



**LIU CENTRE**  
for the Study of Global Issues

---

6476 NW Marine Drive  
Vancouver, British Columbia  
Canada V6T 1Z2  
Phone (604) 822-1558 Fax (604) 822-6966  
[www.liucentre.ubc.ca](http://www.liucentre.ubc.ca)

**An Encounter with Emma:  
Rethinking Security and State Sovereignty**

By the Honourable Lloyd Axworthy, PC, OM, PhD  
Director and CEO of the Liu Centre for the Study of Global Issues  
University of British Columbia

Presented at the S. D Clark Lecture  
Isabel Bader Theatre  
University of Toronto  
Wednesday, October 17<sup>th</sup>

## Where is Emma Today?

Some might wonder why a de-frocked minister, ex-politician from the West is being given the honour of lecturing in a series dedicated to one of Canada's foremost academic leaders. I was just a little curious myself when the offer was first made. Then, I came across an article written in dedication to Professor Clark, entitled "*Crushing the Power of Finance, the Socialist Prairie Roots Of S.D. Clark*". And herein lies the link. The radical prairie roots are obvious. But "crushing finance," a little more hidden and obscure, until one remembers that for most of my career in government I was on the other end of that equation. I was the Crushee of the Department of Finance. Who better to come and pay homage to a man who had both the wisdom and the guts to advise that Finance, the department I'm speaking of, being crushed.

More important is the debt we all owe for his pioneering work explaining and analysing the distinctiveness of the Canadian reality that has been a source of ideas for generations of scholars and students. To quote from Professors Magill and Michelson: "he has given Canadians more knowledge of the world in which they live and how they might guide it more positively in the future." What could be a greater legacy than that, and better advice and inspiration to someone lecturing in his name? And, what admonition could be timelier, as we stand on a cusp of history with the earth shifting rapidly beneath our feet.

As I speak here tonight, joining you in this exercise of dialogue we know that we are not alone in coming together to look for answers and seek some meaning in events of the past month. In countless arenas around the world, over thousands of kitchen tables, at the doorstep and the lectern, questions are being asked and solutions are being searched. Our First Nations have a name for it. It is called a healing circle, where after an event of grief or tragedy people come together to share their feelings and express their thoughts. This is now literally happening on a global scale. We are partners in this worldwide healing circle, giving contemporary meaning to the example of Professor Clark, to gain knowledge of our world and seek from that knowledge the guidance for a more positive future. And where else is it more appropriate than in the setting of one of our great universities, the home of S.D. Clark and the place where more than anywhere reason and judgement should prevail.

So who is this Emma whose name appears in the title of this talk? First let me say that while my first grandchild born here in Toronto just seven weeks ago is named Emma, and I would be glad to entertain you for the next hour with a full photo essay of her, it may not be quite what the Department of Sociology had in mind when they issued the invitation. I should also give warning to any English major who seeing the name Emma on a poster has wandered in expecting a learned dissertation on Jane Austen, then you might be disappointed (in fact, anyone who came in the hope of learned dissertation on any topic may experience the same sense of disappointment). It's only been a year since I left the world of the thirty-second clip, and I am just now slowly learning how to use sentences and paragraphs.

Emma is a young, thirteen year old girl from the Gulu region of Uganda who I met just over a year ago during an international conference on war-affected children held in my home city of Winnipeg. She had come all that way to tell her story, and for an hour or so in a room in the old Fort Garry hotel she told a harrowing tale of being abducted at the age of nine by a rebel group working out of the Sudan, turned into a sex slave by one of the warlords, giving birth to a child of her own at the age of eleven, seeking escape by becoming a warrior and in turn ordered to kill her own family and members of her tribe.

Now, she resides in a refugee camp, infested by disease, in constant fear of further violation and kidnapping, surrounded by land mines that prohibit any return to her village or any chance to take up a normal life, and abandoned by authorities forgotten and ignored by her government and certainly by the wider international community. Yet, she believed enough to come to an international meeting along with children in similar circumstances, along with NGO's and ministers from like-minded governments to draft a protocol against the use of child soldiers and a plan to help them become full citizens again. A plan that was slated for discussion in New York at a meeting on children's rights the day the planes crashed into the World Trade Center.

Why should she be the subject of a lecture before a discerning university audience? Is her story any different from the countless tragedies that take place on a daily basis in different parts of the globe? Does her story have any relevance to these troubled times of ours in the aftermath of Sept 11<sup>th</sup>? Why should any one in this room care about an isolated young girl in a far away corner of Africa when so very close to home the risk of sudden and violent attack is so real? What's the point in even discussing her problems when we are engaged in a war against terrorists who threaten our very way of life?

To answer let me recall a statement I have always found compelling, that

“the narrative of public life today is increasingly centred on the human story not a soliloquy of the state.” It was a way of saying that increasingly the issue of our time is the security and rights of the individual, not that of the nation state. That individuals are at risk around the globe because of their vulnerability, and because in a highly integrated, interdependent global system, the ability of affording protection through the existing state institutions and practices that have traditionally been the first line of defence is questionable.

In that sense the story of Emma as a war child fits with the stories of innocent passengers at Logan airport boarding a commercial jet that soon becomes a projectile aimed at an office building, or the Afghan child who steps on a land mine, or the Canadian nurse hacked to death in Cheyna as she tries to give medical aid to victims of the civil war or the teen dying on Hastings Street in Vancouver from an overdose of heroin coming from the golden triangle of south east Asia or the teenagers in a Tel Aviv shopping mall snuffed out by a bomb blast triggered by a dispossessed youth from a refugee camp drawn from his abiding sense of hopelessness to become a human carrier.

Each in their own way is a target and a victim of a global system of violence that preys on innocent people, spreading and metastasizing through a worldwide circuitry of transportation, information, finance and organization that enhances the predatory power of the arms trader, the human trafficker, the warlord, the sexual tourist, the religious fanatic, the ruthless political leader, the Osama bin Laden. This is the dark mirror image of the global system that fuels our international trade, commerce, investment, and communication. It is the seamy underside of the global village; that we thought was the harbinger of prosperity and progress but is also the herald of despair, uncertainty and fear.

At stake is the most fundamental of human rights the right: freedom from fear – the right to have basic protection against physical assault that ends life or impairs ability. All else is contingent on having this protection of enjoying a modicum of human security. Yet, it is becoming increasingly at risk because it happens at a global scale, and our answers, our solutions are anchored to a nation state system that finds it increasingly difficult to predict or respond. Consider for a moment some recent statistics about conflict and

violence. Ninety per cent of casualties are now civilian. Of the 170 million people killed by violent means since the Second World War, 130 million were victims of their own government, the very bodies assumed to be their protectors. Reminding us that state terrorism, the violent expulsion or extermination of helpless citizens sponsored in the name of authority is just as virulent, if not more so than non-state extremists that are the present object of a worldwide man hunt.

It is a reality that has always been with human kind, but now the criminal practitioners have at their disposal all the tools of contemporary technology, weaponry, propaganda and the Internet that allows them to infiltrate and transcend borders at their ease. It is a reality that if one could take a satellite infra-ray photo in time sequence it would show a remarkable interplay between those selling drugs, supplying AK-47's, laundering money, teaching terrorist training camps, buying diamonds, operating front organizations, harbouring outlaws and hijacking planes for suicide missions.

September 11<sup>th</sup> was not the beginning of that reality, but it was the awakening for many that it exists. The shock was not only at the calamity and the appalling human tragedy, but that it happened in the most powerful nation, with the biggest military, the most extensive intelligence and the most vigilant system of national security. It brought home the realization that even a super power is susceptible, and that traditional methods of security and protection based on the inviolability of the nation state are not effective in protecting individuals against the purveyors of violence and conflict.

And, as Emma would remind us, it brought us into the world of fear and uncertainty that has been the commonplace of existence for her and so many others like her who have lived with this realization all their lives. We have joined their world, and in that sense we have become more equal and hopefully more aware of our common humanity.

The shock waves coming from the attacks on New York and Washington have shaken the foundations of conventional thought and jolted many in high places from complacency and self-satisfaction. Policies of inwardness and isolation are being discarded for a more active internationalism and engagement. The faith in the marketplace as the repository of all that is good and necessary in decision making is being replaced with a somewhat renewed recognition of the usefulness of public goods, and governments are slowly emerging from their sleepy hollows to once again consider investments in the common security and stability of their citizens. A renewed level of attention and public concern is now overtaking societal self-indulgence and disdain for public discourse. Reality television is not watching an ersatz program on survival or how to be a millionaire, it is watching the nightly news as the bombs drop, and the refugees flee.

So now we see a rallying to arms, the emergence of an international coalition to prosecute the counter measures against the extremist Al Queda, its leader bin Laden and their protectors the Taliban and whoever else may get swept up in the military campaign. Terrorism has become the enemy and around the world, at least in the western world, there is a remarkable mobilization of resources and effort to bring it to bay. Security has become the preoccupation and the focal point of government intent, and not another day goes by without another notice of more guards, controls and surveillance.

It is also bringing about a surprising change in views and political alliances. The Bush administration is now paying its bills at the UN, talking about nation building, and extolling some of the virtues of international cooperation. Russia, even China, has been remarkably collegial on the battle against bin Laden, and we witness the approbation of American troops being stationed in central Asia with nary a snort from Moscow and Beijing.

Border states with Afghanistan are quiescent and in some cases supportive, sharing an active dislike for the disruptive and messianic ways of the Taliban, mindful of the teeter totter they play on if Muslim emotions become aroused and the notion of holy war gains momentum by some military act that goes too far. It is a swirl of shifting currents and eddies that rush us all along so fast that even the most facile commentators can't keep track.

Commentators however are in universal agreement that the world will never be the same, and there is no doubt that we are in the midst of a period of major global restructuring and realignment.

It is just that no one so far as I've seen has a satisfactory blueprint, other than a military response, which as each day goes by, appears problematic, and a resort to more stringent enforcement and intelligence measures that basically treat symptoms not causes. The agenda changes by the day, and all kinds of scripts are being written in haste, or old priorities are being dusted off in the name of security, given new camouflage and covering and go unchallenged or unquestioned because we're in a non-challenging state of mind.

Thus, the rush to proclaim a fortress North America, or the assertion that drilling in the Arctic Reserve is in our security interest. How about missile defence says President Bush, with nary a contending voice? The tabling of legislation this week in the Commons is redolent with the language of protecting national security, not protecting people and stretches the power of the state with its power of preventive arrest.

War does not welcome dissent. Governments are pushed into rush judgements. The curtain of secrecy quickly drops. Alternate views are not generally given much play. As a result we find deeply hidden between all the announcements and statements a narrowing of interests and a constriction on debate. A sense of myopia prevails as we focus through a telescope at the visage of Osama bin Laden and his cohorts and don't see the need for a fundamental shift in the paradigm, the lens through which we view the issue of global security and the consequent need to re-circuit our response into a global network.

This is where it is important to bring Emma back for a replay as her story provides a counterpoint, and may offer the germ of an agenda that broadens the range of choices and presents a different set of options.

Her story reminds us that security risk and threat is a commonplace way of life for most of the world's population. Everyday in countless ways individuals face personal injury and death through a variety of pitfalls and perils: conflict, drugs, land mines, ethnic cleansing, kidnapping and abduction, torture and imprisonment, environmental disaster, famine and flood that spill across political boundaries. The predators come in many forms, and they cross frontiers with impunity. They challenge the capacity of the present nation state system, even its international expression through conventional multilateral cooperation to manage and control.

This has been dimly recognized over the last decade, as witness the shift on international agendas. G-8 communiqués and General Assembly resolutions have been replete with warnings and good intentions. It's just that the action wasn't commensurate with the rhetoric and the painstaking business of constructing adequate, effective international governance was in its infancy, constantly under funded, and contested by powerful interests, and the purveyors of conventional wisdom alike.

In Canada, beginning in the mid-nineties when we, like everyone else, were searching for a strategy, a road map, we began to explore the notion of human security – the responsibility to protect people as our guidepost. This led, as some might remember to a series of interrelated initiatives: the land mine treaty, the International Criminal Court, the protocol on child soldiers, the protocol at the Security Council on the protection of civilians, the redefining of sanctions, international codes of conduct for corporations, laws against child violation, peace-building investments, the commission on humanitarian intervention, the OAS drug strategy, the international communication initiative, the global human rights register.

Our design was to draw these works together as a way towards redefining and restructuring the international governing system towards a global set of standards, rules, institutions, practices that could reduce the incidence of human risk, establish the right of people to enjoy the freedom from fear, and set out the rules governing the actions of governments and private actors in being responsible for their actions.

As important as the measures was the process of making decisions in a inclusive, open and democratic way. This involved working with civil society, the Red Cross, like-minded nations as partners in the development and implementation of treaties and action plans. It meant fostering global Internet and media links among young people to share their concerns and mobilize action. It meant opening up our own government's policy process and encouraging our academics, students and civil groups to undertake their own direct international ventures such as the opening to North Korea through our policy of public diplomacy. It meant experimenting with new trans-border institutions like the Arctic Council and the North American Trilateral Committee. In effect, we were trying to grow a political system that engaged and involved a variety of different players in the design and delivery of an international system that went beyond and above the standard arrangements on inter-state relations and agreement.

We were, as I look back on it now with a certain degree of detachment, involved in global community building, the key word being community. Let's stop for just a moment to consider that word community. The Webster's defines it as people with common interests, an interacting population of various kinds of individuals. Doesn't that just about describe where we are as members of the global village.

If you go back to the literature of community organizing by Saul Alinsky and others then community takes on the further meaning "of a place where people prevail", leading as it did in the 60's to the rallying cry for empowerment of people, giving them the power to build their own community. Doesn't that tell us something about the need to elevate the empowerment of people to the international plane so that they can be involved in the shaping of decisions that shape them?

If you go into the vast body of scholarship in sociology on community then you find general agreement that community only succeeds when there is an active organizational life between the individual and government

providing pluralism of groups and views, serving as an vehicle for expression and outlet of concerns and interests. S.D. Clark himself in his work on the prairie frontier described the emergence of social movements that crystallized and identified the vague feelings of frontier people and gave them clearly defined goals and political vehicles that could provide solutions to their needs.

Contemporary fashion is to talk of social capital, agreement across the intellectual spectrum by conservatives and liberals alike that the interaction among various associations, anchored by key community institutions, is the basis for stability, prosperity, and indeed security.

The trick is how to translate this to the global level and create a system that gives voice to common concerns, shares interest, empowers people and engenders the development of organizations and groupings that allow "people to prevail?" That is why Emma came all the way to Winnipeg. She believed that by being there, associating with others with similar concerns, having a chance to tell her story, mixing and matching with foreign ministers and UN officials that there just might be a chance to change her life and that of her one year old child. Compare that to the hopelessness and sense of dispossession that impels a young man to strap a bomb to his belt or coldly sacrifice himself and hundreds of other innocent people in a hijacked airplane.

Emma was placing her faith in a process that involved her in a combined community effort, drawing on a multitude of talents and resources to institute a world of law and fairness, based on a form of global governance. She was stepping like Alice into a different world, not of wonder but of global democracy rooted in a notion of an international community, framed through the development of a human infrastructure. This is not suggesting that the state is threatened, or is withering away, but rather that state sovereignty is having to be reconstructed in a way which accommodates the multiplicity of political, economic and social dynamics which do not respect borders. The challenge is in reconstructing a statehood that is best able to deliver social goods, security, prosperity, and freedom in the context of a global community with its myriad of cross border associations, interests and ideas. For this we need institutions that encompass a higher degree of integration, and a wider degree of public involvement than presently encompassed in the accepted notion of multilateralism.

There is a struggle to make a transition from the system that prevails, and in fact predominates, to one that has more consonance and better fits the emerging reality of our common fate and future. There is plenty of opposition. Many leaders of powerful governments don't like this notion, especially the most powerful ones who see this as a dilution of their special position and status. Many poor, developing countries are nervous, seeing this as a threat to their sovereignty, and sometimes to their villainy. But, it is happening, inexorably and with reason even with the brush backs and rear guard action of the rear view thinkers. It is the task of institutions such as this with all the intellectual firepower that is here to replicate, in effect the mission of S.D. Clark and others of his generation to define community, but at the global level.

But, what does this have to do with today? Where does this fit with the hard-nosed, immediate battle against terrorism? It has a great deal to do with what is happening today because it may just supply the answers missing in the present military-based approach.

This is where Canada can make a difference. I think you know my belief that we have the ability and the position to make a difference. That we should play the role of a tipping agent, using our unique strengths as a people to open the box, be a catalyst for change, set trends.

All that is ever needed is political will and leadership. In my view it might just help define a distinctive role for Canada to become the voice for an international community strategy and an activist in making it happen. Let us forget the fortress mentality, the implied message that we are dividing the world into for and against, good and bad, white hats and black hats, hawks and doves and start using the language of collective action and involvement. Let's start with the enlistment of civil society in both the debate and the decisions – more openness not less. And let's start reaching out to build bridges to those who feel on the sidelines. Let's bring the Emma's of the world into the fold by dealing with their security concerns.

Specifically this is a role Canada can play in setting an agenda for the anti-terrorist coalition, not only in meeting immediate issues, but using this period of fluidity and change to help redefine the notion of statehood in a global community way. Here are some suggestions:

1. Let's make sure that the new coalition is not a replica of old cold war alliance models where there is a hub and a spoke. If indeed we are all in this together, then we must insist that not all strategy and decisions are made in Washington and conveyed to those on the periphery. This should begin with a meeting of the key participants in the military effort to ascertain its results in actually severing the terrorist network, its impact on civilians, and its exit strategy. How long and for what purpose will it continue? Are reports of the use of cluster bombs reliable, including the dispersal of anti-personnel land mines, in direct contradiction of the Ottawa Treaty? If so, can we remain as a complicit partner in the violation of a treaty that we worked so hard to achieve? If we are to be partners then we need to assert that partners help decide.

2. Help organize, through the UN, a major, multifaceted humanitarian campaign involving substantial commitment of resources and security. The present efforts are minimal. Dropping food packages into mine fields, or asking kids to hold bake sales simply shows that this is for show not for effect. There has to be a coordinated mobilization of the international community behind food, water, sanitation, housing, security, and disease prevention. So far no one has stepped forward to take the lead, and with winter on the way a disaster of epic proportions looms. If this occurs all the troops and bombs presently being deployed will be for naught in battling terrorism, compared to the anger and resentment, fertile breeding grounds for terrorist recruits that will emerge.

Similarly, land mines corrupt the Afghan landscape, preventing any economic development and must be removed. That could be embarrassing if they have US markers on them.

3. Offer the experience we have gained in various peace-building activities sponsored over the past years. Begin by pointing out that replacing one bad regime with another is doomed to history repeating itself. Didn't Osama bin Laden once work with the CIA against the Russians? It amazes me that in the so-called nation building now being discussed it is grounded on the premise that you can create instant government by importing a group of outside, exiled warriors and ex-kings, and totally ignore the people of Afghanistan who presently are there who have a rudimentary civil network. Or not develop a partnership with aid agencies who really know what's going on better than the experts at CNN to plan a program of re-building using indigenous structures of support.

Moreover in the current rush to find allies, coalition members must think very carefully about the implications of arming non-state actors for short-term gain. Western governments have begun clandestine arm shipments to the Northern Alliance whose human rights record is barely indistinguishable from the



Taliban, saying that the enemy of my enemy is my friend. What is the consideration, and implication of introducing even more weapons into a country already awash in weaponry?

4. Which takes us to the larger issue of whether there is any hope for a country like Afghanistan and many, many others as long as there is an unfettered trade in small arms. The recent UN Conference failed to reach an agreement on restricting transfers of weapons to non-state actors, mainly because of opposition by major suppliers like the United States and Russia. If the 47 post cold war conflicts are any lesson, then any hope of stability in Afghanistan after the bombing is illusory without a mandatory control on proliferation. Where is Canada's voice on that crucial element in peace building? Shouldn't the agenda of the new coalition include a renewed commitment to reach international agreement of a treaty limiting the sale and export of the small arms weaponry, knowing as we do the close connection this has to terrorist activity and use?

5. So too, we should be paying attention to the wise words of Nobel laureate Kofi Annan, speaking at the UN last week on the subject of terrorism (hard to find his words because most Canadian media covered the speech of Rudy Giuliani instead). He said that while the world was unable to prevent the September 11<sup>th</sup> attacks, there is much we can do to help prevent future acts carried out with weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear, biological and chemical which if used would have killed not thousands but millions. He called for a strengthening of norms against their use and proliferation, including passage and enactment of key treaties, especially those outlawing chemical and biological weapons and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty. Now, anyone following this crucial sector of security will know that recently there has been a substantial retreat from support for such measures and great reluctance of great powers to follow up on their undertakings. As people cower at the reports of the anthrax scare, few bother to ask why the international agreements covering these matters lie fallow or in the case of the chemical weapons treaty rejected by the United States. Shouldn't we be raising this as a crucial priority if we are indeed serious about terrorist threats, and getting our coalition partners to sign on?

6. The same holds true in perhaps the most important piece of architecture needed to offset the security hazards to humans: the construction of a well functioning international criminal legal system. The Security Council, in a little acknowledged resolution took a major step, in using its Article 7 authority to require member nations to implement a series of far reaching measures. This is a very important precedent that can and should be built upon in setting out standards for other forms of international crime. It is still premised, however, on the notion of individual state response. I don't believe that is good enough. There needs to be a much stronger transnational capacity to deal with crime, including terrorism, incorporating the principles of anchor institutions that I previously referred to. In this respect, the International Criminal Court is an institution that has come along at the right time in history.

The Court is the first new global body of this new century, and at its heart is the holding of individuals, not states, accountable for crimes of genocide and against humanity, including terrorism. From its core there is a spin off of a number of far reaching requirements in establishing an effective international legal order. While it itself is a Court of last resort, it carries the responsibility for every nation to be an extension of the international rule of law and set into their criminal law and police functions the need to apprehend and prosecute war criminals. Out of this requirement can easily grow the basis for much better functioning intelligence gathering, surveillance, police cooperation, and harmonization of judicial procedures. As the recent work of the Princeton Project attests that is already beginning to happen.

Its utility as a deterrent and as a way of affecting the behaviour of international criminals can also be demonstrated. The indictment of Milosevic by Louise Arbour as prosecutor for the Hague Tribunal was a

crucial element in ending the conflict in Kosovo and a necessary element in opening the way for the emergence of responsible democratic government in Serbia. Think for a moment what it would mean for all those who see Osama bin Laden as a hero to have him publicly tried in an international court as a war criminal, and have him publicly exposed for heinous crimes against innocent people. This is not some pipe dream, some fuzzy liberal concoction as portrayed by editorialists for the National Post. This is a way of strongly curtailing the acts of international criminals, and doing it in a way that upholds and enhances the rule of law which is the proper antidote to those who try to wreak havoc and chaos on our international system.

It is also close to being a reality. Forty-two nations have ratified out of a needed sixty. The Preparatory Commission under Ambassador Phillippe Kirsch of Canada is now working on organizational protocols and plans. The court could be in place next year, ready for the trial of international terrorists. But, catch this. Last week the Bush government endorsed a Bill in the US senate introduced by that great troglodyte Jesse Helms that would withhold foreign and military aid to any country that would be so bold as to ratify the statute on the International Criminal Court – not very convincing evidence of a commitment to the international rule of law.

This would not happen if other nations including our own would make the case for the court and develop it as a critical part of any strategy of anti-terrorism.

7. There are a number of other ways in which the present security concerns can be linked up with related global wide issues to create a synergy of action and initiative. Meeting climate change concerns through conservation and alternate fuels lessens dependence on Middle East oil, reducing the geo-political pressures to have a military presence in the region, one of the irritants that fundamentalists feed upon. The atmosphere of cooperation could propel us toward a new round of trade talks that would give southern countries a serious say in the distribution of benefits, for a change. The reacquired taste for public spending might just spill over from security and military measures to a focus on foreign aid and public infrastructure at the global level. The awakened recognition of the corporate private sector in the question of international risk should logically lead to a more active interest in socially responsible investment and stronger codes of conduct. Their preoccupation with North American perimeter defence could be transformed into a serious discussion on how to properly manage continental integration in a way that maintains the integrity of the component parts. The list could go on.

Making this happen is not automatic. Right now we are following a narrow pathway, stuck in intellectual ruts, not looking at the broader landscape – perhaps to be expected perhaps so soon after a tragedy. But not a course we should continue for long. The world, especially Emma's world is looking for new guideposts, more skilful navigation.

This is the place where that wider perspective, that spirit of exploration should begin. Policy makers are too occupied, media makers too captive to immediate events, NGO's not possessing the full complement of analytical tools, business caught by the bottom line. So where else but in the academy, the universities can the new maps be drawn. Not in splendid isolation from reality, but in the full mix of engagement with all sectors of society, reaching out to the best minds and energies of our students, and arching over to our counterparts in other parts of the world.

There is strong appetite for knowledge of our world in all its complexity. There is a public yearning for understanding of the situation we are in. There is a public hunger to find solutions that make sense of the

contradictions and confrontations we face. The demand for a security policy with human, individual protection as its priority has never been greater, nor the possibility of major reform to bring about a functioning international community to achieve it more likely.

Are Canadians in the thinking chambers of this country up to meeting that challenge, taking on the work, unpopular as it might be, to charting a course that breaks new ground in global community building? That I think is an appropriate question to ask in a lecture honouring S.D Clark who put his scholarship to work in a different time when the formation of a Canadian community was at stake.

Last Saturday's Globe and Mail carried a powerful piece by John Le Carre saying that the terrorists have already won because we are reacting out of fear, doing things that will change our ways for the worst. It had resonance with a lot of people and as we watch events unfold, it appears that he might be right.

There is a choice, however. We can give in to events, or we can try to change them. We all agree that September 11<sup>th</sup> ushered in a different world. The question is will it be a better world? That is what stands in the balance as we gather here tonight. We have choices to make.

And Emma, what about her? Where does she stand in all this turmoil? On the week that the planes struck the World Trade Center and the Pentagon, a team of people from my centre at UBC were making ready to go to the Gulu region in Uganda to work with children in that region, helping them to organize a local program for the rehabilitation of child soldiers, to work with the Canadian NGO Canadian Physicians for Aid and Relief on a land mine awareness program and to document the impact that war has on youngsters as a way of buttressing international efforts to deal with the problem.

The mission was postponed, for obvious reasons, but is scheduled for resumption next January. It is a sign to Emma that her trip was not in vain, and that there is a community that cares. She made an extraordinary effort to make the right choice and not give up on the world. We can do no less.