

# When Humanity Fails: Lessons from the UN General Who Tried to Stop the Genocide\*

---

SENATOR ROMÉO DALLAIRE \*\*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Thank you. There is nothing like getting an award before you speak.<sup>1</sup> That's a great encouragement. Good morning to all of you snowbound Manitobans. I have spent many days at what we used to call the 'bald-ass hills' of Shilo, freezing to death, trying to defend the Western world from out there. And so I am at home and today I sort of feel at home; both on account of the weather, and also by being in this type of room, although usually I am not the one standing in front of those chairs. I am usually a member of the Court Martial, and so am sitting at the front of the room.

I think it is worthy that I try to sell my wares to you this morning in regard to human rights and the advancement of humanity in this very complex and ambiguous era. I was asked to be disciplined this morning and not speak too long, so I do not know how I am going to be able to get through the 143 slides I brought. As a soldier and not an academic, I use every pedagogical tool that is available. We are very visual people, so the slides are there to reinforce what I hope to pass on today. I will do something that usually retired Generals and apprentice politicians are not very good at: I will work at brevity. When I spent my time with the US marines<sup>2</sup> they taught me

---

\* This speech was delivered at Robson Hall on 5 October 2012. The event was organized by the Mahatma Ghandi Centre of Canada in conjunction with the University of Manitoba Centre for Human Rights Research.

\*\* LGen (Ret'd), Senator, O.C., C.M.M., G.O.C., M.S.C., C.D.

<sup>1</sup> Senator Dallaire was presented with the 2012 Mahatma Gandhi Peace Award by the Mahatma Gandhi Centre of Canada president, Dr. Krishnamurti Dakshinamurti.

<sup>2</sup> Senator Dallaire attended the US Marine Corps Command and Staff College in Virginia. LGen (ret) Roméo Dallaire, *Shake Hands with the Devil: The Failure of Humanity in Rwanda*

to power talk, so I hope you'll be prepared to listen as we move through the subject matter rather rapidly.

## II. OVERVIEW & HISTORY

The subject is something that is very simple. Just looking at the title of my lecture, there is not much to it. I believe it is essential that I establish the grand strategic framework within which we should all be working, something that is not often articulated.

It starts with a fundamental question: is the future of humanity merely a struggle to survive on this planet, or is humanity destined for something far more positive? Do you envision a future of continued thriving in an atmosphere of hope? Because, if your vision of the future is based on mere survival, where we struggle solely to manage our existence on this planet, then you are already starting from the wrong premise.

In fact, by constraining the future of humanity to mere survival, you curtail an important source of innovative thinking, and extinguish a source of initiative; in effect, you limit a significant motivator for individual commitment to this very human endeavour. So I hope to argue today that no matter what number of human beings may end up on this planet, the aim of humanity and of human beings is to thrive and continue advancing. To seek that serenity that individuals want for themselves, and for those who are close to them. I hope to argue that the aim of humanity is actually to advance beyond a perverted Darwinism—premised on a view of humanity where the sole objective is to fight for survival, with the strongest winning—and to embrace a view of ourselves as instinctively desiring a life where we can project our capabilities into the future.

I am of the school that says that we live because we want to seek that serenity, and that one day we will, in fact, resolve the frictions of our differences by non-violent means and actually eliminate the need for conflict. This may take a couple of centuries, but that's okay. What are a couple of centuries in the history of humanity, if within those centuries, with the advancement of human rights and ideological revolutions, we're actually able to move to that level? That would be a massive, in fact, unimaginable for many, level of progress. With the cumulative effect of our efforts, if we work for our lifetimes on the advancement of human rights, with the desire for

humanity to continue thriving, and the objective that all humans be treated as humans, we can achieve that. At least, that is what I believe. And I think that's a far more positive premise to look into the future with than the more Western concept of 'how are we going to survive, and how am I going to beat the other guy, and how am I going to actually gain and maintain my capabilities?'

### III. TECHNOLOGICAL ADVANCEMENT, & A GENERATION WITHOUT BORDERS

Let me start with a reference to a short book.<sup>3</sup> It is only 97 pages, and without pictures. It was written by a Polish journalist who has travelled extensively over the last decades. He argued that for about four centuries the Eurocentric Caucasian world was the real world to [Europeans], and that everybody else was the 'other'. Anyone who was not European, in other words the rest of humanity, was the other. Based on that premise, the policies of how they saw themselves advancing were influenced significantly. In some circumstances those policies had positive effects, but in others, particularly with Colonialism, the effects were very negative. Fortunately, through contact and time, the illusion of superiority promulgated by the Eurocentric Caucasian framework, which facilitated treating everybody else as the 'other', has been discredited. Thank God.

It is only relatively recently that this has changed, because of some of the revolutions in technology and travel, the ability of education moving throughout the world, and the communications between all different societies. We're now at a position where the other is also the other. That is to say we're all the other to somebody else. So there is no more central entity that could, in fact, curtail us from advancing humanity.

Now, having gotten rid of that pretentious haughty position of the Eurocentric body and all of its power, we have the ability, and are in a position to move the whole of humanity. Soon, we'll be able to Skype anyone in the world, so there is an obvious new trend, and a new dimension to how we can perceive humanity.

That is why when I look at the students here, and as I looked at the students two days ago at Dalhousie, when I spoke at their graduation, I spoke

---

<sup>3</sup> Ryszard Kapuscinski, *The Other* (Brooklyn: Verso Books, 2008).

of a whole new generation: the under 25 mostly. This generation is what I call 'the generation without borders', because the revolution in communications has effectively eliminated borders. This holds true even in respect to places that we consider to be very far away. For my generation and me, Africa was incredibly far away. For this generation it is only a sophisticated 12-hour flight away. It is no more than that. So in this era that we find ourselves in, there are enormous opportunities, and one of the great opportunities is that youth can actually push aside some of the generations before them and become activists and generators for the future of humanity.

However, these opportunities also carry an incredible responsibility. It is the responsibility of being engaged, not only as activists in the field and locally, but in the processes through which power is being transferred and used. I'll give you an example. In this country, those between 18 and 24 to 30 years old represent about 35 percent of the voting population in this country. Yet, on average, barely forty percent of youths are going to the polls, the lowest of any age group. That means that Federally, on average, and you can interpret it all the way down, there are millions of votes that have never been tabulated because no votes were cast. And that is still ongoing. That number of votes could have a significant impact in the country.

This becomes even more significant when you look at individual circumstances, such as electoral ridings where an MP was elected by 40 votes. It would only take the votes of a single class and BINGO: you've got a different person sitting in Ottawa. Now consider in this era of social communications, where you can coalesce like never before, how you can, in fact, significantly influence the face of politics in one election. If, with all of the tools that are available to you now, and with this sense of responsibility towards humanity, something that seems to be appearing more and more within your generation, if only you decided to vote you could change the face of politics in one election! You could vote for the parties that are there, or you could create your own parties; it is all open to you.

And so the responsibility side of it is the following: you, the 18-25 going towards 30 year olds, you hold the balance of power in this country. You're the ones that will tip the scales. You have the power. If you do not exercise it then you are being irresponsible. Making accusations that politicians are not inspiring you, and so on, is not valid a position that you can hold. If you believe in basic principles like humanity, human rights, the rule of law, good governance, gender equality, and education, then you have no right to just say

you do not like the political elite of the country. You have a responsibility to change it. And contrary to my generation, you now have the tools to do so.

This is the era into which we have stumbled. Prepare yourselves for it. In fact, we are starting to realize it ourselves and, as you are moving through the ranks of the education system, hopefully you are beginning to realize it as well. So, it is a significant responsibility but it is also an incredible opportunity. There are some pretty significant problem areas and concerns, but you have the tools to address them. And, by the by, because you can talk to almost anyone around the world through technology, and thereby communicate without borders, you can actually frame humanity en masse, and conceive of and understand things like the environment at the global scale.

The environment is more than local; the environment is the world, it covers the whole planet. Human rights encompass all of humanity; there are no artificial limits to what you're doing. There are opportunities in the unanswered questions of our era. Questions like: are all humans human? Are we all equal, really? Is every human being equal, or are some human beings more human than others? Do some people count more than others? We put commanders in the field on these very complex missions, and hold them more accountable for bringing everybody home safely than actually accomplishing a mission, and saving maybe tens of thousands of lives, and helping, in essence, a democracy re-establish itself.

During the genocide in Rwanda the extremists would use very young children to stop convoys of humanitarian aid, water, food, medical supplies, wood, and so on. These young kids would have to follow the orders they were given, because if they didn't the extremists would simply have killed them. There was a civil war going on, and genocide behind the lines. On one occasion, I went between the lines into this 'no-man's land' and, up ahead about a couple of hundred meters, there was this little boy about seven years old. The immediate reaction was that this might be an ambush, because that was how they were often able to stop those convoys. So we stopped and I jumped out with a couple of soldiers. No ambush. We went to the huts along the road, looking for somebody to take care of this child, and all we found were bodies of people who'd been killed weeks beforehand. As we're looking we lost the child. So we doubled-back, and we found him in a hut where there's a male and female adult, and a couple kids. They were half eaten by dogs and rats, and he's sitting there as if he's at home. So I picked him up, and brought him in front of my vehicle. I looked at him. The boy's stomach

was bloated; he was mangy, dirty, in rags, and surrounded by flies. But then I looked into his eyes. And what I saw in the eyes of that little boy—seven years old, in the middle of civil war and genocide—was exactly what I saw in the eyes of my seven year old son when I left Quebec City for Africa. They were the eyes of a human child, and they were exactly the same. That kid was just as human as my son.

Those children are just as human as ours. So when we see the response to the massive abuses of these children, compared to our reaction to an amber alert here, we have got to start questioning whether or not we really consider all humans human, or whether we have established a bit of a pecking order. I would argue by our actions and inactions, particularly over the last 20 years (since the end of the Cold War), that the Sub-Sahara Black African has fallen to the lowest level of our assessment of human beings.

A humanitarians' predicament is this: how do we reconcile the humanitarians, the NGOs, the ones working on advancing humanity, with those who are caught up with the security responsibilities; the police, the militaries, and the structures thereof. How can they work together? And why are they, in fact, so much in friction in the field? Why do the NGOs not want to work with the military? Why are they hiring security companies, made up of all kinds of characters, instead of using military forces from Democratic countries, which follow the rule of law, and also humanitarian law and military law? Why is there no way of reconciling that? Why are they insisting on keeping that separation? And is that separation healthy? Why is it that, in front of the International Tribunal for Rwanda (and it was the same in Yugoslavia), I testified several times and brought all kinds of information against those who perpetrated the genocide;<sup>4</sup> yet my colleague, who was with the International Red Cross and who was the only other person or organization in the field during the genocide, refused to testify? They had massive amounts of information that could have crucified some of these characters, but they refused because of that neutrality requirement that they need in order to continue operating in the future.<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup> See e.g. *Prosecutor v Théoneste Bagosora (Military Trial 1)*, ICTR/INFO-9-2-374.EN, News Brief, Lt General Dallaire Begins Testimony (19 January 2004) (International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda), online: <<http://www.unictr.org/tabid/155/Default.aspx?ID=505>>.

<sup>5</sup> For further explanation of the relationship between military and NGO bodies, and the dedication of NGOs to the maintenance of their neutrality, see *Shake Hands with the Devil*, *supra* note 2 at 493.

This needs to be addressed. We cannot simply continue with that separation and friction between parties in the field, who are ultimately all there to try to resolve these conflicts, if not prevent them.

Human rights are the essence of the argument that we are focused on, and anybody who tells me that this is a Western concept is, in my view, completely mistaken. Because the more people are educated, have intellectual rigour and discipline of thought, and are able to look at the problems within their societies and cultures, as well as the impacts those problems have on individual human beings, the more they ultimately accept the premises of human rights (albeit adjusted premises, at times).

So human rights are not a Western thing; human rights are a fundamental human thing. As we consciously go through the decision making process, and as we bring intellectual rigor to the argument, gradually that argument is recognized, and it becomes capable of adjusting some of the ways of thinking maintained by cultural backgrounds that perpetuate the trampling of individual human rights.

And the last, and I think the most significant, obstacle to progress I wish to speak to, is abject poverty. In a world where upwards of 80% of humanity is living in inhuman conditions, poverty must be recognized as one of the greatest impediments to the advancement of humanity.<sup>6</sup> Poverty is a far greater source of friction in the world than a variety of other subjects, including cultural, ethnic, tribal, and even power-sharing conflicts. Poverty, the inability to even perceive hope and advancement undermines humanity globally. To fight poverty, to work towards eliminating it, to have that hope, and to strive to raise the abilities of individuals is a fundamental predicate to human advancement.

During the Vietnam War a song came out that says “war, what is it good for?” and it argues that it is worth absolutely nothing.<sup>7</sup> Beyond being good for

---

<sup>6</sup> See e.g. Anup Shah, “Poverty Facts and Stats”, *Global Issues* (7 January 2013), online: <http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats#src1>; Martin Ravallion, Shaohua Chen & Prem Sangraula, “Dollar a Day Revisited” (2009) 23:2 *World Bank Econ Rev* 163, online: <[http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2008/09/02/000158349\\_20080902095754/Rendered/PDF/wps4620.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/external/default/WDSContentServer/IW3P/IB/2008/09/02/000158349_20080902095754/Rendered/PDF/wps4620.pdf)>.

<sup>7</sup> “War” (music) Norman Whitfield, USA RE0000771893 (2 January 1998) renewal registration for EP0000269562 (27 February 1970) registered. It was written by Norman Whitfield and Barrett Strong, and while originally intended for the Temptations, was released as a single in 1970 performed by Edwin Starr.

nothing, I think it is fundamental to recognize that war is actually outright failure. It is the failure of the political elites to resolve the complex challenges facing them. It is the failure of communities to work through their frictions and conflicts. And it is the failure of individuals to recognize that war means the killing, maiming, and suffering of other human beings. War calls for the destruction of other human beings. Any concept of war, any concept of conflict as a system or method of resolution is a failure. It is not a premise to build on; it is a failure.

This is not to say that the means of resolving conflicts are set out and easily applicable. They are not. I sit on the advisory board to the Secretary General of the UN with Desmond Tutu and Gareth Evans and Mano Mogatu, who was with UNHCR. We are a committee that looks at the prevention of genocide and mass crimes against humanity. It is the first committee out of the UN in over 50 years to look at preventing, and prevention is the aim. Ladies and gentlemen, the prevention of mass atrocities is not accomplished by throwing money after the problem and hoping it goes away, like we have done with Darfur for the last 10 years. It is not going into the middle of a crisis and hoping to attenuate it and maybe stabilize it, as Afghanistan has been, as well as a number of other ongoing crises, like the Congo and elsewhere. The aim is in preventing them from happening. And we have, in the whole history of the post-Second World War, prevented only one little conflict, the South Kyrgyzstan ethnic clashes in 2010, and that was sheer luck. Other than that, we have failed to prevent, but why is that?

The primary reason is because prevention carries a much higher political risk than engagement, but engagement also carries a higher risk than simply throwing cash at a situation. Now, why is prevention a higher risk? It is because if you go into something and try to prevent it from actually happening, and it then doesn't happen, you are held accountable for the resources and the effort you've invested, and the question becomes, well, why did we go in there in the first place? We could have used those resources somewhere else. But on the other hand, if you go in there and things go to pot, then you become one of the targets for having contributed to the situation, for allowing it to degenerate and go to rot. So the political structures that we have are adverse to prevention because prevention is the highest risk.

The reason holding us back from engagement is our fear of casualties. And that came about mostly with Bill Clinton and Mogadishu in 1993. Some of you may have seen the movie 'Black Hawk Down'. When those 18 Rangers



were killed and their bodies, white bodies, were dragged through the streets of Mogadishu, Bill Clinton, who had been pushing extensively for the advancement of humanity, particularly through the UN, and peacekeeping, completely reversed his position. He brought in Presidential Directive 25, in March of '94,<sup>8</sup> which said that the United States will not engage in foreign conflicts unless it is in their self-interest. And so, on the 6<sup>th</sup> of April a genocide begins in Rwanda, and the Americans in the Security Council (not in the room where we have the TV cameras, but in the one where they beat-up on each other) said "we are not going to get engaged because it is not in our self-interest." Within the first week of that genocide, countries sent in reconnaissance teams to look at the problem. They all had to report back through me, and they came to me saying the same thing: we're not going to recommend engaging in this conflict scenario; it seems a bit tribal. There was a sort of a banality to it, a sort of expectation that this type of thing happens in societies that have not achieved the same level of 'civilization' as the developed Western nations. So there's that acquiescence, but additionally the other side of it was that there was nothing there. There were no strategic resources, no strategic value in the country, and the only thing that is there are human beings, and there are too many of them anyways. It is overpopulated. This reasoning ultimately carried the day. Nobody came.

And so, in this era of enormous complexity and ambiguity, the question of human beings has been stripped down to a question of things – a sort of assessment of value. That's why I do not like the term 'human resources'. It brings me far too close to that sort of context. And what moved us into this context? How come things seem to have shifted so much? They shifted at the end of the Cold War. During that big Eurocentric effort we balanced each other out, and we fed all kinds of dictators around the world in order to keep the peace in the many artificial countries that were arising out of Colonialism. Then we sort of pulled the plug on all of them and said, "we do not need you anymore, sort yourselves out, and bring democracy." Well that's kind of difficult in a nation like Rwanda where there had been 150 years of Colonial rule, 25 years of a dictator, and 3 years of a civil war.<sup>9</sup> Suddenly they want me

---

<sup>8</sup> The Clinton Administration, Presidential Decision Directive (PDD-25): US Policy on Reforming Multilateral Peace Operations, (3 May 1994), online: William J Clinton Presidential Library and Museum <[http://www.clintonlibrary.gov/\\_previous/Documents/2010%20FOIA/Presidential%20Directives/PDD-25.pdf](http://www.clintonlibrary.gov/_previous/Documents/2010%20FOIA/Presidential%20Directives/PDD-25.pdf)>.

<sup>9</sup> For a discussion of the Rwandan Genocide and history, see Peter Langford, "The

to bring a democratic election in two years, in a country that doesn't even have a multi-party system. The stupidity of that is beyond comprehension, and what it did was exacerbate the situation and our ability to bring a solution; it created more tensions, more pressures and in so doing, helped accelerate the total devastation that ultimately happened. The election, the democratic election, I think is one of the last tools of expressing a democracy. There's a hell of a lot more stuff, including basic freedoms, speech, media, and so on, that has got to be sorted out when establishing a multi-party system, before you even consider 'maybe we'll have an election'.

What has thrown the curve into that democratization process is that the historically Eurocentric scenario is no more. A scenario where European nations attempt to bring democracy to failed or failing states, regardless of whether it is desired or not, all the while working through these different frictions. There is a new dimension to it, and it is all this stuff which obviously should be of interest in this Faculty. It is the fact that there is one side of the equation that doesn't want to play by any of the rules. We have seen examples of this context in these civil wars: Rwandans slaughtered Rwandans. There were external influences, but it was still them, and in these civil wars and imploding nations, extremism has dominated. This side of the equation, which plays by no rules, is armed through the proliferation of small arms, and they have power, and they play by none of the rules. Neither humanitarian law nor the law of armed conflict will stop them. The Russians, we knew what their ethos was and we knew they would go by conventions and so on, but not this extremism. So, how do we then provide security when they're not playing by the rules? How do we establish an atmosphere of security? How do we even consider our security? What we did after 9/11 is, in fact, panic. The ones who planned and executed the terrorism were extremists who played by none of the rules. And so, given the panic of the Western world, the reaction to that was what?

One, we'll fiddle with our civil liberties by creating the *Anti-Terrorism Act*<sup>10</sup> or the *American Patriot Act*.<sup>11</sup> We'll fiddle with our human rights by permitting

---

Rwandan Path to Genocide: The Genesis of the Capacity of the Rwandan Post-colonial State to Organise and Unleash a project of Extermination" (2005) 7:3 Civ Wars 1.

<sup>10</sup> SC 2001, c 41. See also the newly passed *Combating Terrorism Act*, SC 2013, c 9, which reinstated controversial aspects of the *Anti-Terrorism Act* that had previously been sunsetted.

<sup>11</sup> *Uniting and Strengthening America by Providing Appropriate Tools Required to Intercept and*

torture. We have even recently seen the government permit the reception and use of information acquired by third-parties through torture.<sup>12</sup> I haven't seen everybody in arms about that, and we're going to use that to crucify people in this country? With torture, or playing with human rights, how far can you go with that? How do you control it when you start fiddling with it? You can pull out finger nails, but not toe nails?

And then we threw out many of the conventions; for example, the Geneva Convention, by creating Guantanamo Bay.<sup>13</sup> There is also the fight that I've been engaged in on behalf of Omar Khadr, a child soldier who was finally brought to Canada after being subject to conduct that amounted to torture and 8 years in jail in Guantanamo.<sup>14</sup> We, in responding to this complex and ambiguous era, have gone down the road of the bad guys, of the extremists. And we're throwing out centuries of work in trying to advance our societies, ultimately. Very rapidly, we have seen the extreme of what has happened to humanity, we have seen genocide reappear on a massive scale. We saw, of course, the killing fields in Cambodia, but also the never-again

---

*Obstruct Terrorism (USA Patriot Act) of 2001, Pub L 107-56, 115 Stat 272.*

<sup>12</sup> See "RCMP, border agents can use torture-tainted information" (24 August 2012), *CBC News* online: *CBC News* <<http://www.cbc.ca/news/canada/story/2012/08/24/rcmp-border-agency-information-torture.html>>.

<sup>13</sup> Geneva Convention III: Relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, 12 August 1949, online: UN Documents <<http://www.un-documents.net/gc-3.htm>>. Prior to 2006 and a putative shift in Pentagon policy, the US Government contended "the Geneva Conventions would be respected as a matter of policy but that they did not apply by law to terrorism suspects held at Guantanamo Bay." See Charles Babington and Michael Abramowitz, "US Shifts Policy on Geneva Conventions", *The Washington Post* (12 July 2006) online: *The Washington Post* <<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/content/article/2006/07/11/AR2006071100094.html>>. Famously, US Secretary of Defence Donald Rumsfeld stated, "we do plan to, for the most part, treat them in a manner that is reasonably consistent with the Geneva conventions, to the extent they are appropriate." Andy McSmith & Anton La Guardia, "Blair wants detainees held in line with PoW convention", *The Telegraph* (17 January 2002) online: *The Telegraph* <<http://www.telegraph.co.uk/news/worldnews/asia/afghanistan/1381817/Blair-wants-detainees-held-in-line-with-PoW-convention.html>>.

<sup>14</sup> See e.g. *Canada (Prime Minister) v Khadr*, 2010 SCC 3, [2010] 1 SCR 44; "Dallaire accuses Canada of hypocrisy on Khadr case", *CTV News* (1 April 2008) online: *CTV News* <<http://www.ctvnews.ca/dallaire-accuses-canada-of-hypocrisy-on-khadr-case-1.286482>>; Anna Mehler Paperny, "Khadr 'relieved' as return to Canada puts his fate in prison system's hands", *The Globe and Mail* (29 September 2012) online: *The Globe and Mail* <<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/national/omar-khadr-in-canadian-prison-after-return-from-us-guantanamo-bay-base/article4576945/>>.

concept of the Holocaust which, ladies and gentlemen, has not worked. If it worked, there wouldn't be any genocide. It hasn't worked.

#### IV. PREVENTION OF GENOCIDE IN THE FUTURE

So, what new concept will be advanced to prevent genocides in the future? How will we prevent mass atrocities? What is of great significance to me are some of the demographics that define developing countries, where in some places 50% of the populations are under the age of 15.<sup>15</sup> The reason this is relevant is that the greatest victims of contemporary conflicts are not just women, but also children. That means that the future of those nations is defined by trauma. They are being heavily mortgaged, so how are they going to get ahead of the game? How are they going to bring solutions to these complex problems if they have been the ones who've been the primary targets?

In Rwanda, they slaughtered over 350,000 youth under the age of 15, and the ones who were doing the slaughtering were youths under the age of 21.<sup>16</sup> So, there is a promise that is missing in the exercise, and that is the belief in human rights and the protection of the rights of children. But, do we protect, do we believe in human rights, or the rights of the child in regard to them being that innocent component that we want to develop into building our future societies?

Well, very rapidly, one of the most horrific consequences of our era has been the use of children as weapons. They're actually weapons of war and they are very effective. They are the most sophisticated low-technology weapon in the inventory today. When we ended the Cold War in '89 we didn't destroy all of those weapons, we sold them off. There are hundreds of millions of light machine guns that a 9 year-old can use very effectively,<sup>17</sup> and

---

<sup>15</sup> See e.g. *The World Factbook*, online: Central Intelligence Agency <[https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/wfbExt/region\\_afr.html](https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/wfbExt/region_afr.html)>. Niger, for example, is listed as having 50% and Uganda 49.8% of their populations under the age of 15.

<sup>16</sup> Romeo Dallaire & Jessica Dee Humphreys, *They Fight Like Soldiers, They Die Like Children* (Toronto: Random House, 2010) at 124 (reference to 4500 people under the age of 18 being part of the massacres) [Dallaire & Humphreys].

<sup>17</sup> Dallaire & Humphreys, *ibid* at 33. Accord Rebecca Peters, "Small Arms: No Single Solution", *UN Chronicle* (1 January 2009) online: UN Chronicle <<http://www.un.org/wcm/content/site/chronicle/home/archive/issues2009/wemustdisarm/smallarmsnosinglresolution>>; United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs, *Small Arms and Light Weapons*:

ammunition up the ying-yang. Lots of kids, lots of weapons, lots of excellent tools with which to conduct conflict.

At any one time, we have hundreds of thousands of children being used in over 30 countries by State and non-State actors as outright, primary weapons of war. Not secondary, but primary. Of which, 40 percent are girls, who are far more useful than boys because in many of those male dominated societies they not only fight up front and lead, but run the bivouac and maintain the logistics, while being sex slaves and bush wives also.

This has finally been recognized as a war crime, and is being increasingly prosecuted by the newly created International Criminal Court, one of the great advancements of our time.<sup>18</sup> The court has a lot of road to cover, and the jurisprudence of the Rwandan tribunal,<sup>19</sup> the Yugoslavian tribunal,<sup>20</sup> and the Sierra Leon tribunal,<sup>21</sup> is helping it, but the International Criminal Court to me, is the greatest movement that has happened in bringing humanity under some sort of semblance of order. That criminal court has finally put a couple people who have recruited children in front of it, but have not necessarily effectively prosecuted them.<sup>22</sup>

---

Africa, online: United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs <[http://www.un.org/disarmament/education/docs/SALW\\_Africa.pdf](http://www.un.org/disarmament/education/docs/SALW_Africa.pdf)>.

<sup>18</sup> *The Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court*, 17 July 1998, 2187 UNTS 90 No 38544, 37 ILM 1002 (1998) (entered into force 1 July 2002). For the prohibition regarding child soldiers, see Art 8 s 2(e)(vii), added through resolution RC/Res 5 of 11 June 2010.

<sup>19</sup> The International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda was established by the United Nations Security Council, *Establishing the International Tribunal for Rwanda (with Annexed Statute)*, SC Res 955, UNSC, 1994 UN Doc S/RES/955, see online: <<http://www.unictr.org/Home/tabid/36/Default.aspx>>.

<sup>20</sup> Designed to address the on-going humanitarian crisis in the Balkans, the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia was the first of its kind since the Nuremberg and Toyko trials and is now celebrating its 20<sup>th</sup> year, online: International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia <<http://www.icty.org/>>.

<sup>21</sup> The Special Court for Sierra Leone was established jointly by the Sierra Leone national government and the United Nations in August of 2000 to address the violations of human rights since 1996, online: Special Court for Sierra Leone <<http://www.sc-sl.org>>.

<sup>22</sup> Thus far, only one individual has been convicted of war crimes for enlisting and conscripting children under the age of 15 and using them in hostilities by the International Criminal Court; *Situation in the Democratic Republic of Congo in the case of the Prosecutor v Thomas Lubanga Dyilo* ICC-01/04-01/06, Trial Judgement (14 March 2012), (International Criminal Court), online: ICC <<http://www.icc-cpi.int/iccdocs/doc/doc1379838.pdf>>.

And yet, while it is a war crime to recruit children, there is also a sin behind it: the boys can be often more rehabilitated into society with the old warrior concept, but the girls who have been abused are shunned by their families and their societies, who often have one or two children, are simply abandoned. The cultural stigma is so strong that they actually feel guilty for having been abused.

We permit those things to happen. Preventing that weapon system [child soldiers] from being used is something some of us are working extensively on,<sup>23</sup> and I am going to move rapidly from that to some of the slides that I hope to bring to you to reinforce my position.

One, Yogi Berra, the great American philosopher, was right when he said: “the future ain’t what it used to be.” But the quote is incomplete as such. He should have continued, “the future is a lot closer than you think.”<sup>24</sup> Previously, we had 20 years of apprenticeship and now they have barely 5. Things have picked up since then, due to the technological revolution, and other facets of the informatics revolution. Your future is now 5 years down the road. It is right in your face. You have to be adjusting and you’ve got to be engaged because we are not in an era of change anymore, we are in an era of revolutions – and that is what’s happening out there. There is an absolute need to create that communion between humanity and the planet. There is no way we will be able to thrive if we’re going to continuously try to find ways simply to survive.

The fact that we have nuclear weapons that can wipe out all of humanity on the planet, and that we have put hundreds of billions of dollars into modernizing them since the end of the Cold War but have not invested the same into environmental protection proves how conflicted we are in trying to look at that future.

Another premise I wish to advance is that the frictions of our differences seem to degenerate so rapidly in conflicts because of the availability of weapons and the ineptness of the political elites of the world to go beyond

---

<sup>23</sup> The Romeo Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative is a global partnership committed to ending the use and recruitment of child soldiers worldwide, through research, advocacy, and security-sector training; The Romeo Dallaire Child Soldiers Initiative, online: <<http://www.childsoldiers.org>>.

<sup>24</sup> The quote referred to by Yogi Berra, a former American Major League Baseball catcher, outfielder and manager, “The future ain’t what it used to be”, was one of many quotes attributed to him, and allegedly uttered by him around 1974. See generally Yogi Berra, *The Yogi Book* (New York: Workman Publishing Company, 2010).

politics and to become statesmen. Statesmanship, flexibility, humility, innovative ideas – that is what we must push them for. I am going to rather rapidly switch to some of my concluding slides. I wish I did not have to move so fast.

## V. WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Firstly, I think it is important that we recognize that the future of humanity – its eyes, ears, and voice – lies in the NGO community. In my view, the NGO community is covering all the bases. [Let me give you an example:] One day, when I was working for the Minister of CIDA,<sup>25</sup> three guys walked into my office and said, ‘we’re here because we need some support.’ I said, ‘who are you clowns?’ They responded, ‘we’re Clowns Without Borders from Montreal.’<sup>26</sup> ‘What do you guys do?’ I asked, and they said, ‘we go into refugee camps and internally displaced camps and we teach children games, we teach them how to laugh, we teach them how to survive.’

The NGO world – join them, create them. You do not need the big outfits to go beyond this campus and go and get your boots dirty in the developing world. As a rite of passage, from your undergraduate or even high school program, you must recognize your privilege. It is the privilege of being citizens of this incredible country, which is one of the 11 most powerful nations in the world, out of 193 United Nations member states. Use this privilege, as a rite of passage, and get a pair of boots soiled on the earth of a developing country. See, taste, touch, feel, and hear what is happening to 80% of humanity. Bring that back and influence your surroundings.

The NGO world is where coalescence will occur, and where public opinion and policies will be powerfully influenced in the future. So, do not just throw cash at the issue, get engaged! The mandates of the past do not work – peacekeeping *a la* Chapter VI, short pants with the blue beret. You need to have instruments to protect the populace; we need to engage under

---

<sup>25</sup> Senator Dallaire served as Special Advisor to the Minister responsible for the Canadian International Development Agency on matters relating to War Affected Children from 2000 to 2005.

<sup>26</sup> Clowns Without Borders is an organization founded originally in Barcelona to offer humour as a means of psychological support to communities that have suffered trauma. See generally Clowns Without Borders, online: <<http://www.clownswithoutborders.org/>>.

Chapter VII and Chapter VIII.<sup>27</sup> Ambiguity and complexity are the norms, they are the characteristics of a whole new arena that we have stumbled into and do not have the solutions for. Afghanistan is still on-the-job training, just like Haiti is still on-the-job training, and everything in between. Where before we either did war or peace, we must now deal with everything in between.

As a result, we are facing incredible ethical, moral, and legal dilemmas, because we do not know how to handle these problems. We do not have the background that we used to have in the classic era, where you had diplomacy doing its work, and if it screws it up then you turn to the Generals that say, 'go in and fight, win the war, and then after that we'll rebuild it.' Well, that sequential exercise is gone. Everything's going on concurrently. You're trying to simultaneously establish an atmosphere of security while bringing in rule of law, putting in the infrastructure, seeing to the emergency needs, and establish capabilities for and practice of human rights. It is all going on at the same time. How do they all work? How do these disciplines work together? We're finding that we do not have these solutions. We do not have those answers.

When Boutros Ghali ordered me out in the third week of the Rwandan genocide, after they had already pulled out most of my troops, he said the international community could not handle the slaughter of 450 peacekeepers.<sup>28</sup> 10,000 Rwandans were being slaughtered every day, but they couldn't handle the death of 450 peacekeepers. He ordered me out of the country with my troops, and I refused. He repeated it, I refused it, he hung up, called back, his chief of staff repeated it, and I refused again. And I refused, not because I sat there and I thought, 'will I be Court Martialed?' Or, 'what the hell is going to happen?' No, it was something akin to instinct. It was instinctive because the ethical framework and values that had been passed down to me through our communities and our system of education, etc., had produced that response. His order was legal and he was my boss. He had the legal right to order my troops and I out. But his order was immoral because we had over 30,000 Rwandans from both sides under our protection. One

---

<sup>27</sup> See generally *Charter of the United Nations*, 26 June 1945, Can TS 1945 No 7 at Ch VI-VII, online: Charter of the United Nations <<http://www.un.org/en/documents/charter/>>. For a discussion of the differences between operations conducted under resolutions authorizing action under various chapters see United Nations Peacekeeping, *Mandates and the legal basis for peacekeeping*, online: United Nations <<http://www.un.org/en/peacekeeping/operations/pkmandates.shtml>>.

<sup>28</sup> See generally "To go or to stay?" in *Shake Hands with the Devil*, *supra* note 2 at c 11.



government had already pulled troops out and 4,000 people were slaughtered in the space of hours.

Those are but some examples of the ethical quandaries we are facing in these complex times. There are others: do you shoot children who kill? How do you handle child soldiers? This era brings us to some very simple options. One, we survive it and being in Canada we can do that because nobody knows we're here (look at an American weatherman's map). The whole infrastructure of this country is built on the concept that nobody will ever attack us. When I commanded the Quebec area, I observed that the whole massive hydro capabilities that feed all of the New England area was so insecure, a platoon of dummies could completely wipe it out. We are founded upon this concept that really we are good guys, and nobody really wants to do us any harm. Well, that's not factual anymore.

Another option is to build a wall like the Americans wanted to do after 9/11, and not let anybody in the country that has a black moustache. I think the answer is to go to the source of the rage. We have seen some from the extremism of the Muslim world, and there is nothing that prevents the 700 million Sub-Sahara Black Africans doing exactly the same thing. We need to go to the source of the rage and attenuate it there.

This is where this country has got to go. We're not an 'on the side line' country, we're one of the countries in the leading middle powers of the world. We also have tools that other countries seek: our work ethic, our technology, and our belief in human rights. We do not want to subjugate anybody, although we continue to fail the Aboriginal communities of our country. I sit on the Aboriginal Peoples Committee in the Senate and you do not have to go too deeply into the origins of the *Indian Act* of 1876 to understand that the legislation was created to assimilate the Aboriginal Peoples into the European nation-state system. That's still on the books.<sup>29</sup> When I sit there, I feel like I'm a white Rhodesian. It is a serious shortcoming and something that we must address. But beyond the legacy of the Aboriginal Peoples in Canada, we are not a predatory nation.

Internationally, we have a lot of assets that many countries want to be engaged with. And so, if we are not sitting in the Security Council, it is not

---

<sup>29</sup> The reference here is to the originating documents of the *Indian Act*, which are the *Gradual Civilization Act*, S Prov C 1857 (20 Vict), c 26 and the *Gradual Enfranchisement Act* SC 1869 (31 Vict), c 42.

because we didn't win it, it is because we lost it.<sup>30</sup> It only made about a day and a half of media here, but in many of the developing countries it was seen as a great abandonment. They were looking to Canada to take a leadership role. They saw us as a tool for bringing assistance and innovative thinking, as we had done in the past. Interesting enough, the big countries are just as pissed off. Because they see us as an instrument to bridge what they're doing or what they maybe shouldn't be doing with the rest of the developing world. We abandoned that position and that responsibility by not being there. This country has a responsibility to move into the new era and you have responsibility to be engaged in it. And in so doing engaged in ultimately working towards the prevention of conflict in the future.

Let me jump forward, as time is running short. I'll end here. What is the year 2017 to you? The year 2017 will be the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of one of the most stable democracies in the world. It will also be the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of Vimy Ridge, where your peers went across the pond, fought, bled, and died, for victory. Our right to progress as a nation state, versus merely existing as a colonial cousin, was bought in blood at Vimy Ridge. So it is the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of that price and the 150<sup>th</sup> anniversary of our system of governance, and what's the plan? What are we going to do? Build a whole bunch of centennial rings again? Hey, what is the plan that will culminate in 2017? Let me put it in another way; what are we going to start in 2017? What will be the vision of this incredible nation that has, since World War II, never actualized its near limitless potential? What is the grand strategic guidance we're going to give to this nation as it moves into this complex and ambiguous world? What focus will we have? How will we guide this incredible potential? Do we want to guide it? Are our political masters doing that? Are they leading?

Well I can tell you that I raised this question in Caucus five years ago and got an uninspired response. I raised it again a year ago and got the same answer. The same thing happened this morning. You'll get the same answer if you look at the political platforms of all the parties. With little differentiation,

---

<sup>30</sup> In 2010, having withdrawn its candidacy after losing two votes to Germany and Portugal, UNGA, 65th Sess, 28th Plen Mtg, UN Doc A/65/PV.28 (2010), see online: <[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=A/65/PV.28](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=A/65/PV.28)>. And, in 2014, Canada declined to bid for the position: Stephanie Levitz, "Canada won't run for UN Security Council seat in 2014", *The Globe and Mail* (1 May 2013) online: *The Globe and Mail* <<http://www.theglobeandmail.com/news/politics/canada-wont-run-for-un-security-council-seat-in-2014/article11650813/>>.

all they say is, we'll celebrate the 150<sup>th</sup>. Bullshit. We can do better than that. Looking to the future, we have an extraordinary opportunity, but we are running out of time. So, maybe we want to do something. Maybe we want a grander design of things. Maybe that might be a reference which can guide us internally and externally and which can guide youth towards what they want to achieve and how to achieve it.

## VI. CONCLUSION

And so I would argue that my vision of optimism is credible. It is not 'pie in the sky'. It is not innocent. I'm not an innocent dreamer. I believe we can establish these objectives, but it is a long-term objective. And so, if you're engaging in this vision then you're engaging in long-term. If we're going to assist countries, we have got to be there for 40 years, 50 years, 60 years and so on. We have been in Cyprus for 50 years<sup>31</sup> and nobody's complaining. Someday they won't need the UN, but they're not killing each other and they're talking. So what's 60 years in the life of a nation? If it can, in fact, establish that atmosphere and I think that's what we want to do. And if it takes a couple centuries, well I'll do my part and hopefully influence a few youths too.

As far as the tools that we need, I have already mentioned NGOs, but there are three more aspects I think deserve mention. First, we must focus on the empowerment of women. If we do not do that, we're screwed. Women have got to be engaged in the world, and not just in the developed countries. Their voice, capabilities, sensitivity, and flexibility, is what is required for reconciliation and prevention. The guys simply do not have it; they're too hung up.

And so, empowering women is the number one objective in moving towards that elimination of poverty and prevention of conflict.

The second one is education. We need the tools and intellectual rigor to understand the problems, and the same intellectual rigor to bring about innovative solutions. Education, education, education.

---

<sup>31</sup> The UN adopted resolution 186 which established a UN Peacekeeping Force in Cyprus on 27 March 1964: United Nations Security Council, *The Cyprus Question*, SC Res 186, UNSC, 1964 UN Doc S/5575, see online: <[http://www.un.org/ga/search/view\\_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/186\(1964\)](http://www.un.org/ga/search/view_doc.asp?symbol=S/RES/186(1964))>.

Third, move away from this concept of tolerance. Who in the hell are we to tolerate somebody else? Tolerance does not reflect equality. We should be talking about respect.

And last, have the courage of the responsibility to protect. When massive abuses of human rights are happening within a nation state, recognize that sovereignty is not a *carte blanche*. We have a responsibility to go in and protect. We must operationalize that, since we created the concept in 2001 and sold it to the UN and the world in 2005.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have abused the time allotted to me, thank you.