

Aileen Carroll, Member of Parliament, noted in introducing presentations that the best approach to prevention issues is inclusive, coherent and comprehensive. All stages of conflict must be taken into account and prevention from a regional approach and response is essential.

Independent Chilean security analyst Raul Sohr stated that a central challenge of conflict prevention is to redefine the concept of security and diffuse a shared understanding of human security where a large degree of scepticism continues to exist among a number of states. An additional challenge is to strategically use the concept of human security to redefine perceived threats. For example, in the 1970s, the Peruvian state defined security issues as threats to national sovereignty by neighbouring states, accordingly planning a military response. As it turned out, the largest and most destructive threat to the Peruvian state was internal; the Peruvian state was not militarily equipped to deal with the *Shinning Path* revolutionary group. Central threats to human security today include: a) militarism and military spending; b) threats to human rights; c) crime and disparity of resources; and d) threats to democracy and civil society.

John Watson, of CARE Canada, said it is critical to recognize the changing nature of conflict and the increase in human insecurity in the post-Cold War era. Political leaders, once propped up or kept out of power by intervening world powers, have sometimes resorted to the politics of 'hate' in order to stay in power. There are central themes in this strategy, which include: land and property rights (legal issues); illegal economies; and media and hate propaganda. Globalization is not necessarily a positive phenomenon, particularly given that shares in prosperity are not even. Parallel to this, there has been a drop in development assistance in the post-Cold War era. The rise of neo-liberal economics sometimes compels leaders to choose between structural adjustment programs (SAPs) or hate politics. Hate politics then becomes a justification for militarism. When we start conflict prevention analysis from this assumption, new pressure points are revealed, points where non-governmental organizations can respond and act effectively. For example, when there is a loss of international resources, local leaders often lay blame on propertied minority groups. Therefore, work on legal property issues is a critical place to intervene. Radio and rallies evoke hate politics to mobilize people around leaders – this is an early warning indicator (monitor hate) that flags "goon squads" that act as enforcers of hate politics. While the prospects for prevention may be grim, as it is difficult to reverse hate politics, at least NGOs and international organizations can lay the ground work for prevention.

Susan Brown, of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), contended that a conceptual link between development and conflict has slowly evolved in development agencies, so that prevention-oriented policy and tools exist today to assist bilateral and multilateral development organizations. CIDA has developed the Peacebuilding Fund, recognizing that prevention is the most effective way of going about the development business - the Carnegie Commission demonstrated this in nine case studies, where the cost of conflict was estimated at \$216 billion US. If prevention had taken place, the world community would have saved 76%, Brown argued. Similar studies on military spending and peacekeeping have been done by the Bonn International Centre for Conversion. But the dilemma is that it is easier to mobilize after conflict and not before. Most intervention, particularly development, occurs after a conflict takes place, when it is easier and safer to work. In other words, a *culture of prevention* does not yet exist. At the same time, some new initiatives are occurring. These initiatives include the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) Development Assistance