

- How do we engage the moderate Muslim World and support notions of shared (global) citizenship?
- What are the consequences of what has been called a *hyperpuissance* of the United States?

The Chair invited participants to address five broad themes:

- Security Threats/Perceptions
- “Homeland”/Global Responses
- Perspectives on Terrorism
- “Security for Whom?”
- Canadian Interests and Values: Security Policy Implications.

Ten participants agreed to lead off discussions on those themes.

### **Security Threats/Threat Perceptions**

Leading U.S. policy-makers hold a narrow, military-oriented view of security. From this point of view, there are four general categories or sources of threat to U.S. security: the possible rise of a potential Great Power competitor; conflict in Europe, Asia and/or the Persian Gulf; nuclear proliferation; and terrorism. None of these present any real challenge to the U.S., and even Iraq does not constitute much of a threat against the military might of the U.S. A potential nuclear war between India and Pakistan, while not likely, is not impossible at some time in the future. Other states, such as Iran and Iraq, wish to gain nuclear weapons, and in fact the greatest threat arises from the “loose nukes.” The threat of terrorism, though important, has been somewhat exaggerated, and perhaps the greatest significance of September 11 was that terrorists demonstrated their capability to wreak damage. Other specific threats include stability in Pakistan and Afghanistan, and the lack of solution to the Arab-Israeli conflict.

For societies outside the United States and for many Americans, this view of threats to security is incomplete. For some, the security of individuals has gained recognition and importance. This definition is broader than the traditional interpretation of security which was narrowly defined as security of the state alone. Furthermore, the nature of conflict has evolved, creating a situation where, in the 1990s, the absolute number of wars or armed conflicts had declined, in part because of UN involvement in peace-building. Nevertheless, certain regions, notably Africa, have not experienced a decline in conflict, and today the vast majority (90%) of wars occur in poor countries, and the vast majority are intra-state conflicts. Such evidence suggests that lack of economic development is the core cause of global conflict and, therefore, development in the South should be seen as an important security policy for the North. Also, a greater priority should be assigned to conflict prevention (which also has the added benefit of being less costly than war or peacebuilding). Nevertheless, lack of economic development cannot be the sole explanation