New Security Issues in a Globalized World*

LLOYD AXWORTHY
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Canada

In the first paper, the Canadian Foreign Minister, the Honorable Lloyd Axworthy, outlines a proposal to expand the focus of the foreign policy activity of governments beyond the traditional emphasis on a "hard" security agenda to tackle issues of immediate concern to individuals. He highlights, in particular, the campaign to ban anti-personnel mines; efforts to combat international drug smuggling; and the continuing struggle against human rights abuses. In each of these representative areas, the interests of individuals on the streets of North American cities and in former combat zones in Asia and Africa are of foremost concern. Canada will continue to invite other countries to join in this new approach to the human security challenges of our changing times.

In the second article, Mr. Axworthy expands on the campaign to ban anti-personnel land mines, a campaign which has come to be called the Ottawa Process. Mr. Axworthy believes this process and its success demonstrates the ability of the international community to cope with changes and trends which have emerged since the fall of the Berlin Wall trends which are a different breed of challenge than those to which we had become accustomed for so many years after the Second World War. He calls for a renewed focus on humanitarian standards; new forms of partnership at the international level; the maximum use of "soft power," or the non-military tools of diplomacy; and a focus on the security of the individual in an unpredictable and often hostile international environment.

* Direct all correspondence to Lloyd Axworthy, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 125 Sussex Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, K1A 0G2, Canada.

Canada-Korea Security Cooperation: New Era, New Opportunities^{*}

I am honored to have this opportunity to outline some recent directions in Canadian foreign policy, particularly in the area of human security, and to highlight the many points of convergence I see between the international approaches taken by the Republic of Korea and by Canada.

Starting with the fall of the Berlin Wall, a series of unparalleled events have reshaped the international landscape into something we could scarcely have imagined a decade ago. Who would have imagined then that it would take only a few years for the Iron Curtain that had divided Europe for so long to shatter completely? That Nelson Mandela would become President of South Africa? That Kim Dae-jung would become President of the Republic of Korea?

The election of President Kim, a man known for his legendary courage and his deep commitment to human rights and democracy, is a symbol of the wave of democracy that has swept the globe in the last decade. Through his far-sighted "sunshine policy" towards North Korea, President Kim is tackling one of the last remnants of Cold War tensions. He is preparing Korea for a new era of peace and reconciliation as the Republic celebrates its fiftieth anniversary. Canada shares his hope that the international wave of democracy and respect for human rights will at last reach North Korea's shores. Our policy of modest dialogue and humanitarian assistance to the DPRK (Democratic People's Republic of Korea) is directed towards that end. I should add that in keeping with the policy, the Canadian government recently announced a contribution of C\$5 million in additional food aid to famine victims in North Korea.

Historic change on this sort of scale can never, of course, bring only good. As international borders become more porous, Foreign Ministers find themselves increasingly grappling with issues that directly affect the daily lives of individuals: international crime, environmental degradation, human rights abuses, and bitter internal conflicts. Most recently the Asian financial crisis has brought home the realities of the new global economy.

In my meetings in July with President Kim and Foreign Minister Park Chun Soo, I assured them of Canada's continued willingness to assist Korea through these difficult times and to support Korean efforts towards economic reform. The rich bilateral relationship we enjoy is built on a strong commitment to mutual prosperity for both our peoples. Canada was prompt in supporting Korea through its recent economic troubles with

^{*} This speech was given at the Seoul Forum on July 21, 1998, at the Grand Hyatt Hotel in Seoul.

tangible financial assistance and continued open markets. We remain committed to a growing political and economic relationship.

It is particularly important that the international community address the severe human and social impact of the Asian financial crisis. At the last meeting of APEC foreign ministers, we agreed on the need to look at questions of social adjustment and human resources in the region. As a former Minister of Human Resources Development, these are issues I have a particular interest in. Now, with the financial crisis affecting the daily lives of millions of ordinary people, it is all the more urgent for us to work together to ensure that problems in financial markets do not result in further social unrest and human hardship. Canada is supporting work within the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, as well as within our own bilateral programs, on this aspect of the crisis.

Be it financial crisis or the effects of environmental pollution, these problems are felt acutely at a local level, but tackling them effectively requires cooperation at the regional, and even the global, level. It also requires new international approaches and, in some cases, new institutions. After all, the traditional structures of international diplomacy were not formulated to deal with problems that largely ignore state boundaries.

In light of these changes, Canada's foreign policy has changed also. I have made "human security" a major new focus: that is, the view that security goals should be primarily formulated, and achieved, in terms of human, not state, needs. When we took a lead in the campaign to ban anti-personnel mines, for example, our aim was to tackle the humanitarian crisis arising from the threat to millions of individuals posed by these weapons. Now we are working to improve human security in a range of other areas, in cooperation with like-minded governments.

This means tackling some of the human issues often overlooked by traditional approaches to international security: issues like the fate of children in armed conflict or forced into exploitative forms of labor; like the battle against transnational organized crime; like the need for an International Criminal Court. Along with other like-minded states, such as Korea, we want to work together to change the foreign policy equation. The old approaches to international security simply will not solve problems of the sort I have listed. Instead, we want to develop a new approach, by building international "coalitions of the willing" around specific shared goals and values.

Let me outline in a little more detail how I see this new form of diplomacy working in three areas: the campaign to ban anti-personnel mines, the battle against international drug smuggling, and countering human rights abuses.

The global convention banning anti-personnel mines is one of the very few areas on the human security agenda where Canada and Korea do not see eye to eye. I am sensitive to the special situation of Korea in this regard, but I would like nonetheless to outline Canada's thinking on the landmines ban, and the areas where I believe we can work together despite our different views.

The campaign to ban landmines was a response to the human security crisis that these weapons have caused. Its goal was to improve—or save—the lives of the many civilians threatened by these cheap, widespread killers. Those supporting the campaign do not

deny that, in some circumstances, anti-personnel mines have a certain military utility. But we believe that this utility is far outweighed by the thousands of civilian lives and acres of land around the world that these weapons take year after year, long after the war in which they were deployed is officially over. Moreover, in the course of the campaign, it became clear that the only way to end this mass destruction in slow motion was through a total ban on anti-personnel mines.

Since the signature of the convention banning anti-personnel mines in December, 1997, momentum towards a global ban has continued. To date, 129 countries have signed the Ottawa Convention and 36 have ratified it.¹ We hope to reach our goal of 40 ratifications this fall, which is the minimum number of ratification required to transform the convention into international law.

We continue to hope that the Republic of Korea will be able to sign the convention. But at the same time, we understand Korea's need to ensure deterrent capabilities, given the volatile nature of the situation on the Korean Peninsula. As one of the countries that fought beside South Korea, Canada remains committed to a stable and secure Republic of Korea. We also applaud the measures taken to date to respond to the humanitarian concerns raised by anti-personnel mines. By declaring an indefinite export ban, and by placing all landmines within the well-defined and heavily guarded demilitarized zone, ROK has ensured that innocent civilians are not put at risk.

Nonetheless, the international community has created through the Ottawa Convention a new norm that all states, even those with difficult security environments, must move towards. Military forces around the world are adapting to the new reality that anti-personnel mines are no longer an acceptable weapon of war. Most recently, the United States has committed itself to finding alternatives to the anti-personnel mines it uses, and to signing the convention by 2006. We are convinced that the Republic of Korea will eventually be able to renounce anti-personnel mines without compromising the effectiveness of defense, particularly given that the ban does not apply to mines triggered by tanks or other heavy vehicles.

The process leading to the signature of the convention was characterized by its openness and its inclusiveness. It was open to all, hostage to none. In that same spirit, we are ready to cooperate on mine action – de-mining and assistance to survivors with – all willing partners, whether they have signed the convention or not. Canada has pledged \$100 million over five years toward meeting the goals of the convention, and we are committed to ensuring that there is a coordinated international effort in mine action. I salute the contributions that Korea has made to the UN mine action funds to date. I hope that we will be able to work together in the future in this area.

Some of the funds Canada is putting towards mine action will be used to support research on technology for humanitarian de-mining. We are also looking at acceptable and more humane alternatives to anti-personnel mines an aspect that might be of particular interest to Korea. Recently, Canada announced the establishment of a new Center for Mine-Action Technologies based at our Defense Research Establishment in Suffield.

¹ As of September, 1998.

Alberta. It will undertake research on improved methods of mine-clearance and more humane alternatives to anti-personnel mines.

For most of our citizens, thankfully, anti-personnel mines are only a distant threat. But other threats to human security come much closer to home. The international trade in illegal drugs and other illicit substances, for example, affects both our countries. This is truly the dark side of globalization—when teenagers in Vancouver are overdosing on heroin from Burma that has transited through a third country, with the profits laundered through a fourth.

This is an area where, in my view, regional cooperation in building innovative approaches can be extremely effective. Regional approaches allow us to tackle all stages of the problem in an integrated way, from the supply end through the demand end of the equation. Korea has been at the forefront of regional cooperation on drugs, both under UN auspices and through regular liaison meetings of international anti-drug officials. Korea and Canada co-funded a drug interdiction project in the Amazon region as part of a regional anti-drug strategy for the Americas.

Two years ago, at my request, the issue was added to the agenda for discussions between Foreign Ministers from ASEAN countries and their dialogue partners. At our most recent meetings in Manila in July, we held fruitful discussions on this issue, which resulted in a number of practical proposals. Much remains to be done of course, but by establishing regular regional dialogues, I believe we have taken an important step in the right direction.

If I were to point to one aspect of human security where there is greatest scope for cooperation between Korea and Canada, it would be human rights. I have already mentioned our great respect for President Kim and for the important steps he has taken to further the cause of human rights both at home and internationally. We share with him the view that this is equally important both as an end in itself and as a necessary condition for sustainable economic development. Long-term economic and social growth requires solid policies and institutions, built on a foundation of democracy, rights and justice.

I see growing opportunities for us to work together, starting from this shared viewpoint, to build the sort of new institutions and partnerships required to protect human security and human rights in a changing world. In this context, I applaud President Kim's announcement of plans to enact human rights law in Korea and establish a national human rights commission. Canada will be following closely these important developments.

Just before visiting Korea, I was in Rome, where lengthy negotiations to establish an International Criminal Court ended in success. I am very pleased at the outcome of the negotiations in Rome, which approved the creation of an independent and effective Court. This body will act as a court of last resort, to ensure that those who commit the worst human rights abuses—genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity—no longer do so with impunity. Canada and Korea, as members of the like-minded group, worked long and hard together to ensure that this body is a court worth having. We can be proud that we have played a part in the founding of a key new international institu-

tion, and that in the process, we have developed creative tools that will serve us well as we tackle other challenges ahead.

The establishment of the International Criminal Court and the signature of the convention banning anti-personnel mines are clear signs that we can make progress in tackling human security problems if we are willing to be bold, and to undertake a new style of diplomacy. Now the international community is turning its attention to other pressing human security problems as well, as attested by recent international conferences on child sexual exploitation, on the illicit drug trade, and on small arms and light weapons.

This is not to say that the old problems of "hard security" have disappeared. You have only to look north to the demilitarized zone, or west to where India and Pakistan have been testing nuclear devices, to recognize this. The latter is an issue of grave concern to both our countries. India's actions have undermined thirty years of successful management of the nuclear non-proliferation regime, and constitute a serious threat to international and regional security. We cannot allow this to be the start of a new arms race in Asia.

Korea and Canada have an excellent track record in cooperation on the more traditional security agenda, one that I hope to see continued. We share the same goals and approach to peacekeeping, and, in fact, a Korean was the first foreigner on the staff of the L.B. Pearson Peacekeeping Centre. We are very pleased to see a Korean filling the post of UN Undersecretary-General for peacekeeping. Since the early 1990's, we have expanded our activities to promote regional security, most recently through the arms control workshop held jointly last month by Canada and the Korean Institute of Defense Analysis.

Thus, the "hard" security agenda remains a serious concern for us, but in addition, not in exclusion of, the requirements of the humanitarian agenda. Canada's desire for an improved security situation on the Korean Peninsula, for example, is matched by our concerns about the deplorable human rights situation in the DPRK. The DPRK government's unacceptable public denunciations of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights only heighten these concerns.

No doubt there will be further difficulties ahead. But I am confident that we can move beyond them. We can do so by applying the positive lessons we have learned so far:

- The importance of focusing on human needs in guaranteeing international peace and security;
- The need for a transparent approach that brings states and civil society in open dialogue;
- The importance of new coalitions, be they regional or of like-minded states; and
- The willingness to build strong new norms and institutions where needed.

These are, in my view, key elements of a new diplomacy that addresses the human security challenges of our changing times. A new diplomacy that offers, I believe, even greater possibilities than before for cooperation between Korea and Canada on the international scene. The establishment of the International Criminal Court is only the first example of what we, in partnership with one another and with other like-minded countries, can achieve as we move towards the new millennium.

The Landmines Campaign in Context*

THE OTTAWA PROCESS

The campaign to ban anti-personnel landmines had its roots in a growing awareness of the true nature of these weapons and their effects. Aid workers, medical personnel, members of non-governmental organizations and others saw firsthand the carnage that anti-personnel mines were causing: some 26,000 people killed or injured every year, most of them civilians. They saw that anti-personnel mines were killing and wounding decades after the conflicts in which they were laid were over. They saw entire communities terrorized and impoverished, and large tracts of land rendered useless. And they saw a problem that was not going to go away, with perhaps as many as 100 million landmines deployed in 70 countries, mainly in the developing world. Faced with a humanitarian crisis on this scale, they began to speak out, and to mobilize public opinion.

As this civil society campaign took off in the early 1990's it focused increasingly on a total ban on anti-personnel mines as the only effective solution. Partial bans or restrictions on these small, cheap and relatively simple weapons would be too hard to enforce effectively. Moreover, many respected military officers agree that anti-personnel mines are not essential to military operations, and are frequently mis-used. They argue that these weapons should be banned because their humanitarian consequences far outweigh their limited military value.

What has come to be known as the Ottawa Process grew out of two related strands: this civil society campaign, and efforts by some governments to raise the profile of the landmines issue in the context of a review of the Convention on certain Conventional Weapons (CCW). These two strands joined in 1996 at the first of a series of informal meetings in the margins of the CCW review between governments and NGO's (non-government organizations) supportive of a ban on landmines.

In December 1996, Canada hosted a formal meeting of 50 pro-ban governments, 24 observer governments and numerous non-governmental representatives. At the end of that conference, I challenged the global community to return to Ottawa by the end of 1997 to sign a convention banning landmines outright. The Ottawa Process was launched, and a period of intense work began.

A core group of committed countries Austria, Belgium, Canada, Germany, Ireland, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, the Philippines, South Africa and Switzerland - started a process that culminated in the drafting and negotiation of the convention. As other

* The speech was given at the Foreign Policy Association in New York, New York, on June 19, 1998.

countries joined, momentum built. The decision of Britain and France, following general elections in both those countries, to join the ban campaign provided an invaluable boost to the process. In parallel with this process, we worked with non-governmental bodies to support a high-profile campaign to build grassroots support for the convention.

The result: in December, 1997, 123 countries signed a convention to eliminate the use, production, stockpiling, and transfer of anti-personnel mines, more signatories than even the most optimistic supporters had envisaged at the start of the process. Since that time another six countries have signed, bringing the total to date to 129 signatories.¹ The ban represented a new norm in international disarmament. It was a major, though by no means final, step towards ending the humanitarian crisis caused by these weapons of slow-motion mass destruction. And it was backed up by commitments of close to half a billion dollars U.S. from the international community for the destruction of stockpiles, de-mining, and assistance to victims.

The Ottawa Process was exceptional on a number of fronts. A unique coalition of governments, civil society, and international groups worked closely together to make the convention a reality. The convention broke records for the speed with which it was developed and negotiated, as well as for the number of signatories, and is now well on its way to breaking more records for speed of entry into force. As of early September, 36 signatories had ratified the convention. The 40 ratifications required for entry-into-force will almost certainly be reached by early fall, 1998. Perhaps most importantly, this Convention was the first international disarmament agreement to ban a weapon in widespread, active use around the world.

THE NEXT PHASE: MAKING THE BAN REAL

In Canada and elsewhere, attention is now focused on the next phase: ratification, universalization, and full implementation of the Convention. A central element of implementation is mine action. There is an urgent need to clear land of mines so that people can return to their homes and their livelihood. We must address the crucial long-term issue of ensuring the rehabilitation of mine victims and their reintegration including social and economic into their societies and into productive, meaningful lives.

Canada has allocated \$100 million over the next five years to these ends. It will fund projects such as a new Centre for Mine-Action Technologies based at our Defense Research Establishment in Suffield, Alberta. The Centre will undertake research on improved methods of mine-clearance and more humane alternatives to anti-personnel mines.

Within the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade alone, we will devote over \$6 million this year to supporting ratification and universalization, and to building the United Nations' capacity to co-ordinate global mine action. In cooperation with the Canadian military, we will use some of these funds to help others destroy stock-

¹ As of July 23, 1998.

piles of anti-personnel mines. We will help our partners within civil society to develop their capacities in supporting and monitoring implementation. Canada will also be contributing to the massive task of clearing the millions of mines in the ground in Mozambique, Angola, Central America, Cambodia, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. As one of our first mine action projects, the Canadian International Development Agency will put \$10.5 million over three years into a program to strengthen mine clearance efforts in Mozambique.

As we work to expand support for the ban, the United States' announcement that it will sign the Ottawa Convention by 2006 was welcome news. It is a clear sign of the legitimacy and credibility, which the Convention has acquired. I do, however, have reservations about the major condition that the US government has placed on signing the Convention: that of finding alternatives to anti-personnel mines. This is disturbing because it continues to cast the problem as a military one, rather than the humanitarian issue that it is. If this is truly what is standing in the way of the United States joining the Convention, I hope that it will commit serious energy and resources to finding those alternatives, the same kind of energy that it has committed to humanitarian de-mining.

The United States says that it cannot sign the Ottawa Convention at present because of its "unique responsibilities." I would submit that part of America's global responsibility is to recognize that the world has changed, and that the old ways of doing business no longer hold. Other countries have also argued that their special circumstances make it hard for them to sign the convention. Whatever the difficulties of their individual security environments, they have the responsibility to move towards the new international norm established by the Ottawa Convention.

THE BROADER CONTEXT

The success of the Ottawa Process is in itself a clear indicator of this change. Exceptional as it is, the Ottawa Process did not spring out of nowhere. It emerged from the seismic shifts that have realigned the tectonic plates of world affairs since the fall of the Berlin Wall. It is, I believe, only the first example of an emerging international response to these changes and the longer-term trends that underlie them. After an initial period of paralysis in the face of the "new world disorder," the international community is starting to develop new tools and new ways of doing business.

Broadly speaking, I see four trends, and four responses to them, that gave birth to the Ottawa Process. The four trends are as follows:

- First, a change in the nature of the conflict, with bitter internal wars that primarily target civilian populations taking over from traditional wars between states as the greater source of global instability;
- Second, increasingly permeable international borders, through which people, information, goods, natural resources and money pass for good or for bad;
- Third, with globalization and the information technology revolution, the emergence of a global

- commons – the Internet equivalent of Marshall McLuhan's global village; and
- Fourth, a diffusion of international power at the level of both state and non-state actors, which has led to a democratization of foreign policy. This is due in part to the growing importance of what the American theorist Joseph Nye termed "soft power."

RESPONSES TO INTERNATIONAL TRENDS

These trends have already been described extensively by observers of international affairs, so I will not belabor them here. I would like to spend a little more time, however, outlining four important aspects of the emerging international response to them. These four aspects are:

- An approach centered on human security;
- A renewed focus on humanitarian standards;
- New forms of partnership; and
- Maximum use of "soft power" through a combination of old and new tools of diplomacy.

Foreign Ministers used to be concerned above all with the security and integrity of the state. Increasingly, however, as borders become porous and the Cold War standoff is replaced by a multitude of intra-state conflicts, international decision-makers deal with issues that directly affect people's daily lives. Whether the focus is international crime, transboundary pollution or human rights abuses, our basic unit of analysis and concern has shrunk from the state to the community, and even to the individual. It is in response to these developments that a "human security" approach has emerged, one which formulates security goals primarily in terms of human, rather than state, needs.

In this context, international humanitarian standards and humanitarian laws take on a new importance. As internal conflicts increasingly target civilians, the old standards regarding use of certain classes of arms and treatment of individuals in times of war no longer provide sufficient protection.

The landmines campaign shows how, by looking at a problem through a human security lens, we can apply the basic principles of humanitarian law in a new area to address a severe humanitarian crisis. The campaign started from the premise that the lives and limbs of millions of civilians take precedence over military and national security interests. On this basis, we were able to establish a new norm in international disarmament: an outright ban on landmines, on the grounds that risk of severe harm to civilians was inherent of this class of weapon.

If we focus the human security lens on other areas such as conflict prevention, environmental protection, or human rights, the inadequacy of existing tools of international diplomacy becomes clear. In Rwanda and in Bosnia, for example, the international community was unable to respond effectively to complex internal conflicts. Based on the lessons learned from these failures, it is working to develop new approaches, so far with mixed results.

One positive outcome has been the development through creative ad-hoc means of new cooperative approaches to human security problems. Perhaps the most striking aspect of the Ottawa Process was the unusual and successful partnership forged by governments, international organizations, and civil society.

Dialogue, lobbying, and outreach between governments and civil society on international issues are not new. What was unusual about the Ottawa Process was that governments and civil society worked directly together as members of a team, with remarkable success. The process was open to all NGOs, governments, the Red Cross, even individuals and hostage to none. The only requirement to join was the acceptance of a single, unshakable bottom line: that the only way to deal with landmines effectively was to ban them outright.

A good deal of attention has been paid to the non-governmental members of the coalition. Deservedly so, since they played a crucial role, recognized by the awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize to the International Campaign to Ban Landmines (ICBL) and its coordinator, Jody Williams. But governments had an equally important, if sometimes less visible, role to play. The real key to success was in how the players joined forces to work together.

As the Ottawa Process moves into its second phase, this remarkable "coalition of the willing" continues to develop and thrive. Donor nations are working to coordinate demining and victim assistance efforts, and to create synergies with the military, with NGOs, and with local populations on an unprecedented scale. This work may have significant long-term impact in terms of improving donor coordination in development assistance.

It is through implementation that the special nature of the landmines Convention becomes apparent. It is much more than a simple treaty to control or ban a weapon. Instead, it provides a detailed, unambiguous framework for a full range of integrated mine action. Thus, the money pledged to support implementation is not simply increased funding to support "business as usual." Every time we take on an initiative, we first ask ourselves: does this help us implement the Convention? Does it fit into our framework for coordinated universal action that transcends artificial barriers between humanitarian, development, and disarmament goals?

It is clear that we must mobilize more resources for mine actions, but in doing so we must assure our taxpayers and supporters that this will be money well spent. This requires that we rapidly learn and apply the lessons of the past five years of mine action. One of the strengths of the Ottawa Process was its ability to link the local to the global. As we work to ensure that the Convention becomes a real engine for change in the lives of those affected by landmines, we cannot lose sight of the tremendous moral, political, and financial support that the grassroots of this movement can provide to our collective efforts.

The landmines coalition was certainly unusual, but why was it so successful? In large part, I believe, it was successful because it combined old-style diplomacy with high-tech advocacy to make maximum use of its soft power resources.

The governments within the core group of the coalition did not include the larger powers, but respected countries from across the range of the traditional hard-power

"pecking order." In the past, these countries would have been limited by the rigidities of Cold War alliances and divisions to acting as honest brokers. In the current more fluid international situation, however, the core group could use its skills in communicating, negotiating, mobilizing opinion, working within multilateral bodies, and promoting international initiatives to achieve the outcome we wanted.

The coalition was setting the international agenda and exerting international leadership in the face of lack of enthusiasm and even outright hostility on the part of some larger powers. This was soft power in action.

How did we do it? In part, through good old-fashioned diplomacy: a barrage of phone calls, letters, demarches, corridor discussions, informal consultations, and formal negotiations at every level, from heads of government to junior officials. In part, through using traditional tools in new ways: for example, through an extensive series of regional conferences to raise awareness and build support for the ban, sponsored by governments with the ICBL and the Red Cross. We also did it in part, through a high-tech advocacy campaign of the type not usually associated with the staid world of foreign policy.

The late Princess Diana played an invaluable role in bringing the landmines campaign into a million living rooms around the world to build understanding and support. At the same time, the coalition used videos, newsletters, cell phones, and the Internet to build support for a ban within governments and civil society. If readers are interested in this aspect of the campaign, I would encourage them to visit the special landmines Web site established by Canada entitled "Safe-Lane" (www.mines.gc.ca). We used this site to broadcast the proceedings of the signing conference in all UN languages in real-time audio, another first for the Ottawa Process.

FUTURE PROSPECTS: A NEW DIPLOMACY?

The Ottawa Process is relatively new, and it is still evolving. I believe it is a positive indicator of a new type of diplomacy suited to a new era, but I do not want to overstate the case. The proof of the process lies in the success of the next phase of the landmines campaign entry into force and implementation and in the use of these new tools in other areas.

Another indicator of the success of this type of approach was the recent agreement to establish a permanent International Criminal Court (ICC). I believe that an independent, effective ICC will be a key institution of the new diplomacy. It will help to deter some of the most serious violations of international humanitarian law. It will give new meaning and global reach to protecting the vulnerable and innocent. Isolating and stigmatizing those who commit war crimes or genocide and removing them from the community will help to end the cycle of impunity and retribution. Without justice, there is no reconciliation, and without reconciliation, there is no peace.

Nor do states need to fear intrusion by the ICC into their sovereignty. The principle of "complementarity" ensures that the Court will exercise jurisdiction where national systems are unable or unwilling to prosecute transgressors. It will be in a sense, a court of last

resort, a final bulwark to ensure that those who commit heinous crimes do not go unpunished.

In an era of declining state autonomy and power, we face the question of who, ultimately, decides issues of international morality and legality. Individual states? The international community? A "global commons?" The International Criminal Court will help to resolve this dilemma by providing a respected, unbiased point of final appeal. If we can establish new norms—like the ban on anti-personnel mines—and new institutions, like the ICC—we will be laying the foundations of a new diplomacy focused on human needs. A similar approach may prove useful in addressing other human security concerns such as small arms proliferation, children's rights, including the recruiting of child soldiers, and human rights overall.

I know that there is scepticism in some quarters about the Ottawa Process and about the notions of soft power and human security more generally. Supporters of a "realpolitik" view argue that the end of the Cold War has simply returned the world to a balance of economic and military power. They may pride themselves on their hardheaded approach, but in fact, it is they who are refusing to recognize that international realities have changed.

In a world where CNN brings every war into your living room, what use is military power alone if public opinion sharply restricts the circumstances in which it can be used? In a world where Foreign Ministers sit down to discuss global warming, hate propaganda and child labor, it is clear that zero-sum applications of hard power are not going to solve all the problems we face.

In my view, true realism lies in recognizing that addressing non-traditional problems requires new approaches and new tools. That the democratization of international relations is a reality, one to be applauded rather than resisted. Above all, that a new diplomacy is urgently required to address the challenges and opportunities of a new era.