

conflicts relating to trade in illicit resources, such as diamonds. This creates impossible tensions between nations. An example is the trade in diamonds in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea.

In most of these scenarios, General Dallaire said, we have found ourselves wanting in assessing their impacts, in developing the political will to intervene in a proactive fashion, and in deploying resources to attempt to stop them. This is not only in primarily military conflicts, but also where we see slaughters of ethnicities, religious groups and the like. Certainly in Rwanda, the idea of genocide was foreign to our minds because genocide equated to the Holocaust during the Second World War. We could not imagine anything coming close to the Holocaust and so we had picked up new terms such as ethnic cleansing or political decapitation. To spark a reaction, we found ourselves using the word 'holocaust.' Even with this terminology, there was no reaction or interest because there was no self-interest. There have been ad hoc reactions, he said. We have poured a lot of money into aid, to wash our hands of the blood because of our non-intervention or will to intervene. Or, we have tried to ignore conflict, or gave haphazard support to a single nation, a coalition, or the UN. While we have found ourselves facing many disparate conflicts in Africa, with others waiting in the wing, it is funny how Zaire has disappeared off the map since we started concentrating on Afghanistan. But the philosophy of sorting out one crisis and moving onto the next one is not conducive to resolving conflict in the long term and hopefully preventing it from exploding.

There are two questions to ask ourselves. First, "Are all humans human or are some more human than others?" For example, a staff officer from a country that was assessing whether to send some of its military into Rwanda, went to General Dallaire's office about three weeks into the genocide. He asked questions such as: How many were killed last week? How many today? How many are likely to be killed tomorrow? How many more weeks will this continue? When asked why do you need such statistics, it became clear that for their small population to support this effort, their calculation of political risk was that for every one of their own soldiers killed or wounded there had to be 85,000 dead Rwandans. Another nation did an assessment and in debriefing General Dallaire said: There is really nothing here. We have no self-interest here. There is absolutely no value. All you have here are humans.

When every human being is not perceived as being human, the will to assist either proactively or to stabilize the situation simply does not exist. There is no will strong enough to go in there and face such catastrophic scenarios. There have been a few exceptions, but mostly we tend to wait until the situation stabilizes, the number of dead has augmented and then we throw in billions of dollars in aid, Dallaire said. Who is making money on this aid? It seems to be an interesting business to be in. Rather than giving \$200 million to save a nation from avoiding a catastrophe, and failing to give the money to the UN for the general to operate, we then give billions of dollars in aid, only a few months later.

Can we answer the questions: "Are all humans human or are some more human than others?" Do we have the right tools in these complex conflicts to do the job? Do Western security, diplomatic, or humanitarian methodologies actually work in Africa? Do they provide instruments to actually resolve these conflicts? Are we just adapting Cold War methodologies that are rarely innovative, adaptive or anticipatory and are incapable of supporting the implementation of peace agreements? For General Dallaire, a whole new military and diplomatic