

also be violators of fundamental human rights and freedoms. The distinction must be made between weak government and good governance.

Finally, it was emphasized that there is no quick fix to the problem and “one size does not fit all”. As such, the problem needs to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. What is clear, however, is that the problem cannot be solved on the ground or dealt with at the humanitarian level. International/multilateral level solutions must therefore be explored.

Two gaps were noted: warlords often use the rhetoric of grievance to legitimize their actions, how do we differentiate between the wolf and the sheep, between warlords and true national liberation movements? And, how can warlords be best held accountable for human rights abuses? What is the tradeoff between peace and justice? What if any impact will the International Criminal Court have on addressing the issue of warlords?

Four recommendations were made. First, that multinational corporations be held accountable for their collusion with warlords. A code of conduct coupled with monitoring mechanisms, spot checks and audits is required. Second, the UN should take a more proactive and forceful role in addressing the problem. For example, a proposal was forwarded to transform the Trusteeship Council into an entity that could specifically tackle the problem of failed states. Third, the British military intervention in Sierra Leone is a case in point that warlords can be put down quickly. Because warlords learn from each other’s experiences, the use of force to apprehend some warlords would send a clear message to others. Finally, the foreign assets of known warlords should be traced and frozen. Travel bans for warlords, their families, and close associates should be put in place.

*Rapporteur: Mark Selby, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs*

## SESSION 9.5: Issues and Trends Follow-Up

James Wright from DFAIT, chair of the closing session, said that over the course of the three days of the consultations very intense, productive discussions and debate had occurred. However, the consultations had highlighted real challenges lie ahead, such as engaging Washington, examining the root causes of terrorism and other forms of violent conflict, and international humanitarian law issues. He also noted that human security is an important aspect of the work in the reviews proposed for foreign, defence and aid policy.

Paul Evans from the University of British Columbia noted that the Consultations showed there were many issues which intersected between policy development, field activity, activism and advocacy and academic research. He suggested that useful follow-up could be carried out in the areas of the root causes of conflict and terrorism and information technology and the dark side of its uses by ‘uncivil’ society actors. More concretely, he suggested convening a workshop to match Human Security Fellows with representatives from the Department of Foreign Affairs to determine where research connects with various themes relevant to the government. NGO colleagues would be invited to join the discussion. Secondly, there is also the possibility of collaborative research by the academic and NGO communities being carried out for presentation