

INAUGURAL TALK
ROYAL ROADS HUMAN SECURITY AND PEACEBUILDING PROGRAM

used that term, albeit without much of a definition, to describe what he foresaw. Certainly the world was generally seen as becoming more benign. Force would be replaced by peace and justice. We could focus on the security of individuals.

We live in a world in which there is substantially increased “mutual vulnerability”. This phrase was coined, incidentally, by Jorge Nef, one of the Faculty for this program, and Ivan Head when both were at the International Development Research Centre. I now have the privilege of chairing the board of IDRC which has had for several years a program in peacebuilding. Mutual vulnerability is a continuing theme to IDRC’s work.

Clearly we are increasingly inter-connected with each other – for better or for worse, as the case may be. I would argue that, on the whole, it is very much for the better – it provides for a richer world, providing we sort out some major problems before they arrive on our door step.

Robert Kaplan has stated that “two dynamic classes will emerge under globalization – the entrepreneurial nouveaux riches and, more importantly, the new sub-proletariat: the billions of working poor, recently arrived from the countryside, inhabiting squatters’ settlements that surround big cities in Africa, Eurasia and South America”. These people are not all going to remain passively in such circumstances for long. Some have charged Kaplan is too pessimistic, but before dismissing him, read what he has to say – look at the increasing prevalence of gated communities.

Let me give you one more quotation, this time from Samuel Huntington, best known for his book The Clash of Civilizations, although this quotation does not address that controversial hypothesis. He has written that “the world is a dangerous place, in which large numbers of people resent (American) wealth, power and culture, and vigorously

oppose our (he is again referring to American bu

most important causes of conflict, I might add Royal Roads is fortunate to have one of the world's leading experts on its faculty in the person of George Irani.

The means of pursuing conflict are also changing. These means are becoming increasingly lethal. The knowledge and material to construct chemical and biological weapons are increasingly dispersed. While chemical weapons may be difficult to use against civilian populations on a large scale, the same is not true for biological agents. The former may be hard to deliver, but the latter are not. The knowledge and material for nuclear weapons are, however, more difficult to acquire than those for CB, but not impossible.

The perpetrators of conflict are, obviously, no longer just states and their armies. The rise of non-state actors is an important development at both the state and international level. There is no question that al Qaeda wanted to acquire weapons of mass destruction and would have been prepared to use them. Al Qaeda may be a leader in this area, but is not alone.

Not only is it a dangerous world, but different elements of it are taking on greater importance. Failing and failed states cannot just be forgotten, although it is often difficult to know what to do. Wars cannot go on interminably, although it is often difficult to know how they can be stopped. Conflicts need to be resolved or at least managed. The basis for peace must be built. Canada can help, although I must say I worry about the increasing impact of the various Diaspora in that they push our political leaders to take

sides rather than to pursue peacebuilding. This is a very important issue. As someone of Scottish background, am I missing my calling, not fulfilling my clan responsibilities, by not advocating Scottish independence?

Some people focus too exclusively on the instruments of conflict in their efforts to improve the world. Let me state very directly that, while it can be argued the world would have been better if nuclear weapons had never been invented, the genie cannot be put back in the bottle. Nuclear weapons will be with us forever. They are too easy to build, too small and perceived as too necessary to a few states for their security for them to be renounced. What we need is to reduce numbers, to control the weapons themselves and to ensure that further proliferation does not occur. We need to ensure that nuclear weapons will never again be used.

Nor is it possible to eliminate the small arms which kill so many non-combatants in the world today. The tragedy of child soldiers and children as victims is enormous. The image of a twelve year old with an AK-47 and a necklace of bullets is one we have seen much too often. We can and should reduce access, but these weapons will also always be around. We need to do much more to reduce the causes of conflict that motivate people to want to kill each other.

I believe that we are far better off to invest our energy and money in tackling the roots of conflict, in controlling – as distinct from trying to eliminate - in feasible ways the instruments of conflict, and above all in building peace. We need to develop our conflict

management capabilities and increase training in this area. This, of course, is the subject matter of the Conflict Analysis and Management program at Royal Roads. The emphasis on analysis is worth underlining.

what the Carnegie Commission calls both structural – systemic - and operational – more immediate - policies to confront these risks. We need more qualified people prepared to devote their efforts to increasing human security and building peace. Our education system needs to be changed in consequence, and I am proud to be affiliated with an

who want to get their hands on WMD and attack the US in a way that threatens its very existence. Regardless of the background, the history of US foreign policy, how we arrived here, that is where we are today. The US will act on that basis.

I believe, by the way, there is no question but that these threats are real. There are people in the world with the will and the capability to wreak great damage on the United States.

That is not to say everyone in the US – much less the world - is agreed as to what should be done. There are many Americans who would strongly prefer that the US acts with its friends using multilateral approaches. But there is general agreement that the United Nations botched its opportunity in the Iraq crisis. Few Americans that I know would now be prepared to put their security in the hands of that organization. Actually few would have done so at any time during the last half century. The US clearly has the power and the will to act unilaterally when need be. It will do so, particularly when feeling it is confronted with an existential threat, unless there is a credible multilateral alternative available. This is an important area for Canadian foreign policy initiatives, but that would be the subject of a different talk.

In short, the US has become an empire. Of course, most Americans are deeply offended at the idea. This, however, is a denial of reality.

Empires are not new. Power politics have not disappeared. The previous predominant empire, the British Empire, did not end that long ago. Although there is nothing new in

empires, their character has changed. Holding territory is now of less importance. Economic objectives remain, for example, with respect to oil, but the foreign territories being held are not being taxed, as they were by most previous empires. Homeland security objectives may be more important as motivating factors than they were for empires of other epochs. Empires go on.

There are actually interesting parallels between the British Empire and those who see the “21st Century as belonging to America”. Both rely on military dominance and hard power. Both connect economic interests and foreign policy. You might have thought “shock and awe” was something new. In mid-Victorian times the British tactic was known as “butcher and bolt”. Neither empire counts deaths of their citizens and those of their enemies in the same way. Neither have doubts about who has superior culture and values. Finally, there was never a doubt on which side God could be found.

The US is seeking or alre

The important thing is not to waste one's time lamenting what is not likely to change. The best is usually the enemy of the good in this imperfect world. What we need are practical approaches to real life problems.

The media has forced the realities of human security into our living rooms. Who can look at little Ali, twelve years old, missing most of two arms and one leg and not shudder – if not cry. What did he do to deserve such an awful fate? The international community has rallied to help poor Ali – at least the Ali we know – but how many more Alis are there out there?

Iraq also brings home to us the realities of peacebuilding. It is one thing to defeat Saddam and his awful regime. It is quite another to build peace in that country. And speaking of “country”, is it one except as devised by the victorious powers after World War I in Paris and maintained by a series of more or less repressive regimes ever since? How does one build a democracy in the wake of Saddam? When can elections be held? This is not just a technical question but one of how best to build a stable society. Who decides who should be in the interim regime? What happens if many people (at least those who express their view) want an Islamic state based on Sharia law? Is Fareed Zakaria right in believing there are pre-conditions for democracy in the level of GDP per capita and, even more important, in the presence or absence of a legally based liberal society? If these conditions are not met, Zakaria foresees something akin to mob rule.

There are clearly questions of law and order in Iraq. Here the record of the liberators/invaders in Iraq is less than sterling. Surely the problems which occurred could have been foreseen. Now what is to be done? Can one use police from the previous regime? Does the level of policeman matter in answering this question? What kind of assistance can the outside world offer? As Tom Friedman and others rightly ask, how long should and how long will the commitment of outside assistance last?

These are the kinds of questions that our learners will be examining. There are no easy answers. Our learners will be doing more than examining these questions. They will be working on doing something practical about them. They will draw on their experience. They will build on that experience in the cour