REUTERS/Sukree Sukplang

HUMANITARIAN RESPONSE AND INTERNATIONAL ENGAGEMENT IN FRAGILE STATES
How Britain and Canada Could be More Effective

Wiston House, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3DZ

1-3 November 2011   Sponsored by Thomson Reuters

The Canada – UK Colloquia

The Canada-UK Colloquia are annual events that aim to increase knowledge and to educate the public about the advantages of a close and dynamic relationship between Canada and the United Kingdom. These conferences bring together British and Canadian parliamentarians, public officials, academics, private sector representatives, graduate students, and others. The organizers focus on issues of immediate relevance to both countries. One of the main endeavours of the colloquia is to address these issues of mutual concern through engaging
British and Canadian experts in dialogue.

The colloquia are supported by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade in Canada and by the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in the United Kingdom. The conferences are organized by the School of Policy Studies at Queen's University, on the Canadian side, as well as by the Canada-UK Colloquia Committee on the British side, from which an executive board, the Council of Management, is elected annually.

The first colloquium was held at Cumberland Lodge in Windsor Great Park in 1971 to examine the bilateral relationship. A British steering committee, later to become the Canada-UK Colloquia Committee, was launched in 1986. The Queen's School of Policy Studies assumed responsibility for the Canadian side in 1996, succeeding the Institute for Research on Public Policy. Previous reports can be found at *www.queensu.ca/sps/canuk*

About the Author

Paul Cornish is Professor of International Security at the University of Bath. His career has included a variety of policy, research and academic appointments, all concerned with security and defence. He was Carrington Professor of International Security and Head of the International Security Programme at Chatham House from 2005 to 2011,having previously been Director of the Centre for Defence Studies at King's College London from 2002 to 2005. He has lectured in security and strategic studies at the University of Cambridge and at the Joint Services Command &Staff College, and has served in the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (as an arms control analyst) and the British Army.

His published work, conference speeches and lectures cover a range of subjects including national strategy, cyber security, the ethics of the use of armed force, arms control and non-proliferation, counter-terrorism and the future of international security. Professor Cornish is a member of the UK Chief of the Defence Staff's Strategic Advisory Panel and is a frequent commentator on national and international media. He was educated at the University of St Andrews, the London School of Economics, the Royal Military Academy Sandhurst and the University of Cambridge.

Table of Contents

Preface

This Rapporteur's Report summarises the discussions at the Canada-United Kingdom Colloquium on "Humanitarian Response and International Engagement in Fragile States : How Britain and Canada could be more Effective" held at Wiston House, Sussex in December 2011. This year's event marked the 40th Anniversary of the CUKC and we were delighted to be able to mark the occasion at a dinner at Mansion House, courtesy of the Lord Mayor of London, Alderman David Wootton.

The annual Colloquia have become established over the years as a means of enabling Britain and Canada to engage in discussions on important topics of mutual interest. The recurring threat of national and regional conflict in the Middle East and elsewhere underlines the critical importance of this year's topic, and the responsibility on countries like Britain and Canada to find ways to prevent and contain the corrosive and destabilising effects.

At the end of this Report you will find a set of recommendations and suggestions encapsulating the thoughts and conclusions that emerged from the Colloquium and which we hope will influence policy-makers in both countries.

We should like to thank the Colloquium Chair, Lord Hannay, for his skilled chairmanship of the proceedings at the Colloquium and whose many years of experience added particular insights into the areas discussed. We are indebted and wish to record our thanks to the special advisers, Nicolas Maclean assisted by Paul Schulte in the UK and Andrew Grant in Canada. Their combined knowledge and guidance enabled us to put together a detailed programme for analysis and discussion. We are very grateful to Paul Cornish for discharging the difficult role of Rapporteur with great skill and professionalism, as evidenced by this Report, and, not least, to all our speakers and participants who made the event so stimulating and informative.

Any gathering of this kind cannot happen without devoted and tireless effort behind the scenes. In this regard George Edmonds-Brown, Executive Secretary of the British Committee, is to be congratulated in organising the entire proceedings so successfully.

Special thanks are due to our sponsors who have provided the essential means to enable the Colloquium to take place. We remain deeply appreciative of the continuing financial and other support of the Foreign & Commonwealth office and the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade. Thomson Reuters have once again served us handsomely as our principal sponsor and our thanks are also due to Taylor Wimpey, Shell and DLA Piper for their sponsorship.

We trust that you will agree that this Report stands as a serious contribution to the ways in which Britain and Canada should be looking at solutions to the many intractable issues surrounding humanitarian intervention in fragile states.

Philip J Peacock   Robert Wolfe
Chairman   School of Policy Studies
British Committee   Queens University

Humanitarian Response and International Engagement in Fragile States: How Britain and Canada Could Be More Effective

Professor Paul Cornish

INTRODUCTION

The 2011 Canada-UK Colloquium chose to address some of the most complex and contentious aspects of contemporary international security policy: the response to humanitarian crises around the world and the most effective ways in which to engage with fragile states. In his preface to the Colloquium programme Mr Andrew Mitchell MP, Secretary of State for International Development, noted that in 2010 alone some 263 million people around the world were affected by disasters and crises of one sort or another. And given trends in population growth, resource consumption, urbanisation and environmental change, the demand for humanitarian response and action seems likely only to intensify. There is a pressing need for humanitarian response to become more efficient, effective and timely. With their deep commitment to the international humanitarian system, and as close friends and allies, Canada and the United Kingdom have an excellent opportunity to build upon their existing work and to show what more can be done.

The Colloquium began with briefing visits to the House of Commons where participants heard the views of Mr Douglas Alexander MP, Shadow Foreign Secretary and formerly Secretary of State for International Development, Mr Alistair Burt MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State in the Foreign & Commonwealth Office, and Mr Martin Horwood MP, a Liberal Democrat Spokesman on Foreign Affairs. Further briefings took place at the Department for International Development, where the Colloquium heard from Mr Alan Duncan MP, Minister of State, and from Ms Sheelagh Stewart, Head of the United Kingdom's interdepartmental Stabilisation Unit. Following a visit to the Ministry of Defence and a discussion with General Sir David Richards, Chief of the Defence Staff, about his command of the successful British military intervention in Sierra Leone in the year 2000, the Colloquium moved to the Canadian High Commission where it heard from Ms Monique Villa, Chief Executive Officer, and Ms Jo Weir, Director of Training Programmes, Thomson Reuters Foundation on training journalists in fragile states.

That evening the Chairman of the Canada-UK Colloquia, Mr Philip Peacock, hosted the 40th Anniversary Dinner of the CUKC at Mansion House, courtesy of the Lord Mayor of London Alderman David Wootton. They both made speeches, as did the Commonwealth Secretary-General Mr Kamalesh Sharma, Canadian High Commissioner Mr Gordon Campbell,

Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr Bob Dechert MP, and Mr David Craig, Managing Director of Thomson Reuters, representing the Colloquium's Prime Sponsor. After that participants travelled to Wilton Park in Sussex for the opening of the 2011 Colloquium, which took place the next morning with initial comments by the Colloquium Chairman Lord Hannay of Chiswick and by Mr Philip Peacock, UK Chairman of the CUKC, and Professor Robert Wolfe, Canadian Chairman, followed by a key-note address by Minister of State at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office Lord Howell of Guildford.

SESSION 1: WHETHER AND WHEN TO RESPOND?

The first formal session of the Colloquium began with a discussion of the changing nature both of armed conflict and of intervention, introduced by Professor Sir Adam Roberts, President of the British Academy and formerly Professor of International Relations at the University of Oxford. The character of war and violent conflict has always been contingent; determined by prevailing geographical, strategic and technical circumstances. But over the past 60 years or so the very nature of war appears also to have undergone fundamental and possibly enduring change. Traditional armed conflict (of the sort with which we have been familiar for at least 600 years) was fought largely between what would now be known as sovereign states, over territorial and other disputed claims, especially since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648 based on the principle "*Cuius regio, eius religio*". Interestingly, even while cross-border wars were being fought it was still possible, and perhaps even essential to argue for the idea of inviolable state sovereignty as the central organising principle of international politics. Since the middle of the twentieth century, however, this pattern has steadily given way to conflicts which, while they might well involve (in an all-too recognizable way) disputes over territory, resources or political power, are nevertheless internal (or largely internal) to a state and are less likely therefore to cross or challenge international boundaries. War, in other words, has become in its nature more *national* than *international*.

If armed conflict has changed, both circumstantially (as it always must) and fundamentally, then so too has the idea of intervention in the territory and the affairs of sovereign states. Paradoxically, just as the twentieth century saw an overall decline in the violation of borders for reasons of conquest, so the latter half of the century saw a growth in the notion that international borders were, after all violable if done under legitimate authority, and for the right reasons. That list of reasons might include the prevention or termination of civil war, the deployment of an inter-positional peacekeeping force, the ejection of a tyrant (a process which would now be known as 'regime change'), the protection of people from 'democide' and physical abuse, and the provision of food, water, medical aid and emergency housing. Thus, while for centuries the shibboleth of state sovereignty had been proclaimed while inter-state warfare raged all around it, in the high-minded but (arguably) intellectually more consistent mood of interventionism which took hold in the latter half of the twentieth century, sovereignty was increasingly seen as more of a conditional than an absolute attribute of statehood.

The new interventionism raises several difficulties, however. In the first place, what is the correct term to describe a state which, for whatever reason, is considered a suitable candidate for intervention by external powers? The 'failed state' of the 1990s could be regarded by the less than scrupulous as an open invitation to annexation on one pretext or another. The current preference is for 'fragile state' – a term which conveys the impression that while there

might be concerns over governance or human security these flaws can all be repaired in order for the state in question to regain its full status in the international system. The notion that there is such a thing as a 'normal' version of statehood which can be recovered and restored lies at the heart of the doctrine known as Responsibility to Protect (R2P), to which the 2011 Colloquium was to devote a good deal of attention.

TEXT BOX 1: **Responsibility to Protect**

Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect.[1]

Another difficulty was that intervention might be undertaken for a complex of reasons, not all of them altruistic or humanitarian in the strictest sense. In the case of cross-border refugee movements, for example, while a neighbouring state might be driven to intervene by a laudable wish to reduce human suffering, it might also be motivated by more straightforward self-interest in the perception that uncontrolled movements of people could provoke tension and conflict on its own territory. And for the least scrupulous neighbours, a humanitarian crisis of one sort or another might, as suggested earlier, also become a pretext for an armed intervention in order to seize territory or eliminate an uncongenial regime.

A more serious difficulty with the argument for intervention is that it has, to date, achieved only a handful of relatively modest successes: the ejection of Iraqi armed forces from Kuwait in 1990-91; action in Bosnia-Herzegovina from 1995 onwards (i.e. after the Srebrenica massacre); operations against Serb troops and police in Kosovo in 1999 (an operation which, significantly, proceeded without the explicit authorization of the United Nations Security Council); and finally the international military operation in Libya from March to October 2011. But if these four operations (together with other cases of arguable success such as in Sierra Leone, East Timor and Côte d'Ivoire) constitute the credit side of new interventionism, the debit side is heavily burdened by *non*-interventions in such cases as Rwanda, Somalia and, latterly, Syria.

Furthermore, in all four cases, the Colloquium heard, military action was relatively brief, relied heavily upon air power and was supported by local partners. This might have an effect other than that which was intended by the operation, however. Although any military intervention must involve the risk of death or injury for deployed personnel, the use of air power and the reliance on local allies and proxies might give the impression that, in spite of their high-minded rhetoric, the risk appetite of the intervening powers is carefully governed; at best a 'limited liability' approach, and at worst little more than a token gesture. These impressions can be extremely significant. If local populations perceive a discrepancy between interventionist rhetoric on the one hand and the risk appetite of the intervening forces on the other, they might become sceptical of the interveners' actual intentions and indifferent to the risk being confronted by individual military personnel. The apparent ingratitude of the local population might then, in turn provoke an impatient or angry

---

[1] *The Responsibility to Protect*, Report of the International Commission on Intervention and State Sovereignty (Ottawa: IDRC, December 2001), p.xi.
[2] Prime Minister David Cameron's speech to the United Nations General Assembly in New York, Thursday 22 September 2011.
[3] World Bank, 'Harmonised List of Fragile Situations, FY 2012',
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTLICUS/Resources/FCS_List_FY12_External_List.pdf

reaction among elements of the intervening force. In the worst case, that anger might be manifested in the form of brutality committed against the local population. British and Canadian troops have both been involved in such incidents; an experience which suggests that the link between high-minded interventionist rhetoric on the one hand and appalling behaviour on the other might be more causal than accidental.

More generally, the longer term military prospects for protracted and ambitious external intervention looked increasingly unpromising, with smaller and more tightly budgeted Western armed forces, growing populations in crisis areas, and the worldwide diffusion of effective shoulder fired weapons and expertise in improvising explosive devices.

The Colloquium heard that R2P could be said to have developed the long-standing debate on humanitarian intervention insofar as it shifts discussion from the question of a *right* to intervene (exercised by external powers, according to their interests and assessments) to the existence of an *obligation* to intervene (on behalf of harmed or repressed people). The scope and authority of this obligation remain opaque – participants discussed briefly the differences between *duty* (whereby action is obligatory) and *responsibility* (whereby action is perceived to be more discretionary) in the diplomatic language used to describe this obligation. Nevertheless, the significance of the shift is that it introduces a different frame of reference for the intervention debate: the starting point for discussion should be the condition of the local population rather than the interests of external governments. Prime Minister David Cameron's speech to the United Nations General Assembly in September 2011 was a bold attempt to assert R2P in this new, broader framework.

TEXT BOX 2: **Prime Minister David Cameron on R2P**

You can sign every human rights declaration in the world but if you stand by and watch people being slaughtered in their own country, when you could act, then what are those signatures really worth? The UN has to show that we can be not just united in condemnation, but united in action, acting in a way that lives up to the UN's founding principles and meets the needs of people everywhere.

In 2011 as people in North Africa and the Middle East stand up and give voice to their hopes for more open and democratic societies, we have an opportunity and I would say a responsibility to help them.

Here at the UN, we have a responsibility to stand up against regimes that persecute their people. We need to see reform in Yemen. And above all, on Syria, it is time for the Members of the Security Council to act. We must now adopt a credible resolution threatening tough sanctions. Of course we should always act with care when it comes to the internal affairs of a sovereign state. But we cannot allow this to be an excuse for indifference in the face of a regime that week after week arrests, intimidates, tortures and kills people who are peacefully trying to make their voices heard.

Of course I recognise that many have long been committed to non-intervention. But my argument is that where action is necessary, legal and right, to fail to act is to fail those who need our help.[2]

Professor Roland Paris, Research Professor of International Security and Governance at the University of Ottawa and the second speaker of the session, took a rather more ambitious approach to intervention. It was a misconception, he argued, to suppose that outsiders cannot achieve the building or rebuilding of a state and that they should not therefore try. It might be that interventions in Iraq and Afghanistan have proved to be disastrous for all

---

[2]Prime Minister David Cameron's speech to the United Nations General Assembly in New York, Thursday 22 September 2011.

concerned but this pessimistic diagnosis is not appropriate in all circumstances. In many other cases the overall intervention effort has been largely beneficial. The deployment of a major peacekeeping operation after a conflict can reduce the risk of a renewal of conflict by 35-90 per cent, as well as reducing the chance that conflict might break out in neighbouring areas.

Intervention has its merits, yet Professor Paris acknowledged that a good deal of caution was due. In the case of a conflict which was still underway, for example, it would be difficult to judge when and how to intervene. In other cases an international presence can tend to perpetuate rather than to reduce tension and conflict. Professor Paris noted that an international presence can become self-perpetuating and can pose a form of moral hazard for local people, in that they might not be encouraged to think and prepare for themselves for as long as they believe the international presence will remain. Professor Paris's most trenchant complaint was with the use of language: 'fragile states' might be a useful term in certain respects but it obscures as much as it reveals and does not represent a distinctive category of countries. Referring to the World Bank's 'Harmonised List of Fragile Situations', Professor Paris noted that the 33 countries listed did not all share the same circumstances.[3] Stewart Patrick's seven part typology shows that these circumstances range widely from 'endemically weak' to 'prolonged political crisis' to 'reform-minded government'.[4]

Professor Paris concluded by asking whether R2P was a useful framework for deciding whether and when to intervene. He detected an overreaction to the success of the Libya intervention in 2011. There were those – including Gareth Evans, formerly co-chair of the International Commission on Intervention and State Responsibility which had produced R2P – for whom the Libya operation represented a vindication of the principle after a period of mounting doubt.

TEXT BOX 3: **Gareth Evans: R2P before and after Libya 2011**

Before:
If the unanimous adoption of the R2P principles by the 2005 World Summit and the UN Security Council is not to be the high-water mark from which the tides recede – if the responsibility to protect is not to become an idea whose time has gone as fast as it came – then a serious ongoing diplomatic and other advocacy effort has to be made to explain and defend the norm, with serious efforts being sustained over a number of years not only to enshrine R2P principles in the language of relevant international, regional and national institutions and forums beyond the UN, but also in their institutional practice.[5]

After:
Libya has shown that the responsibility to protect has come of age.[6]

While the Libyan intervention might be said to have been successful locally and in the short term, its wider and longer-term implications have yet to be seen. There are grounds, in other words, both to welcome R2P and to be sceptical of it as a policy framework. How then

---

[3]World Bank, 'Harmonised List of Fragile Situations, FY 2012',
http://siteresources.worldbank.org/EXTLICUS/Resources/FCS_List_FY12_External_List.pdf
[4]Stewart Patrick, 'Failed States and Global Security: Empirical Questions and Policy Dilemmas', *International Studies Review* (Vol. 9, No. 4, Winter 2007).
[5]Gareth Evans, 'The Responsibility to Protect: an Idea whose Time has Come … and Gone?', *International Relations* (Vol. 22, No. 3, 2008), p.289.
[6]Gareth Evans, quoted in 'Evans talks military intervention', *The Prague Post*, 12 October 2011:
http://www.praguepost.com/news/10544-evans-talks-military-intervention.html

should R2P be described and understood? If intervention is indeed becoming more obligatory, then R2P must be more substantial than a set of principles which governments may or may not observe at their discretion. Yet R2P cannot yet be said to be an established norm of international politics – important questions remain as to the universality and the authority of R2P and the continuing crisis in Syria indicates clearly enough that a strong sense of voluntarism still obtains where intervention is concerned. For the present, therefore, R2P might best be understood in language which combines the pragmatic with the progressive: as 'work in progress' or, in the words of the 2004 High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change, as an '*emerging* norm'.[7] When is a norm not a norm? Interestingly, to describe a norm as 'emerging' is very probably to reveal a normative preference.

Session 1 concluded with a discussion of four core policy challenges. The first of these concerned the definition and application of R2P. One participant asked whether the time had come to clarify and solidify the principle and to establish, in particular, whether R2P could justify regime change (especially by the use of air power). Other participants argued, however, that any attempt to consolidate R2P, whether legally or politically, through deliberation in the UN Security Council or elsewhere, would run the risk of destroying R2P and the principles which underpin it, just as it is becoming more consolidated. Second, participants acknowledged the risk of short-termism in humanitarian response and international engagement in fragile states. Without what one discussant described as 'strategic patience' the broader and longer-term aims of any intervention were not likely to be realised, to the almost certain detriment of the local population. Yet is it reasonable to expect a hastily assembled 'coalition of the willing' to remain patient in this way for months or even years? There is a balance to be struck, in other words, between commitment and expectations.

The third policy challenge is the consistency with which the argument for intervention can be made and implemented. A long-standing criticism of the argument for intervention is that it is selective, both in practical terms and morally. The problem comes when governments choose to intervene in certain areas or in certain cases, but not in others. To the extent that any such interventions are justified – and they do tend to be – in the language of ostensibly universal ethical norms (i.e. the right not to be oppressed or brutalised by a government), intervening states risk the charge of hypocrisy when they use universalist moral language to justify an intervention, yet do not intervene universally in all cases of moral breakdown. If it was right to intervene in Libya, the argument goes, then by extensions it must be right to intervene in Zimbabwe. And if there is no intervention in Zimbabwe, the moral quality of the intervention in Libya is called into question as a result.

In their response to this rather fundamental criticism of their motives and behaviour, intervention-minded governments have taken to arguing that because ethically driven action cannot be undertaken *everywhere* it does not follow that intervention should not be attempted *anywhere*. The criterion of utility should always be considered. An intervention should, at least, leave a situation no worse than it was, and ideally better. But if it appears that an intervention would worsen the situation, then it should not be undertaken. The just war tradition could provide a useful framework for analysis: an intervention should do more good than harm, should have a reasonable prospect of success and should involve the proportionate use of force. Another requirement from the just war tradition is that all other means of resolving the crisis or conflict should have been exhausted. This prompted discussion of the fourth policy challenge. In the view of one participant, a disservice is done

---

[7] *Report of the High-level Panel on Threats, Challenges and Change* (New York: United Nations General Assembly, A/59/565, 2 December 2004), p.35.

to R2P if it is understood in largely military terms. The challenge to intervention-minded governments is to ensure that all levers of governmental power and influence can be deployed to best effect, with military force being considered only as a last resort. This in turn prompted another discussant to suggest that selectivity – inevitably both a feature and a perceived flaw in intervention operations – should be less a matter of apology and more a matter of principle in the intervention debate.

TEXT BOX 4 **Summary of the OECD Principles for Good International Engagement in Fragile States and Situations**

THE BASICS
  1. Take context as the starting point.
  2. Do no harm.
THE ROLE OF STATE-BUILDING AND PEACEBUILDING
  3. Focus on state-building as the central objective.
  4. Prioritize prevention.
  5. Recognize the links between political, security and development objectives.
  6. Promote non-discrimination as a basis for inclusive and stable societies.
THE PRACTICALITIES
  7. Align with local priorities in different ways in different contexts.
  8. Agree on practical coordination mechanisms between international actors.
  9. Act fast…but stay engaged long enough to give success a chance.
  10. Avoid pockets of exclusion, so-called "aid orphans".

SESSION 2: GOVERNANCE, SECURITY AND JUSTICE

In the second session the Colloquium turned from matters of high principle to consider the context – national, regional and international – which frames the debate and at times generates the impulse to intervene in the internal affairs of a state. What causes these crises and are there more effective ways, other than military intervention to resolve a crisis and prevent further collapse?

Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon, formerly leader of the Liberal Democrats and High Representative for Bosnia and Herzegovina from 2002-2006, opened discussion by describing a power shift along two axes. The vertical axis concerned the internal governance of the nation-state, where he sensed a weakening in the capacity to hold decision-makers to account and to regulate behaviour. This was accompanied by a migration, or diffusion of power along the horizontal axis, out of the nation-state and onto the global stage. Given the inadequacy of governance mechanisms at the international level, influential, powerful and, in some cases, destructive non-state actors see this shift as an opportunity to pursue their goals with relative impunity. We are faced, therefore, with a crisis of governance, in two parts: not only do accountability and regulation need to be restored at the national level and policed more effectively, but governance structures need also to be improved – or perhaps built from scratch – at the international level.

How might the construction, reconstruction or expansion of governance best be achieved? Should the United Nations be given the task? The UN certainly has international legitimacy but does it have sufficient, and sufficiently widespread, political authority to decide in matters of accountability and regulation and then to enforce those decisions? Alternatively, might it be more productive to rely upon treaty-based organisations? A certain amount of

caution should be exercised at this point. A treaty-based approach might have a pragmatic, problem-solving resonance to it, yet there is an obvious difficulty in that treaties, and the organisations which are borne of them, are largely the province of nation-states which, as we have seen, are undergoing their own crisis of governance, nationally and internationally. Clarity of purpose is essential if confusion and self-contradiction is to be avoided. Having acknowledged that a transfer of power has taken, or is taking place along the horizontal axis, is the intention to use international treaties differently and to devise different forms of treaty-based organisations in order to achieve a new and more effective framework of international governance which embraces a wider collection of state and non-state actors? Or is the intention to restore the state, with its treaty-making authority, to the heart of the international system and achieve international governance by that route?

Lord Ashdown's account of a global diffusion of power – or a shift along the horizontal axis – also has an ethical dimension. That is to say, it is not only the established *forms* of governance which are being undermined by a lateral shift of power from state to non-state actors, but also the *substance* of governance which confronts a challenge to the assumed intellectual and moral hegemony of western values. As a result, it is becoming ever less reasonable and coherent to conceive of humanitarian intervention, by military or by any other means, as the projection by western nation-states of western cultural and ethical *mores*.

A new approach is required, one which can encourage interaction and consensus-building among state and non-state actors across the globe as well as between western and non-western value systems. Lord Ashdown's suggestion is for *interdependence* to become the organising principle, and for the *network* to become the organising mechanism of a more durable and convincing international legal framework for intervention. This framework should be sought neither in the state nor in western values exclusively, but in the intersections or 'docking points' between different political and cultural systems. Intervention in humanitarian crises might then come to be understood as the legitimate pursuit of mutual interest: a globally acknowledged framework of ideas and laws implemented on a case-by-case basis. At present there could be said to be three responses to the call to intervene in a humanitarian crisis. The first response is to do nothing – a response which ignores, rather than answers the moral and political problems discussed during the Colloquium. The second response, as attempted in Iraq and Afghanistan, is to intervene, fight, win and then create a suitable system of government. This option, in Lord Ashdown's view, is no longer credible. Instead, intervention should not only be consistent with international law but should also be undertaken on behalf of the people at risk. In 2011 it was, rightly, the Libyans who fought the war, albeit with assistance from NATO and others, just as it is the Libyans who must construct the peace. Any proposed intervention should be tested against a set of objective, impartial criteria: a breach of international law should have been committed; a threat to wider peace must be identified; all other means to resolve the crisis should have been exhausted; the response should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the crisis; the response should be consistent with international law; and finally, there should be a good prospect of success before intervention is undertaken.

While Lord Ashdown's six criteria offer what would appear to be an objective and impartial basis for analysis and decision-making, they are nevertheless derived from the *jus ad bellum* principles of the western just war tradition. The provenance of these ideas might limit their popularity and applicability. During discussion the Colloquium heard that in 2004 the UN Security Council heard a proposal that the just war criteria should be accepted as guidelines for the application of armed force, but the proposal has not yet been accepted.

Due to a last minute cancellation by Ambassador Elissa A. Golberg, until August Director General, Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force (START) Secretariat, at the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, and now Ambassador and Permanent Representative of Canada to the Office of the United Nations in Geneva and to the United Nations Conference on Disarmament, a Canadian point of view was put forward by Ben Rowswell, Canadian Representative in Kandahar until 2010. He drew from his first-hand experience in Afghanistan, Iraq and Somalia, and from the abstract prepared by Ambassador Golberg. In an international environment characterized by increasingly complex crises – whether man made or natural – Canada was frequently called upon to contribute its expertise and resources. Canada's approach to responding to acutely fragile and crisis affected states had evolved significantly in the past 10 years. The Government of Canada now draws on a range of integrated strategies, tools and mechanisms to prevent and effectively respond to crises - whether on a bilateral basis or in support of a coordinated international response. Central to this is the work of START, through which Canada channels its efforts in responding to international crisis situations and tries to achieve its goals of building effective and accountable state institutions; advancing the rule of law and security sector reform; and securing the protection of civilians.

In discussion, participants raised a number of points relevant to the theme of governance, security and justice. First, intervention-minded governments should seek objectivity not only in their behaviour but also in their judgements. Why, asked one participant, is intervention not considered appropriate in the case of Somalia? Might the answer be that Somalia is neither sufficiently important, wealthy nor externally dangerous? Another participant argued for timeliness in the resort to R2P, as had happened when the population of Benghazi was threatened with massacre. Too long a resort to diplomacy or regional hand-wringing could allow another Rwanda. Others pointed out that careful consideration should also be given to the duration of an intervention in, or engagement with a fragile state. By one view, it can take a generation or more for civic society to develop and mature, to the point that the armed forces of a state no longer consider themselves to be solely responsible for its governance. Intervening governments should therefore be committed to the development of civic governance as a long-term project rather than as a short-term 'fix'. Another participant was critical of a 'cult of capacity building' which paid too little attention to the need to develop, in parallel, local structures and systems of governance and accountability. Finally, the Colloquium was reminded that the success of long-term governance and security projects would be determined not just by local conditions but also by the domestic politics of the intervening state, where support for humanitarian engagement would need to be encouraged and sustained.

SPECIAL REPORT BY LORD ASHDOWN ON ENHANCED CRISIS RESPONSE

Recommendations to the British Government for an improved approach to the provision of emergency assistance after natural disasters had been presented to DFID by Lord Ashdown's working group in the spring of 2011. Lord Ashdown made a speech during lunch about this initiative and took questions.

SESSION 3: ROLES FOR THE MEDIA SPECIAL REPORT BY LORD ASHDOWN ON ENHANCED CRISIS RESPONSE

Mr Doug Saunders, European Bureau Chief & International Affairs Columnist, The Globe and Mail, made an illustrated case that the motives and modalities of international responses to humanitarian crises are the subject of a long-running and complex political and ethical debate. One of the more contentious features of that debate concerns the roles of the media in such situations. Should we ask of the media that they simply report all that they see and hear, as accurately, comprehensively and dispassionately as possible, in order that public and politicians can form their own judgement? If so, then it would be legitimate to ask whether society should expect *any* person, in whatever capacity, to be dispassionate and to suspend judgement when confronted by human suffering and extremes of misery. Perhaps then, the role of the media should be to embellish and even to dramatise their reporting in order to reinforce the conviction that 'something must be done'? Here, the moral risk is that it can be difficult to distinguish between the noblest of motives and the much less edifying tendency to feed the public's ghoulish interest in 'car crash journalism'. As one participant observed, if the goal is for media coverage to be both compassionate and responsible then as an operating principle '"if it bleeds it leads" is not enough.'

But 'responsible' to what or to whom? For some, the very notion of a 'role for the media' is indicative of a tendency among governments and international organisations such as NATO to regard the media as both monolithic and biddable. As the Colloquium heard, the media must guard against calls to report 'positively' and to assist governments in winning support for unpopular actions. If they are to have value, the media must always be conscious of the risk of manipulation, from all sides.

Mr Timothy Large, Editor-in-Chief of the Thomson Reuters Foundation, offered a more positive and much less equivocal assessment of the roles of the media. In the first place, as the IFRC's *World Disasters Report* of 2005 observed, accurately reported information can itself be a form of aid to people in crisis. For those enduring privation or suppression it can be psychologically and even physically essential to know that others elsewhere are aware of their plight.

TEXT BOX 5: **Information as Aid**

The right kind of information leads to a deeper understanding of needs and ways to meet those needs. The wrong information can lead to inappropriate, even dangerous interventions. Information is also a vital form of aid in itself. People need information as much as water, food, medicine or shelter. Information can save lives, livelihoods and resources. It may be the only form of disaster preparedness that the most vulnerable can afford.[8]

The media might also help to alert 'first responders' to a crisis, such as NGOs, relief workers, donors and policy-makers; Thomson Reuters Foundation's AlertNet seeks to perform

---

[8]IFRC, *World Disasters Report 2005* (Geneva: IFRC, 2005), p.12:
http://www.ifrc.org/Global/Publications/disasters/WDR/69001-WDR2005-english-LR.pdf

Reference was made to the article "This may be peace for Canada – it won't be a lasting calm"
<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/world/doug-saunders/this-may-be-peace-for-canada-it-wont-be-a-lasting-calm/article2258555/>

precisely that function. Finally, Mr Large asked to what extent the media should have a role in 'shaping' the policy agenda within donor and/or intervention-minded governments. This prompted a discussion as to the ethical and political basis of what might be termed 'constructive engagement' on the part of the media. On the one hand, this might be to assume a progressive and cosmopolitan global ethic on behalf of which the media see themselves as an agent, and according to which the choice to intervene is morally right, if not obligatory. By this view, there need be no ethical dispute at all over who should be helped, by whom, in what ways and to what end. Yet this is not an incontestable basis for decision and action, not least when accountability and the responsibility for mistakes are considered. On the other hand, 'constructive engagement' might reflect another, equally contestable view that intervention is a morally anarchic arena in which the media's ethical outlooks are as good and as authoritative as any other and need acknowledge no limits and answer no questions.

Putting these reservations to one side, the sense of the Colloquium followed conventional wisdom in the view that media coverage of humanitarian crises could not be prevented or censored and, in any case, conferred far more benefit than hazard. For those who subscribe to the globalisation of democracy, human rights and the rule of law, the media act to sensitise external awareness and interest, to monitor conditions in unstable areas and, above all, to help consolidate democratic, rules-based governance. In practical terms, media engagement might help to prevent fragile states from sliding into the condition of lawlessness and large-scale human rights abuses which, as one participant observed, would make those states candidates for humanitarian intervention after the problems have become unmanageable; a response which comes at great cost in terms of human misery and financially. As the UN Human Rights Committee of legal experts observed in September 2011, freedom of expression is arguably a 'metaright'; a condition which is fundamental and essential to the enjoyment of other rights. For all these reasons, more thought should be given to the adoption of a 'responsibility to protect journalists'. The Colloquium heard that journalists have increasingly become the targets of violent attacks and arbitrary imprisonment and that in 2011 alone more than one hundred journalists had been killed around the world. Alarmingly, a 'climate of impunity' often surrounds these crimes; a problem which UNESCO is currently addressing on behalf of the agencies and bodies of the UN.

SESSION 4: ROLES FOR BUSINESS & TECHNOLOGY

Is there a place for the private sector in the international response to humanitarian crises and in efforts to put fragile states on a more stable and self-reliant footing? For the first speaker in Session 4 this question more or less answered itself. Sir Mark Moody-Stuart, Chairman of the Global Compact Foundation, argued that the private sector has an essential, if not obvious role for the simple reason that economic activity is essential for livelihoods and for long-term economic and social stability. But rather than set out simply to exploit a commercial opportunity, the role of the private sector should be to act constructively and responsibly to mutual benefit. A number of international initiatives argue for a combination of the commercial with the co-operative. The United Nations Global Compact, for example, is led by business but has essential involvement from civil society. The UNGC's goal is to widen the private sector's engagement in fragile states and then to deepen that engagement and make it more durable. The UN-backed Principles for Responsible Investment initiative,

addressing a range of environmental, social and corporate governance concerns, is a compatible effort to 'better align investors with broader objectives of society.'[9]

TEXT BOX 6: **United Nations Global Compact Ten Principles**

The UN Global Compact asks companies to embrace, support and enact, within their sphere of influence, a set of core values in the areas of human rights, labour standards, the environment and anti-corruption:

Principle 1: Businesses should support and respect the protection of internationally proclaimed human rights; and
Principle 2: make sure that they are not complicit in human rights abuses.
Principle 3: Businesses should uphold the freedom of association and the effective recognition of the right to collective bargaining;
Principle 4: the elimination of all forms of forced and compulsory labour;
Principle 5: the effective abolition of child labour; and
Principle 6: the elimination of discrimination in respect of employment and occupation.
Principle 7: Businesses should support a precautionary approach to environmental challenges;
Principle 8: undertake initiatives to promote greater environmental responsibility; and
Principle 9: encourage the development and diffusion of environmentally friendly technologies.
Principle 10: Businesses should work against corruption in all its forms, including extortion and bribery.[10]

Sir Mark Moody-Stuart suggested several ways in which the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom could assist and encourage the private sector to become more constructively involved in fragile states. He welcomed the efforts of the Canadian International Development Agency and the Department for International Development in London to involve the private sector more systematically in their work. Looking elsewhere in government, he urged the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Foreign and Commonwealth Office to be more cautious in their support for the imposition of sanctions during times of crisis. Economic and trade sanctions can prevent the early, trust-building relations which are the foundation of longer-term commercial and economic development. He wondered whether the crisis in Syria might have been managed more effectively if economic and trade relationships had been more advanced. In that regard, one participant disagreed, arguing that sanctions were rightly a central feature of the response to the crisis in Syria and generally, otherwise the Responsibility to Protect doctrine might become too closely (or even exclusively) associated with military activity. Finally, Sir Mark Moody-Stuart urged deployed governmental missions and agencies to be more assiduous in working with local civil society and commercial networks in order to achieve more integrated (and durable) business development.

The theme of corporate responsibility was developed by the second speaker in Session 4, Mr Nolan Watson, President and Chief Executive Officer of Sandstorm Gold and Sandstorm Metals & Energy. Mr Watson began with the observation that whereas irresponsible business practices can contribute to instability, when business and investment are conducted in a sustainable way, using best practices from both a humanitarian and an environmental perspective, then business activity can improve the stability of fragile states. The challenge for governments – both intervening and local – is to find ways to encourage responsible business to become involved and to make their first investments in an otherwise unstable political environment. Too often, however, businesses can be discouraged by the risk that their property and investment will simply be expropriated; by excessive taxation; by

---

[9]Principles for Responsible Investment: http://www.unpri.org/principles/
[10]United Nations Global Compact: http://www.unglobalcompact.org/AboutTheGC/TheTenPrinciples/index.html

pervasive corruption; and by interference from special interest groups and lobbyists in commercial decision-making.

Mr Watson offered a compelling analysis of the Chinese approach to development assistance. Chinese government policy is so closely integrated with Chinese commercial activity and with Chinese humanitarian efforts, he suggested, 'that they are nearly indistinguishable'. The effect on the government of a fragile state is relatively straightforward: if attempts are made to expropriate assets from Chinese companies then they risk the withdrawal of both government aid and humanitarian relief. There are questions to be asked about the Chinese method, not least in the preference for imported Chinese labour. Nevertheless, China's tripartite approach has proved to be effective, so much so that in Mr Watson's view the Chinese have 'provided more economic stability in fragile states than nearly all of the other governments in the world combined.' Conversely, in the Canadian and British approaches each element (government, commercial and humanitarian aid) is left to fend largely for itself, thus exposing each of the three elements to greater risk. Mr Watson called upon both governments to act in more of a facilitating role; tellingly, the Colloquium heard that Canadian public opinion is increasingly suspicious of government's ability to carry out a task but is willing to trust the government to facilitate others to do it.

If, in both Canada and the UK engagement in fragile states could be conceived of as a three-way, inter-linked effort involving public policy, commercial activity and altruistic humanitarian assistance then business people would have more confidence to take commercial risk and would feel more protected as they did so. Several benefits could be envisaged: partnerships could be sought between local governments and business investors; businesses and charitable bodies could be encouraged to develop closer working relationships; educational initiatives could be planned in order to train local cohorts of specialist managers and experts; and efforts to protect commercial assets and investments could be a vital element of the campaign against corruption. To achieve these goals, governments in Canada, the UK and elsewhere need to be 'more strategic and more forward thinking' in their relationship with the commercial sector. But, as the Colloquium heard, great care must be taken in order to ensure that close working relationships do not lead to confusion; if civil society organisations and NGOs are seen as agents of either commercial or governmental/military interests then their distinctive contribution will be undermined and they might face unexpected hazards.

SPECIAL SESSION ON AFGHANISTAN

After Session 4 a Special Session was held Afghanistan. This consisted of a detailed presentation led by Mr Francesc Vendrell, Chairman of the Afghanistan Analysis Network and from 2002 to 2008 Ambassador and Special Representative of the EU for Afghanistan. This was followed by an active discussion.

SESSION 5: WORKING WITH INTERNATIONAL ORGANISATIONS

The fifth session of the Colloquium asked how Canada and the United Kingdom could work more effectively and efficiently with the various international organisations involved in humanitarian assistance. The first speaker in the session was Sir John Holmes, formerly UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Co-ordinator, for whom the principal difficulty was the level of organisation and communication among the various bodies involved. However much governments might hope for a coherent and broadly rational international system with which to engage, 'the international humanitarian response scene is not a system in any recognisable sense.' He went on to describe what might best be understood as well-intentioned chaos: 'a haphazard collection of organisations and groups which have over the years decided to take on the role of trying to alleviate the world's misery.'

The constellation of organisations includes the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) and a range of United Nations bodies such as the UN High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), the UN Fund for Children (UNICEF), the World Food Programme, the Food and Agriculture Organisation, the UN Population Fund, the International Organisation for Migration and others. These international bodies are accompanied by international NGOs including Oxfam, Save the Children and Médecins sans Frontières, as well as many national or local NGOs. The UN's Office for the Co-ordination of Humanitarian Affairs (OCHA) has the task of co-ordinating these efforts, within certain parameters. OCHA cannot issue instructions to these organisations; they can only make recommendations while respecting the basic humanitarian principles of independence, neutrality and impartiality.

Given predicted stresses on natural resources it seems only likely that there will be more humanitarian crises around the world in the foreseeable future. Demographic trends suggest, furthermore, that these crises will be increasingly intense. The outlook could be very dismal indeed. Rather than organise the occasional response to a large-scale humanitarian or natural catastrophe in one or more parts of the world, we may now face, in Sir John Holmes's view, the 'gradual emergence of chronic acute vulnerability for large populations: people living on the edge of disaster on a permanent basis, and tipping over the edge with increasing frequency.'

Various organisational improvements have been suggested, including the consolidation of all UN humanitarian agencies into one overarching body and the creation of a standing international humanitarian force of some sort – a 'red helmets' equivalent to the UN peacekeeping 'blue helmets'. Sceptical of these ideas, Sir John Holmes's preference was to concentrate on anticipatory planning and upstream preventive measures designed to reduce risks wherever possible and increase resilience at local level. It is notoriously difficult, however, to persuade governments to invest in prevention and disaster risk reduction; an area where joint UK and Canadian leadership would be especially welcome, therefore. Efforts should also be made to close the artificial and wasteful gulf between the humanitarian and development 'operational and funding silos' and, wherever possible, to rationalise the number of organisations involved in humanitarian response and disaster relief, perhaps through a system of self-certification on the part of NGOs. Finally, more effective communication should be sought with the affected population in areas of conflict, humanitarian crisis and natural disaster. Following the earthquake in Haiti in 2010, insensitivity to local needs and views was identified as a major weakness in the international response. Overall, there is a case for a 'new business model' in which local capacity building is favoured over an expanded international effort, which places more emphasis on disaster

risk reduction and which encourages closer relationships between governments, civil society and the private sector.

The second speaker in Session 5, Senator Hugh Segal, also pursued the theme of efficiency and coherence within and among international humanitarian organisations. Senator Segal, who serves on the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs and is a member of the Eminent Persons Group of the Commonwealth Secretariat, argued that as well as a clear sense of any problems which might exist at the organisational level, what is also needed is a set of 'actionable choices' for both the Canadian and the UK governments. If international organisations are among the preferred instruments for dealing with fragile or failed states then how can governments exploit the potential of these organisations to the full? This question becomes especially important when the scale of the humanitarian challenge is realised. R2P posits a 'post-Westphalian' world of conditional sovereignty, and in that world international intervention is becoming a necessity rather than the exception: 'Borders provide a measure of protection from the outside world only when what goes on within those borders reflects something other than genocide and systemic, massive human rights violations, state-sponsored illegitimate violence against one's own citizens, religious oppression or the critical aspects of societal collapse producing humanitarian suffering.'

Arguing for a prophylactic approach to state failure, Senator Segal spoke of the need to identify the trigger points – violations of 'core standards of rule of law, democracy and human rights' – which can be the earliest indications of an impending breakdown into sovereign incapacity. But such an approach requires a degree of confidence and even boldness on the part of the organisation or government concerned. In Senator Segal's view a distinctive contribution could be made here by the Commonwealth which has been explicit as to its core values and principles and which is an organisation to which both Canada and the United Kingdom are deeply committed.

TEXT BOX 7: **Affirmation of Commonwealth Values and Principles (2009)**

We, the Heads of Government of the Commonwealth […] reaffirm our strong and abiding commitment to the Commonwealth's fundamental values and principles. We reaffirm that the special strength of the Commonwealth lies in the diversity of its membership, bound together not only by shared history and tradition but also by an ethos of respect for all states and peoples, of shared values and principles, and of concern for the vulnerable. We solemnly reiterate our commitment to the Commonwealth's core values:

- International peace and security
- Democracy
- Human rights
- Tolerance, respect and understanding
- Separation of powers
- Rule of law
- Freedom of expression
- Development
- Gender equality
- Access to health and education
- Good governance
- Civil society[11]

---

[11]Commonwealth Secretariat, *Affirmation of Commonwealth Values and Principles*, Port of Spain, 29 November 2009:
http://www.thecommonwealth.org/document/181889/34293/35468/216908/commonwealth_values_and_principles.htm

Senator Segal concluded by suggesting three areas in which joint action by Canada and the United Kingdom could be developed. First, a Canada-UK task force could develop an early warning system which, by mapping the risk of atrocities and other catastrophes, could be used to trigger preventive intervention by both governments and the organisations of which they are members (including the Commonwealth). British and Canadian military staff colleges could collaborate to share best practices and could involve DfID and CIDA specialists closely in such an effort. And finally, the two governments could establish a joint Task Group on failed states. Drawing upon the accumulated military, intelligence, financial and development experience of both countries, the central purpose of the Task Group would be to examine how collective planning and the sharing of ever more scarce resources could result in early, prophylactic and effective engagement in failing states.

SESSION 6: GOVERNMENT - NGO RELATIONS AND THE ROLES OF NGOS

Having examined the role of governments, the media, the private sector and international organisations, the penultimate session of the Colloquium turned to non-governmental organisations. Powerfully motivated, with broad popular support and often very well funded, NGOs have become a central feature of the humanitarian engagement debate. Their analysis and reporting of crisis situations can shape opinion and policy and their work on the ground can contribute decisively to the effectiveness of any international engagement. But what can be said more specifically of the role of NGOs and what sort of relationship should be expected between NGOs and one other, vitally important agent of humanitarian engagement – national governments?

Mr Michael Bailey, Senior Policy Advisor Humanitarian and Security issues at Oxfam, observed that as well as a galaxy of NGOs of various shapes and sizes, individual donors were also coming to the fore, with their own motives and expectations. If there could be a single, coherent account of so many different motives and so much varied activity it might be summarised in three steps: first to provide aid to alleviate crisis conditions; second to reconstruct; and third to improve. The second and third of these steps are the particular concern of NGOs and individuals committed to the development of civil society. Civil society initiatives can improve resilience, locally and nationally, in a range of ways: through community organisations; through campaigns to improve the social and economic position of women, their education and health; through micro-credit programmes; and through sector-specific efforts such as farmers' groups. A strengthened civil society can then move to the third step; the task of holding governments to account, achieving constitutional equity and stability, and countering corruption.

As far as relations with government are concerned, Mr Bailey stressed the need for NGOs and private donors to be independent of governments and their foreign policies and of international organisations. Moreover, it was vital for NGOs to be *seen* to be independent and impartial otherwise their credibility (and perhaps even their security) could be undermined. Mr Brendan Gormley, Chief Executive of the Disasters Emergency Committee, had earlier made a similar point, insisting that NGOs and civil society organisations (CSOs) should at all times avoid being seen as agents of foreign governments or of any commercial or military interest.

In her address to the Colloquium Ms Dorothée Gizenga, Executive Director of the Diamond Development Initiative International, examined the role of NGOs and CSOs in the particular (and particularly difficult) circumstances of resource-rich fragile states. For such states,

effective natural resource governance is not only essential to their development it is also key to conflict prevention, as the recent history of conflict diamonds has demonstrated. The elimination of illicit trade networks – whether in minerals, narcotics or timber, for example – will never be a sufficient solution to the problem, however. What must also be addressed is what Ms Gizenga described as the 'root cause of illicit trade': the demand for such resources in developed countries. If the governments of developed countries are genuinely concerned to improve conditions in resource-rich fragile states then the first step should be to acknowledge that developed countries, and their demands for resources, are very much part of the problem. It is not sufficient for the governments of developed countries to provide moral support (and perhaps even some funding) to NGOs and CSOs working in resource-rich fragile states; such governments have an ethical obligation to engage in such work and to play a more instrumental role. Ms Gizenga described the evolution of the Kimberley Process[12], addressing the problem of conflict diamonds, as an example of a co-operative effort between international NGOs, local CSOs, the private sector and foreign governments.

----
[12]J. Andrew Grant, 'The Kimberley Process at Ten: Reflections on a Decade of Efforts to End the Trade in Conflict Diamonds', in Päivi Lujala and Siri Aas Rustad, eds., *High-Value Natural Resources and Post-Conflict Peacebuilding* (London: Earthscan / Taylor & Francis, 2011, 159-179).

Ms Gizenga then offered a critique of the sequenced response model; the notion that core problems (not least conflict itself) should be dealt with as a priority with other, associated problems (in the case of conflict diamonds these would include child labour and other, widespread human rights abuses, as well as environmental degradation) being managed at a later stage. As she observed, in complex international negotiations involving dozens of
governments, 'later never comes'. There is a compelling case, therefore, for concurrent activity and this, in turn, requires a more mature and forward-looking relationship between governments, the private sector and NGOs/CSOs. Above all, initiatives such as the Kimberley Process require an explicit acknowledgement that improved standards of human rights should be a primary objective, rather than an optional addition. General social and economic development were essential to the success of specific initiatives such as the Kimberley Process and, in that regard, Ms Gizenga regretted the absence of development ministries and agencies at Kimberley Process meetings; although USAID has consistently attended such meetings since 2003, DfID has attended on only two occasions (in 2008 and 2009) and CIDA just once, in 2010.

In a stark illustration of her argument that resource governance must address a spectrum of supposedly secondary concerns, Ms Gizenga concluded with a plea that the widespread incidence of rape in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC) should be taken more seriously by the international community. Describing rape as both a violent and reprehensible assault on a woman's body and as a systematic weapon of war, the intention of which is 'to shred families and community relationships beyond the hope of repair', Ms Gizenga called on the governments of Canada and the United Kingdom to consider rape much as they would other military practices (such as the use of anti-personnel land mines or the indiscriminate use of armed force) which deliberately expose civilian populations to unconscionable harm. She called on both governments to press the DRC government to reform its armed forces and to prosecute any actors, state or non-state, responsible for rape atrocities. In conclusion, Ms Gizenga reflected on the speculation that the next resource-based conflict in Africa will be over access to water; a commodity in which the DRC is particularly abundant. Has the international community considered whether water could indeed be the next conflict resource, whether the DRC is sufficiently resilient to meet such a challenge, and whether rape will once again be used as a weapon of intimidation in efforts to gain access to resources?

During a wide-ranging discussion particular lessons were drawn from Haiti, both about the need to ensure that buildings in earthquake zones were constructed more effectively to withstand probable risks and that NGOs and CSOs should better coordinate their efforts to avoid duplication and maximize inter-operability. Closer attention should be paid to best practice internationally and to the rapid diffusion of the most appropriate technology. German mobile hospitals were mentioned in this context. National fire and rescue service were collaborating abroad more frequently to meet the challenge of rapid deployment after international disasters. This was greatly valued by recipients and supported by assisting country populations but needed adequate funding as a normal part of emergency relief budgets.

SESSION 7: MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS FORWARD

Having surveyed the humanitarian response debate in some detail, in its closing session the Colloquium looked to the future, asking how policy could be better co-ordinated and practice made more efficient and effective. Lord Hurd of Westwell, Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs in the governments of Margaret Thatcher and John Major, introduced discussion with a cautionary note. Lord Hurd observed that where humanitarian response is concerned, the policies of both Canada and the United Kingdom are in important respects shaped by decisions taken in Washington. Describing the response to Iraq's invasion of Kuwait in August 1990 as the high point of the Anglo-American relationship, Lord Hurd argued that although the UK took part in the military action against Iraq of its own will, the British contribution was nevertheless subordinate to US leadership. Lord Hurd was clear that intervention operations – military or otherwise – required international legitimacy if they were to proceed. This meant, in practice, that interventions in a fragile state should not take place without the explicit authority of a UN Security Council Resolution. The Security Council is now the sole legitimising authority for such action: although the UN General Assembly 'Uniting for Peace' device is still formally available under the UN Charter it is no longer considered operative. Finally, Lord Hurd warned that where military force is used, the possibility of so-called 'collateral damage' can never be excluded entirely, and suggested that more serious thought be given to the problem of how, when and by whom a given intervention should be brought to a conclusion.

Ms Carolyn McAskie, formerly UN Assistant Secretary General for Peacebuilding Support and now a Fellow at the University of Ottawa, began her remarks with a plea that the term 'humanitarian intervention' should not become a casual euphemism for military intervention in crises which have become a humanitarian disaster, whether man-made or natural. The international response to complex humanitarian crises around the world needs to be rather more sophisticated than the default assumption that military intervention will, somehow, solve the problem. There must be, in the first place, the political will to intervene and then to orchestrate the most appropriate forms of engagement such as political mediation, inward investment, social and economic development and so on. Intervention-minded governments must, of course, be willing to provide the resources necessary and they must, above all, be willing to use the established mechanisms of the United Nations, rather than seek to reinvent the wheel from time to time. In Ms McAskie's view, UN integrated missions offer 'the only universal platform currently capable of delivering complex security, rule of law, political and human rights mandates.' If the UN can provide the organisation for an international response to a crisis, the Responsibility to Protect doctrine provides a persuasive new rationale for that response. As well as organisation and

rationale, what is needed now is a process which can trigger the international response by identifying crises as they begin to emerge.

For Ms McAskie non-response was not an option, for several reasons. First, chronic conflict anywhere in the world can only be considered a problem everywhere in the world. Local conflict can spill over into the surrounding region, can provide a breeding ground for terrorism and can prevent the achievement of development goals. What is more, the advent of instant global communication makes it increasingly difficult for evidence of egregious human suffering to be seen as anything other than an affront to human dignity and justice and to wish to do something about it. As far as the cost of intervention is concerned, thought should also be given to the cost of not intervening. Peacekeeping is more expensive, argued Ms McAskie, than development: 'Either pay now or pay more later could be our mantra.'

Ms McAskie concluded by suggesting six elements of a new way forward. First, serious efforts should be made to improve our understanding of the sources and determinants of state fragility. Second, while early warning mechanisms could certainly be more advanced, what is also essential is that governments and international organisations should be willing to hear the warnings and act upon them. Third, more consideration should be given to the mediation of disputes before they can degenerate into tension and then conflict. Mediation, argued Ms McAskie, is less costly than both peacekeeping and humanitarian response. Fourth, UN peacekeeping operation should be given more, and more vocal support from governments: 'if you have a problem with UN peacekeeping you can solve it by helping, not by walking away.' Fifth, the practical relationship between humanitarian assistance and development aid needs more careful thought; working in fragile states can be fraught with uncertainty and even danger. Ms McAskie noted that DfID's approach to working in fragile states 'is recognised as the best by the donor community' while observing that donors should also work more efficiently among themselves. Finally, although it is generally good practice to seek the most efficient use of scarce resources, the scale of the problem is such that new sources of funding must be found. Perhaps a variant of the 'Tobin Tax' on currency transactions could be considered? Rather than ensure exchange rate stability, as originally conceived, the purpose of the new measure could be to fund international efforts first to identify humanitarian crises as they begin to emerge and then to respond to them using the most appropriate and effective ways and means.

CONCLUSION

In its final session the Colloquium reviewed several of the themes arising from three days of wide-ranging, well-informed and challenging debate. With a particular, but not exclusive interest in making Canadian and UK policies more effective, participants addressed four broad aspects of humanitarian response and international engagement in fragile states: analysis; approach; agency and action.

The **analysis** of humanitarian crises and state fragility could be much improved. The Colloquium heard an appeal for national and international policy to be driven by the most sophisticated and timely analysis, characterised as much by deep and expert knowledge as by lateral thinking. A more wide-ranging assessment might, for example, admit a more prominent role in humanitarian response for emerging countries with their all-too evident political authority and economic weight. This in turn could encourage debate on a more equitable and efficient sharing of the burden of the international response to humanitarian crises and state fragility. Analysis should also extend to emergent problems, such as piracy and large-scale movements of people for environmental reasons; these and other

phenomena promise to complicate still further the problem of, as well as the response to fragile states. Serious thought should also be given to organising this growing list of challenges according to priority. At a time of global financial stringency this task seems unavoidable, but by what method and criteria should it be done, and by whom?

Principle and motive are what define the **approach** to intervention and engagement in humanitarian crises and fragile states. The R2P doctrine is driven by an uncompromising moral force, and it is this which in large part makes it such a revolutionary idea in late-Westphalian international politics. Yet it is an idea which continues to be surrounded and constrained by cynicism. If R2P is to be allowed to fulfil its potential then governments should be encouraged to evoke it more frequently and more explicitly, thus establishing R2P as an international norm as much by *fiat* as by argument. But is the 'moral force' behind R2P really incontestable? In a world of fluid multipolarity, which values should obtain? Whose principles deserve more credence than others? And who should decide? Several participants were cautious of ethnocentrism disguised as general truth and the Colloquium heard that in parts of the world R2P might be seen as the stalking horse for neo-colonialism. Above all, there was a need for the discussion of the response to humanitarian crises and state fragility to move beyond what one participant described as 'a discussion among ourselves to a discussion *for* those most affected.'

If there can be said to be a responsibility to protect, who or what has the responsibility to act? The question of **agency** prompted a number of observations. In the view of one participant, the idea that governments and the private sector should collaborate more closely is an idea from the world that was; a world of clearly defined centralised hierarchies and of linear relationships of cause and effect. A new approach is now needed. Canada and the United Kingdom are both admired internationally and both should use their reputation to become respected network facilitators, encouraging coalitions of influence, expertise and capability to come together as the situation demands. The Colloquium also discussed the response of international organisations. One participant observed that the UN Peacebuilding Commission was designed to have effect both upstream and downstream; to contribute both in the prevention of crisis and conflict and in the response. But developing countries had lacked enthusiasm for a United Nations body committed to prevention, on the grounds that it might allow a form of soft, irresistible, international *dirigisme* in the sovereign affairs of the less stable and less successful states. Perhaps then, the time has come for a complete reassessment at the highest level? Another historically-minded participant wondered whether the moment had arrived for the creation of the fourth major international institution of the modern period, following the Congress of Vienna in 1815 and the beginning of the Concert of Europe, the Versailles Treaty of 1918 and the development of the League of Nations, and the San Francisco Conference of 1945, from which the United Nations Charter was born. Perhaps the genesis of this new international institution will be shown to have been the Canada-UK Colloquium held at Wilton Park in 2011.

Finally, discussion turned to **action**: what should be done, and at what stage? Anticipatory, upstream action is generally acknowledged to be the most appropriate, timely and cost-effective way to deal with crisis and conflict. But anticipation is the rarest of skills. The case for anticipation is often clearest only in hindsight and in times of financial difficulty the argument for cost-effectiveness can, paradoxically, be difficult to make; prophylactics do, after all, cost money. On those occasions when decisive anticipatory action does prove to be possible, the Colloquium heard that a certain robustness will nevertheless be necessary. In matters of complex public policy, no matter how sophisticated and timely the preparation might be it is never possible to exclude the possibility of failure. The challenge to policy-

makers is to ensure that failures are small and frequent rather than large and overwhelming, and that the lessons of failure are used to improve future policy.

The Colloquium concluded with a plea for a more optimistic outlook. These are difficult times but this is not a reprise of 1929-39, with a global catastrophe looming inevitably in the near future. There have been successes, such as Libya, and there is every reason to suppose that with a positive outlook and a dynamic policy framework much more can be achieved. This is not the moment, in other words, to withdraw from humanitarian response and the problem of state fragility on the grounds that these are complex and intractable problems in which we can barely afford to become involved. The mere fact that we debate the idea of humanitarian response is in itself a norm-building intervention of sorts. Ideas and actions can make a difference. In the 1930s, the Colloquium heard, it was the reaction to economic collapse, rather than the collapse itself, which caused the crisis in European and international security. The international community can, and indeed must manage friction and failure in the international political and economic system as and when it arises. What is at stake is nothing less than the idea of a rules-based international order. This is an idea to which both Canada and the United Kingdom are committed, not as some curious ethnocentric spasm but as the best hope for global stability and human fulfilment.

TEXT BOX 8: **Suggestions and Recommendations by Colloquium Participants**

PREVENTION

- R2P should focus on Responsibility to Prevent as much as to Protect; hence Senator Hugh Segal's proposal to develop existing co-operation between staff colleges, or even establish some new joint body to co-ordinate expertise, provide an early warning system, and develop "prevention" to reduce the need for "cure".
- There should be a concentration on anticipatory planning and upstream preventive measures designed to reduce risks wherever possible and increase resilience at local level. It is notoriously difficult, however, to persuade governments to invest in prevention and disaster risk reduction. The Canadian and British governments are urged to give leadership in this direction.
- There is a need to identify the trigger points – violations of 'core standards of rule of law, democracy and human rights' – which can be the earliest indications of an impending breakdown into sovereign incapacity.
- Such enhanced collaboration, also involving DfID and CIDA specialist and accumulated military, intelligence and financial information, might help our respective Governments to map the risk of atrocities and other catastrophes and to trigger preventive intervention by both governments and the organisations of which they are members (including the Commonwealth which can make a distinctive contribution, based on the Core Values and Principles formally affirmed in 2009).
- More consideration should be given to the mediation of disputes before they degenerate into severe tension and then conflict. Mediation is less costly than both peacekeeping and humanitarian response.
- New sources of funding may have to be found to pay for international efforts, first to identify humanitarian crises as they begin to emerge and then to respond to them using the most appropriate and effective ways and means.
- The greater the economic stresses, the greater the propensity for violence and discrimination, therefore the greater the urgency for concerted and timely external action on economic stabilization and development, e.g. the wholly inadequate donor response to the World Bank Consultative Meeting on Somalia 1984, which was followed by the slow descent into state collapse.
- Industrialized countries should be careful not to undermine fragile agricultural economies, as in some parts of Africa, through excessive carbon emissions and other harmful environmental practices in their own countries.
- There is a need for a more integrated approach between governments, business and the NGO sector, with regular consultation on longer term trends and their short and medium term implications. Scenario exercises would be worthwhile as a methodology.
- The Canadian and British Governments were urged to help build maximum international support for The United Nations Global Compact, which is led by business but has essential involvement from civil society, with the goal of widening the private sector's engagement in fragile states and then to deepening it so that it becomes more durable.
- Sustained support should also be given to the UN-backed Principles for Responsible Investment initiative, addressing a range of environmental, social and corporate governance concerns, so as to 'better align investors with the broader objectives of society.

STATE-BUILDING

- The UK and Canada should follow the example of Norway and the USA to participate and implement fully the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative (EITI), as should other industrialized and newly industrializing countries.
- Participants recommended an integrated rather than a "sequenced response approach", the latter based on a belief that core problems (not least conflict itself) should be dealt with as a priority with other, associated problems being left for later, e.g. in the case of conflict diamonds these would include child labour and other, widespread human rights abuses, as well as environmental degradation.
- Intervening governments should be committed to the development of civic governance as a long-term project rather than as a short-term 'fix'. 'Capacity building' should pay attention to the need to develop, in parallel, local structures and systems of governance and accountability.
- Local capacity building should be favoured over an expanded international effort, placing more emphasis on disaster risk reduction and encouraging closer relationships between governments, civil society and the private sector.
- The British and Canadian governments were recommended to give more sustained support to the valuable Kimberley Process on conflict diamonds by ensuring that their ministries and agencies were consistent in attendance, as USAID is.
- Civil society initiatives can improve resilience, locally and nationally, in a range of ways: through community organisations; through campaigns to improve the social and economic position of women, their education and health; through micro-credit programmes; and through sector-specific efforts such as farmers' groups. A strengthened civil society can then move to the third step; the task of holding governments to account, achieving constitutional equity and stability, and countering corruption.

RESPONSE TO NATURAL DISASTERS

- The need was stressed for stakeholders responding to natural disasters to liaise and co-operate more effectively, and to be less competitive;
- Efforts should also be made to close the artificial and wasteful gulf between the humanitarian and development 'operational and funding silos' and, wherever possible, to rationalise the number of organisations involved in humanitarian response and disaster relief, perhaps through a system of self-certification on the part of NGOs.
- There is scope for more regular pooling of experience by Canadian and British fire and rescue services about rapid deployment overseas in the immediate aftermath of earthquakes and other natural disasters.
- More effective direct communication should be sought with the affected population in areas of conflict, humanitarian crisis and natural disaster, e.g. insensitivity to local needs and views was identified as a major weakness in the international response to the earthquake in Haiti.
- Information diffusion, as facilitated by the Thomson Reuters Foundation's AlertNet, should be further promoted and as early as possible after a disaster hits.

RESPONSE TO R2P SITUATIONS

- Participants in the Colloquium endorsed the principles of R2P set out at the UN in 2005, particularly that military intervention should be seen as a last resort, after diplomacy and other measures had failed.
- On the other hand, the importance of timeliness in international engagement was well recognized, if major loss of life or even genocide were to be avoided.
- Any proposed intervention should be tested against a set of objective, impartial criteria: a breach of international law should have been committed; a threat to wider peace must be identified; all other means to resolve the crisis should have been exhausted; the response should be proportionate to the scale and nature of the crisis; the response should be consistent with international law; and finally, there should be a realistic prospect of success before intervention is undertaken.

- The industrialized democracies should recognize the extreme sensitivity of many developing countries to intervention by them that seemed like neo-colonialism. That was one of several different reasons for Russian and Chinese vetoes on the Security Council, since their perception that the West had overstepped its UN mandate for military intervention in Libya.
- The importance of local regional support and involvement was underlined as a precondition for engagement in most circumstances, e.g. Libya versus Syria;
- The Canadian and British Governments were encouraged to see that UN integrated missions offer 'the only universal platform currently capable of delivering complex security, rule of law, political and human rights mandates in a crisis.'
- The British and Canadian governments should consider endorsing the recent initiative by President Obama and Secretary of State Clinton to establish an Atrocities Prevention Board.(reference: http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2012/07/195409.htm)
- The governments of Canada and the United Kingdom were urged to consider rape much as they would other military practices, (such as the use of anti-personnel land mines or the indiscriminate use of armed force), which deliberately expose civilian populations to great harm. For instance, both Canada and the UK should support efforts by the Congolese government to reform its armed forces and to prosecute those responsible for rape atrocities. (This was an example of a wider problem).
- Governments should not endanger NGO representatives by associating them too closely with the implementation of political objectives. NGOs must be seen to be independent and impartial for their effectiveness and the relative safety of their personnel.
- Unfettered media coverage and maximum transparency was always to be welcomed.

LONG-TERM
- There was a vital need for improved understanding of foreign cultures, societies and languages, especially since so many conflicts were intra-national rather than international;
- Increased funding for existing tertiary educational institutions was needed in relation to this, in spite of overall budget constraints;
- Efforts should be made through the Canadian and British education systems and through the media to increase public awareness of the self-interest and moral imperative to provide adequate funding for national and UN involvement in humanitarian response and international engagement. This would also sustain a more vocal support of UN peacekeeping efforts by national governments.
- Climate change is one factor behind the rise in the incidence of desertification and permanent flooding, among other phenomena, which are likely to pose increasing political and humanitarian challenges. The British and Canadian Goverments might stimulate international discussion of the possibility of creating a new category of Environmental Refugee, in addition to the categories of Political and Economic Refugee already recognised in UN Conventions.
- In the medium term the Canadian and British Governments might again encourage the UN to accept Aquinas's Just War criteria as guidelines for the application of armed force, as had been attempted by some member states in 2004.
- In the longer term the Canadian and British Governments should encourage the UN to change the discretionary "Responsibility to Protect" under clear and agreed criteria and with due legal authority to an obligatory "Duty to Protect" (D2P), even if the trigger is bound to remain political in practice.
- The Canadian and British Governments should encourage UNESCO and the UN as a whole to adopt 'a Responsibility or preferably a Duty to Protect Journalists', who have increasingly become the targets of violent attacks and arbitrary imprisonment, while a 'climate of impunity' often surrounds these crimes. It was noted that journalists also have a duty to report responsibly.

APPENDIX

PROGRAMME

The 2011 CANADA-UK COLLOQUIUM

"Humanitarian Response and International Engagement in Fragile States: how Britain and Canada could be more effective."

Thursday 1st December

Briefing Day for the Canadian delegation

9.00	Arrive House of Commons; met by Mr Andrew Rosindell MP, Council member CUKC and Chairman of the British-Canadian All Party Parliamentary Group
	The Rt. Hon. Douglas Alexander MP, Shadow Foreign Secretary and former Secretary of State for International Development
	Watch Speaker's Procession in Central Lobby, Houses of Parliament accompanied by Mr Andrew Rosindell MP
	Martin Horwood MP, Chair of the Liberal Democrat international affairs team
	Mr Alistair Burt MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State, Foreign & Commonwealth Office.
12.20	The Rt. Hon. Alan Duncan MP, Minister of State, DFID and working lunch with Ms Sheelagh Stewart, Head of HMG's Interdepartmental Stabilisation Unit
14.25	General Sir David Richards, Chief of Defence Staff, and former Commander of British forces in Sierra Leone.
15.55	Presentation on Training Journalists in Fragile States by Ms Monique Villa, Chief Executive Officer, and Ms Jo Weir, Director of Training, Thomson Reuters Foundation
18.30	Reception and CUKC 40th Anniversary Dinner, at the Mansion House, with the Lord Mayor of London, the Rt.Hon. David Wootton, to be addressed by HE Mr. Kamalesh Sharma, Commonwealth Secretary-General, David Craig President, Governance, Risk & Compliance, Thomson Reuters and Mr Bob Dechert MP, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canada

Friday 2 December
Location: Wiston House, Steyning, West Sussex, BN44 3DZ

THE 2011 CANADA-UK COLLOQUIM

Chairman: Lord Hannay of Chiswick GCMG, CH

09.00   **Introduction**: Mr Philip Peacock Chairman of the British Committee, CUKC, and Dr Robert Wolfe, Canadian Co-ordinator, CUKC

Opening of 2011 Colloquium:

The Rt. Hon. Lord Howell of Guildford, Minister of State at the Foreign & Commonwealth Office

Mr Bob Dechert MP, Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs, Canada

Chairman's Opening Remarks: Lord Hannay

09.15-10.45   Session 1: Whether and When to Respond?

UK: Professor Sir Adam Roberts KCMG, President, The British Academy, and Fellow, Balliol College, University of Oxford, former Professor of International Relations, University of Oxford

Canada: Professor Roland Paris, University Research Chair in International Security and Governance, University of Ottawa

10.45   Break for tea and coffee

11.00-12.45   Session 2: Governance, Security and Justice

UK: Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon GCMG, KBE, PC, Leader of Liberal Democrats 1988-99, High Representative for Bosnia and Herzogovina 2002-2006

Canada: Mr Ben Rowswell, Former Representative of Canada in Kandahar

12.45   Lunch (with an address by Lord Ashdown to brief CUKC Participants on his recent report for the British Government on ways to improve Emergency Response after Natural Disasters)

14.00-15.30   Session 3: Roles for the Media

UK: Mr Tim Large, Thomson Reuters Foundation

Canada: Mr Doug Saunders, European Bureau Chief & International-Affairs
                 Columnist, The Globe and Mail

15.30   Break for tea and coffee

15.45-17.15   Session 4: Roles for Business & Technology

UK: Sir Mark Moody-Stuart KCMG, Chairman, Global Compact
                 Foundation,
                 Director of Accenture and of Saudi Aramco, former Chairman of the
                 Royal Dutch/Shell Group

Canada: Mr Nolan Watson, President & CEO, Sandstorm Gold & Sandstorm
                 Metals & Energy; President, Nations Cry.

17.15-18.45   Discussion of Afghanistan led by Mr Francesc Vendrell CMG, Former
                 UN Assistant Secretary-General and EU Special Representative for
                 Afghanistan

19.30   Reception and Colloquium Dinner
                 Mr Peter Watkins CBE, Director General, Defence Academy of the
                 United Kingdom

Saturday 3 December

09.00-10.30   Session 5: Working with International Organizations

UK: Sir John Holmes GCVO, KBE, CMG, Director, The Ditchley
                 Foundation, former UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian
                 Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, former UK Ambassador to
                 France and Portugal, and former Principal Private Secretary to the
                 Prime Minister

Canada: Senator Hugh D. Segal OC, (Kingston-Frontenac-Leeds), Chair of the
                 Special Senate Committee on Anti-Terrorism, member of the Senate
                 Committee on Foreign Affairs, and member of the Eminent Persons
                 Group of the Commonwealth Secretariat

10.30   Break for tea and coffee

10.45-12.30   Session 6: Government-NGO Relations and the Roles of NGOs

UK: Mr Brendan Gormley MBE, Chief Executive, Disasters Emergency
                Committee
                Mr Michael Bailey, Senior Policy Adviser on Humanitarian and Security Issues,
                Oxfam

Canada: Ms Dorothée Gizenga, Executive Director, Diamond Development
                Initiative International

12.45   Lunch

14.00-15.30   Session 7: More Effective Ways Forward

UK: Rt. Hon. Lord Hurd of Westwell CH, CBE, former UK Secretary of
                State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

Canada: Ms Carolyn McAskie OC, Fellow at the University of Ottawa and
                Former United Nations Assistant Secretary General for Peacebuilding
                Support

15.30   Break for tea and coffee

15.45-16.45   Rapporteur's report and discussion

                Rapporteur: Professor Paul Cornish, Department of Politics, Languages
                & International Studies, University of Bath

16.45   Closing Remarks by Colloquium Chairman

17.00   End of Colloquium

17.15   Organisers' Meeting

20.00   Farewell Dinner

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

CHAIRMAN

Lord Hannay of Chiswick GCMG, CH
Co-Chairman, All Party Parliamentary Group on Global Security, former UK
Ambassador and Permanent Representative to the UN

RAPPORTEUR

Professor Paul Cornish
Department of Politics, Languages & International Studies, University of Bath.
Former Carrington Professor of International Security and Head, International
Security Programme, The Royal Institute of International Affairs, Chatham House

UK MINISTER OPENING THE COLLOQUIUM

Rt. Hon. Lord Howell of Guildford
Minister of State at the Foreign & Commonwealth Office

UK ADVISERS TO THE 2011 COLLOQUIUM

Mr Nicolas Maclean CMG
Chief Executive MWM (Strategy), former Senior Fellow, International Institute for
Strategic Studies.

Mr Paul Schulte
Non-Resident Senior Associate, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace
Visiting Senior Research Fellow Centre for Science and Security Studies, Department
of War Studies, Kings College, University of London

CANADIAN ADVISER TO THE 2011 COLLOQUIUM

Dr J. Andrew Grant
Assistant Professor, Queen's University

SPEAKERS: MANSION HOUSE DINNER 1 DECEMBER

Rt. Hon. David Wootton
Lord Mayor of London

HE Mr. Kamalesh Sharma
Commonwealth Secretary-General

Mr David Craig
President, Governance, Risk & Compliance, Thomson Reuters

Mr Bob Dechert MP
Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Foreign Affairs

SPEAKERS: COLLOQUIUM DINNER 2 DECEMBER

Mr Peter Watkins CBE
Director General, Defence Academy of the United Kingdom

BRITISH SPEAKERS (in order of presentation)

Professor Sir Adam Roberts KCMG
President, The British Academy, and Fellow, Balliol College, University of Oxford, former Professor of International Relations, University of Oxford

Rt. Hon. Lord Ashdown of Norton-sub-Hamdon GCMG, KBE, PC
Leader of Liberal Democrats 1988-99, High Representative for Bosnia and Herzogovina 2002-2006

Mr Tim Large
Thomson Reuters Foundation

Sir Mark Moody-Stuart KCMG
Chairman, Global Compact Foundation

Mr Francesc Vendrell CMG
Former UN Assistant Secretary-General and EU Special Representative for Afghanistan

Sir John Holmes GCVO, KBE, CMG
Director, The Ditchley Foundation, former UN Under-Secretary-General for Humanitarian Affairs and Emergency Relief Coordinator, former UK Ambassador to France and Portugal, and former Principal Private Secretary to the Prime Minister

Mr Brendan Gormley
Chief Executive, Disasters Emergency Committee

Mr Michael Bailey
Senior Policy Adviser on Humanitarian and Security Issues, Oxfam

Rt. Hon. Lord Hurd of Westwell CH, CBE
Former UK Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs

OTHER BRITISH PARTICIPANTS

Ms Rushanara Ali MP
Shadow Minister for International Development

Mr Chris Austin
Head of Conflict, Humanitarian and Security Department, DFID

Sir Andrew Burns KCMG
Hon. President Canada-UK Colloquia and former British High Commissioner to Canada

Mr Anthony Cary CMG
Executive Director, Queen's Blyth Worldwide and former British High Commissioner to Canada

Mr Peter Chenery
Hon. Treasurer CUKC

Dr. Ian Collard
Head, North America Department, Foreign & Commonwealth Office

Professor David Cope
Director, Parliamentary Office of Science and Technology, CUKC Council Member

Mr Nuradin Dirie
Independent Analyst specialising in the Horn of Africa with particular interest in Somalia.

Ms Lyse Doucet
BBC Presenter

Mr George Edmonds-Brown
Executive Secretary, CUKC

Baroness Falkner of Margravine
Liberal Democrat Justice Spokesman

Mr Kevin Farrell
Political Officer, British High Commission, Ottawa

Mr Brian Ingle
Head of the Disaster Management Unit, Plan International - UK

Dr Geraldine Kenney-Wallace FRSC
Chair, Chi3 Photonics, CUKC Council Member

Dr Randolph Kent
Director, Humanitarian Futures Programme, King's College, London

Mr William Horsley
Chairman, Association of European Journalists (UK)

Mr Roderick Johnson MNI
Chief Coastguard, HM Coast Guards

Rt. Hon. Dr Denis MacShane MP
Member of Parliament for Rotherham

Dr Ayesha Nathoo
University of Cambridge

Ms Emily Paddon
University of Oxford

Mr Philip Peacock
Chairman, Canada-UK Colloquia

Mr Dave Ramscar
Chief Fire Officer, Lincolnshire Fire and Rescue

Ms Jane Reeves
Senior Vice President, Global Government Affairs Coordinator, Thomson Reuters

Major-General Sir Sebastian Roberts KCVO, OBE
Senior Army Representative at the Royal College of Defence Studies 2007 - 2010.

Mr Andrew Rosindell MP
Member of Parliament for Romford, Member of the Foreign Affairs Select
Committee

Ms Carla Thomas
North America Department, Foreign and Commonwealth Office

Ms Anikka Weerasinghe
Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, UK Branch

Mr Robert Wilton
Head of Policy/Political Affairs, International Civilian Office, Kosovo

CANADIAN SPEAKERS (in order of presentation)

Dr Roland Paris
University Research Chair in International Security and Governance, University of Ottawa

Mr Ben Rowswell
Former Representative of Canada in Kandahar

Mr Doug Saunders;
European Bureau Chief & International-Affairs Columnist, The Globe and Mail

Mr Nolan Watson
President & CEO – Sandstorm Gold & Sandstorm Metals & Energy;
President – Nations Cry.

The Honourable Senator Hugh D. Segal OC
Chair of the Special Senate Committee on Anti-Terrorism, member of the Senate Committee on Foreign Affairs, and member of the Eminent Persons Group of the Commonwealth Secretariat

Ms Dorothée Gizenga
Executive Director, Diamond Development Initiative International

Ms Carolyn McAskie OC
Fellow at the University of Ottawa and former United Nations Assistant Secretary General for Peacebuilding Support

OTHER CANADIAN PARTICIPANTS

Dr Christopher Berzins
Deputy Director for Northern Europe, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade

Mr Claude Boucher
Deputy High Commissioner of Canada

HE Mr Gordon Campbell
High Commissioner of Canada

Ms W.R. Nadège Compaoré
Graduate student, Queen's University

Dr Mel Cappe
University of Toronto and Chairman of the Canadian Advisory Committee

Colonel Robert Chamberlain MSC, CD
Director Peacekeeping Policy, Department of National Defence, Ottawa

Mr Chris Cornish
Conference Co-ordinator, Queen's University

Dr Robert Fowler
Former Permanent Representative of Canada to the UN and former special envoy of the Secretary-General to Niger

Dr Louise Fréchette
Former Deputy Secretary General of the United Nations

Mr Kumar Gupta
Head of Advocacy, Political Affairs & Public Diplomacy, Canadian High Commission

Ms Samantha Jenkins
Dalhousie University

Mr Anatoly Levshin
Graduate student, University of Oxford

Colonel M. D. Makulowich MD, CD
Army Advisor to the Canadian Defence and Liaison Staff, London

The Honourable John McKay PC, M.P
Liberal Member of Parliament for the Riding of Scarborough – Guildwood

Ms Leslie E Norton
Director General International Humanitarian Assistance, Canadian International Development Agency

Dr Kim Richard Nossal
Director, Centre for International & Defence Studies, Queen's University

Ms Susan Ormiston
CBC Television

Professor Tony Penikett
Tony Penikett Negotiations Inc., former Premier of the Yukon

Mr Scott Proudfoot
Minister Counsellor Political Affairs & Public Diplomacy, Canadian High Commission