

people on the ground. They are points of discussion at kitchen tables rather than abstract, "high politics" issues. Politicians must react.

Conflict has increased in the past decade. We can not even count the number of lives lost. These are intrastate wars, based on ethnic, religious and economic divisions, in which 90% of casualties are civilian. Contemporary intrastate conflicts do not have internationally established rules of war. This means that people are forced from their homes because they are ethnically different. They are driven from across borders to fulfil tactical prerogatives of oppressive states. Children are often used in these wars and countless other unconscionable acts perpetrated. This shocking disregard for human life must be countered. Securing human life must be at the centre of foreign policy. To this end the human security framework should be further developed.

There is a need to rearrange ourselves into new coalitions and utilise new technology. The Ottawa process may be a model for New Diplomacy. It capitalised on broad public awareness about the negative impact of landmines for civilians, it actively involved the public, and new technology was exploited. The debate over the establishment of the International Criminal Court in Parliament created interest in the new institution and nurtured thinking about Canada's own legislative system. Politicians, like-minded countries and other international actors realised it was time to change the rules, culminating in the signing of the Rome ICC Treaty. The Treaty ensures that criminals can no longer hide behind state sovereignty. Furthermore, crimes against women and girls and other sexual crimes can no longer be committed without impunity.

Contrary to some criticism of the human security approach, advocating the defence of suffering people is not an assault on the sovereignty of states. Who enforces legitimacy if states can not protect or if they abuse their own populations? What criteria define the sovereignty of states? To counter the charge of neocolonialism, collective action is necessary and fora, such as this one, have to be found to tackle these challenges. Preventing abuse, stopping atrocities, stemming drug traffic, are enormous problems that no one state can tackle alone.

Intervention should not be seen always in negative terms. We would applaud police intervening to save a victim, or a doctor's intervention to save a life. The term covers a wide spectrum of action and includes prevention. The recently mandated mission to Peru to oversee the reconstruction of democracy following the recent elections, first in the history of the Organisation of the American States, was a conflict prevention exercise. Peruvian society was very polarised and restless about the state's actions during the elections. The mission intervened before conflict erupted by acting as a party in a continuing dialogue and diffusing tensions. At other times, like in Rwanda, it is imperative that the international community intervenes militarily. While some argue that military intervention is only possible with the approval of the Security Council, the veto can not be the defining tool of action today. Nevertheless, deciding when intervention is warranted poses serious questions. Under whose auspices? By what criteria? Recognizing what standards? Using what tools?

Canada has been striving to include a stronger human security dimension into the work of