
REPORT FROM THE CHAIRMAN

Finding the words to mark the destruction of a vision is neither easy nor pleasant. But like it or not, that is my task in this last Annual Report of the Canadian Institute for International Peace and Security. Expressions of disappointment, even anger, would clearly be out of place. So the tone of this brief statement will instead be one of pride in accomplishment, and of congratulation to the many individuals who have contributed to this unique and successful venture.

A decade or so ago Canada had achieved global recognition for its special contributions to the cause of peace, and for its leading role in the search for a more secure and stable international environment. A group of thoughtful Canadians saw this as an opportunity to create a new, distinctively Canadian, entity, one that could become a national focal point for the stimulation of policy research and public understanding of the issues involved.

Their vision was supported unanimously and with enthusiasm by Parliamentarians of the day, on both sides of the House of Commons and the Senate. Thus the Institute came into being, with the passage of Bill C-32 in June 28, 1984, as a surprisingly independent body with assured funding and the stimulating mission that is printed elsewhere in this Report.

Translating an exciting concept into a working reality was a daunting task. William Barton and Geoffrey Pearson, the Institute's first Board Chairman and Executive Director respectively, and its inaugural Board of Directors, can attest to that. But by 1988, when Bernard Wood took over as Chief Executive Officer and I became Chairman, the Institute had already emerged as an important national resource, and as an internationally recognized force, for the promotion and understanding of peace and security issues.

The subsequent achievements of the Institute are described later in this document and in earlier Annual Reports, and I shall not repeat them here. Two indicators of success deserve particular mention. First, the remit of the Institute required it to work with what often seemed to be two opposing forces: in simple terms, those favouring peace through conciliation on the one hand, and those emphasizing the need for greater security on the other. While probably not satisfying the extremes at either end of this spectrum, the Institute clearly helped to bring about dialogue and a degree of understanding between those holding opposing views on the issue. Many came to realize that without security there is no peace, and without peace as a goal, security is an empty pursuit. And second, the Institute did its work efficiently; it never became bureaucratized, and it consistently met impressive standards of effective performance and productivity.