontational to cooperative policies, such as reversing its vote against establishing the International Criminal Court. Other cooperative moves should include ratifying the Convention on the Law of the Sea, and adhering to the Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Landmines. Key steps to renewing the movement to nuclear elimination would be ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, adherence to a universal declaration of no first-use, de-alerting of strategic weapons, separation of warheads from delivery vehicles, and significant reductions in nuclear arsenals "until 32,000 weapons become 5,000 and then 1,000 and then 500".

Causes of Conflict and Violence

Speaking on *Patience and the Long Term*, **Élisabeth Barot** underlined the importance of patience and education in developing a culture of peace. "At this moment the most dangerous threat for peace is impatience with a system that is under the stress of change." Education guided by democratic and participatory principles should lead to long-term management of change to replace crisis management, particularly in three areas of critical importance: biodiversity, cultural diversity, and access to information.

Ms. Barot stressed that "exclusion in all its form has a potential for violence. In a world of increasing diversity, we must be aware of the dangers of exclusion and marginalization, which diminish our capacity to live together in peace." In face of growing disparity between the communications capacity of the deprived and affluent worlds, "the ethical imperative ... is to formulate a concept of the public interest and take a balanced view of the needs of the users and communicators of information and of access-providers and content-providers the world over. Further, the corresponding practical problem is to identify and develop organizations capable of giving this concept effective voice."

The New Diplomacy: Peace-building

Janis Alton focused on the movement to incorporate women's insights and activism in the field of demilitarization and security. Her account goes from Hague to Hague: the 1899 Hague conference of 29 nations to "fight for world peace and abandon all wars", inspired in part by the advocacy of Baroness Bertha von Suttner and her book *Lay Down Your Arms*, and the 1999 Hague conference, with 10,000 non-governmental and governmental delegates, which led to the "Women Building Peace" global campaign. In between, the Congress of Women opened at the Hague in 1915 in the midst of World War I, bringing together some of the best known radicals of the day; their call to the nations for mediation to end the war ran up against the fatalism of the military imperative. But they created the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), whose president today is Bruna Note, a member of Canadian Voice of Women (VOW) for Peace.

The formation of VOW in 1960 was an effort to overcome the continuing isolation of women from the political mainstream. It called on Canada to declare itself a non-nuclear country and to urge the U.S. to stop atmospheric nuclear testing. Over the years VOW campaigned for the broadening of the concept of security. On the international scene, the Fourth World Conference of Women in Beijing in 1995 was the largest gathering of women in history: 40,000. Canada's failure to live up to commitments at Beijing has been sharply criticized by the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA), a 40-member coalition including VOW. Women still have a long way to go to win systematic inclusion of women in UN processes dealing with political conflict.

Human Security Agenda

Ann Denholm Crosby said Canada pursues trade and military policies that are at odds with the goals of human security and soft power. This country pursues human security goals through the anti-landmines movement, efforts to curtail small arms and light weapons, the establishment of the International Criminal Court, and trying to reduce victimization of children in conflict. Canada's primary foreign policy goal, however, has remained "the promotion of prosperity and employment" for Canadians through rules-based economic multilateralism. This activity reinforces the processes and forces of economic globalization, which has its "dark side" in the widening gap between rich and poor, environmental degradation, resource depletion, and mass movements of population. "These conditions also create conflicts amongst peoples, which are often expressed through intra-state violence, human rights abuses, criminal activities, the drug trade, prostitution, child soldiering, and arms trafficking."

Canada is trying to ameliorate with one hand the ills it is helping create with the other. Similarly, instead of seeing soft power as an alternative to hard power, Canada sees negotiations, persuasion and non-military approaches as part of a continuum leading to hard power if they don't work. "Employed this way, soft power does not carry a critique of either military means or the ethos that supports it." Nevertheless, the use of human-security and soft-power approaches has brought greater voluntary participation and openness into Canadian international policy and increased the opportunity for "addressing the roots of insecurities rather than only the manifestations".

Discussion Groups

(The following accounts of the three discussion groups, prepared by the rapporteurs, conclude with recommendations as approved in general by the final plenary session of the Conference. In the case of Small Arms and Light Weapons, a specific resolution was adopted by the plenary and appears as Appendix 1.)

Group 1: Kosovo

The group reflected a certain gloom over the long-term prospects for Kosovo, but recommended that Canada continue its activities to promote peace in the region. Canada's contribution should be part of international activities, including those aimed at establishing stable structures of justice, education and health. Members expressed the view that hostilities in Kosovo will end only when the culture of violence, hatred and revenge is countered with peace education. In health aid, more emphasis should be placed on programs for post-traumatic stress.

It would be helpful if neighbouring middle-power countries like Italy and Greece encouraged investment and promoted prosperity and political stability in Kosovo. Eventually there might be a regional non-aggression pact of all countries in the region, including Russia. With no sign of a solution to the divisive sovereignty issue, the lesser evil is to ignore it while other policies are put into effect.

Group 2: Small Arms

Thr Group reviewed Peggy Mason's documentation of the lessons of the land mines campaign and their possible application to control of small arms and light weapons (SALW). Elements of the land mines success story included government leadership, a knowledgeable and motivated humanitarian community, mobilization of NGO support, partnership between government and civil society, a clear goal, and convergence of parties in the negotiating endgame. It should also be remembered that the Ottawa process could move fairly swiftly because anti-personnel land mines were marginal to the defence policies of most countries, and of little importance economically.

In the case of SALW, there is no single goal, such as an outright ban. Rather the goal is complex and multi-facetted, requiring mutually reinforcing actions at the national, regional and global levels. It is difficult for governments to agree on a program. The very success of NGO-government cooperation on land mines seems to have blunted the willingness of NGOs to exert critical pressure on governments. The economic impact of SALW is important to some countries, notably the former Soviet Union and Eastern European countries.

The Group held that civil society must be forthright in criticizing government, like-minded governments must agree on a program of action, parliamentary oversight and accountability of arms transfer policy must be increased at the national level, and the problem of converting SALW industry to other economic activity must be taken up.

Group 3: War-Affected Children

Since the establishment of the Rights of the Child in 1989, issues involving children in conflicts have received much more attention than in the past. The continuing magnitude of the issues was illustrated at the 2000 Winnipeg Conference. The Group found three issues particularly pressing: impunity of governments owing to failure to ratify agreements and become accountable; protecting children from HIV/AIDS, and definition of youth, with particular emphasis on including youth in negotiations rather than just treating them as listeners. More attention should be given children in prisons, particularly in obtaining legal aid.

1. Principal Speakers

Keynote Speech: Creating A Culture of Peace

By Mary-Wynne Ashford

> *(Material in this address is taken from a chapter by M.W. Ashford MD, PhD, in* War or Health*, edited by Hanna Tapanainen, to be published in January 2001. The chapter is entitled "Stubborn peace: Communities that refuse to fight".)*

Studies of war usually focus on the causes and contributing factors in the conflict more than the protective factors that may help a community resist violence. Historical analysis, for example, describes the economic, political, social and cultural context that seemed to make war inevitable. Recently, however, some organizations, such as International Alert, have been examining the peace capacity of societies at high risk of armed conflict, and attempting to enhance their inherent strengths to resist war. Some communities have taken grassroots actions to prevent armed conflict; these communities offer important lessons about what kinds of outside interventions might support and strengthen the indigenous initiatives. That is, in addition to studying what goes wrong, it is important to study what goes right when a community chooses not to take up arms.

When people choose to stand in unarmed opposition to hate-mongering and tyranny, refusing either to fight or to submit, they demonstrate that alternatives can be found, even in desperate situations, and that the community itself is the source of power. I argue that these strong communities share common attributes that contribute to a culture of peace.

I will outline several examples of grassroots resistance – stubborn communities that refused to go to war. Fortunately, some of these communities have analyzed the reasons for their success and provided their comments in discussions or publications. Their insights are valuable, particularly for nongovernmental organizations working in the field of peace building where outsiders try to offer assistance and international solidarity to communities at risk.

Until the 1980s, the best-known example of the power of nonviolent resistance was Gandhi's long, determined fight against British rule in India. Although many died in the struggle for independence, the moral authority of Gandhi's methods undermined the rights previously accorded to colonial rulers and laid the groundwork for ending colonialism elsewhere. The lessons Gandhi taught were well known in the Philippines when people were subjected to the rule of Ferdinand Marcos. Their struggle for democracy and the final "velvet revolution" is documented in Ed Garcia's book Pilgrim Voices: Citizens as Peacemakers.1

Marcos was a brutal dictator known as the Hitler of the East, whose regime lasted from 1972 to 1986. In the Philippines, a predominantly Catholic country, the Church initially espoused what it called "critical collaboration" with the government. As the Church became more and more

critical and less and less collaborative, it eventually issued a pastoral letter advocating nonviolent resistance. Many disagreed vigorously with the letter, but by 1984, people were participating in demonstrations and strikes despite the risk of jail, torture or murder at the hands of the army. In 1985, Marcos called a snap election and then moved to declare himself as president against the results of the vote. By this time there was a very active network of thousands of parish churches all over the country, sheltering and training a nonviolent movement opposing Marcos.

Corazon Aquino's opposition party used marches and petitions, trained poll watchers, held rallies, vigils and civil disobedience to undermine Marcos' attempt to steal the election. Crucial defections from the government by two key leaders provided the final crisis. Marcos ordered the army to capture the defectors. Cardinal Jaime Sin, the head of the Roman Catholic Church, rushed to the Church-owned radio station and called the people to gather on the streets to prevent the army from taking the rebel officers. Millions of people poured onto the streets. Determined to stay as long as it took to depose Marcos, the people prayed and sang, shared their food and drink, and somehow gave the occasion the atmosphere of a picnic. They stayed on the streets for four days until Marcos finally fled.

After Aquino took over, the Filipino peace movement reflected on what made their nonviolent revolution possible. They pointed to their common religious faith, and the support of church leaders who had encouraged grassroots groups based in churches all over the country .They described their strength as coming from their faith and their bubbling sense of humor. The people shared common goals of social justice and had leaders who could articulate the issues and inspire others.

Ed Garcia, a political scientist and former Jesuit priest, was one of the writers of the new Philippines constitution. In discussing the role of the outside world, he comments that letters of support from outside the Philippines sustained him while he was in prison and that international solidarity strengthened his commitment and showed him that he was not alone.

The images of the "velvet revolution" in Manila inspired people elsewhere to demonstrate against oppressive regimes. Only a few years later, in 1989, we saw some of the most memorable television footage of our time when soldiers watched people dancing on the Berlin Wall, and held their fire. In the months that followed, dramatic civil resistance toppled dictators in country after country in Eastern Europe with little bloodshed.

Meanwhile, in the Philippines under Corazon Aquino, areas of civil war continued to flare, leading the peace movement to form the Coalition for Peace and the multisectoral Peace Advocates. These groups met to help peasants and aboriginals who were caught between the army and the guerrilla forces. In the villages, first the army would come and execute those people they claimed were collaborating with the guerrillas. Then the guerrillas would return and execute those they accused of collaborating with the army. The strategy the farmers developed was to draw a map of their village with a circle around it. They took the map to both groups. "This is a Zone of Peace," they said. "Do not enter this area carrying weapons." Surprisingly, both the army and the guerrillas respected the Zones of Peace.

Many international organizations have benefited from the commitment of Filipino peace groups to share their experiences through publications and conferences. After one conference, Eduardo Marino took the idea of Zones of Peace back to his own community in Colombia, an area called La India.2

In La India, peasants were caught between the army, the paramilitary groups supported by the government, and the guerrillas. Colombian peasants were being summarily executed, exactly as the Philippine people had been. They were told by the army, "You have only these choices: join us, join the guerrillas, leave the area forever, or die." The farmers devised another choice. They went to each group and asked, "Who are you fighting for?" All of the commanders responded by saying, "We are fighting for you!" The peasants answered, "You have been fighting for us for 15 years, but we have been the only victims of this conflict. We ask you to stop fighting for us. We want to stay on the land and work for a living in a safe environment for our children." As in the Philippines, the fighting ended and the farmers were able to grow and market their crops for the first time in many years. Today, despite frequent setbacks and horrifying massacres, 28 Zones of Peace persist in Colombia.

Another of those zones, San Jose de Apartado, is a very active "Communidad de Paz" which has a Web site and opportunities for international membership to support the community.3 San Jose de Apartado is a small hamlet where peasants had organized a cooperative to market and process cocoa beans. In February, 1997, the paramilitaries came in and ordered everyone to leave, accusing the villagers of running a supply post for the guerrillas. They then dragged the four elected members of the board of the cooperative from their homes and executed them.

Several hamlets combined to declare themselves a Community of Peace and committed themselves to a declaration:

- Not to participate in the war in direct or indirect form.
- Not to carry arms.
- Not to manipulate or give information to any of the parties involved in armed conflict.
- Not to ask any of the parties to solve conflicts.
- Each one commits him/herself to search for a peaceful solution and to a dialogue for solving the conflict of the country.

The idea for the community of peace originated with the Bishop of Apartado, Monsenor Isaias Duarte Cancino. The peasants began to have workshops with the Intercongregational Commission for Justice and Peace (CINAP). The ceremony to declare the community of peace was made in the presence of Pax Christi, the Diocese of Apartado, CINEP and the media. Five days later, the peasants were bombarded by the army and paramilitaries and several peasants were assassinated. The peasants were forced to leave the hamlets under the threat that if they did not, more killings would follow. There were, however, two people from the CINAP accompanying them when the exodus occurred and many of them, feeling supported in their stand, made the decision to stay in San Jose.

Since it has declared itself a Communidad de Paz, San Jose has seen the death of 35 members – 33 executed by paramilitaries and 2 executed by FARC guerrillas. Nonetheless, the community is determined to continue with its policies of nonviolent resistance as the only way forward for them. In March of 1998, 240 persons initiated the first return to the hamlet of La Union. The ultimate objective of the Peace Community is for all the members to be able to return to the hamlets from which they were displaced.

Zones of Peace organized from outside a community can also contribute to a peace process.2 For example, UNICEF's humanitarian cease-fires for the immunization of children established children as a zone of peace. Under James Grant's leadership, negotiations with the government and the guerillas in El Salvador permitted repeated three-day cease-fires during which international teams carried out primary health care and immunization of children in war zones. These cease-fires laid the groundwork for later peace negotiations in El Salvador.

Another community that received a Fifty Communities award was the Tibetan community at Dharamsala, India. Over 80,000 Tibetans led by their religious and temporal leader the Dalai Lama have fled the Chinese occupation of their country and established a refugee community at Dharamsala. Facing the destruction of their culture and religion – of the country's 6,259 monasteries, nunneries and temples, all but eight have been destroyed – they had a duty which far transcended the need merely to keep body and soul together: to nurture a whole civilization in exile. A democratic administration in exile was set up at Dharamsala to manage the affairs of the Tibetan refugees. With the assistance of the government of India, Tibetan schools were established to impart modern secular education to the Tibetan children while also emphasizing the learning of Tibetan language and literature, history, culture, religion, arts and crafts. Today there are 85 Tibetan schools throughout India, Nepal and Bhutan with a total student population of 27,585. About 70 percent of children attend school. Nearly 200 monasteries and nunneries have been established to revive religious education and traditions. In short, the Tibetans have kept alive in India what was almost totally destroyed or Sinocised inside Tibet. Credit for the success of the Tibetan community at Dharamsala and elsewhere undoubtedly goes to his Holiness the Dalai Lama who received the 1989 Nobel Peace Prize. The dedication to peace and to creating concerned human beings is what guides all the activities of the Tibetan community in exile – its education, health care, economic and environmental initiatives, its performing arts and literature, its scientific studies of the mind and spirit. The unique combination of pragmatism has been called a “culture of the heart”.

Another example of a community that refused to fight is the Kosevo Hospital in Sarajevo. In 1995, as part of the UN Fiftieth Anniversary celebrations, Friends of the UN recognized the hospital as one of fifty outstanding communities in the world.4 Two doctors came to New York to receive the award just after NATO strikes began forcing the Serbs to withdraw. Before the war, Sarajevo was a very cosmopolitan city with a thoroughly mixed population of ethnic and religious groups. People had intermarried for years. When the war began, media incited hatred between groups, but the people of Sarajevo held to their pluralism and refused to turn against one another.

The hospital was the leading educational, diagnostic and therapeutic institution in the country, with 41 clinics and institutes, 2,100 beds, modern diagnostics and therapy. Only 600 metres from the enemy lines, it continued to work under impossible conditions. There was no electricity, water or gas and only minimal amounts of medical materials and medicines. Staff of the hospital worked and treated thousands and thousands of wounded and sick in the besieged city. The hospital was under constant artillery barrage, receiving 1,470 hits, of which 687 landed directly on clinics and institutes. Dozens of patients and staff were killed or wounded in hospital beds, in the hospital compound, or while on duty .

Dr. Mirza Dilic wrote in 1995 of their experience:

> How did we, exposed to the blockade and enemy attacks, maintain the universal principle of the Hippocratic oath and offer to help everyone, including enemy soldiers?
>
> Simply put, Kosevo hospital had to succeed. If we had not succeeded in organizing the work and showing that one can work even under impossible conditions, what would have happened to the thousands of wounded civilians and the sick? We were simply doomed to success.
>
> We have succeeded thanks to the engagement of our people, thanks to a wish to help, thanks to the courage and devotion of the medical staff, thanks to respect for human rights, thanks to our efforts to preserve a multi-ethnic, and multi-religious community, thanks to the unselfish aid of many humanitarian and other organizations from the whole world.
>
> Unfortunately, the war in Bosnia continues. Sarajevo is still under a blockade, it has been encircled for 40 months. Already 1,300,000 (yes, you read correctly, one million and three hundred thousand) shells have hit the city. Civilians are still dying on its streets and squares. We are still struggling to help and save the wounded and sick. But fortunately, we know we are not alone. We have friends all over the world and we know that all those who help us now will one day be proud of the help they have given us.

When the doctors were asked to draw lessons from their experience, they emphasized solidarity in the face of adversity, the importance of altruism and a selfless call to help others. "The path we take," they said, "is always a choice to live according to our ideals or to join with the forces of violence and oppression."

Two other factors were deeply significant. One was that the surgeon who led the hospital inspired his staff with his moral courage and persistence, and the other was that they received international support in the form of letters and occasional supplies from outside.

There are other stubborn, nonviolent communities within countries where violence is erupting today despite significant movement toward peace. In Israel, for example, there are more than 1,000 peace organizations, most with memberships of both Jews and Arabs. There is an

international community founded by Fr. Bruno Hussar as an oasis of peace, called Neve Shalom/Wahat a1-salaam.5 The community began slowly in the l970s and continues today with active support from outside Israel. Fr. Bruno wrote of his vision:

> We had in mind a small village composed of inhabitants from different communities in the country. Jews, Christians and Muslims would live there in peace, each one faithful to his own faith and traditions, while respecting those of others. Each would find in this diversity a source of personal enrichment. The aim of the village: to be the setting for a school for peace. For years there have been academies in the various countries where the art of war has been taught. Inspired by the prophetic words: "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more," we wanted to found a school for peace, for peace too is an art. It doesn't appear spontaneously, it has to be learnt.

Lessons for the international community

The Friends of the UN invited the fifty award-winning communities to a seminar in New York, where they offered many insights into their successes.6 They spoke of their sense of altruism, of being called to show the highest possibilities of being human, of a sense of dignity, identity and self -respect. They valued their ingenuity in designing initiatives that were home grown, not handed to them by outsiders. The communities described their moral code of decency, equality, respect for life and the individual, and their rejection of raw power, threats and greed. The vast majority pointed to their spiritual strength, and their religious or cultural traditions as sources of resilience, perseverance and hope. Respect for nature was often a part of this framework. They spoke of their common vision and goal in social justice, and the importance of community ownership of programs. Often there was a charismatic leader, but speakers were convinced that even if the leader had died, the people would have continued on the same path. Organizational structures were based on participation, equality and shared power. In fact, the people described the ideal structure as more circular than linear. They offered advice that communities should establish a culture of dialogue, build relationships across barriers, focus on practical results, build the legal basis for equality, disseminate skills and knowledge, and hold onto courage, hope and humor. They stressed the importance of a legitimate economic base as essential to long-term success.

What strategies for outside support and intervention arise from the lessons of these communities? The first is that simply showing concern provides those working for reform with a sense of solidarity that helps dispel the helplessness that often paralyzes action. Second, the importance of education in moral values is clear in all the cases described. The moral values are often based in a deep religious faith or spiritual traditions that could well be supported by adherents in other countries. Third, the development of structures and strategies such as zones of peace and training in conflict resolution can often be facilitated by outsiders who bring new ideas and materials to help organizers. Fourth, communication is key to successful action. The international community could take a powerful initiative in providing fax machines, cell phones, photocopiers and e-mail access to organizers working toward social justice and democracy in communities at risk. Fifth, outside assistance can also be valuable in the establishment of a justice system and educating

people about participatory democracy. Sixth, a charismatic leader drew many of the communities to action. Whether outside support can nurture such a leader is not clear, but media attention to the leaders may bring the issues to the public sphere. Media attention is a two-edged sword, sometimes protecting prominent leaders, sometimes precipitating violence against them. These are only a few examples of communities that have chosen a determined stand against hatred and war. Their work is extremely dangerous, and some attempts have failed tragically.

Building a culture of peace is one way to reduce the likelihood of violent conflict and war. Learning from the communities that have created resistance to war is an essential step in developing new ways to support the strengths of local initiatives and protect local activists in their work for social change.

REFERENCES:

1. Garcia, Ed. (Ed.) 1994. Pilgrim Voices: Citizens as Peacemakers. Ateneo de Manila University Press.

2. Seymoar, Nola-Kate and Juan Ponce de Leon. (1997). Creating Common Unity: Models of Self Empowerment 50 Award Winning Communities. New York: Friends of the UN .

3. http:// www.igc.apc.org /csn/sanjose/index.html

4. http://nswas.com/ index.html

5. Langley, Winston E. (1997) Children, a Global Ethic, and Zones of Peace. Peace Review: A Transnational Quarterly, vol. 9, 2.

The Politics of a Culture of Peace

The Group of 78 and Canadian Values for Peace

Senator Douglas Roche

In 1981, a group of distinguished and visionary Canadian intellectuals, ambassadors, MPs, and authors among others, founded the Group of 78 with a declaration encouraging basic priorities needed for an effective Canadian foreign policy.

A cross-section of the Canadian political actors of the time was revealed in the membership of the 78 prominent Canadians: The Liberals Eugene Forsey, Jacques Hébert, Renaude Lapointe, Donald MacDonald; the Progressive Conservatives Gordon Fairweather, David MacDonald; the New Democrats Andrew Brewin, Alfred Gleave; the now Independent Senator Lois Wilson.

The Group of 78 immediately called for:

- The removal of the threat of nuclear war, the greatest danger facing humanity.

- Strengthening the United Nations and other global institutions to bring about a pacific settlement of disputes, foster international cooperation, promote the growth of international law and the protection of basic human rights.

- Mobilizing the world's resources to achieve a more just and equitable international order and bring an end to poverty.

Advancing peace and disarmament through common security and a combined global effort with other peoples were ambitious and far-reaching goals in 1981. This was a time of intermediate-range nuclear forces (INF) being introduced into Western Europe, the birth of the neutron bomb, and acrid public denunciations between the superpowers.

Believing that a basic attribute of human nature is cooperation, not confrontation, the Group pressed the government of Canada through the following years to pursue the United Nations agenda for world security, insisting, in the words of King Gordon, that this agenda is "the assertion of sanity in an interdependent world".

By 1995, when the government did a full-fledged review of Canadian foreign policy, much of what the Group of 78 stood for had found its way into Canadian policy.

In its document, "Canada and the World," the government cited three key foreign policy objectives:

- the promotion of prosperity and employment, anchoring international stability and progress toward sustainable development;

- the protection of our security within a stable global framework achieved through an effective United Nations and the rule of law, not power;

- the projection of Canadian values and culture that promote human rights, the rule of law, democracy, and the environment as the foundation to international relations.

G78 has been on target

The Group of 78's thinking proved right on target in its delineation of global problems and the approaches to alleviating them. As the 1990s progressed, the Group of 78's vision and Canadian policies began showing up in the international system, particularly in the UN global conferences of the last decade. The series of large-scale UN conferences were watersheds in shaping our global future. They have made an impact by:

- mobilizing national governments and non-governmental organizations to take action on global problems;

- establishing international standards and guidelines for national policy; and

- serving as a forum where new proposals can be debated and consensus sought.

The interrelated values of peace, social justice, economic well-being, and ecological balance, articulated by the UN, now form the basis for the most practical kind of foreign policy for any country.

All this work was sharply focused in the United Nations Millennium Declaration. A summit of 149 heads of state in September affirmed the central tenets of the global security agenda:

- Strengthen the rule of law.
- Make the United Nations more effective.
- Strive for the elimination of weapons of mass destruction, particularly nuclear weapons.
- Halve the proportion of the world's people living in absolute poverty by 2015.
- Ensure children everywhere have access to education.
- Promote gender equality.
- Fully respect and uphold the Universal Declaration of Human Rights.
- Ensure and embark on new efforts of environmental conservation and stewardship.

Just as the world needs a revitalized UN to build the conditions for world peace, so the UN needs a strongly committed Canada. The Group of 78 ensures this.

The Group of 78 is not, of course, solely responsible for the development of this new global security agenda. Nor is the Canadian government. Many forces in the world have been moving

on this progressive agenda. That is exactly my point. The Group of 78 has for nearly two decades been in the forefront of the development of global security policies now coming into the mainstream.

One might think that the Group of 78 could now rest on their laurels. Job well done.

Sorry. Not only is there no room for complacency, there is a new urgency in articulating the Group of 78 values throughout the land today.

Reactionary policies of the Alliance

This urgency is caused by the new assertion of a political philosophy at complete odds with the Group of 78. This philosophy is encapsulated in the foreign and defence policies of the Canadian Alliance, now the Official Opposition in Parliament.

Claiming that Canada's international credibility has been "shamefully squandered during the past 30 years", the Alliance's foreign policy document, *Canada and the Millennium,* alleges that Canadian foreign policy is "now composed of little more than fashionable catch phrases such as "soft power" and "human security".

Consider four of the Alliance's main foreign and defence policies contained in the party's official documentation:

- An increase in Canadian military spending by practically doubling the defence budget in terms of GDP by the 2010-2015 period. The necessary funds can be found in savings realized in Canada's foreign assistance budget.

- Increasing military spending and capabilities in order to strengthen Canada's role in NATO, since "all hopes the UN would create the conditions for eliminating war have been dashed".

- The Canadian government, having done "incalculable damage" to the national interest in its "fascination" with the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons, cannot base its approach to national interests and international security on such outdated, ideologically-driven diplomatic policies.

- Canada must be supportive of American defence initiatives such as the development of an effective ballistic missile defence system.

Responding to the Alliance

Allow me to respond to these beliefs in light of world developments.

First, Canada's current military spending is $11.5 billion. In real terms this ranks Canada sixth in military expenditures among its NATO allies. While the Alliance calls on Canada to match the NATO average of 2.1 percent of GDP, NATO's military spending is already greater than the rest of the world combined and is 18 times greater than all seven so-called "rogue" states put together. Perhaps it is not a case of Canada spending too little on the preparation for war, but its NATO allies spending too much.

Though Canada's defence budget was cut 25 percent in the 1990s, its foreign aid programs have been gutted by almost 40 percent. Official Development Assistance now hovers at $2 billion, or 0.28 percent of GNP, the lowest level ever in Canada. This is practically out of sight of the established UN target of 0.7 percent of GNP and yet some would cut it even more and give the proceeds to the military.

Those who seek to cut foreign aid further should re-examine the premises of development policy, taking into account that poverty and under-development is the leading cause of violent conflict. Of states in the bottom half of the annual *Human Development Index* in 1998, almost half (41 percent) experienced war on their territories within the previous decade, while only 15 percent of states in the top half of the index had experienced war within the same period. No amount of military strength can effectively confront this challenge to international peace and security.

Second, this new political thinking virtually writes off the United Nations as an instrument of peace, ignoring the 172 peaceful settlements that have ended regional conflicts, which the UN has negotiated since 1945. If the UN is not yet a perfect instrument, neither is NATO, which violated its own charter in the bombing of Kosovo.

For Canada, both the UN and NATO are important vehicles for us to express Canadian values. NATO's militaristic solutions to problems cannot be allowed to overcome the UN's steady development of international law and peacekeeping measures in the resolution of conflict.

There are times when the use of force may be legitimate in the pursuit of peace, but unless the UN Security Council is restored to its pre-eminent position as the sole source of legitimate force, the world is perilously forgoing law for anarchy. Ultimately, it was UN Security Council Resolution 1244 that ended the Kosovo war, providing for an international military and civilian presence "under United Nations auspices" to keep the peace. It is a tragic irony that, after all NATO's destruction, the Kosovo war ended with an agreement that could have been reached before the bombing. The rejection of international law for national interest is not a suitable pillar upon which to build a viable system of international peace and justice.

Third, the Alliance asserts that the idea of eliminating nuclear weapons is based on the "naïve belief that the knowledge of how to make such weapons, and the will that some states will always have to acquire them can simply be made to go away". This view toward Canadian policies on nuclear weapons and their elimination is equally incongruous with present needs and reality.

The 2000 Review of the Non-Proliferation Treaty concluded with a consensus accepted by the five Nuclear Weapon States for an "unequivocal undertaking to accomplish the total elimination of their nuclear arsenals". The NPT has 187 signatories, making it the world's most comprehensive disarmament treaty.

The International Court of Justice ruled that nuclear weapons are implicitly illegal, and that negotiations to eliminate them must be concluded. The overwhelming majority of nations at the UN have voted for their elimination in recent General Assembly resolutions. Can these high-level actions be dismissed as mere naïveté?

Senior military figures in both the United States and Russia state that nuclear weapons cannot be used to fight wars and are too dangerous to maintain. A statement signed by 131 international civilian leaders from 49 countries, including 52 past or present presidents and prime ministers, called for the achievement and enforcement of elimination.

When asked whether the Canadian people want to see their government lead negotiations for a Nuclear Weapons Convention, 92 percent of Canadians responded favorably. When asked the same question, 87 percent of respondents in both the United States and Britain agreed.

Fourth, clearly the world wants nuclear weapons eliminated, but they are bound to proliferate with the deployment of a missile defence system in the United States. There are those, like the Alliance, who maintain that because the U.S. is Canada's most important ally, we must support its military initiatives such as ballistic missile defence (BMD).

This logic is fundamentally flawed. The potential consequences of BMD deployment are enormous and must be seen beyond Canada-U.S. relations.

Remaining true to multilateralism

Should Canada support exclusive pursuit of military superiority over rules-based arms control? Because the U.S. is Canada's most important ally, it is Canada's obligation to ensure that the U.S. does not threaten to undo the whole structure of arms control agreements built up over decades by substituting for them a doctrine of unilateral defence.

Rather than supporting BMD, Canada needs to emphasize that the response to the ballistic missile threat -- as much as there is one -- needs to be part of a broader concern for the international community. That's the point made by several NATO allies, particularly France.

Canada must not only resist participating in the development of BMD but, as a key ally of the United States, it must insist that the United States remain true to its multilateral commitments.

Snide references to "soft power" and "human security" show just how out of step these reactionary political policies are with the modern world. All the characteristics of globalization show how dependent human beings are on one another around the world for both peace and prosperity. This calls for an integrated agenda for peace and sustainable development.

The year 2000 has been designated the International Year of the Culture of Peace. This requires new political priorities for cooperation and sustainable development instead of armaments. The Group of 78 was founded on these values, but it must persist speaking forcefully to ensure that Canadian policies continue to reflect these principles.

Cooperation or Confrontation?

Rear Admiral Eugene Carroll, jr. (USN-Ret)

(Address on receiving the Tom Perry Peace Achievement Award of Physicians for Global Survival)

In the years I was privileged to know and work with him in the cause of peace and justice, Tom Perry was the kindest, most humane and dedicated gentleman I knew. I say this in spite of the fact that he almost got me in trouble once. More about that in a moment.

His positive optimism and energetic commitment to anti-nuclear activities was all the more remarkable because of the harm he suffered in the United States. The Dies Unamerican Activities Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, abetted by the U.S. Federal Bureau of Investigation, literally hounded him because of his anti-nuclear activities in the 1950s. Ultimately, in order to continue his medical career, he emigrated to Canada in 1962. Faced with the necessity to start anew he never lost his dedication to the cause of peace and it was in Vancouver that I came to know and admire Tom Perry.

Following one formal program at University of British Columbia, Tom published his first book *The Prevention of Nuclear War*, which included my formal paper and informal responses to questions from the audience. That is where he got me in trouble. In 1984, in Little Rock, Arkansas, of all places, during a debate on defence issues my adversary quoted from Dr. Perry's book. To the question, "Who is advising President Reagan on nuclear weapons?", part of my reply was that President Reagan's National Security Advisor "knew as much about national security as Miss Piggy". I was chastised for lack of patriotism and disrespect to my betters, even more so because I had been speaking "in a foreign nation"!

After the shock of hearing my scarcely-remembered quote, I managed to respond that my conscience was clear because I had subsequently "apologized to Miss Piggy and she had forgiven me". Judging by the audience reaction, I really wasn't in trouble after all.

Now to turn to – *Confrontation or Cooperation?*

You, as Canadians, know more of events and conditions in the United States – far more I regret to say – than U.S. citizens know about Canada. There are many reasons for this but two stand out. First, as major trading partners, more than 80% of all of your exports go south while slightly less than one quarter of U.S. exports come here. If the U.S. economy sneezes, Canada may contract pneumonia. You are wise to keep a wary eye on us Yanks.

Acute case of national hubris

The second reason is what I want to discuss this evening, one which I believe must be a continuing, irritating problem for Canadians. This is the growing isolation of the United States

stemming from an acute case of national hubris. Our Secretary of State says the United States stands taller, sees further than other nations. The President declares that we call the shots. Senator Jesse Helms stands astride the U.S. Senate, a chauvinistic jingo who rejects the concept of a global community based on the rule of law. Washington speaks as the sole superpower and international norms are for lesser nations.

It is true, perhaps, that never in the history of the world has a single nation ever exercised the preeminent influence globally which the U.S. wielded in the 20th Century. The question now becomes, what lies ahead in the 21st Century? Will it be another American Century? Or could this great power slip away, be thrown away, and the 21st Century become the anti-American Century?

The answer is that it depends on whether the U.S. attempts to perpetuate an American global hegemony as the world's only military superpower - or if they seek to exercise constructive leadership as a cooperative member in a peaceful world community governed under the rule of law. Confrontation or cooperation?

Unfortunately, the U.S. Congress and the Executive seem determined to make military power the primary instrument of U.S. foreign policy. The U.S. is the only nation in history which has formally divided the globe into military zones and appointed a General or an Admiral to be Commander-in-Chief within each zone. There are nearly a quarter of a million uniformed troops permanently assigned to these Commanders, heavily armed and fully combat ready to intervene militarily in not one, but two conflicts anywhere on earth and to win both wars nearly simultaneously. President Clinton has proclaimed that he will act multilaterally where possible but is prepared to act unilaterally when necessary.

Forward presence

This aggressive posture is called forward presence, in current jargon. In truth, it is no more than gun boat diplomacy which through the implied threat of military action is intended to influence and control events to U.S. advantage. This confrontational approach to foreign relations is extremely negative because it is based upon coercion rather than efforts to develop constructive approaches of mutual benefit. It also creates pressure to use military force when significant issues lead to public awareness of pending problems with another nation. All too often the United States finds that gun boat diplomacy has put us in a position where the use of force will not resolve a problem but we will look foolish and impotent if we fail to act after threatening to do so. Kosovo is only the latest example of this process.

Yet another dangerous, potentially fatal, form of confrontation is intensifying through U.S. nuclear policies. In 1995 the U.S. led efforts to extend the Non-Proliferation Treaty indefinitely. To inspire the non-nuclear states to agree, we joined the other four nuclear powers to make a formal pledge in a statement titled, "Principles and Objectives For Nuclear Non-Proliferation and Disarmament." This contained a joint commitment to: "The determined pursuit by the nuclear weapons states of systematic and progressive efforts to reduce nuclear weapons globally, with the ultimate goal of eliminating those weapons..." That is an unequivocal commitment to get rid of all nuclear weapons.

Despite this, two years later President Clinton flatly renounced any intention to honor that commitment. In Presidential Decision Directive #60, parts of which were revealed to the media, he approved a policy which declared that nuclear weapons would remain the cornerstone of U.S. security indefinitely. A senior Pentagon official reaffirmed that statement recently by stating that nuclear weapons are an essential element of major power status and "that would never change."

Then, of course, there is U.S. determination to proceed with a national missile defense (NMD) system despite the fact that it will violate the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. As the indispensable partner in the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD), Canada obviously has a major stake in the outcome of this misguided effort.

These policies and programs are an open affront to all of the nations which consented to the indefinite extension of the Non-Proliferation Treaty at U.S. urging and it openly confronts other nations with the need to create their own nuclear weapons.

Standing aloof

Turning from dangerous confrontational military measures, consider another form of confrontation. This is American unwillingness to enter into or support constructive cooperative measures within the community of nations. As the world's superpower we stand aloof from the community. Such growing isolation is pernicious and endangers our long term interests economically, politically and militarily. Several specific examples follow, one of which is of special concern to Canada.

The starkest example of growing isolation is epitomized in the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea. Negotiations on this major effort to develop international law began in 1958 with strong U.S. participation and leadership. This process took 24 years to come to fruition in the 1982 Law of the Sea Convention and it reflected virtually every U.S. demand except for the Article XI provisions concerning seabed mining. For this reason, the industrialized states led by the U.S. refused to ratify the convention.

Twelve more years of negotiations followed while the U.S. insisted on changes in Article XI which led finally to U.S. signature and the convention coming into force in 1994.

Six years later the U.S. still has not ratified it. In short, we are isolating America from the development of a body of international law which covers 70% of the earth's surface and protects freedom of navigation, fisheries, the oceanic environment and the wealth of the global seabed. Worse, we are doing this even though the provisions of the Convention have been shaped through strong U.S. leadership to protect all of America's political, economic and security interests. It is difficult to conceive of a more foolish, shortsighted failure to advance the rule of law in the world order, nor one more certain to generate unnecessary confrontations with other nations in the future.

In 1998, a similar failure occurred in Rome. In this case negotiations were on the provisions for an International Criminal Court. During the early phases of this initiative the U.S. was a leading proponent of a permanent international tribunal which would have jurisdiction over war crimes, crimes against humanity and genocide. In effect, we were working to create a permanent successor to the Nuremberg Tribunal and obviate the need for ad hoc arrangements for special bodies such as the one now sitting in the Hague to consider crimes committed during the dismemberment of Yugoslavia. Unfortunately, our efforts were directed toward creating a Tribunal which would remain firmly under the control of the U.N. Security Council.

There we could exercise a U.S. veto if the ICC moved to act in a way considered inimical to U.S. interests. During increasingly acrimonious deliberations in Rome, U.S. insistence on retaining a means to deny jurisdiction to the ICC created a storm of criticism of the U.S. position by even our closest friends and allies. The final vote in Rome on the Statute for the ICC was 120-7 against the U.S. position. Even worse than the crushing defeat is that we found America voting with nations such as Iraq, Libya and Yemen, radical states little noted for their devotion to human rights and the rule of law. It is sadly ironic that the world's leading democracy has chosen to exclude itself from this initiative. It is even more disheartening that this is only one more among many efforts to establish just and peaceful international norms to which the U.S. refuses to accede.

Another example of U.S. rejection of constructive steps to create a safer and more peaceful world is the Ottawa Convention on the Prohibition of Anti-Personnel Landmines which came into force last year with strong Canadian leadership. President Clinton has conceded that at some date in the future we will consider adhering to the Treaty but first we must find military alternatives to these indiscriminate killers of soldiers and innocent civilians alike. Meanwhile, we ignore the fact that more than 133 nations are already committed to the ban while we stand in opposition with such nations as China, Iraq, Iran, Syria, Congo and Cuba.

Wasting a priceless opportunity

It seems clear that in attempting to perpetuate a concept of foreign relations based on military power the United States is wasting a priceless opportunity to move from a confrontational posture to a cooperative one. Jonathan Schell's latest book, *The Gift of Time*, focuses on the need to get rid of nuclear weapons while there is no active threat to American security except nuclear weapons. By extension, the U.S. can use the gift of time to build a new, long term approach to security in the 21st Century.

On that point, there is an analogy between the need to get rid of all nuclear weapons and the need to achieve a cooperative world community of nations living together in peace and governed under the rule of law. The first similarity is that no one, no individual or group, is wise enough today to say how or when we can actually achieve either goal. It is impossible today to foresee or prescribe all of the conditions which must exist before nuclear weapons are abolished; or, how a system of global governance can be established. Today the realities are that the most powerful nation on earth declares that nuclear weapons are the cornerstone of our security and the same

nation refuses to surrender the smallest scintilla of national sovereignty in the conduct of its international relations. How do ideals triumph over such realities? The answer is the same for both efforts. One step at a time.

With respect to nuclear abolition the steps are ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; the universal declaration of a no first-use policy; the de-alerting of strategic weapons; the separation of warheads from delivery vehicles; significant reductions in nuclear arsenals until 32,000 weapons become 5,000 and then 1,000 and then 500. Then we hope that those who follow us will be wise enough to work out the means of eliminating the last nuclear weapons on earth. Can we be certain of success? No, but we can be certain that as we proceed the world will become progressively safer each step of the way. As the danger of nuclear catastrophe fades, each successive step will become more obvious and more beneficial until the rewards of abolition are irresistible and inevitable.

In an absolutely parallel process, progress from confrontation to cooperation can be advanced one step at a time through practical measures of international cooperation such as U.S. accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In this one step the U.S. would accept the jurisdiction of international tribunals and panels capable of peacefully resolving international disputes in regions covering 70% of the earth's surface.

Another step is to achieve U.S. acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court and increased submission of disputes for adjudication by the International Court of Justice at the Hague. Accession to the Ottawa Anti-Personnel Land Mine Treaty would be another affirmative action. All of these individual measures already have strong acceptance in the world community and active constituencies in the United States.

Just as patient, insistent progress toward nuclear disarmament will one day make it possible to eliminate nuclear weapons as a threat to humankind, so step by step progress in international cooperation will make it possible to increase confidence in and support for the concept of global governance. Only then can we finally turn to the United Nations and help it to grow into the role of world peacekeeper for which it was created 50 years ago.

U.S. cannot stand alone forever

Once again the United States must lead the way in the 21st Century. As long as U.S. leaders are committed to the belief that as the world's most powerful nation we alone are empowered to proclaim and enforce American standards and judgments everywhere in the world, we are doomed to confrontation and growing isolation in a world increasingly ready to adopt global norms and the peaceful conduct of international relations. The vote in Rome of 120 to 7 against the United States was only one more ominous harbinger of the dangers ahead because of chauvinistic reliance on American power to promote U .S. political and economic interests in an interdependent world community. Perhaps today U.S. leaders may believe that we are able to pay the costs of such behavior but the option of standing alone as the world's only superpower will soon no longer be affordable, or possible.

The future security and well being of all North Americans rests on far more than aircraft carriers, strategic bombers and a National Missile Defense System. As the present tragic situation in Kosovo demonstrates vividly, America's magic superpower wand cannot make long-standing problems disappear. In truth, there is no military solution to the ethnic, religious, political and historic disputes which underlie the violence there and elsewhere in the world. Our security, and the solution to such problems in the future, will be promoted far more effectively through wise U.S. foreign policies that lead away from confrontation and to the creation of a peaceful, just and cooperative world order in the 21st Century. I know that we can trust Canadians to be proud, active, and creative participants in the effort to create such a world.

Shalom

2. Panel Presentations

Panel 1 Causes of Conflict and Violence

Patience and the Long Term

Élisabeth Barot

(*Rapporteur's summary*)

As her overall theme, Dr. Barot argued that we need to develop a culture of patience, and take a long-term view to managing change. At this moment, the most dangerous threat for peace is impatience with a system that is under the stress of change.

Violence is neither innate nor inevitable. The United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is committed to education for preventing violent conflict and building a culture of peace. There are no easy recipes for creating a culture of peace; nevertheless, long-term education strategies must be seen as a vital ingredient in preventing future conflict. Such education strategies must be guided by democratic and participatory principles. This is a commitment to long term management of change, rather than our current reliance on short-term crisis management.

Dr. Barot reflected on areas of critical importance to a culture of peace and the future of humanity:

(1) biodiversity
(2) cultural diversity
(3) access to information

We must consider whether we have developed the capacity to monitor the implementation of complex international conventions on these issues. We must follow through on our commitments to these issues in an inclusive manner which allows for dialogue and international solidarity and cooperation.

Problems of food regulation

(1) Biodiversity issues raise complex questions and we must develop the institutional capacity and coordination to cope with them, both domestically and internationally.

Recent debates over the global regulation of genetically-modified organisms (GMOs) are illustrative of the complexity of biodiversity issues. For example, in May 2000 a petition was presented to the Canadian government by the Sierra Legal Defence Fund about our protection from potential dangers of genetically modified foods. Clearly this is an issue that touches on food security and sustainable development. A collaborative response to this petition was

released on September 7 by six Canadian ministries (and is summarized on the Canadian Food Inspection Agency web site: www.cfia.agr.ca). The response would, at least at first glance, appear to be well balanced and describes the high standards used in controlling products developed through applications of biotechnology research. In terms of environment and health, it describes the checks and balances of the system in place and the new legislation in preparation.

Canada has adopted the achievement of sustainable development as a central purpose of the Canadian Environmental Protection Act, Canada's principal environment protection statute. The Canadian government has confirmed in its Guide to Green Government ('Guide') that there are three dimensions to sustainable development that must be integrated: social, economic, and environmental. The Guide points out that such an integrated approach must be based on sound science, including recognition of the precautionary principle -- regulation cannot simply be reactive, responding to problems after they develop.

The global regulation of GMOs raises issues concerning all three dimensions of the sustainable development concept. The government's response of September 7 seeks to reassure the public and gives the impression that everything is under control and that everything is being done in the public interest.

Nevertheless, we must questions these reassurances. Can we be sure that all governments in the world, in the context of the down-sizing of public bureaucracies, have enough personnel to prepare such an integrated approach? In Canada, will we see legislation on this issue actually passed or will it die like the bill on reproduction which died before several legislatures and is still on the order paper? Can we expect all countries of the world to be able to carry the burden of verification which is technically complex and sometimes impossible to carry out in the absence of adequate resources? Given the pace of change and technical complexity of developments in this area, how can we be sure that there is public awareness of, and input on, developments in GMO research and production?

Clearly NGOs have a vital role to play in rasing public awareness and scrutiny in this area. The other lesson to be learned here is the urgent need to develop and reinforce the regulatory capacities of governments in these highly-complex areas.

A culture of peace needs to engage everyone in contributing to a sustainable future for seven generations.

Exclusion can breed violence

(2) As part of building a culture of peace, we must respect cultural diversities and help them to flourish, while respecting the rights of everyone to live in harmony with nature. Exclusion in all its forms has a potential for violence. In a world of increasing diversity, we must be aware of the dangers of exclusion and marginalization, which diminish our capacity to live together in peace.

How are we going to ensure democratic governance of these increasingly-diverse societies? Inside societies, exclusion must be addressed through policies of social cohesion that are working on behaviour and attitudes which include building self-confidence, better mutual understanding between groups, better laws to protect minority groups, and citizenship education programs that are supposed to make everybody a responsible citizen of this world. Education for peace, human rights, and democracy is vital to empowering people and preventing potential conflicts.

Regularly UNESCO requests member states to report on education for peace, human rights, and democracy. The Canadian report is due at the end of 2000. Its first draft signals the many ways in Canada we have begun to think about education in our rights and responsibilities. Interesting work is being done in some provinces where students, the community, and the school representatives come together to develop the rules by which they will run their class. Conflict resolution is democratically organized and is linked with courses on human rights and the pacific resolution of conflict.

Public parks and festivals are effective tools to create common experiences and memories.

In Canada we do not have ready solutions to all the complex issues raised by social diversity, but we are very conscious of the importance of our diversity and we are carefully looking for ways to better organize to live together. Research on this area at the municipal, provincial, and federal levels are improving our capacities to respond to the challenges of cultural diversity.

Such is not the case everywhere. For example, displaced persons are a burden for many countries. Often in these countries the legal status of displaced persons is not settled and they become victims of all kinds of abuses. Comparative studies are being undertaken by UNESCO on the management of social transformation in pluri-ethnic societies. It is vital to support research into how we live together in multiethnic societies, and contribute to the development of legislation and institutional capacity of all countries to support and foster human rights.

As part of working towards a culture of peace, we must respect and promote cultural diversity while respecting the rights of everyone to live in harmony with nature.

Inequalities in information technology

(3) Given the immense impact of revolutions in communications technologies and the new knowledge-based economy, there is an especial urgency to considerations of the 'public good' when dealing with access to information. Clearly we must have grave concerns about whose interests are being represented in these new developments. Differences in wealth, education opportunities, and national production capacities mean different levels of access (and exclusion) to these new information-based developments. Furthermore, corporate concentration, intellectual property rights, the dominance of English in cyberspace, privacy issues, the sophistication of surveillance technologies, and government efforts to restrict electronic information flows all raise important concerns about access to, and control of, knowledge.

A culture of peace requires respect for the contributions of all kinds of knowledge as well as sharing this knowledge in solidarity for a just equilibrium between people and nature.

How might we reconcile the interests of information 'donors' and information 'users'? For example, indigenous peoples, who have been targeted by researchers into human genetic diversity, have been particularly sensitive to this issue and have closely followed the recent work of UNESCO on the development of the Universal Declaration on the Human Genome and Human Rights.

The ethical imperative in this context is to formulate a concept of the public interest and take a balanced view of the needs of the users and communicators of information and of access-providers and content-providers the world over. Further, the corresponding practical problem is to identify and develop organizations capable of giving this concept effective voice.

In conclusion, we must promote an awareness of the complexities of these issues and we must develop multilateral capacities to deal with these challenges while guided by the principle of precaution.

Panel 2 The New Diplomacy: Peace Building

The Road to Peace Building: Revolutions in Progress

Janis Alton

(Rapporteur's summary)

Nowadays, high-level official declarations generally promise to support and implement two propositions long put forward by non-governmental organizations and civil society:

- Transition from war to peace badly needs strengthened partnerships between the United Nations and its system, governments, and civil society organizations (the essence of "new diplomacy").

- Women's full inclusion in peace processes is essential.

This paper focuses primarily on women's insights and activism in the fields of demilitarization and security as they contributed to these radical changes.

Early leadership

Although their efforts have had little recognition from historians, women have worked publicly for peace for more than a century. In 1899 Baroness Bertha von Suttner published *Die Waffen Nieder* (Lay Down Your Arms), an anti-militaristic novel that became an international best seller. Her intention was to broaden the international peace movement and create interest in alternatives to war: arbitration, the rule of law and a federation of European states. She wanted to influence the ruling élite and her book had an impact on great men of the time, including Leo Tolstoy and Alfred Nobel. Birgit Brock-Utne suggests that the first Hague conference might not have happened if Tsar Nicholas II of Russia had not been been influenced by her book. After his call for an international conference "to form an alliance of all peace-loving nations to meet at the Hague to form an alliance of nations to fight for world peace and abandon all wars," 26 countries did come together, though they altered the Tsar's agenda to include the laws of war. From this came an ad hoc Tribunal (The Hague Tribunal) in 1899 for the arbitration of conflict. The second Hague conference in 1907 led to the establishment of the Permanent Court of International Arbitration inaugurated in 1913.

Excluded from the management of foreign affairs and defence, women also had minimal authority even in mixed-sex peace organizations. This led to the establishment of all-women societies concerned for human life and using a varied set of non-violent techniques.

All-women peace societies

The Congress of Women opened in April, 1915 in the Hague. About twelve hundred women, chiefly suffragists from western countries, both "enemy" and neutral, succeded in attending. Flush with some of the best known radicals of the day, the meeting aimed for the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means and the suffrage of women. A Canadian professor at the University of Wisconsin, Julia Grace Wales, refined a plan to undertake continuous mediation ("shuttle diplomacy" today) to end the war. They were well-received by prime ministers, ministers of foreign affairs, the Pope and the King of Norway, but they were usually told that it was not time for negotiations; the war must run itself out. Still, they proceeded to establish a permanent peace organization, the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom (WILPF), which exists to this day. Bruna Nota, a member of Canadian Voice of Women for Peace, is the current president.

Nevertheless, the isolation of women from the political mainstream remained, and one can speculate about its relationship to the continuing tyranny of man's oldest profession, but not on its blight on democracy the world over. Forty-five years after the creation of the WILPF, this persistent exclusion propelled the Canadian Voice of Women (or VOW) for Peace on to the Canadian landscape. In its visit to Parliament that year, it asked Canada to declare iself a non-nuclear country and urge the U.S.A. to stop atmospheric nuclear testing. The Voice of Women's appearance aroused derision in some hostile quarters, reflected in letters to the editor, but the movement held to its course.

The Progressive Conservative government of John Diefenbaker told the VOW to "go home and organize". Thousands of women were drawn to the movement, including Maryon Pearson, whose husband "Mike" was then Leader of the Liberal Party and Leader of the Opposition. Immensely capable women such as Thérèse Casgrain, Kay Macpherson and Grace Hartman became leaders of the movement. Forty years later, operating on a shoestring, VOW's peace volunteer and voluminous peace work continues, from Burnt Church to Burundi.

Women lobby for demilitarized, "true" security

In 1962, the VOW convened an International Conference of Women to consider what could be done about the nuclear threat. From this came a request to the UN for an International Year of Peace (later proclaimed as International Cooperation Year in 1965) and a request to the Canadian government for Canada to support the international appeal for a nuclear test ban treaty. In 1985, VOW member Marion Kerans coordinated a Women's International Peace Conference marking the end of the United Nations Decade for Women. Three hundred and fifty women from around the world came to Halifax to discuss true security and women's alternatives for negotiating peace. At the Peace Tent in Nairobi, Margaret Fulton, president of Mount Saint Vincent University delivered the powerful statement from the Halifax conference.

These international efforts altered the military definition of "security", linking it with poverty, militarization and violence, some nine years before the 1994 UN Human Development Report

proposed replacing the narrow concept of national security by an "all-encompassing concept of human security". Still this report did not address the harm of the "war system", a feminist understanding of the true meaning of "security" which was by then circulating in the women's peace movement.

United Nations links

Access to UN disarmament discussions is difficult for women's peace groups, though there have been small, tentative gains. In 1989, a small VOW team including Ms Alton and Ann Crosby, was invited by the NGO Committee on Disarmament to prepare a five-minute oral presentation to the Third Special Session on Disarmament (UNSSOD 3). Most of the official delegates left as soon as it was time for the NGOs to speak, without hearing our request "to increase the participation of women in its peace and disarmament processes". In 1990 in Vienna we combined continued lobbying for our recommendation at the Commission on the Status of Women (arousing little interest in our views, though access had improved) with representations to diplomats engaged in the continuing discussion between NATO and the Warsaw Pact on mutual force reductions, where we had some interesting exchanges.

Still things had improved since 1975, when a proposal by some women's peace groups to put peace issues on the agenda of an intergovernmental conference in Mexico City was rejected, with the exception of the inclusion of a panel on disarmament at the urging of Nobel laureate Sean McBride. Two women were included on the panel, a major breakthrough at the time.

In the 90s, the surge of conferences on international policies increasingly included such issues as environmental and economic security, women's rights as human rights, decent habitats, the abolition of land mines, and the establishment of a permanent court for the prosecution of war crimes, including gender-based crimes. These events led to a greater effort to document women's contribution to peace building. They have also increased the number of partnership processes between civil society organizations and governments.

A highlight of the "new diplomacy" was the overflowing International Hague Conference to Abolish War in May, 1999, led by civil society organizations. In contrast to its solely governmental forerunner in 1899, this conference had 10,000 NGO and government delegates mingling freely. The agenda stressed the interdependent components of human security and led to the launch of the "Women Building Peace" global campaign. In July 1999, the 50-point action plan "The Hague Agenda for Peace and Justice for the 21st Century" was accepted as an official UN document.

Beijing 1995 - a milestone

The Fourth World Conference on Women in Beijing in 1995 was the largest gathering of women in history: 40,000, with the greatest number assembled for the NGO forum, "Look at the World through Women's Eyes". The media gave little coverage to non-governmental events, sticking mainly to the official conference.

Using UN regional opportunities, thousands of NGO women helped to draft the Beijing Declaration and Platform of Action. Implementation at every level would contribute to women's peace-building capacities. UNESCO takes it as its chief reference tool in its Women and the Culture of Peace program and it is the tool used in measuring implementation of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women.

Interested parties now seem to share some core assumptions about world security:

- Military "addiction" is detrimental to security.
- Women are excluded from decision-making.
- The UN conferences have helped the global women's movement where the security challenge is an integral part.

But five years after Beijing, resources for implementation are slim everywhere. A new NGO voice, the Canadian Feminist Alliance for International Action (FAFIA), a 40-member coalition of which VOW is a part, published a stinging critique of Canada's failure to live up to even a fraction of the strategies to which commitments were made in Beijing. The conclusion was that Canada has not promoted women's equality and does not take seriously the links between gender, poverty, health and the environment, between violence and inequality, between democratic participation and good decision-making. Only Quebec, New Brunswick and Ontario bothered to complete a UN-based questionnaire (on one page) on the implementation of the Platform for Action. By default, the Federal government came up with the answers.

Women, sustainable peace and the Security Council

Although women have secured places at the peace table in conflicted countries – South Africa, Burundi, Guatemala, Cambodia, Liberia, Israel, and Northern Ireland – exclusion is the norm. Given the opportunity, women are the main proponents of agendas that include women and children and deal with housing, education,and child care. They advocate strategies and programs to benefit both women and society at large. They alter the understanding of roles women can play.

During preparations for this year's celebrations of International Women's Day at the UN in New York, the President of the Security Council for the month of March, A.K. Chowdhury of Bangladesh, gave delegates his presidential statement about the valued role of women in peace making and peace building and hinted that further affirmative steps by the Security Council were possible.

There are signs of reforms which will benefit all NGOs in their access to the UN. If these include provision for the systematic inclusion of women in the processes of this body dealing with matters of political conflict, that will indeed be revolutionary progress!

Canada's Human Security Agenda: The Least We Could Do

Ann Denholm Crosby

Since the Liberal Government's 1994/95 foreign policy review, and reflecting strong and principled voices that took part in that review, the discourse and practice of human security has been front and centre in the foreign policy agenda of the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT).

In practice, the government has undertaken a number of human security initiatives and is participating in others.

- Canada was instrumental in bringing to fruition, through the Ottawa Process, the Anti-Personnel Land Mine Convention. The convention bans the use of anti-personnel land mines worldwide. It obligates states to destroy stockpiles, remove the weapons from where they have been implanted throughout the globe, and assist in rehabilitating landmine victims and their societies.

- The government is a key player together with a range of non-governmental organizations and international governmental organizations in efforts to control the use, movement and proliferation of small arms and light weapons throughout the world.

- Ottawa was also a key player in establishing the framework for the International Criminal Court.

- It is active in addressing the issues of child soldiers and children as victims of armed conflict

As a direct result of the foreign policy review, government has also established a Global and Human Issues Bureau responsible for a (if not the) range of issues associated with human security. The Bureau shares interests with the human security work that is on-going within the Canadian International Development Agency, CIDA also being responsible for administering Canada's Peacebuilding Initiative, which came into existence in 1996.

Much of this activity has been under the tutelage of our soon to be ex-minister of foreign affairs Lloyd Axworthy, who has articulated what human security is about in a number of forums both here in Canada and elsewhere in the world, including the United Nations.

Human security, he has said, "includes security against economic privation, an acceptable quality of life, and a guarantee of fundamental human rights". Pursuing these ends requires "the rule of law, good governance, sustainable development and social equity".[1] The point of human security initiatives, he argues, is to "put in place the minimal conditions under which a country can take charge of its destiny, and social, political and economic development become possible".[2]

As such, a human security agenda locates security with the individual, alone or in collectives, and includes the kinds of issues for which the Bureau of Global and Human Issues is responsible, described by a former director-general of the Bureau as:

> "the environment, human rights, children's questions (e.g. child labour, children in war, sexual exploitation of children) gender issues, youth, humanitarian policy, conflict prevention and peace building, terrorism, crime and drugs, health, population, migration and refugees, as well as circumpolar and Aboriginal issues".[3]

Another distinctive feature of a human security practice is that it is pursued through the exercise of "soft power". Again in Axworthy's words, soft power methods include "skills in communication, negotiating, mobilizing opinion, working within multilateral bodies, and promoting international initiatives" that focus on the security of the individual, as opposed to the security of the state. These skills, he argues, are particularly suited for addressing the agenda of human security, the kinds of security issues that "do not pit one state against another, but rather a group of states against various transnational challenges".[4]

Together, the discourse and practice of human security, including its use of soft power, constitute an important element of what this conference session refers to as the New Diplomacy – and Canada has been applauded, and indeed applauds itself, for its human security focus and initiatives.

What I want to do very briefly is to see what the government's human security agenda looks like when viewed in the context of the primary foreign policy interests of DFAIT and the hard power or military, interests of the Department of National Defence (DND). Through these lenses, it is not clear how much of that applause is warranted because it is not clear that the human security discourse and practice as plied by the government represents a significant change in status-quo interests.

DFAIT's primary foreign policy interests

Since the 1994/95 FP review, and some argue despite it, the Liberal Government's main foreign policy interest has been, as stated in *Canada In the World*, the government's still-relevant response to the foreign policy review, "the promotion of prosperity and employment" for Canadians through the promotion of rules-based forms of economic multilateralism at all levels. This interest has been avidly pursued by Canada in its activities related to the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Group of Seven/Eight, the World Trade Organization, Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the North American Free Trade Agreement, and the temporarily-suspended Multilateral Agreement on Investment, as well as through the bilateral trade initiatives of Team Canada, and particularly its forays into Pacific Rim countries, the team being composed of Canadian government-business partnerships.

All of this economic activity reinforces the processes and forces of economic globalization. As Axworthy, and many others have noted, however, there is a "dark side of globalization". The forces, interests and processes that propel globalization have contributed directly to:

- the widening gap between the rich and the poor, both within and amongst countries,
- deepening poverty amongst the have-not peoples of the globe,
- environmental degradation,
- resource depletion
- and mass movements of populations because of these problems.

These conditions also create conflicts amongst peoples, which are often expressed through intra-state violence, human rights abuses, criminal activities, the drug trade, prostitution, child soldiering, and arms trafficking.

What is interesting here is that this list of insecurities produced or exacerbated by globalized market forces, the very forces our main foreign policy interest support, is identical to the list of insecurities that DFAIT is attempting to address through its human security agenda.

In a very real way then, we are attempting to address with one hand the very ills we are helping to produce with the other. This should be a cause for concern.

Pursuing conditions that work against processes of "economic privation" and for the ability of peoples to "take charge of their own destinies" is at odds with pursuing trade and investment initiatives designed to promote the prosperity of Canadians within a global economy that inherently thrives on relative 'privation', and necessarily situates the destinies of peoples within that system.

Defence Department hard power interests

The contradiction between the government's traditional foreign policy interests and its 'new' human security agenda is reinforced when the discourse and practice of human security is seen in the context of the government's hard power, or military, interests.

Two points about hard power:

1) A vast academic literature critiques the use of military power for the pursuit of state interests from the point of view of the insecurities it produces for peoples on the way to securing the state, and from the point of view of what it does to the fabric of a society when that society deems it appropriate to use violence in pursuit of its interests. More to the point perhaps, there is a long history of civil society activism along these lines: people like Kaye Macpherson, Muriel Duckworth, Rosemary Brown, and Ursula Franklin have all been awarded the Order of Canada and various Doctorate degrees for their efforts against militarism and in support of the use of soft power as a means to do precisely what Axworthy has said: "to facilitate, or empower, peoples to take charge of their own destinies". In this perspective, soft power is an alternative to hard power.

As applied by DFAIT, however, rather than being an alternative to the use of hard power, soft power is part of a continuum, a tool to be used before resorting to hard power if need be. Indeed, Axworthy has stated that soft and hard power are simply flip sides of the same coin, the latter providing the muscle for the former when required to achieve the ends to which both means are sympathetic. "State security and human security," he has also said, "are in fact mutually supportive."[5]

Should any doubt remain about the relationship between hard and soft power, Axworthy has consistently argued that the NATO bombings of both Bosnia and Kosovo were human security initiatives – "concrete expression(s) of this human security dynamic at work" as he put it. In particular, he declared, the Kosovo initiative "should serve to dispel the misconception that military force and the human security agenda are mutually exclusive".[6]

Employed this way, soft power does not carry a critique of either military means or the ethos that supports it. And we can see that none of the human security initiatives undertaken by the government critique the ethos of using force and violence to secure ends and interests. Some weapons and some military practices have come under criticism, but not the use of weapons or military practices in general. Indeed, in the land mine campaign, it was a weapon that was stigmatized, not its users, which of course were state militaries for the most part pursuing state interests.

2) As noted above, Axworthy has made it clear that both soft and hard power serve the same ends. As Joseph Nye, the author Axworthy often cites on the meaning of soft power, put it:

> Soft power is "the power to co-opt, rather than to coerce, others to your agenda and goals".[7] For Axworthy too, soft power means "negotiation rather than coercion, powerful ideas rather than powerful weapons, public diplomacy rather than backroom bargaining".[8]

In the language of peace research and critiques of militarism, and particularly feminist ones, this translates into bringing "others to your agenda and goals" through structural, as opposed to direct, violence.

The point is that the ends being pursued, whether through the use of soft or hard power, are the ends represented by our agenda and our goals. Thus, although our government is pursuing security for peoples, it is our definition of security that is being pursued, not theirs. And according to our definition, security resides in liberal democratic political practices and the forces of the global market; security belongs to those that adopt, or comply with, both.

And since this is not proving to be the case for large numbers of people within our own liberal democratic country as the market forces compel governments to cut spending on a range of education, health, sports and social safety-net programs, it is difficult to make the case that what is not particularly good for ordinary Canadians is good for other less fortunate peoples. But that is the case we are making.

On the positive side

Whereas the state tends to act behind closed doors in traditional security pursuits involving the military and issues of 'national interest', in human security pursuits it works in tandem with NGOs and concerned citizens through both traditional and non-traditional diplomatic and civil society channels and forums. In this way government activities become more transparent and opportunities are created for civil society to hold the government accountable to its own human security rhetoric.

More to the point perhaps, human security pursuits and the exercise of soft power tend to be hands-on in addressing security issues, instead of arms-length; hence actors are brought into contact with the origins of insecurities, and Canada's role in fostering them through its pursuit of market interests. In this way, spaces are opened for potentially-transformative change; for addressing the roots of insecurities rather than only the manifestations.

Addressing the roots of insecurities means reducing the contradictions between our human security agenda and the government's more dominant foreign policy interest: the pursuit of wealth for Canadians within a global market that by its nature creates or exacerbates insecurities. It also means using soft power as an empowering tool for ends defined by those we aid, rather than as a non-violent tool designed to persuade others to serve our ends.

NOTES

1. Lloyd Axworthy, "Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership." International Journal 53, 2 (Spring 1997), 84

2. From a speech, "Building Peace To Last: Establishing a Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative," delivered by Minister Axworthy at York University, 30 October 1996.

3. David Malone, "The Global Issues Biz: What Gives?" in A Big League Player?, (Canada Among Nations Series), Carleton University, 1999, 197

4. Lloyd Axworthy and Sarah Taylor, "A Ban for all Seasons," International Journal, 52:2 (Spring 1998), all quotes on p. 192

5. Lloyd Axworthy, "Message from the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Hague Appeal for Peace," 13 May 1999.

6. Lloyd Axworthy, "Kosovo and the Human Rights Agenda," Notes for an Address by the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Woodrow Wilson School of Public and International Relations, Princeton University, 7 April 1999, as quoted in Heather Owens and Barbara Arneil, "The Human Security Paradigm Shift: A New Lens on Canadian Foreign Policy?" Canadian Foreign Policy, 7:1 (Fall 1999) 6

7. Lloyd Axworthy, International Journal (Spring 1998) 192

8. Robin Jeffrey Hay, "Present at the Creation? Human Security and Canadian Foreign Policy in the Twenty-first Century," A Big League Player? (1999), 221

3. Discussion Groups

(Rapporteurs' summaries of proceedings.)

1. Kosovo: Looking for a Way Out

John Fraser and Michael Borish, resource persons. **John Graham,** moderator.

The group reflected a certain sense of gloom over the long-term prospects for Kosovo, but recommended in the end that Canada continue its activities to promote peace in the region.

This was part of a broad consensus that the international community should continue its commitment to work for effective social institutions in Kosovo as part of the rebuilding effort, with periodic review of progress. Stable structures of justice, education and health were seen as essential to securing peace in the region.

Some members held that physical security is a requisite for progress on any of these; they proposed that Canada should therefore consider re-committing a military contingent as soon as the defence department finds it to be feasible.

Members generally believed the hostilities in Kosovo will end only when the culture of violence, hatred and revenge is countered with peace education. This could include common texts for school curriculums, supplemented by distance education (an area in which Canada could offer expertise).

In health policy, greater priority should be given to programs for post-traumatic stress – experienced at both the individual and systemic levels in the region – in the hope that the ethos of fear and enmity may be eradicated. Institutions need to be rebuilt from the ground up, implying grassroots participation for 'internal transformation'.

Members saw inclusion of the contesting parties in multilateral initiatives such as those of the European Union as potentially stabilizing influences. In the same vein, it would be useful if neighbouring countries – preferably middle, and therefore non-hegemonic, parties, like Italy and Greece – encouraged investment and promoted prosperity and political stability in Kosovo.

The idea of a regional non-aggression pact, bringing together all countries in the region including Russia, was discussed. To be effective, such a pact would require detailed protocols on monitoring, access and transparency, as well as an international guarantor.

The group agreed that with no sign of a solution to the divisive sovereignty issue, the lesser evil is to ignore it while other policies are put into effect.

2. Control of Small Arms: Applying the Lessons of the Crusade against Anti-Personnel Land Mines

Peggy Mason, resource person. **Ken Williamson**, moderator

The group began by reviewing the background information, prepared by Peggy Mason, on the lessons of the landmines campaign for efforts to control small arms and light weapons (SALW). What are the lessons?

The main one is the powerful synergy created when like-minded governments from North and South cooperate with civil society. Key ingredients of this synergy include:

- a government willing and able to lead on the issue;
- a knowledgeable and motivated humanitarian community;
- an advocacy community of NGOs mobilized in support of the project;
- an active, coordinated partnership between like-minded governments and civil society.

Further keys to success include:

- a clearly defined goal;
- the coming together of the government-NGO active, coordinated partnership occurring in the end game of the negotiating process.

Also we must recognize that:

- the Ottawa process was able to move fairly swiftly as land mines were marginal to the defence policies of most countries.

Finally, the economic dimension must be factored in:

- We must ask questions about the connections between the weapons in question and the money and jobs that are tied up in the production and export of these weapons in supplier nations.

What are the obstacles to using the approach of the land mines campaign to the control of small arms and light weapons (SALW)?

- There is no single identifiable goal (such as an outright ban). Rather the objective is a complex and multifaceted one, requiring mutually-reinforcing actions at the national, regional, and global levels. Given the complexity of the "solutions" to the SALW problem, it is extraordinarily difficult to orchestrate a campaign of the kind carried out in relation to land mines. Governments – even like-minded ones – have yet to agree on the details of a program of action; equally important, neither has civil society, which remains deeply divided in important ways on how to move forward.

- The recent focus on partnerships between like-minded states and NGOs has blunted the energies of many NGOs in pushing their governments forward. This is particularly true where the government in question appears to be "on side" and genuinely interested in cooperating with NGOs. Thus, we have the absurd situation in Canada where we purport to lead internationally on SALW, but we have not yet managed to ratify the Organization

of American States convention against illicit trafficking that we signed several years ago. *And there has been virtually no criticism of this by NGOs*. It should be self-evident that such criticism, far from "hurting" Foreign Minister Axworthy's efforts, would strengthen his hand in cabinet.

- The economic impact of SALW, while vastly overstated globally, has tremendous significance for a specific group of supplier countries – namely those newly emerging democracies of the former Soviet Union and Eastern Europe, which are heavily dependent on defence exports. Russia has stated flatly that, until the problem is squarely faced and solutions are offered, there will be no effective curtailment of exports of SALW to problematic destinations.

The discussion following Peggy Mason's presentation touched on many issues.

Canada has fairly good controls over direct SALW exports. But further regulation is needed over the practice of "brokering": that is, arranging transport, finance, and general deal-making. As brokers do not handle the weapons directly, they are often un-regulated or under-regulated in Canada and many other countries.

Verification of prohibitions or embargoes on the export of SALW may be difficult, but is no longer commonly seen as impossible. Canada and UN ambassador Fowler deserve praise for showing how other UN embargoes were being breached (for example, conflict diamonds). Fowler's report named names, and shamed countries into coming into line. The lesson is that it is important not just to declare embargoes, but also to follow through on their implementation.

It was suggested that shocking images of the impact of SALW could be used to generate support for their control. The landmines campaign used images to great effect.

Many newly emerging democracies (as in Eastern Europe) rely on hard currency earnings from SALW exports. We must think about economic reform and assistance to end this reliance. Finding alternatives is a vital task.

Some countries in the past have suggested that conventional disarmament should not happen before nuclear disarmament. Fortunately, the issues of SALW and nuclear disarmament have, in practice, been de-linked in international forums.

We must look at how companies seek to avoid trade restrictions by licensing production to developing countries.

There is an excellent NGO book on this issue: *Running Guns: the Global Black Market in Small Arms.*

Women are in the majority in the NGOs seeking to put controls on the trade of SALW.

NGOs from the South need financial assistance in order to get to the UN to present their experiences and views.

Project Ploughshares was a pioneer on this issue area.

The Northern Ireland process provides important lessons. We must look not simply at disarming, but also at demobilization and reintegration. We must put the issue of control into larger perspective. When reaching a peace accord, there needs to be detailed, specific, and broadly inclusive agreement on disarming. In Northern Ireland they tried to fudge this, but found that you do not have a real agreement until the disarming of weapons is dealt with. There are a lot of parallels between Northern Ireland and African experiences.

Policy coherence within the Canadian government on this issue specifically, and human security generally, needs major work. Ministries should have coordinated strategies. CIDA and DFAIT should not work at cross-purposes.

You cannot ban all weapons. Tools can become weapons. Therefore, we also need to look to violence prevention.

We need to support the UN definition of SALW, which is the one with the broadest base of support.

Control of SALW is not simply a problem of controlling criminal activity, but must also consider the problem of illicit trafficking undertaken by states. There is opposition, however, by many states to this more comprehensive approach.

Group Recommendations:

(1) Civil society must be forthright in criticizing their respective governments whenever and wherever justifiable.

(2) Call for leaders to lead by agreeing on the main elements of a Program of Action. Likeminded governments should stop competing with each other and agree on the main elements of a program of action in the 2001 conference process.

(3) Call for greater parliamentary oversight and accountability of arms transfer policy implementation at the national level.

(4) The "conversion" dimension of the problem must be addressed.

Finally, it was suggested that the Group of 78 should ask the G78 Peace and Security Policy Panel to draft a policy paper on the best means of controlling small arms and the role that Canada should play. It is suggested that Peggy Mason should be asked to supervise the drafting of such a paper.

3. War-Affected Children

Senator Landon Pearson, resource person. **Samantha Nutt**, moderator.

The establishment of the Rights of the Child in 1989 has had an immense impact on the incorporation of child-related issues into the international dialogue. Within the last ten years, child related issues have become an integral component of both governmental and non-governmental mandates when discussing conflict and conflict prevention.

The conference on war-affected children held in Winnipeg in September 2000 illustrated the magnitude of child-related issues and why they have moved to the forefront of foreign policy.

The conference helped to clarify the issues and set an agenda. Primarily, it was a success because of the incorporation of youth from various countries in the process of negotiation and formulating strategy. Half of the 126 countries at the conference were represented by ministers. The large turnout showed that the issue of war-affected children can no longer be ignored internationally.

The Winnipeg agenda covered 14 issues:

- leadership,
- fulfilment of obligations through signing, ratifying, and implementing the optional protocol,
- increased accountability, decreased impunity, through ratification,
- targeting children,
- negotiating release of abducted children,
- increasing humanitarian assistance,
- focus on preventative rather than curative measures,
- substantial reduction of the use of small arms,
- promotion of health and well-being,
- protecting children from HIV/AIDS,
- peace education,
- concentration on long-term plans and policies,
- engagement of youth in defining policies, and
- improved research.

The group saw three of these as controversial and in need of discussion: impunity, HIV/AIDS, and the definition of "youth". The resulting discussion produced consensus on a number of points.

The group stressed the importance of consistency in support for child-centred initiatives. This generation needed to establish the basis for long-term policies through education and other avenues. Members dwelt on the need to incorporate youth in negotiations, not just treat them as listeners; this would underpin inter-generational and inter-ethnic dialogue.

More emphasis needs to be placed on education to create greater awareness of, and support for, "war-affected children". Official Development Assistance (ODA) in education and health should be increased.

Children in prisons needed greater attention, particularly in obtaining adequate legal counsel and provisions to meet their needs.

Canadians should receive more information on the important work Canada is doing in connection with war-affected children.

The group strongly opposed any naming and shaming activity which was outside the "journalistic" process, where it could be an important way of raising awareness on a number of issues.

Appendix I

Resolution on control of small arms and light weapons (SALW)

(Adopted by final plenary session of the Conference)

The Group of 78 welcomes the leadership shown by the Government of Canada on the issue of international control of small arms and light weapons. By comparison with the campaign to ban anti-personnel land mines, objectives in SALW control are complex and multi-facetted**,** with differences among parties as to appropriate processes and timing. But it is equally important in this case to have consultation and collaboration among non-governmental organizations and governmental agencies in Canada and internationally. Regarding preparations for the UN conference on SALW in 2001, the G78 recommends the following to the Government of Canada.

(1) Canada should ratify as soon as possible the convention of the Organization of American States against illicit trafficking in SALW, a convention signed by Canada several years ago. Lack of ratification casts doubt on Canada's commitment to international peace and human security, while ratification would do the reverse.

(2) Canada should seek agreement among like-minded nations on a program of action for the 2001 conference. Basic agreement within a core group would help generate momentum toward global consensus on SALW control among governments and NGOs. NGOs should be more directly involved in conference preparations and would best serve the interests of public involvement and support by being outspoken in their advocacy.

(3) The Government should favour measures to achieve a high degree of parliamentary oversight and accountability with respect to arms transfers. Such measures would constitute a logical and important extension of the current practice of presenting an annual report on military exports.

(4) Particular attention should be paid to the need to assist newly-emerging democracies in the transition from heavy reliance on defence trade to reliance on civilian industries.

Appendix II

The Group of 78

The Group of 78 is an informal association of Canadians seeking to promote global priorities for peace and disarmament, equitable and sustainable development, and a strong and revitalized United Nations system.

It began in 1980 when a small group including Andrew Brewin MP and Peggy Brewin, Murray Thomson of Project Ploughshares, Robert McClure, former Moderator of the United Church, and King Gordon, formerly of the United Nations Secretariat, drafted a statement on how best Canada could contribute to the building of a peaceful and secure world. In November 1981 that statement, Canadian Foreign Policy in the 80s, was sent to Prime Minister Trudeau. It was signed by 78 Canadians — a group of 78.

The statement set out three inter-related objectives:

1. removal of the threat of nuclear war;
2. the mobilization of world resources to achieve a more equitable international order and bring an end to the crushing poverty which is the common lot of the majority in the Third World;
3. the strengthening and reform of the United Nations and other global institutions designed to bring about a pacific settlement of disputes, foster international cooperation, promote the growth of world law and the protection of basic human rights.

That was the beginning of a dialogue between the Group of 78 and the Canadian government. In the following years, members of the Group discussed, and made their views known, about new issues facing Canada in international relations and their implications for the central, and universal, objectives of policy already mentioned.

The Group of 78

- meets in conferences to consider needed changes in foreign policy, seeking consensus on recommendations to government;
- produces publications on conference findings and special issues;
- publishes *Newslink*, a newsletter for general distribution;
- organizes lunches with invited speakers;
- is launching a website;
- is organizing policy panels to increase its coverage of international issues.