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JOAN B. KROC INSTITUTE FOR PEACE & JUSTICE

The mission of the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice (IPJ) is to foster peace, cultivate justice and create a safer world. Through education, research and peacemaking activities, the IPJ offers programs that advance scholarship and practice in conflict resolution and human rights. The Institute for Peace & Justice, located at the University of San Diego, draws upon Catholic social teaching that sees peace as inseparable from justice and acts to prevent and resolve conflicts that threaten local, national and international peace. The IPJ was established in 2000 through a generous gift from the late Joan B. Kroc to the University of San Diego to create an institute for the study and practice of peace and justice. Programming began in early 2001 and the building was dedicated in December 2001 with a conference, “Peacemaking with Justice: Policy for the 21st Century.”

The IPJ offers its services to parties in conflict to provide mediation and facilitation, assessments, training and consultations. It advances peace with justice through work with members of civil society in zones of conflict and has a focus on mainstreaming women in peace processes.

The Women PeaceMakers Program brings into residence at the IPJ women who have been actively engaged in peacemaking in conflict areas around the world to document their stories, share experiences with others working in peacemaking, and allow time for reflection on their work.

A Master’s Program in Peace & Justice Studies trains future leaders in the field and will be expanded into the Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies, supported by a $50 million endowment from the estate of Mrs. Kroc.

WorldLink, a year-round educational program for high school students from San Diego and Baja California connects youth to global affairs.

Country programs, such as the Nepal project, offer wide-ranging conflict assessments, mediation and conflict resolution training workshops.

Community outreach includes speakers, films, art and opportunities for discussion between community members, academics and practitioners on issues of peace and social justice, as well as dialogue with national and international leaders in government, non-governmental organizations and the military.
JOAN B. KROC DISTINGUISHED LECTURE SERIES

Endowed in 2003 by a generous gift to the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice from the late Joan Kroc, philanthropist and international peace proponent, the Joan B. Kroc Distinguished Lecture Series is a forum for high-level national and international leaders and policy makers to share their knowledge and perspectives on issues related to peace and justice. The goal of the series is to deepen understanding of how to prevent and resolve conflict and promote peace with justice.

The Distinguished Lecture Series offers the community at large an opportunity to engage with leaders who are working to forge new dialogues with parties in conflict and who seek to answer the question of how to create an enduring peace for tomorrow. The series, which is held at the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice at the University of San Diego, examines new developments in the search for effective tools to prevent and resolve conflict while protecting human rights and ensuring social justice.
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BIOGRAPHY OF THE HONORABLE LLOYD AXWORTHY, PH.D.

Lloyd Axworthy is President and Vice Chancellor of the University of Winnipeg. Formerly Director and CEO of the Liu Institute for Global Issues at the University of British Columbia and Canada’s Foreign Minister from 1995 to 2000, Axworthy’s political career spanned 27 years. He held several Cabinet positions, notably Minister of Employment and Immigration, Minister Responsible for the Status of Women, Minister of Transport, Minister of Human Resources Development, Minister of Western Economic Diversification and Minister of Foreign Affairs.

In the Foreign Affairs portfolio, Dr. Axworthy became internationally known for his advancement of the human security concept, in particular the Ottawa Treaty—a landmark global treaty banning antipersonnel landmines. For his leadership on landmines, he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. For his efforts in establishing the International Criminal Court and the Protocol on Child Soldiers, he received the North-South Institute’s Peace Award.

Since leaving public life in the fall of 2000, Dr. Axworthy has been the recipient of several prestigious awards and honors. The Vietnam Veterans of America Foundation presented him with the Senator Patrick J. Leahy Award in recognition of his leadership in the global effort to outlaw landmines and the use of children as soldiers and to bring war criminals to justice. Princeton University awarded him the Madison Medal for his record of outstanding public service, and he has also received the CARE International Humanitarian Award. In 2004, he received the Gandhi, King, Ikeda award. He was elected Honorary Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He has been named to the Order of Manitoba and to the Order of Canada.

Dr. Axworthy holds positions on several boards and companies. He is a Board member of the MacArthur Foundation, Human Rights Watch (where he chairs the Advisory Board for Americas Watch), the Pacific Council on International Policy, and the Ethical Globalization Initiative.

He graduated in 1961 with a B.A. from United College (now the University of Winnipeg), obtained his M.A. in Political Science from Princeton University in 1963, and subsequently earned a Ph.D. from Princeton in 1972. His book Navigating a New World: Canada’s Global Future, Knopf Canada, was published in the fall of 2003.

In February 2004, U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan appointed Lloyd Axworthy as his special envoy for Ethiopia and Eritrea to assist in implementing a peace agreement between the East African countries.

Dr. Axworthy is married to Denise Ommaney. They have three children.
AB: Dr. Axworthy, I’d like to interview you about Canadian human rights policy and foreign policy as well as your path to an interest in these issues. To start, can you please tell me about how you first became involved with human rights and about any special figures, experiences or influences that inspired you?

LA: I think it’s sometimes difficult to parse out the direct influences. I can point first to growing up in the north end of Winnipeg, which was a working class, multicultural area mainly populated by Ukrainians, Jews, Germans, mainly Eastern European first- or second-generation newcomers. Our family moved there after the war and my dad came back as part of a Veterans Housing program. The reason I mention it is because it was a community that really existed on tolerance. There was such a mixture of diverse populations going to school. It wasn’t one class or one culture group, it was a real mix.

But the other side of it is that I had an opportunity as a kid growing up to see injustices firsthand. Some were small insults: somebody with a Ukrainian surname having to change it to Smith in order to be employed at the Hudson’s Bay Company, or things of that kind. And as you deal with your friends or your peers and you pick up these signals, you realize that there is a lot of nonsense going on. That was reinforced by very active involvement in the United Church, a small parish church which is kind of a mainline Protestant church in Canada that, in the Winnipeg context, has been very much influenced by the old social gospel movement that came out of the Midwest in both Canada and the United States. It was closely tied into social democratic politics and issues of labor rights that were part of the agenda. Through the ministers of our church and being involved in youth groups, we learned about what was going on in the way of certain racial injustices and things.

That led me into a pretty active involvement in a variety of youth politics, programs like Model United Nations, where one year I got to represent Israel and the next year Yemen, so I was able to see both sides of the great Middle East dispute. Youth Parliament is a venerated institution in Canada where young people play at being politicians for a week at Christmas time and that was a great learning experience. And I guess whatever my temperament was I was a pretty mouthy kid in high school and always challenging teachers. I was very much influenced as part of the Canadian ferment coming out of the [Lester “Mike” Bowles] Pearson years. Mike Pearson was a real liberal in the sense that he was grounded in those old sort of Protestant values that he expressed, where there was a probity and an integrity. He really set the standard for the country when he did things like peacekeeping and stood up against the Vietnam War. As a young person, you just sort of inhaled that kind of experience.

AB: Can you remind us what Pearson’s position was in Canada?

LA: Pearson was the External Affairs Minister for a very long time, from 1948 through 1957, and then he became Prime Minister. He was the one that expressed a strong sense of Canadian identity—that we had to have good relations with the United States and Britain—but we had to be our own selves and establish our own mark. He won the Nobel Prize for peacekeeping in

---

1 Dr. Alison Brysk is Professor of Political Science at the University of California, Irvine.

2 Pearson was Prime Minister of Canada from 1963 to 1968.
1957, which was a great matter of pride for a lot of Canadians. It was our sort of “coming out party” internationally. Well, really, the Second World War was when we established our credits, because until the United States came into the war we were the North American bread basket supplier, and I think almost a quarter of a million Canadians fought in the Second World War. It was, compared to the size of the population, an extraordinary contribution.

AB: Most Americans aren’t aware of that history.

LA: They’re probably not aware we were in the war. We always like to say we were there two years earlier than the Americans. I guess that’s part of it because I grew up in a family where my father was overseas and so were all my uncles. As a young kid you always dealt with this notion—why were they doing it? Well, the rhetoric at the time was that we were fighting for freedom, fighting against Hitler, fighting to protect people. Anyway, those are the things that I think swirled around.

Then as an undergraduate in United College, which is now the University of Winnipeg, I attended a college with a strong left-wing liberal tradition. Again, there was this social gospel, because it was a United Church college in those days. It really influenced the school. I don’t mean to say that we were sitting down getting lessons on how to be a radical. We were just simply part of a real debate about issues, whether nuclear disarmament or third world crises.

I also became an activist in the Liberal Party. The Liberal Party has lots of flaws (there are more flaws these days than I would care to consider) but it always did have a strong human rights tradition. That was part of the ethos of being a Liberal in Canada. Finally, when I did my graduate work at Princeton, I came down at the outset of the civil rights movement in the United States and the anti-Vietnam War movement. I became actively involved in it with a group of American friends. We went on marches, demonstrations, and got involved in a lot of things. To sum it up, it was the Kennedy years, which I think were very exciting for young people. You saw a young man leading a country, not old farts as they would say, like the Adenauers [Konrad Adenauer, first Chancellor of the Federal German Republic] and the Eisenhowers [U.S. President Dwight D. Eisenhower]. You were finally at that age when you’re in your late teens, early 20s, and able to see how smart the guy was. Kennedy may not have always lived up to his potential in his performance, but he sure had the rhetoric and the timing. He was very inspiring.

So those were the primary influences in my focus on human rights and it was, I think, also mixed into the DNA somehow. It may have come out of our contrarian Welsh background. My great-grandfather had been head school teacher in small Welsh colonies in Patagonia and Saskatchewan and places. I think you just acquire those things. Maybe it’s in your blood that you’re always against the establishment.

AB: When you became part of the establishment yourself, you brought that vision, that certain set of very distinctive values, and you developed those values into this new doctrine of human security which you talk about in your book, Navigating A New World.3 I wonder if you could tell us a little more about your inspiration and some of the ideas that went into the human security concept. And knowing that you’re involved in women’s rights issues, it strikes me that the human security concept is really moving us beyond not only a state-centered understanding of national security, but also a kind of warrior-centered and a male-centered view.

LA: I think that’s right. If I have some talents, one of them is that I’m a quick read: I learn from other people. When I was in the provincial legislature, I was quite young; I was elected when I was 32 or something. One of the determining issues of the time was the whole issue of property equity rights, marriage and settlement. There was an active group of women in my constituency. I represented a downtown, high-rise, hippy-dippy kind of constituency in downtown Winnipeg. I had a group of women who basically got me elected, led by a woman named Jane Hefflefinger. They were dedicated feminists. They

---

3 See Related Resources.
ones who survived and so I had to go into opposition. It was not close. We got thumped. But remember, that was the period which I think was probably the most formative period in the [Pierre] Trudeau government\(^5\) for me, because that's when we got the Charter of Rights.\(^6\) That was a powerful, powerful experience to live through: basically working on the new charter, being part of the debate, which was strongly opposed by many interests in the country. But we had a terrific dialogue inside our caucus, inside the party. It started out as a way of rehabilitating appeal rights from the British Privy Councils, one of the last remnants of our colonial status. But it transferred as the debate went on, primarily due to Pierre Trudeau's initiative, into a much broader blueprint. I remember spending eight hours a day in our caucus debating about whether we'd do the "Volkswagen," which was to simply repeal the amendment clause, or go for the "Cadillac," and go for a Charter of Rights. And we did the Charter and it has fundamentally changed the face of Canada ever since. In fact, it's been the most powerful, potent potion I think that we've developed in terms of developing the human rights culture in the country. Women, as well as aboriginal and cultural ethnic groups, played a very strong role because they were the advocates of the whole issue of establishing group rights as opposed to individual rights. It was a fascinating process in terms of the role of civil societies. They really drove that agenda in terms of embedding a group rights clause into the Charter. That's been something that changed us ever since.

There are two other things I should probably mention before we get into the foreign affairs side. While I was in opposition, I spent a lot of time in Central America. I just decided I'd use my time there, so I got involved in the issues in El Salvador, Nicaragua, the Contra issues and, again through church affiliations, a lot of the interfaith groups asked me to go down as a Member of Parliament. They thought it would be safer if they had a Member of Parliament as part of the delegation, so we spent some time in the Estelí District in Nicaragua. I had real access to El Salvador because as Immigration Minister I allowed a

---

\(^5\) Trudeau was Prime Minister of Canada from 1968 to 1979, and again from 1980 to 1984.

\(^6\) The Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms is part of the Canadian Constitution and includes, for example, aboriginal peoples’ rights and the right to equality, including the equality of men and women. It was made part of the Constitution in 1982.
lot of political prisoners to immigrate into Canada. We had a program where we’d take them right off from jail before they were released into the open to be killed by death squads, so I had a certain kind of cachet in El Salvador. I had good access and I learned a lot working on Central American issues so, to be honest, I developed a real antipathy to some of the U.S. policies that were exhibited in the countries at the time, you know, support for right-wing groups and attempts to overturn governments.

The other major thing that gave me a human security definition was that in 1993, I became Minister of Human Resources, which is sort of the grandmother of all departments. It’s basically looking after all the social programs. But at the same time, the U.N. was engaged in these major international conferences on women, social development and human rights. As Minister for the social programs, I became involved in those: leading the delegations, setting up the programming, developing the policy for Canada’s position, which meant that the 1994 UNDP [United Nations Development Program] Human Development Report on human security kind of stuck in my mind. As soon as they found that there was a global context for women’s rights, employment rights, it really crystallized in a way the fact that we were dealing with human individual issues—and that notion of human security came to be. I began using the language actually when I was Minister of Human Resources.

AB: When you began using that language, was it being widely discussed in Canada or were you the person who introduced this to Canada?

LA: It was being discussed in some of the NGO [non-governmental organization] groups in the broad UNDP concept, but it wasn’t really an active debate. There were people in foreign affairs like Paul Heinbecker8 and others who were picking up on it, but it was not part of the vocabulary at the time.

AB: Once you adopted that new policy paradigm, we get into this question of Canada’s larger role as what some people have referred to as a “moral superpower.” In your book, you talk about how Canada has a unique role to play and a niche in the international system—an honest broker, a mediator, the leader of this new, expanded definition of human security. We certainly see evidence of that in the Ottawa Convention9 and in Canada’s support and promotion of the ICC [International Criminal Court] and other issues. How is it that Canada and Canadians were so willing to support this and have this vision?

LA: I don’t know if I can give you a full explanation (I think that’s really something for some good academic research), but I think Canadians were conditioned, as I said earlier, by the Pearson experience, which was very gratifying for Canadians because they established some international presence. Pierre Trudeau was just outstanding and he actually morphed Pearsonian diplomacy and went beyond it. He became an advocate. It wasn’t just meeting, brokering and “truth speaking to power.” He took on the world in some ways. He confronted very clearly the whole issue of nuclear disarmament. He led a worldwide dialogue which earned him the repugnance of the Reagan Republicans and others. He went around the world saying, “You guys are nuts. Why are you building up arsenals? Let’s snuff them out. These things are risky.”

I was in his Cabinet at the time. It was an exhilarating experience to have your own Prime Minister out there leading with that kind of strong campaign and, in a way, the language of “protection of people” began to emerge. So Canadians were conditioned to expect their government to play that kind of role. Nobody was pretending that we were a great military power, but we took pride in peacekeeping and we took pride in the role Canada played in nuclear disarmament issues.

---

8 Heinbecker is a retired Canadian diplomat. He served in the Department of Foreign Affairs from 1965, and is currently the Director of the Centre for Global Relations, Governance and Policy at Wilfrid Laurier University and a Fellow at the Centre for International Governance Innovation.
9 The Ottawa Convention, also known as the 1997 Mine Ban Treaty, is an international convention that bans antipersonnel mines. By December of 1997 it had been signed by 122 countries. It became binding under international law in March of 1999. See Related Resources for more information.
LA: Yes, we’re an exporting country. For instance, my home city of Winnipeg is the center of the grain trade: the Canadian Wheat Board sells grain in 70-odd countries, so people in the grain business in Winnipeg travel. They’re in Afghanistan, they’re in Argentina, they’re everywhere, and it’s the way the world works. You just have to get on planes, trains and ships to get there. So really, we are a country that’s based first on our natural resource exports, and we’re changing that now, but that really made up a strong sense of involvement. Because of the proximity to the United States, there’s a lot of interchange between the two countries. And I think the Quebec factor was very helpful because the country increasingly became bilingual and saw things through another language and another culture. We had the French connections that were very European, very different. We have some great public domain institutions like the CBC [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation]. We have a national broadcasting system that’s paid for by the government that can afford to have foreign correspondents around the world and are given half an hour to report, because they’re not dependent on commercials.

The other thing was that our federal system was very asymmetrical. Provinces are very strong and we simply learned that you didn’t have to hang your hat on being a Canadian nationalist because you were also closely tied in with your home province or region. You just learned to be a citizen of everything.

I think Trudeau capsulized a lot of that. He was a remarkable, remarkable person. When you look for inspirations, he is certainly one of them. And I think my generation of Canadians (we’re now in the class of being “elders”) were, without any apologies, his followers and missionaries; not because we always thought he had the nicest personality in the world, but because he was gutsy and smart and he had a notion about how the world should work. Trudeau had an almost visceral reaction against nationalism, that somehow it was a genie let out of the bottle, probably because he had experiences in Quebec where nationalism had become very much an overriding issue. So when you heard me talk last night about my aversion to borders and national interests, you see where I come by it.

AB: You also talk about Canada in your book as one of the most globalized countries in the world. Do you think that Canada globalized faster or that globalization was more of an influence on Canada?
into the Americas came out of Quebec. I found that when I was in Central America, you would be bumping into some Quebec priest who was sitting on a hilly somewhere in Nicaragua and he was a real liberation theologian. So Quebec has played a very important role in influencing our outlook on global understanding.

AB: You're talking about leadership and your own experience as a leader. One of the questions we always think about for all kinds of social change is how much can one individual do, whether that's an ordinary citizen, or whether that person is sitting in the Foreign Ministry or other ministries. You talk about how other Cabinet positions also got you involved in foreign policy. How much opportunity do you think you had as one individual to make a difference in Canada's policies? It looks like you certainly played a catalyzing role on the landmine accord. Can you tell us about that?

LA: I came into the position with some real advantages. I'd been in Parliament a long time. I'd been through several ministries and I knew how the system worked. I knew how to deal with the bureaucracy, so compared to a lot of people who come into the portfolio, I had been thinking about it and working at it for a long time, waiting for my chance. I wanted to be Foreign Minister from the time I got into Parliament. But, in the meantime, I built up a real apprenticeship. I knew my craft very well. I also had a position of having a fairly, if not independent political base, certainly a strong political base on my own in Manitoba. I built the Liberal Party in Manitoba. I have the coattails to bring other members in.

I also have known Jean Chrétiens for a long time. We had been through the political wars from the 1970s on together. So it was a little bit more of a peer relationship; it wasn't, “Hey, he's my boss.” He was my boss, there is no question, and he was a very wily, shrewd guy. But we had also been in the Trudeau government together and we had been in opposition together. We knew each other well, so I think he respected the fact that we had been around together. Coming into the Foreign Ministry he had made it very clear. In 1993, I was quite disappointed I didn't go straight into Foreign Affairs, but he said, “Look, we have to make major changes in our social programs and you're our resident left-wing liberal. It's like Nixon going to China; you have to carry these reforms out. Do a good job and Foreign Affairs will be yours at the right time.”

I earned my spurs as a result. I was a good plumber in politics. I had a little bit of an independent base, I knew the bureaucracy, I knew the system, and perhaps most importantly, I had a certain developed set of core commitments. Nothing succeeds in politics like having a little bit of an idea of where you want to go and a belief in what you're doing, as opposed to simply being responsive and reacting. I know that sounds a little George Bush-y, but you need to have a core set of principles.

To give you one example, in the landmine campaign, the major contribution we made was to go for broke and finally say, “We're not going to dance the minuet, we're going to call a conference and invite people.” The press in Canada thought I was nuts. The right wing was chortling away about how I had gone off the deep end, and even the sympathetic ones thought I really had lost my marbles. I didn't care; I'd been around long enough that it wasn't that important.

One other thing that is often overlooked is a Minister's staff. In my view, a good staff makes a good Minister, a bad staff makes a bad Minister. I had incredible young people working for me. I had also put behind me the ambitions to climb the greasy pole. I had a putative interest in running for the leadership of the party in the early 1990s, but from a small province with little money I simply couldn't compete with the guys from Quebec and Ontario. As a family we decided we're not going to go into huge debt to get involved. So I put that behind me. And so when I became Minister I was able to not use my political staff to be organizers and hustlers. I brought in good policy people: smart, young, on-the-edge kind of thinkers and activists, plus an old greybeard

---

11 Chrétiens was Prime Minister of Canada from 1993 to 2003.
At the level of integration, economics, resources and continental cohabitation, it’s becoming more interdependent. One of the things I talk about in the book—and it gets pooh-poohed a lot, but I think it’s time—is that we’ve got to start thinking in terms of a North American footprint of some kind. The NAFTA [North American Free Trade Agreement] architecture is pretty flimsy. That’s why I argue for a serious debate on how we can develop some form of North American structure that will allow us to maintain our independence inside that, versus being bowled over by the Congress or the President if he simply doesn’t give a damn what we think, or if we don’t want to use our energy resources, they’ll take them.

AB: From the U.S. side, what can or should the 49 percent of Americans who have more Canadian kinds of views and values on global issues do to improve and repair the U.S./Canada relationship?

LA: Well, you’ve put your finger on it. A lot of the values and attitudes that Canadians express are ones that we derive from or share with many, many Americans. I think the big fault line is that many of those organizations simply aren’t on the street. If you go to the big universities, they will have hundreds of scholars looking at the politics of Luxembourg or Taiwan, and I’m surprised, coming back into the academic world, at how little is actually being done with Canada in terms of the conventional academic exchanges, papers, associations and stuff like that. It’s all confined in the trade/commerce/NAFTA context or the defense issue, so that we’ve got a bunch of American academics coming up and saying how we should sign the missile defense agreement. And Canadians just say, “Get serious!” So I think there’s a huge vacuum in terms of those issues.

We are in a borderless system in many ways. There has got to be a lot more north-south interchange. This is why I’d like to bring Mexico into that discussion. I think we’re three interesting countries: the world’s superpower; the guy named Joe Stern, who was a college friend of mine who had been head of the Refugee Commission. He was my age and he was sort of the greybeard with a rabbinical kind of Solomon-like wisdom that could be applied. I just had a great staff the whole time and they made me look good.

AB: Clearly part of Canada’s role and part of Canada’s position has to do with Canada’s relationship with the U.S.: interdependence in some cases, certainly a constructive relationship in other cases, and some very serious differences, particularly about the global and human security issues that have been so important to your own work. You certainly discussed what some of those differences were, but I wondered if you had ideas about how and why those differences developed and what we can do to help bridge those differences?

LA: To use Trudeau’s famous phrase, we lie in bed with an elephant and when the elephant rolls over, the chickens get squashed. A lot of what we do is a daily catechism on how you try to protect Canadian freedom of action and integrity and things of that kind. And there is, as I say in my book, a sort of American cheerleading squad inside Canada, mainly in the right wing of the spectrum, which argues incessantly that we basically follow U.S. policies, especially if they are right-wing policies. There’s always that constant dialectic going on in the country.

Most Canadians are increasingly of the view that we need to be even more artistic in our independence. Under the Bush Administration and its policies, there’s been a real pulling away in attitude, not towards Americans as individuals, but towards the country itself. And the value systems are different. We don’t have the same kind of hard rock debates over same sex relationships. There is a debate and it is legitimate, but people aren’t fussed about it in quite the same way. We do have a right wing and the opposition party is neo-cons in disguise from Alberta and B.C. [British Columbia] primarily, but they make no headway east of Saskatchewan. There are a few in Manitoba, but when you get to Ontario and Quebec, they just get snuffed out. So I think there is a changing relationship at the level of politics and attitude and values.

12 See the Organization of American States website in Related Resources for more information on NAFTA.
a prosperous, well-endowed, value-added country; and Mexico, which is still a developing country, but acquiring a lot of sophistication in its politics and getting over some of its old, proletarian habits. I think we make an interesting three amigos, you know? On the Canadian side, we’ve not done nearly enough to use our diplomatic network to engender that. In foreign affairs, they still think you deal with the U.S. from Ottawa to Washington. Our consulates are still mainly trade consular outposts. There are some exceptions to that, mainly when we have political people at the consulates. I find that when you bring in ex-politicians, they know how to schmooze, they know how to connect. Our foreign affairs officers, mainly because of trade officials in this case, tend to be preoccupied with investment and trade and not with NGOs or religious groups and things of that kind, and we’ve certainly missed the boat in the last two years by still focusing on what I guess you’d call the blue states. We have very little Canadian representation in the southwest of the United States. Canadians are just catching up that that is increasingly the center of political gravity.

AB: So what is your parting advice to U.S. peace activists, students and other people who want to see greater peace, cooperation and the kind of values that Canada advocates?

LA: Think seriously about internships and exchanges and cross fertilization of ideas. There is a lot that could be done together. I said last night I think there is a certain North American view that needs to be brought into these discussions on peace studies, conflict resolution and human security issues. And that’s where my own sense of how we make the world run comes from these kinds of networks. While you need institutions, government institutions, and you clearly have to work through them, it is these networks that can drive the agenda.
Dr. Axworthy has been an outspoken advocate on human rights and on nations’ accountability to protect their citizens from war and injustice. I met Dr. Axworthy in the late 1990s when he was Minister of Foreign Affairs; I was working at a meeting up in Ottawa looking at the prevention of deadly conflict. One of the issues we were discussing at the time was the case of Kosovo. I remember that Dr. Axworthy joined us one afternoon for the session. I think all of us in that room—there were maybe 15 people—were incredibly impressed because he walked in and, instead of telling us what the government’s position was on Kosovo, he actually asked us questions. What did we think? What were our views on what was happening? What were our views on the way out of the crisis in Kosovo? He was really a listener and we were very impressed that someone would take the time to come into this meeting, listen and be open to the different views that were expressed in that room.

After reading Dr. Axworthy’s installation address that he gave at the University of Winnipeg this past June, it’s clear that he really is a listener, a learner and a powerful leader. In taking the position of President of the University of Winnipeg, his undergraduate alma mater, it may be that Dr. Axworthy has not only come home, but has found his true niche as an academic policymaker. And I’m reminded of something that President Carter always used to say, which was that he used the presidency as a stepping stone to become the Chair of The Carter Center. I think that Dr. Axworthy has used his experience in government to come home and be an academic leader at the University of Winnipeg.

For those of us here at the University of San Diego, when you read what he
wrote and hear what he said during his address to the University of Winnipeg, it sounds as if he had read the mission of the University of San Diego. He talks about service, compassion, diversity and inclusivity. Dr. Axworthy speaks of shaping new, equitable and sustainable urban environments, of opening the door to aboriginal people, and of inspiring young people to a life of public service. He says that you can’t manage a world fraught with risks with old institutions, so universities must light the way forward by being innovators, conveners, educators, counselors and good neighbors. He urges all students to accept the challenge to become global citizens. Dr. Axworthy, in this day and age, is still not afraid to be an idealist, but has the rare ability to translate idealism into actions that have ripple effects across the world and make our global community a more human and decent place to be. It is a great honor to welcome Dr. Axworthy.
Joyce, thank you very much for those very kind words. Good evening, everyone. I was particularly intrigued by your commentary about my new day job as the president at a university and the high ideals to which I aspire. In arriving there, I was told quickly that my task was to get the tuition down for the students, get free parking for the faculty, and field a good basketball team for the alumni.

It is great to be here at the University of San Diego, where I already feel, after a very short time, a sense of companionship. Our two universities derive their roots from colleges that had a religious base and, therefore, still feel deeply the values that are part of the educational experience and are also committed to being institutions—particularly the one that we're in tonight—that believe that you can translate ideas into action. That, I think, is a very strong calling.

I should also acknowledge in the audience a good friend of mine, Pat Broe, who is a member of the President's Council of the University of San Diego. He is also the operator of the Port of Churchill in Northern Manitoba which, if let alone, will be the new Antwerp of North America. So we're very, very pleased to have him here. And I am very pleased with so many of you who've come to join me tonight in what I hope will be a good conversation.

I was told, again, becoming a president of a university, that it was a little like being a caretaker at a cemetery: there are lots of people under me, but nobody to listen. So the idea of actually having an audience tonight is nice. I really welcome the chance to be with you this evening to have some listening, speaking and sharing going on, because I have always felt in my 30-some-odd years that I spent in the Canadian Parliament and various areas where I had a number of contacts with this country—including five years as a graduate student here—that we really have to have more of a discussion and a dialogue and get to know each other much better.

When the Prime Minister at one point was planning a speaking tour in the United States and he wanted to get some survey material as to what Americans said about us, he instructed me to go out and hire the best firm that I could to come and do a sampling of American attitudes. I got the results back and merely put them in a bottom drawer with a lock on it. After a while, he started pestering me saying, “All right, where are the results? I'm launching my tour.” And, I said, “Oh, Prime Minister, I don't think you really, really want the study. Why don't you just do this, kind of, spontaneously?”

“No, no,” he kept insisting. What I was trying to hide from his political perception was the question that was asked as to who was the best known Canadian in the United States. The answer was not Jean Chrétien. It was Pamela Lee Anderson. And when I showed him that, he asked, “Why?” I said, “Well, they probably see more of her than they see of you.”

I've since found out that there's been something less than an enthusiastic reception for Canadian views in the last year. I was watching one night an interview with Ann Coulter—whom I gather is one of the well-known authors of political fiction in the United States—who said the Canadians are lucky that we allow them to co-exist with us on the continent. I wasn't really quite sure I would call it luck. I mean, I was never quite sure that was the word that I would use. And then, another one of the “distinguished” commentators, Tucker Carlson, said that [Canada] kind of was like Honduras, only a little bit colder and not really as interesting.

So as you can imagine, in my days as a Foreign Minister, I had to spend a lot of time working out some of these interesting and important relationships we had as we shared this fascinating piece of geography called North America. But we were always under some restraints because people in the State Department were paying attention. So I was always very precise, you know, and really calibrated my words with great precision when I felt that I had to dispute something. So when I left government, I felt liberated. I felt that now I could throw away the briefing notes and get away from all the “dos” and “don'ts.”

One of my first ventures was to be asked to be a speaker at the University of Taiwan. I gave my talk and a nice young man at the end of it came up and said, “Look, Dr. Axworthy, you were Foreign Minister of Canada for five years.
You lived next door to the most powerful country in the world. We live next door to a powerful country. Do you have any advice on how to deal with this border?" Well, I looked at him and the briefing notes weren’t there and, you know, I was kind of on my own. I fell back on an old saying that we have in the province of Manitoba. I said, “Well, it’s a little like making love to a porcupine: do it carefully.”

I don’t think it translated into Chinese all that well though. In fact, I was pretty sure that it didn’t because the next morning, I was asked to one of these power breakfasts: you know, you go to Taipei, you’re up at 5:00 in the morning and I was supposed to go there and talk about trade and all these things. And when I got into the room there was, sort of, an awkward kind of response. I mean, the body language wasn’t exactly warm and cuddly and, actually, nobody was looking at me. So I said to my host, “Have I committed some problem with protocol here?” He said, “Well, maybe it had something to do with the story in this morning’s newspaper.” And I said, “Well, what did it say?” because my Chinese wasn’t that good. And he said, “Well, it quoted you as saying that when asked how you would recommend us to get along with China mainland or with the United States, your answer was that it was kind of like making love to a concubine.”

So if any of you thought you were coming tonight to get a real hard-nosed analysis of international thrills, my newfound liberation may come as a disappointment. But I’ll tell you what it does do. It has made me reflect on this question of borders. How do you get along with them? How do you deal with them, particularly because we are living in an increasingly borderless world? As you may know, last year I was appointed by the United Nations Secretary-General to be envoy for Ethiopia and Eritrea, where there has been a border dispute, which four years ago resulted in about 100,000 killed and wounded in a very tough war. Since then, there’s been a stalemate in any resolution to that conflict. I spent literally two or three months trying to work with the leaders of the two countries to find some way in which this border dispute, a line drawn in the sand between two countries, can get resolved so that both can get on with the important task of helping to redeem the difficult economic situation of their people, and to begin developing more of the regional stability, among other things, that you’re supposed to do at the U.N.

One of the things that I felt was most disturbing and unsettling about this border problem was a report that the World Bank delivered that showed that the inability to resolve the border resulted in some 15 to 18 million people in both countries falling below the poverty line, which in both countries is about $200 at best anyway. And you start wondering what it is in the pride and prejudice that leads respected governments to put so much currency into the defense of this border, when, in fact, the real tough, important issue was the deplorable state that many people were in, and how the ability to reach across the border would result in an enormous upsurge of development, trade, commerce, security and investment—the things that I think were most prized and most important to the people of that area.

I think it’s fair to say that they’re not alone. Borders still represent, for virtually all of us, 200 years of the history of life. Certainly, you know, as your northern neighbor, we sympathized with your own country after 9/11 and realized how the question of borders became, once again, so dominant and so important. We realize that it’s still the touchstone that determines and shapes so much of our discourse and so much of our action.

And yet, at the same time, as I was coming back from my trip to Ethiopia just in the early part of January, just as we were all reeling from the impact of the tsunami event in Southeast Asia, it drew very clearly in my mind that, for all the pre-occupation with borders, we were living in a borderless world. Here was a calamity of enormous significance that didn’t recognize borders—11 countries with over 100 nationalities from different areas and regions were affected. And the response, the ability to be able to protect those people, did not rely upon individual governments getting their act together. It was simply a phenomenon that had become global in its reach and, I think perhaps even more dramatically, global in its response.
It was fascinating, I think, to watch the way in which the different countries drove their governments into a more active and engaged involvement. But it was not led by the leaders of the state, it was led from the grassroots by schoolchildren selling pizzas, service clubs holding special events, and universities holding vigils. It was a real example of a global grassroots movement that said we’ve got to respond.

And there is the dichotomy that we live in. Day in and day out there’s this balance between the border and the borderless world, and that’s really, I think, one of the key questions that I wanted to address tonight, the issue of how you resolve it. How do you begin to make sense of it and how do you begin to build upon that new phenomenon that was so much part of it, especially when you think of the fact that we are living in a world which is very much influenced by the existence of a global underworld?

When I came into foreign affairs in the mid ’90s in Canada, the first mandate (when you get a letter from the Prime Minister saying, “Here’s your job”) was to protect Canadians. And that’s what it said, first paragraph. I suddenly realized, how do I protect them when tens of thousands are traveling as tourists, or as students or as business people? How do I protect them against the drug cartels, the terrorists or the criminals, within my own range and influence as a leader in a national government? And therefore, it dawned on me pretty quickly that I’d better find some friends; we’d better collaborate. We’d better find some way of connecting and hooking up and building networks, because even for the simple task that I was facing as part of my mandate to protect my own citizens, I couldn’t do it alone. Neither could we as a government do it alone.

I recall that this Institute has been very deeply involved in northern Uganda where I’ve also spent some time over the years; but last year I was asked by Human Rights Watch to lead a mission to Colombia to table a report on child soldiers. The report was subtitled, “You’ll Learn Not To Cry.” I always feel, as I think many of you do, that the best way of explaining the way of the world is through stories. It’s not the soliloquy of the state; it’s the human story that really counts. And when we got to Bogotá, we met a number of the young children who had been child soldiers and who were really the authors of this report because it was based upon their experiences. This was the opening preface. I hope you don’t mind my just recounting it for a moment.

...the best way of explaining the way of the world is through stories. It’s not the soliloquy of the state; it’s the human story that really counts.

This is the story of Angela who had been taken away from her village in the northeast corner of Colombia at the age of 12. This is what she said:

Well, I had a friend, Juanita, who got into trouble. We’d been friends in civilian life; we shared a tent together; we were taken into the camps of the rebels together; and she got into trouble. She tried to escape and was captured. The commander said to me that it didn’t matter it was my friend, she committed an error and had to be killed, and I was the one to do it. I closed my eyes and fired the gun, but I didn’t hit her, so the commander said, ‘Well, here, shoot her again.’ So I did. The grave was nearby. I had to bury her and put dirt on top of her and say a prayer. Afterwards the commander said, ‘Angela, you did quite well even though you started to cry. You’ll have to do this again many more times until you’ll learn not to cry.’

In a way, that summed up for me, in part, this kind of borderless world we live in, because this young girl—and it’s a story that’s repeated a 1,000 times a day in hundreds of places around the world—was being faced by a predator who had taken advantage of her innocence, turned her into a warrior, put a horrible test on her, and at the age of 12, she was having to tell her story. Can
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And as we were talking about the role of university: my university is in the downtown part of the city where the average adult population has grown substantially, and they are scarred deeply by their experience in residential schools to the point where they, too, have lost their identity of who they are. That’s why Sontag said, you know, it is important that we take some time to stand aside and think about the pain of others, because that pain is ours. And I think, at least in my own vivid experience, there is an appetite amongst our populations to do that.

When I published my book last year, I got to go on one of those, sort of, magical mystery tours where you end up doing hotline shows at 6:00 in the morning, explaining globalization somewhere between the weather and the hockey scores. And I was fortunate enough to visit some American cities where we had the same experience. Everywhere I went, I got a sense that the people did feel an urge. They wanted to respond, weren’t sure how, and felt increasingly disconnected from the traditional channels of government and politics and things that I had grown up in. I mean, I was part of that system for 30 years and I felt that we were doing a job. And, all of a sudden, I realized that for many people, they were feeling that what was happening out there in the world

you imagine when you see your own children or grandchildren, just what kind of wrenching trauma that must have caused? But it could be told over again in Congo, or Darfur, or northern Uganda, or by the same kind of children in many places.

On the way back from Bogotá, as I was still very much affected by this, I met another Canadian businessman, a mining engineer, who was flying back to Vancouver. He said, “Well, I read about your mission here in the paper.” He was very honest; he said, “What’s that got to do with us? Tell me why we should really be involved. This is Colombia’s problem after all.” I reminded him that the same drug cartels that were behind these groups who had kidnapped Angela and Juanita are the same drug cartels that were distributing hard crack on the streets of eastside Vancouver, where we have 30 young people a month overdosing. They could be part of the global network of distribution and supply—the same cartels that last year had a profit margin of $15 billion, which exceeds the gross national product of about three-quarters of the world’s countries. It simply showed that we weren’t immune. Maybe they weren’t kidnapping our young aboriginal girls off the street, off Hastings Street in Vancouver, but they were killing them nonetheless; and, therefore, we were as much responsible for coming to grips with those issues as were the authorities in Colombia.

I’ve been reminded about the book that was published just before her death by Susan Sontag, where she says, “We must regard the pain of others.” She talks about how the quintessential experience of being in a modern world is looking at calamity, looking at a calamity which oftentimes simply gets deposited in our mental membrane or gets archived somewhere in our recessive memories and, after the first flush of indignation or response, simply becomes part of that collection. And you know, as much as all of us were deeply affected by the horrible events in Southeast Asia, it tended to cloud and shadow what had taken place months before, where 100,000 people were being ethnically killed in Darfur, and 2 million forced into refugee camps. How many more images have we absorbed and dealt with, and how much have we, in many cases, ignored it?

was not being directly communicated or connected to who they were, what their lives were, what they were trying to say. It reminded me of the comment by the Jesuit theologian Teilhard de Chardin, who said, “A great many internal and external portents have caused us all to feel, more or less confusedly, that something tremendous is taking place. But what is it?” What is it?

Let me try to address some of those questions about “what is it?” because I think it behooves us in a sense of being in a university, where the search and the exploration, the navigation of “what is it?” is in many ways our prime responsibility. And I learned this the tough way because as a foreign minister I was basically a plumber. I was fixing leaks everyday. I didn’t have much to do with the architecture of how it worked, but I began to realize as I was being asked to fix those leaks, that if I didn’t have an idea, if I didn’t have some sense of a core commitment of what I thought was happening, we were simply responsive and reactive. We weren’t really giving direction. I wasn’t doing my job until I was able to try to address that in a way that gave some cohesion and some sense of place and positioning, so that as a community of people in the country, we Canadians could try to understand that what we were doing had some relationship, some relevance to “what is it?”

So we came up with this concept—it wasn’t ours originally. It was real unique and it really derived from a report at the United Nations table in ’94. We took hold of the idea of human security, as opposed to national security. And it’s a very simple idea, horribly complicated and difficult to implement, but it was a simple idea, saying that increasingly, the issue of risk and threat is a risk and threat to people and individuals, not to nations and governments. We were basically saying that the notion of sovereignty as it has evolved over 200-and-some-odd years was, in itself, still an essential ingredient, but, in itself, was not sufficient. National security was, in itself, not sufficient to protect people and, in fact, when taken to extremes—taken to the outer edges—the preoccupation with national security could end up degrading the individual security of people. So we played around and said, “How does that apply to the kind of day-by-day operations, and how do we begin to make that a matter of direction?”

I recall, and I say this with some trepidation, that I was launching this idea at the University of Toronto, and one of our distinguished political scientists got up and said, “Well, Minister Axworthy, I may concede that human security works in theory, but does it really work in practice?” Well, that really threw me for a loop. It probably drove me back to the university to find the answer. But what it really meant is that we began to put a different lens on our perception of how the world worked, and that the only way that we could begin to assure security based on a human dimension was to begin acting in a different way. It went, because we weren’t great theorists, into very practical, direct action.

As was described in the introduction, perhaps the lesson that I learned the most from was the ability and the interest of a worldwide coalition of individuals to get the treaty to abandon the use of landmines. It didn’t start with the governments. It actually started here in the United States with the Veterans of Vietnam Foundation, who were young Americans coming back from that war experience who, realizing just what a vicious sort of weapon landmines were, provided the money to set up an international coalition. That was the origin of the landmine treaty. Then people like Senator Pat Leahy from Vermont picked it up and ran with it. And President Clinton, actually, in his first address to the United Nations, made the case for a treaty on landmines. We said, “Well, you know, if it’s good enough for Americans it’s got to be good enough for us.”

But, more importantly, it was the direct contact with this fascinating constellation of people around the world, victims of landmines; people who had tried to recover their countries—whether it was Cambodia or Mozambique or Nicaragua—after the war and conflict was over and tried to restore the agriculture or the forest. And all of a sudden when they walked into the unmarked pathway, well, they had a leg blown off or they would lose their life. By the way, just to fast-forward, it still exists. There are serious landmine fields between Ethiopia and Eritrea because we haven’t been able to get an agreement to remove them. And every month or two a shepherd, a nomad or a child is wounded or killed by a landmine.
But that taught us a lesson that there was a base of support and commitment to develop a human security approach. We ended up creating a group of 14 countries called the Human Security Network that tied us very closely with NGO networks around the world, with the Red Cross institution. For the first time, decisions were being made not through the formal structures of intergovernmental relations, but by networks who were simply working together, collaborating, building on each other and beginning to find some way to get the answer.

We began to see that notion of how you recalibrate public policy for the protection of individuals; not that we ignored national security—in a sense we still had several armed forces and we were still prepared to commit—but we realized that there was more to it than that. And I’ve got to tell you, the test, the real place where to use the old expression, “the rubber hit the road,” was when we came to Kosovo. As we were all extolling the need to provide protection for individuals, we had members of the Security Council of the United Nations and we brought in protocols for peacekeeping that said the responsibility of peacekeeping is not just to divide warring parties, but to protect civilians. We didn’t want to see Rwanda happen again. We didn’t want to see Srebrenica happen again. We didn’t want to see people with blue helmets standing aside while the local population was taken off to be murdered in a cave or a canyon somewhere with no protection. But then we hit Kosovo and we knew what was going on from all the reports coming in. I know you saw from the kind of stuff coming in that ethnic cleansing was taking place, no question about it. And we danced the diplomatic minuets, we had meetings all over the place, and at the Security Council we couldn’t get an agreement to intervene because the Russians were going to veto. So you know the rest of the story. We went to NATO and we got engaged and, eventually, we got to stop the killing, and slowly and fitfully have started the rebuilding in that country from the kind of divisions that the boundaries had created for so long.

I didn’t like what happened. We committed. I was asked by the Prime Minister to recommend to the Cabinet whether we should get involved or not, and we did, because I felt that I couldn’t, with any honesty, stand up for a human security principle if I wasn’t prepared to ultimately be faced with a choice of the ultimate use of force to protect people. You know, it’s like a cop on the beat. The worst time to come is actually when they call your cards. Are you prepared to use them? Well, I didn’t like the fact there were no rules. The decision was ad hoc. It bypassed the United Nations, so there wasn’t a collective judgment. It did go to NATO, which was, after all, a military alliance.

So I established a commission called the International Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty with the approval of the Secretary-General. We got a number of countries involved. Canada and major U.S. foundations helped support the research. I think it was a real attempt to get a hold of a new idea, about how it could work in a way that would refurbish and rehabilitate the somewhat tattered position that the U.N.—which we’d all—fallen into. And I’d say now that that, to me, was perhaps one of the things that I was able to do that still carries some significance, because what happened is that the notion of “human security” has morphed into a new concept called “responsibility to protect.” Now, what do we mean by that?

Well, the commission looked at this and said, you know, if you go back into the roots of government, go back to the 18th century, to France or Great Britain and this country, and look at the role of the state and the relation of the individual to it, one primary purpose of the state is the protection of its citizens. What they were saying is, “How do we extend that fundamental responsibility to protect into a global domain? How do you do it?” They came up with a formula and it said that if a state or government is incapable of protecting its own people, just doesn’t have the wherewithal, is a failed state, won’t protect its people, or if the state is itself the predator—the one that’s actually doing the killing or the cleansing—then the international community has a responsibility to protect. We turn sovereignty on its head. We basically say sovereignty is not a prerogative of the state; it’s an earned right to provide protection for the citizens of the state; if it doesn’t fulfill that responsibility, that mandate, then there has to be some way of insuring the protection takes place.
place. This doesn’t mean some willful, capricious attitude; let’s walk in where we want to go. It means setting up a very high threshold or test. It has to be genocide. It has to be real murder. There has to be real cleansing. It doesn’t mean you go in because you make up reasons for it. There has to be a real severe test—a clear, objective, hard-nosed test. There has to be collective decision-making on it. You also have to make sure that the means are appropriate to the crime.

In Kosovo, we had some real scrambles with the military people who wanted to bomb. You know, they are trained to win. As foreign minister, I had to say, “We’re not out to win, we’re out to stop and protect.” We went through some very tough discussions with our military commanders saying, “You have to put some rules in. You have to use means appropriate for the objective and the goal.”

...the whole point about R2P, responsibility to protect, was that we were basically redefining the notion of the boundary of sovereignty.

In other words, the whole point about R2P, responsibility to protect, was that we were basically redefining the notion of the boundary of sovereignty. We’re not talking about some kind of fantasy of world government. We’re saying that of course states have to exercise their responsibilities; but, if they don’t, or can’t, or won’t or themselves are the violator of the basic rights of people to live in freedom from fear and the right to exist, then somebody has to do it. Well, it has to be done by rules, law, proper process and by making sure that it is not an abusive exercise.

This is not some abstract, academic exercise of hypothetical simulations, boy, this is real, because the issue of intervention—of how, when and who goes in to influence the affairs of another state—is probably the most critical and difficult conundrum that we face in this new century of ours. And it’s not easy to answer. I’m not saying that I’m coming up here with a fully described and widespread consensus on what we’re going to go. It is debatable. There are still many of those who will simply say we should exercise no restraints on our sovereignty. We have a right to do what we want within our own boundaries. We have the right to do what we need to do to protect ourselves in our own boundaries, which is where the whole issue of boundaries gets tied in with this issue of the borderless world that we live in.

The responsibility to protect is (and I just give you this caution because I think it’s important for an institute such as this and this university, which are clearly committed in terms of their willingness to engage in these issues) the core principle behind the high panel on U.N. reform that was tabled just in December, and which will form the basis of a major debate about the reformation of the U.N. system in the future. We finally recognized that the old organization that was the brain child of the Second World War, of Franklin Roosevelt and those who put the treaty together, has served a purpose, but it was no longer dealing with the world the way it was. It lost enormous credibility over Iraq. It has been besieged by challenges of corruption in the Oil for Food program. In other words, it’s an organization that needs some fresh air. At the very core of it, at the very center of that discussion that the Secretary-General is launching in which all the world leaders will come to New York in September of this year, the responsibility to protect is a principle that will be debated deeply. The question is, are we ready to do something about it? What does it mean, for example? Well, let me give you some examples of very specific consequences.

If you even begin to take it as at least being partly credible, then it does lead to some very significant reforms. It means, for example—and I say this to an American audience—that the big powers in the Security Council, the P5

I’m not saying it’s the only answer, but let me just give you an example, a clear example of how I saw it work.

In the case of Kosovo, we were sitting in some breezy, windy, old castle in Germany, trying to negotiate a peace deal with Milosevic. We weren’t going anywhere. I mean, the Russians were sending envoys and we were having conversations and he was basically thumbing his nose—until the tribunal for the Balkans. We got a message when we were out at dinner one night, and I got a little note saying Louise Arbour, who was the chief prosecutor and happened to be a country-person of mine, is going to indict Milosevic and six of his comrades. So I thought as part of dinnertime conversation I’d share that with the other foreign ministers of the GA [General Assembly]. I said, “By the way, guess what’s going to happen tomorrow?” Oh, you should have seen them. They said, “Oh God, you Canadians, you’re doing it again. You’re interfering and they’ll never come to the table.”

I said, “Look, you can grieve all you like and complain; there’s not that much I can do about it. I know Louise Arbour, and if I turn up and say, “Don’t do it, Louise,” I would be indicted. So she did it. In 24 hours Milosevic was at the table. In 48 hours we had a peace agreement, and three months later he was whisked off to be held accountable for his crimes. Why? Well, partly, as we used to say in politics, because all of a sudden those around him didn’t want to be in the next Christmas card with him. He lost his base. He was indicted. He was a criminal. He no longer had the kind of aura that leaders have. You didn’t want to be too close to Milosevic after the indictment.

Today in Darfur, interesting issue. The commission that reported just last week clearly said that’s one of the most effective ways of stopping the killing which is going on incessantly. Let’s make the contrast to the number of casualties and victims in western Sudan in the last year—and it’s not the only place—mounts up to about 35 World Trade [Center] attacks. I think, by the way, that the U.S. administration was very courageous in coming out and saying

This is a country made up of the rule of law, and I don’t want to be rude, but your present administration is doing everything they can to destroy the new institution called the International [Criminal] Court, which is based upon a rule of law. And many of us in Canada and around the world find that intolerable. We don’t accept it. We don’t. I happen to think that—and I’m not speaking ex cathedra—in terms of a battle against terrorism, the International Criminal Court could become the center linchpin in an international judicial system that would hold people accountable. It would provide a deterrent. It would provide a way of identifying the criminals, whether they’re the Pol Pots or the Idi Amins or the Osama Bin Ladens, and say, “Hey, you are going to be held to judgment, and it’s going to be based upon rules of law, not upon an individual’s decisions.” I’m not saying it’s the only answer, but let me just give you an example, a clear example of how I saw it work.

Will the big powers give it up? No, but they can be brought to bear on a new standard. The responsibility to protect is basically a new international norm, if you like. And I believe in norms. I think people do because all of a sudden if they begin to use a veto to stop an effort to protect people, then they’re going to have to answer the question, why? What gave you the right to stop the kind of intervention that must be brought to bear in the western part of Sudan or many other places? All of a sudden there’s a new norm out there. And that should have or could have the same kind of emulsion that we saw in things like the deliberations over the landmine treaty and other efforts. It has to be based on some serious work and deliberation and efforts. You say, “We’re not asking you to get off the Security Council, we’re not asking you to stop the veto if there’s an aggression across your border, but don’t use it when we’re trying to save women and children.” It means establishing serious commitments on international law.

Today in Darfur, interesting issue. The commission that reported just last week clearly said that’s one of the most effective ways of stopping the killing which is going on incessantly. Let’s make the contrast to the number of casualties and victims in western Sudan in the last year—and it’s not the only place—mounts up to about 35 World Trade [Center] attacks. I think, by the way, that the U.S. administration was very courageous in coming out and saying

18 The report of the International Commission of Inquiry on Darfur to the United Nations Secretary-General was issued on 25 January 2005. See Related Resources.
this is genocide: Colin Powell’s statement before Christmas, saying let’s not accept it, let’s not sugarcoat, cotton candy this one, this is real serious genocide: deliberate policies by a government to eliminate a group of people. A lot of innocent people have lost their lives based upon the inability of the world community to get their act together and protect.

So the United Nations set up a commission to examine it. They didn’t quite come to the conclusion that it’s genocide because they said there’s some further evidence that has to be introduced, but it is a crime against humanity and what should we do? Let’s refer it, as the Security Council has every right to do under their own statute, to the International Criminal Court, and say to the Sudanese leadership (in fact, there’s a list of people who are already there) that if you continue to commit crimes against humanity, recruit child soldiers, use rape as a weapon of war, exterminate people or cleanse people, you will be indicted. I’ve got to tell you, folks in Khartoum are terrified of that possibility. Nothing affects leaders more to know that they’re not going to go to London for this season’s fashion show. They want to travel. They want to get out. I’m not being facetious.

The toughest restraint and sanction you could put is not to stop supplies going in, not to stop food, but just simply say to the leadership, you’re going to be indicted. Anywhere in the world you go, you can be held accountable. You can be tried, you’ll be picked up by the government of that state, if it’s Germany or France, wherever—except not in this country, because the present government won’t recognize that as being a legitimate tool; so here you have a conundrum. The U.S. has taken the lead in Sudan, in saying there’s a real international crime going on, but because of their objections to the Court they won’t agree to a reference in the Security Council, which could have a huge impact on stopping that crime against humanity. And that’s what I mean by the responsibility to protect. I mean, that’s what we’re talking about. It changes the world a little bit, it changes the equations, and it makes people start thinking in a different way about what their responsibilities are. That’s where I’m not out here to become a sort of missionary. I’m simply saying that if you want to build up a set of rules about the way the world is going to work on this borderless issue, we better start doing it.

Let me just give you a final example of one that is very close to me and, I think, to Pat Broe because of his work up in the north. We know that, by the latest report of the Pentagon, the most severe security threat the world faces is the climate change taking place, and that the most evident place where the canary is in the mineshaft is in the northern circumpolar areas of this world—where the United States, Canada, the Nordic countries, Russia, are all finding a collapse going on in their ability to sustain life, vegetation and animal life, and where the levels of fresh water are now rapidly increasing.

A lot of innocent people have lost their lives based upon the inability of the world community to get their act together and protect.

The flow of fresh water coming out of the Hudson Bay’s tray is now beginning to match up with the Gulf Stream that’s moving up, fundamentally changing ocean patterns. The waters are opening up for navigation and there will be serious interest. The Russians are much further ahead than we are in developing plans for major transportation shipping through that area. We’re opening up a whole new other world, and there’s no governance. There’s nobody exercising any responsibility to protect the people or the polar bears. Right now we’re staying in a hotel on the Pacific coast, and I suppose five years from now we might find ourselves lapping at the bedposts because simply, those levels are changing. There is a classic case, and there are many of them. There’s a classic case that no one country is responsible. There is no one administration that is responsible. It’s all of us.
It is a real responsibility to protect, but there’s no ability to do it, which takes me to the third idea. Because I know that we have a certain religious history, this is what I call the “New Testament” of security. You go from human security to responsibility to protect, to what I really call the global public domain, where you begin to extend and elaborate not world government, but the responsibility to build internationally, globally, a set of institutions and practices. They can be universities, they can be business associations, and they can be world corporations, where there is an attempt or effort to say there are standards, rules and practices that where there are issues that we all face as one, interdependently, we have to make some decisions about how we exercise our joint responsibility. I’m not here to do the history, but remember that the United States has been one of the most successful, if not the most successful, country in building a public domain, of saying we work by the market; but there are certain rules the market works by. There are certain restraints in the role of government. There are certain ways that people participate. There are certain ways that we make sure that decisions are shared collectively. Our own country is the same. Many countries in Europe are. There are movements towards democracy that make that happen. People have built successful public domains nationally behind our borders.

The issue is whether we can build the same sense of domain, public interest and public responsibility on a global level. That is the question that many of the young people sitting in this audience tonight are going to have to answer. It’s the kind of challenge that I see in my own university: we just set up a thing called the Global College, which is an attempt to reach out and say that all we can do is pass on some of our angst and anxieties because we don’t have the answers, but we can really begin to apply that notion of a public domain, a global public domain, eventually to the management and government of security, security in all its dimensions—pandemics, diseases, environmental calamities—and regard the pain of others, which increasingly becomes our pain, in Susan Sontag’s words. So that’s, if you like, truth-speaking from your northern neighbor.

We think it is time we built a public domain. We can’t do it without the United States. You are the anchor of any new efforts to build a public domain because of the power and the history and experience. We’re not a big military power, we have no sense of manifest destiny, we don’t carry sticks; but we do believe that there are ideas and interests and collaboration that we can make. Within this North American context we can work ultimately together, from Ottawa to Washington, from California to Manitoba, from business group to business group, from labor union to labor union, from student to student, from university to university, to find those answers, because that’s what the public domain is about.

---

**We think it is time we built a public domain.**

**We can’t do it without the United States. You are the anchor of any new efforts to build a public domain because of the power and the history and experience.**

---

It’s not just government; it’s networks of people, institutions, organizations and associations that allow us all to maintain connections. When I read President Bush’s inauguration speech, or the State of the Union, about how we must dedicate ourselves to the pursuit of liberty—great. Whose liberty? And what happens to the Inuit of my country and your country who are losing their freedom to survive because of policies being made around the world? How do we share our technologies as North Americans with China and India, which are on a huge growth trajectory, but are going to need some answers from us, whether it’s about applying new gasification techniques for coal or whether it’s providing efforts to provide emissions control, where California is taking the lead? There are a lot of things we can start not only doing for ourselves, but begin to share with a lot of others, and not as a ruler.

Let me just close with this. In going back to university, I acquired a new technology myself: I learned to read. And I went back to a 1948 inaugural
address by a well-known Canadian economist called Harold Innis, who was head of the Royal Society, which is a group of scientists and academics. I was struck by the tale called “Minerva’s Owl.” Probably some of the philosophers know what Minerva’s Owl is about, but there’s an old philosophical saying that Minerva’s Owl flies at dusk, which means once you see it, it’s too late to do anything about it; you’re responding and reacting too late. You’re not in the front of the curve, you’re behind the curve. And I think we’re increasingly guilty of watching Minerva’s Owl fly at dusk. The real issue is, and I think maybe it starts in places like this, when can we see Minerva’s Owl fly at dawn? That’s the time when we begin to meld and morph from human security, to responsibility to protect, to a global public domain. Thank you very much.
it is very limited. I mean, the budget of the Office of Political Affairs at the U.N. that I basically report to has less of a budget than the San Diego police force. So how do you go out preventing things if, in fact, what you're doing is saying that we can't do these things because we're not anywhere?

I'm going to be sort of judgmental in this, which is a nice way of saying I'm going to give you my full opinion: I find it odd, strange and maybe even just a little silly, that we can be, and we say we are—your country and mine—anxiously working to establish a rapid reaction force under NATO to move into areas of crises and conflict with all of the latest transportation, logistics and communication, but when it comes to suggesting the same idea that the United Nations have a rapid reaction force to get to the crisis early, to stamp it out before it becomes a conflict, people throw it up as if somehow you're going to commit a form of hari kari and that we all have, you know, the black helicopters. To use Jesse Helm's famous phrase, “They are going to come and get us.”

You say, “Wait a minute, that's what the U.N. was set up to do.” And what would happen if you were ready to move in these emerging crises? Darfur is a clear example. We have spent months dancing around the issue of who's going to go to Darfur to protect people. We eventually say it will be the African Union, except the African Union doesn't have any communications equipment, transport or logistics, and none of the rest of us are prepared to go there to do it, to prevent the killing of these people. So I'm saying that there are rules and institutions, but mainly it's a lack of tools as well. And that's where I think there's a judgment to make.

When individual countries do it, you hold them responsible. Let's be frank, you're not going to stop big powerful countries, but you can hold them up to what I used to call the naming, gaming and shaming issue. You don't let them get away with it. You say, “That's wrong. Here's a standard.” We have to
substantially enhance the human rights system in the world so that those kinds of grievances can be held up to light and can be examined and interpreted. So there are lots of bits and pieces, and that’s where I really think that we haven’t done nearly enough work. Again, I’m using the big “We” in places like universities to put that together and bring it forward as a form of advocacy—at least to say, “Here are our best thoughts and analyses; here’s where we think we should go.” That’s where I think you can be able to put some real meat on the bones of responsibility to protect.

JN: Thank you. We have a couple questions related to the U.S., and, as you can imagine, given what you’ve just been talking about, the first question asks for you to please comment on the PATRIOT Act. Then we have the U.S.’ position on the ICC, and in that regard, what prospects do you see for the success and efficacy of this new institution, specifically related to Darfur? And then another question related to the U.S. intervention in Iraq.

LA: I’m going to be generic in my answers. It’s not fair for me to try to give my own assessment of the PATRIOT Act because I’m not American. We’re neighbors and because we share so much, there was an enormous sense of grief at what took place; but, we couldn’t quite get the same political reaction developing that took place in this country. One thing that I guess I learned over the years is that war of any kind fundamentally changes the constitution of any country. It changes the international constitution. It gives the state more power versus the individual. I mean, that’s just one of the products of war. What is missing, I think, is that when those powers are established, there has to be much better oversight and much better ability to render them in a more accountable, transferable way.

What I would like to share with you is that the PATRIOT Act has consequences far beyond U.S. borders. It has a huge impact on our border. We are facing a major inquiry in our own country right now of a Canadian of Syrian descent who was picked up in the United States and sent back to Syria without any due process. We found that in our own RCMP [Royal Canadian Mounted Police] we were complicit in this. We found out that under the counter-terrorism legislation that both countries passed, there’s a big subterranean set of regulations that nobody knows anything about. Even in our parliamentary system, where we have to provide oversight of security matters, they’re not giving access to what those rules are. So as a result, because Maher Arar was a Syrian and was there as a landed immigrant, our Charter of Rights, which is very explicit on this matter, has been eroded. And the inquiry is looking into who is responsible for it.
countries around the world are beginning to apply international criminal law on an ad hoc basis, country by country. And therefore, we already saw [Secretary of Defense] Donald Rumsfeld last week saying he was afraid to go to Germany because there could be an indictment not only under the ICC, but through the German law. Well, that’s wrong.

There should be an international standard, an international justice system built around it. So I don’t believe in having the idea that one country can begin adjudicating against a citizen in another country. But if we all agree on what the rules are and that there’s a process for doing it, I think that provides much better protection for a country like yours, which has to take real responsibilities for its international work. I mean, it is the most important international area, and I think when we come to issues of intervention, as we’ve been talking about tonight, having the ICC there is the best form of leader protection for any action that a U.S. national would take, or Canadian national for that matter. But these are arguments that are not being debated that way. They’re just not.

As far as the ICC is concerned, I think it’s going to go ahead. It would be a huge boost if eventually the United States joined in, even with reservations, even with strings, but because I was partly responsible for drafting the statute because we were leading the charge at the Rome Convention, we’d built in a lot of safeguards. One of the great mythologies is that a U.S. GI is going to be picked up by the Court. Of course he won’t be. The Court is a court of last resort. If you have a national court system that adjudicates on international law, the International Court has nothing to say. With the Rome Statute, we embedded the crimes against humanity in our criminal code. So as a result, a Canadian is accountable if they’re involved in some form of war crime and will be judged by our courts. So this whole idea that somehow there’s going to be this international organization that’s going to impose itself is wrong.

The real issue is, are we prepared to accept the fact that crimes against humanity have to be adjudicated? The first recourse is through the national, domestic system, whether it’s military or a civil court system. And I think once that case is made, I think there is a lot more protection in it for Americans than is presently being given because it really means that what’s happening—and I don’t want to get into a law discussion—but what’s happening is, other
Let’s talk about security for a moment. The last figure I saw was that about 40 percent of U.S. energy in the next ten years will come from Canada, primarily from natural gas resources in our oil supply. The continental energy policy that Congress is debating says we’re going to rely on Canada and Mexico for a major source of our energy supply. That’s security and it’s an important one. I think it would be helpful not to be relying upon Middle East oil in this case. But there are consequences to that because we’re a signatory. So if we’re going to be exporting, and I don’t even say it’s exporting because I don’t think the border matters anymore, then we have to be able to say that the quid pro quo is that we have to see what’s going to happen in terms of emissions standards. How do we work this thing out?

And the whole issue of water—fresh water and the prairies—we live and die in terms of fresh water. And we have a Red River basin with the Midwestern states that floods every four or five years and devastates our cities because farmers on both sides of the borders have basically filled in the waterholes that used to capture excess water. For the first time in a long time we are experimenting with developing a basin control across the border, one that we all have to share in the proper application of our water. And that’s where I think we have to be going.

There are so many of these things, and NAFTA right now is primarily a trade and commerce agreement. I think we have to begin to see how we refurbish it to take into account issues of energy and water, and eventually cross-border flows of people. I mean, I’m sure everyone in this room can tell me more about the issues you deal with in cross-border immigration. But we have a system that we’ve established. I was an immigration minister (I was a minister of everything at one point in time), and what we did was, we simply provided a system where if someone came to work in Canada as a domestic or farm worker or other things, after a period of four years—as long as they didn’t have trouble with the law—they had the right to apply to become a citizen. That’s worked very nicely for us. I’m not saying it’s applicable here, but it’s a lesson that could be shared. And that is where we have to get into a discussion of these issues. I mean, you and I at our respective institutions should be leading the way and getting that kind of forum, so that particularly our students can be getting engaged in these issues because they’re going to come up with those answers.

Can I talk a little bit about the mid-Canada corridor for a minute? Pat Broe’s company has the Port of Churchill, which is more than sea access into Europe. Lots of plans have been developed on developing a transportation corridor, connecting Murmansk [Russia] to Monterrey [Mexico]. It would substantially reduce transportation costs that would help both of our countries in terms of their economic productivity, which is what the Europeans have already done. And we have to get in on the act, otherwise we’re going to end up paying accelerated transportation costs and lose the opportunity to trade with Europe on the way. But we don’t talk about it cross-border; we’re still playing this border game. And that’s why I’m getting a little frustrated with borders.

JN: I’m sorry to hear that because actually the next couple of questions deal with the border, but a particular border that is in your hat as the U.N. envoy to Ethiopia and Eritrea. There are a couple of questions I believe from some people in the audience from that region. One of them asks, what would be your position and advice regarding the border problem between Ethiopia and Eritrea? And also, what have you done so far to assist the Ethiopian leaders to comply with the Algiers Agreement?

LA: I’m going to have to back up just a little bit because in my present role what I say is taken note of. What have they done or what’s the mandate? It’s very simple then just to get the two sides talking. Maybe some of you haven’t followed the issue, but as some of you know, after the war ended in 2000, there was the Algiers Agreement, which set up an independent Boundary Commission that had to go back and look at all the maps and decide where the boundary was between Eritrea and Ethiopia. Both governments agreed that it would be binding, whatever decision was made. When the decision came out, the Ethiopian government didn’t like it and said that they were not going to adhere to the recommendations of the Boundary Commission. Eritrea says it’s the rule of law. They stopped talking for four years. So the Secretary-General said, “Your job is go get them talking; but most particularly, to try and get both sides to adhere to the agreement.”
LA: Well, as I said, I’ve spent a lot of time there. I think part of the reason is that various international actors have seen the Ugandan government as one of the good guys. It’s a government that has properly tackled the AIDS problem and it brought in a number of economic reforms. But hidden up in northern Uganda, there has been this nasty war where 8,000 or 10,000 kids are kidnapped every year. And in the refugee camps there are what, a million and a half people?

I had a quaint, sort of, moving personal experience, which made me get involved in northern Uganda, not the same way that Joyce has done, but in a more diplomatic way. We hosted a conference in Winnipeg in the year 2000 on war-affected children and there was a weird kind of wheeling-and-dealing to try and develop an agreement on protocol for the protection of child soldiers. And I was asked to meet with two young Ugandan girls who had come all the way from the Gulu area to the conference. This, sort of, real nice-looking and very cheerful young girl named Emma sat in this chair across from me and talked about how she had been abducted and became a mother at the age of 11 because she was basically a sex slave of one of the commanders. She was asked to become a warrior, had to go back to her village and, like Angela, had to kill somebody in her village. She escaped, was living in the camp and she came here to ask the rest of us for some help.

I promised I’d go back there, which I’ve done on several occasions and met with some government officials; I met with my own government, the Commonwealth governments, and the rest of them. And I just had a feeling that there was a reticence because they don’t want to put [Yoweri] Museveni under the gun. But where I think they’ve really fallen apart now is with respect to all of the efforts that have established monitors for the human rights abuses in the camps, which are huge. There are about 60,000 kids every night that go into the streets looking for protection because of the fear of abduction.

In terms of trying, here’s a case where I think the ICC actually is going to be a catalyst. It’s been a force for the rest of the community. We have to resolve the traditional justice system with the international justice system. But I think,

In Ethiopia’s case, just before Christmas, Prime Minister Meles Zenawi did issue a statement in his parliament about accepting the principles of the Boundary Commission report, which was a real step forward. The question now is to get them to actually start talking about it in front of the Boundary Commission. There will be a meeting on February 22, two weeks from now. And my job has been basically to be the go-between, to be the interlocutor and to try to give arguments or cases as to why it’s in their interest. So whether it’s the council-based one, or the people being killed by landmines, or the economic poverty reduction issue, it is my job to try to dance the sort of classic diplomatic minuet. I don’t want to say much more on that because I’m still hoping we can get the two sides together, so I don’t want to sound like I’m prejudicing one or the other.

I will say one thing though. What’s going on in the Horn of Africa has some real potential. I mean there is a real movement on now to seriously work at how the international community can apply serious investment in foreign aid to the countries to really begin to uplift it. Jeffrey Sachs came out with a really very strong report just before Christmas. I think it’s a good report. It makes sense. But it can never be implemented if you don’t get the conflict out of the way. And that’s the big problem. The development agencies are not prepared to accept that conflict is part of the equation that they have to manage. It’s simply not a matter of transferring money. If you have a conflict it’s going to stop you from reducing poverty. It’s about as simple as that.

JN: Staying in Africa for the moment, there is a question I believe from someone from northern Uganda. The government of Uganda is not protecting its citizens in the north. It is killing them and has put them in concentration camps. Jan Egeland, the U.N. Under-Secretary-General [for Humanitarian Affairs], calls the situation in Uganda the worst, most forgotten catastrophe in the world. Why is the international community ignoring the plight of northern Uganda?

And then, they are very effective in getting it into the public eye. It is the classic case that information is a very important tool in terms of ensuring protection of people. They themselves can't do it; they can't pass the rules; they can't intervene; but they can give you the groundwork and make it public. Then it's up to the rest of us to respond. And that's where they put the onus back onto the governments and other institutions to say, “Here are the facts; do you want to see the whole thing?” Here are the facts, ma’am. That's what Human Rights Watch does, and they do a tremendous job around the world in doing it. So I would endorse Joyce's recommendation. It's a great organization to be involved with.

JN: Finally, this question asks how Canada and the University of Winnipeg prepare its people to be conscientious world citizens.

LA: I think on the broadest level, the most important thing that happened to us as a country was the passage in 1982 of the Charter of Human Rights. I think we created a culture of rights in our country that has really changed quite palpably and visibly the sense of our own responsibility because it did introduce the notion of protecting group rights. And therefore, in that sense, much of the divisiveness of what we see in a lot of the areas about social, economic and political rights no longer have the same ferocity because we're simply saying that over 25 years between parliament and the courts, we've worked out most differences, which means that in terms of a multicultural, multiethnic, multi-diverse society, we've probably gotten used to it and it works. That I think is perhaps most important.

But now the issue is how you extend that. How do you make that the broader application? And the thing that I launched at our own university was to establish what we call a Global College—a place in which not only will we do the research on climate change, public health or human rights, but we're developing curriculum for each of our undergraduates to get involved in. I think the innovative part is that we've now invited as full members, as part of that college, representatives from the new immigrant groups: the Somalis,
Ethiopians and the Sudanese. They’ve come to Canada and have an enormous wealth of experience about the way the world works. And I want our students to have the full exposure to them as teachers. And it’s really kind of an interesting chemistry going on in terms of involving the diaspora groups, as you call them, as full members of the university community. We bring them in as fellows.

To give you one example, as we were setting up at the college, a group of parents who were primarily from Sierra Leone and from Sudan, whose children were at a local high school which is a block and a half away, came and said, “OK, so you’re the guy that hosted the war-affected children’s conference here a couple years ago.” I said, “That’s right.” He said, “Well, we’ve got news for you. We’ve got 300 war-affected kids in our high school who have come to this country with the trauma and the scars of being part of a conflict, going through the refugee camps, and they arrive in this country bearing all that tough baggage, and nobody’s doing anything for them. Can we get this college involved?”

And the answer was, “Yes.” We’re doing this. We’ve got our people, our faculty and our students. We’re doing mentoring and working, and it will now become a world microcosm—a way in which they’re able to come to grips with a world issue. So war-affected children just aren’t people you sort of see on the docket entries in Sierra Leone or in Uganda. They’re part of our neighborhood and, therefore, we better come to grips with it.

And I would like to close during this last question. If I had a real dream—I sound like a nut, some crazy visionary, but—I think that ultimately we have the technology now to connect and hook up, through the power of information, young people around the world. I mean, my son plays a video game with somebody in New Zealand. We have this enormous capacity to connect around the world, on video games and on the internet. But how are we connecting on peace studies, climate change and human rights, so that we all start talking to one another? And again, I have seen a group of war-affected kids from Africa talking to a group of high school kids in our own country. For the first half an hour there was a real reservation. But then they talked about their experiences, and by the time that internet dialogue was over, they were talking about what kind of music they listen to and why their parents are so difficult to get along with. I mean it became young people talking to young people. And I think you know the capacity that we have. We make enormous investments in the new information systems, for commerce and for business. And for all the tremendous potential it has to create a form of global educational system that allows young people to talk and share with one another, I think it would put all the rest of us diplomats and conflict resolution people out of business. Thank you very much.
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In recent years, the University of San Diego has hosted many distinguished guests, including Nobel Peace Laureates and former Presidents Jimmy Carter and Oscar Arias, Supreme Court justices, United Nations and United States government officials, as well as ambassadors from countries around the world. In 1996, the university hosted a Presidential Debate between candidates Bill Clinton and Bob Dole.

The USD campus, considered one of the most architecturally unique in the nation, is known as Alcalá Park. Like the city of San Diego, the campus takes its name from San Diego de Alcalá, a Franciscan brother who served as the infirmary at Alcalá de Henares, a monastery near Madrid, Spain. The Spanish Renaissance architecture that characterizes the five-century old University of Alcalá serves as the inspiration for the buildings on the University of San Diego campus. The architecture was intended by the founders, Bishop Charles Francis Buddy and Mother Rosalie Hill, to enhance the search for truth through beauty and harmony. Recent additions, such as the state-of-art Donald P. Shiley Center for Science and Technology and soon the new School of Leadership and Education Sciences building, carry on that tradition.

A member of the prestigious Phi Beta Kappa, USD is ranked among the nation’s top 100 universities. USD offers its 7,500 undergraduate, graduate and law students rigorous academic programs in more than 60 fields of study through six academic divisions, including the College of Arts and Sciences and the schools of Business Administration, Leadership and Education Sciences, Law, and Nursing and Health Science. The Joan B. Kroc School of Peace Studies is scheduled to open in the fall of 2007.
BE A PEACEMAKER.

Support the Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice.

You can support the educational, research and peacemaking activities of the Joan B. Kroc Institute by making a secure, tax-deductible, online donation at http://peace.sandiego.edu or mailing the donation form below with a check payable to:

Joan B. Kroc Institute for Peace & Justice
University of San Diego
5998 Alcalá Park, San Diego, CA 92110-2492

__ I would like to join the Institute's Leadership Circle with a gift of $1000 or more and receive invitations to special receptions and events.
__ Enclosed is a check for my gift __ See credit card information below

__ I would like to support the Institute's programs with a gift of:
__ $500 __ $250 __ $100 __ $50 Other ________________
__ Enclosed is a check for my gift __ See credit card information below

Please charge my credit card: __ American Express __Discover __Master Card __Visa

Acct. # ___________________________ Exp. __________________

Signature ____________________________________________

Name ________________________________________________

Address ______________________________________________

City/State/Zip/Country __________________________________

Phone (Day) (_____):_________________ (Eve) (_____):_________________

Email ________________________________________________

__ Please add me to your mailing list for information about Institute programs and upcoming events.