

**Welcome: Shri. M.K. Narayanan, Vice-President,
Centre for Security Analysis**

Mr. Chris Patten, Commissioner for External Relations and Chancellor of Oxford University, Honourable Prof. S.P. Thyagarajan, Vice Chancellor, University of Madras, Prof. S. Karunanidhi, Registrar of Madras University, Prof. Gopalji Malviya, Head of the Department of Defence studies, University of Madras, members of this very distinguished audience, ladies and gentlemen,

It is indeed a very proud privilege to welcome such a distinguished personality as Mr. Chris Patten, who is presently one of the leading stars of the European Commission, and some one whose career I have followed very closely over the years. For me it is a red-letter day, for it is not every day that there is a synthesis of two important events. One, to speak from the premises of this venerable University, and two, to welcome a celebrity like Mr. Chris Patten, a person whose bio-data overwhelms each and every one of us. How does one welcome or how does one introduce a person who was Political Advisor to the Home and Political Office of the United Kingdom, Chairman of the Conservative Party of the United Kingdom, Governor of Hong Kong in its most tumultuous phase, Chairman of the Independent Commission of Policing for Northern Ireland and so on? As a member of the European Commission in charge of External Relations, and as the Chancellor of Oxford University, Mr. Patten is today one of the most prominent personalities, intellects and intellectuals one can hope to meet.

I have a special interest in what Mr. Chris Patten did as Governor of Hong Kong and as Chairman of the Independent Commission of Policing for Northern Ireland. I was fascinated by the way Mr. Chris Patten handled the transition of Hong Kong and its integration with mainland China. I think Mr. Raghavan, who is here as a member of the audience, would remember that we as young officers working in the Government of India had the fortune - or the misfortune - to be indirectly a part of the policy making mechanism (though not very successful) dealing with China. Therefore, for such of those who have carefully followed Mr. Patten's tactics of dealing with China - pre-empting their meticulous planning and their kind of convoluted logic which denotes much of Chinese thinking - that he should have conducted the whole issue of negotiations almost single-handedly and to have managed this with such consummate skill and finally integrated Hong Kong with China, is indeed a revelation. It has metamorphosed the region and today, China is imitating Hong Kong rather than the other way about. If there is any bigger transformation in the history of the modern world, I have yet to come across it. I believe every one of you here would agree with what I say.

Mr. Chris Patten embodies the European idea. The European Commission represents what is, in fact, the truest symbol of the disinterested guardian of European interests. The Commission that Mr. Patten represents has remained above the daily din of battle over national interests. It embodies the common interest, rather than self-interest. For many of us in India, this multinational European Commission signifies the spirit of good relations and we are indeed

privileged that Mr. Patten who represents the highest symbol of this kind is present here. For those of us who are part and parcel of the rocky seas of parliamentary democracy in this country, we are equally enamoured by what the European Commission has succeeded in doing, viz., to steer between the Scylla and Charybdis of everyday affairs.

One aspect which has not been talked about too much, definitely as far as Asia is concerned, is how Mr. Patten has transformed the Royal Ulster Constabulary in Ireland, and made it into the Police Service of Ireland. There are in this audience quite a few of us who are ex-policemen. And the change (in Royal Ulster Constabulary of Ireland) that has been brought about is truly dramatic and remarkable. I think those of us who have been members of Police Commissions would realise how difficult it is to transform policemen, of which I am one. I think this would represent one of the high points of Mr. Patten's career.

I hope that the new European Constitution which is about to be initiated would finally produce a truly federalist vision and would maintain the fine balance that has been achieved over the years. We in India would be particularly interested in knowing how they are going to reconcile the basic issue of insertion of God and Christianity into the European Constitution. As a truly secular nation, we look forward to the outcome with the greatest interest.

Thank you very much.

**Presidential Address: Shri. S.P. Thyagarajan, Vice-Chancellor,
University of Madras**

Your Excellency Mr. Chris Patten, Chancellor of the Oxford University and the European Union Commissioner for External Relations, Mr. Francisco Gomes, Ambassador and Head of the Delegations, respected Shri. M.K. Narayanan, former Director, Intelligence Bureau, dear Prof. Gopalji Malviya, Head of the Department of Defence Studies, University of Madras, and my colleagues Prof. S. Karunanidhi, Registrar in charge University of Madras, distinguished diplomats, distinguished dignitaries, my dear faculty members, distinguished alumni and dear students,

The University of Madras is greatly honoured to have Mr. Chris Patten, Commissioner of External Relations of the European Union, among our midst today. The European Union delegation consisting of the Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, in his capacity as President of the European council, Mr. Romano Prodi, the President of the European Commission and Mr. Patten himself as the Commissioner for External Relations for the European Union are participating in the EU-India Summit at New Delhi on 29 November 2003. In the summit, Honourable Prime Minister of India, Shri. Atal Behari Vajpayeeji and External Affairs Minister, Shri Yashwant Sinha would participate and review the state of bilateral relationship and strengthen the existing tie-ups besides bringing about newer relations. It is in this connection that His Excellency, the Chancellor of Oxford University and the European Union Commissioner for External Relations, Mr. Chris Patten is

here today and he is going to deliver a public lecture on “Conflict Prevention and Peace Building”.

Your Excellency, may I bring to your kind notice that this University was founded in the year 1857 as one of the three oldest universities in India, developed on the model of London University. She is going to step into her 150th year in 2006; and the university is gearing up to modernize herself in all spheres of activity, but especially in the area of internationalising the university facilities and academic programmes. We have already research relationships with European Union countries in the mode of European Union projects in the area of Science and Technology and also in the area of social sciences and humanities. Just to cite a few examples are the Indo-German project which is operating now in the Department of Genetics, the Indo-UK projects involving Glasgow University and Caledonian University with the Department Micro-biology and the University of Oslo project which just got completed with the Department of Political Science and Public Administration, and so on. You will be happy to know that the University has a Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution Studies from the month of April 2003, jointly handled by the departments of Politics and Public Administration, International Law, Christian Studies, and Islamic Studies, hosting lectures and seminars relating to peace, including conflict management. The Department of Defence Studies has also been involved in programmes of this kind in association with the Centre for Security Analysis. In October 2003, the Centre for Peace and Conflict Resolution has hosted the mediation training skills programme with the help of a Fulbright scholar from Portland State University. There is also a study India programme in the University on cultural studies, gender and environmental studies, film and media, and community studies. This programme has informal relations and interactions with the European, Asian and South Asian Studies Centre, European Association of Southeast Studies at Lieden, and the European Institute of Asian Studies at Brussels. So why I am trying to focus all these is to bring to your attention that the University of Madras is already into international tie-ups with several countries abroad and more especially with the European Union countries. In the changing paradigm of internationalisation of higher education, the University of Madras is already geared up and is going to set up an international centre of higher education to attract foreign students in a significant way in our university system, as agreed upon by the University Grants Commission. This would be by way of having joint degree programmes and twining programmes with foreign universities and hence it is my fervent appeal to your Excellency, the European Union Commissioner of External Relations, to consider our University as a formal player and partner in any joint programme between India and European countries in areas of higher education and research. It is to be underscored here Sir, that this University has been recognised as an University with potential for excellence by the University Grants Commission, as one of the first five universities in the whole country. The University has also been accredited at the highest level by the National Assessment and Accreditation Council.

With these few words, I once again express my gratitude and thanks to Mr. Chris Patten and the European Union delegation for having consented to visit

this premier University of this country and to deliver this unique lecture on “Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building”. We look forward to your kind and enchanting lecture Sir.

Thank you very much.

**Lecture - “Conflict Prevention and Peace-Building”:
His Excellency, Mr. Chris Patten, European Union Commissioner
for External Relations and
Chancellor of Oxford and Newcastle Universities
27 November 2003**

Vice Chancellor, Shri. S.P. Thyagarajan, ladies and gentlemen,

First of all, I thank you for these very kind remarks you made about me, which my father would have enjoyed and which my mother would certainly have believed. I am glad that you mentioned about my experiences in organising the Police Service in Northern Ireland. It was certainly the most difficult job that I have ever done. People very often ask me about its consequences. I am reminded by your own experiences of meeting Chou En-lai, of his reply when he was once asked what he thought about the consequences of the French Revolution. He thought for a moment and said, “I think it is too early to tell.” I think we actually managed to produce some beneficial results, something closer to real time, in Northern Ireland. At least, I fervently hope that’s the situation.

I am once again delighted to be in India, the largest democracy in the world, a country whose history is intimately bound up with the history of my own country and a country which has been a beacon of hope and light to all who believe in democracy and the rule of law. I am pleased of course to be in Chennai and am delighted to be here in your University, a university which is older than one of the universities where I am the chancellor and a little younger than the other. It is certainly older than the New Castle, but Oxford is quite old. People ask me what the Chancellor of a university in the United Kingdom does. Chancellors or Rectors, as they are known in the Italian universities, are called *il magnifico* and people often wonder what *il magnifico* does at a British university. I recall the answer given by one of my predecessors, Harold Macmillan, who was Prime Minister and Chancellor of Oxford. He replied, “The Vice Chancellor runs the university, and if you didn’t have a Chancellor you couldn’t have a Vice Chancellor.” My immediate predecessor when asked what the job entailed said, “impotence assuaged by magnificence”. And I am still learning how to be magnificently impotent. But I do feel very strongly, as pointed out by the Vice Chancellor, about the need to strengthen and develop the links between higher education worldwide. I noted with interest, about what you are already doing. I hope that many of your postgraduate students would benefit from the scholarship programme, which we have just announced for India. And I hope, we would also be able to develop links between your university and some of ours through our global campus programme, which is intended to strengthen the very links to which you referred.

Let that be a sort of a round about way to the subject that you have asked me to discuss this afternoon - Conflict Prevention. I was asked by the BBC Radio 4 the other day to give a talk on Christmas afternoon. Not to replace or rival the Queen, but they wanted me to give a talk, looking back on the year that is coming to an end. When I look back on the year, it is difficult to be cheerful about it. One can think of personal reasons for being cheerful. My eldest daughter was married in August, but to me it has been a rather grim year or at least a grim few months. Two of my friends died violent deaths. Sergio Vieira de Mello, who was the epitome of an international public servant, a great and wise man, was blown up in the UN Headquarters, Baghdad, on 19 August. I went there in September to see the ruins of the building where he and others had laid down their lives. And then in October, the Swedish Foreign Minister, Anna Lyndh, was stabbed to death in broad daylight in Stockholm. More recently, a great friend of mine and a friend of India, Hugo Young - the most distinguished political columnist in the United Kingdom - died all too young of cancer. So it has been a pretty gloomy few months, and if you add to that the international outlook, it is not a cause for very great cheer.

An arc of instability is running from the poor Afghanistan, through Iraq to the Middle East (Palestine). There is instability in Africa, Latin America and Columbia. It is a pretty gloomy prospect and a real worry, unless we are much more sensitive about the relationship between the Islamic world and the world in particular of Europe and North America. There is in my judgement a danger of turning Samuel Huntington's thesis about the *clash of civilisations* into a bloody reality. We often talk about the end of the Second World War as though it was the end of wars. But, in fact, in the last decade alone, two and a half million people have died in conflict, and another thirty one million have been displaced, have lost their homes, and have had to flee from their villages and their communities as a result of conflict. And that has been the story even in Europe. It was in the 1990s that we saw a terrible war in what had been Yugoslavia. We saw Yugoslavia dismantled in bloodshed and mayhem. While Europe and others stood by arguing, 225,000 Bosnians died. We saw the sort of ethnic cleansing in southeast Europe that we thought had ended forever with the Second World War. In my view, these experiences in the southern Balkan did more than almost anything else to impel the European Union to take a more proactive role in developing a common foreign and security policy.

Against that background, it's not difficult to understand why we feel so concerned about the peace process in Sri Lanka, a process which has been one of the few rays of hope or light in an otherwise pretty gloomy scene. 65,000 people out of a population of 19 million in Sri Lanka have lost their lives. 700,000 or 800,000 have been displaced from their homes. Yesterday, I spent part of the day with the mine detection and clearance units - brave non-governmental organizations - which are attempting to turn Sri Lanka into a mine free island. Even today children are losing their limbs and lives by accidentally setting off mines. Sri Lanka, as known to you, has huge potential. It is a beautiful island described not extravagantly as the corner of paradise. An island with extraordinarily good social indicators in terms of health - which are almost as good as those in parts of Europe - enrolment at school

and literacy, it has huge economic potential. In the 1960s, it had the same Gross Domestic Product (GDP) per head as Singapore and Malaysia. So we believe that the peace process in Sri Lanka is of great importance not only for Sri Lanka, but for the region and the world too. It is not surprising that we should want to support it. And I shall return to that point in a moment.

Nor should it be surprising that, in macro political terms, the European Union is so concerned about conflict prevention and its practical aspects. After all, in a sense, the European Union as an institution is the most successful example of conflict prevention that one could point to. The European Union was formed because of conflict. Europe had fought three civil wars in seventy years - between France and Germany and others involved on every occasion. And the impulse for political and economic integration in Europe, in a sense, came from France and Germany. The reconciliation between those two great countries should involve them lashing themselves together at the heart of a broader unique structure in which European nations try to share their sovereignty and through sharing their sovereignty better protect their own national interests. It is what some people called the notion of a post-modern state - that one can through allowing others to interfere in your own affairs actually better protect overall your own national interest. European Union, today representing 15 countries, will shortly represent 25 and more. The paradox today is that there are more nation-states in Europe than had ever been before, but most of them are either already members of the European Union or wish to become members of the European Union. So, they are able to combine a sense of national identification or a sense of national loyalty with an understanding of the importance of sharing sovereignty. I think it is also possible to look at the whole process of enlargement in the European Union as a sort of conflict prevention. I don't think it is extravagant to argue that, perhaps the main reason why the disintegration of the Soviet empire in central and east Europe did not lead to a hard landing or conflict was the speed with which the then European Union offered membership to the countries freed from totalitarianism. It helped the countries of the west Balkans to move in the direction of the establishment of liberal market economies and political democracy.

Europe doesn't seek in any sense to rival the United States as a military power. The United States is responsible for about forty percent of global expenditure on defence and armaments. The United States President has only recently announced huge increases in public spending on defence; at the same time expenditure on programmes for health and education have been cut. There isn't a single European country where a political party could get elected on that platform. There is a difference in political culture between Europe and the United States. That doesn't mean that we play a negligible role in security terms or in peacekeeping terms. We do recognise that we have to spend what we already commit to defence, for example, by combining more effectively in areas like defence research and development, and procurement. But we already do a good deal of peacekeeping. In Afghanistan, under NATO command, there are many European forces. In the Balkans, under European command with NATO assets, there are European forces. Only 10 percent of the armed forces in the Balkans come from the United States. Further, we have just undertaken a classic peace keeping operation in Ituri, Congo, in

which there was European command and European forces, and no NATO assets. We want to be in a position where we can do more to keep the peace around the world, without always having to depend on the United States, which may not always wish to be involved as was the case with the Congo. We recognised this through those sort of peacekeeping operations, as in Kosovo and the first Iraq Gulf War (in which there was unanimity).

We recognise that some times in order for the international rule of law to apply, it is necessary to support it with military forces and military interventions. But, we also think that the beginning of wisdom in conflict prevention is to understand that even if you have the largest hammer in the world not every problem is a nail. There are very often other things that you need to do rather than apply force. I will mention just three or four them now.

First of all, invariably there are economic and social causes for conflict. Economic and social causes don't justify terrorism. They don't always explain away conflicts. But its not irrelevant that twenty-five of the poorest countries in the world are countries which are at present convulsed in conflict or only recently escaping from wars and conflict. One fifth of Africa is at present a war zone. So, we make a large contribution to development assistance. We provide about two thirds of all the grant aid in the world. In my view, the development assistance that we provide by trying to alleviate poverty and contributing to sustainable development is important in preventing conflicts as well. Do we do enough in the provision of development assistance? No, we don't. We have committed ourselves to a benchmark increase in contributions to development assistance. All the member-states of the European Union have to raise their own development programmes to the average of the European Union, at which point the average would of course have gone up and a new benchmark is set for them over the next period.

Secondly, one needs to look at the relationship between conflict and state failure or at least the failure of institutions in the states. A number of states are pre-modern. There are states in which the governments cannot provide citizens with the basic stability, and which they have a right to expect and which is essential for economic and social progress. Afghanistan was manifestly in that state; Somalia was manifestly in that state. Afghanistan was not so much an example of state backed terrorism as of a terrorist backed state. Therefore, the second point that I want to make, is that we have to look far more explicitly at institution building and the establishment of a framework for good governance, democracy, rule of law and protection of civil liberties, if we are to prevent more states degenerating into that pre-modern condition with all the consequences for the rest of us. You can't quarterise states that export instability. We know that the consequence of globalisation is that we share the same problems, whether epidemic disease or organized crime. I am particularly interested in the relationship between governance and stability in the Middle East. It is very often said in the West that we can't risk democracy in Arab countries because of the example of Algeria. It is very often said that democracy would open the way to extremist fundamentalism. Its very often argued that it is better to keep as it were or "autocrats in place" rather than risk them being replaced by governments which may be less inclined to think well of us. I think those are extremely dubious arguments. I

think authoritarianism helps to encourage and incubate extremism for two reasons. First of all, authoritarianism is also invariably a cause for bad economic performance. Secondly, authoritarianism, trampling on freedom of speech and association, and denying people the right to share in determining their destinies, creates alienation. In a Marxist sense, creates a sense of dispossession and therefore encourages people to turn to violence as a way of changing the political order. So, it is very important for us to try to develop better governance in Middle Eastern countries. I think the way in which the European Union handled the application of Turkey to become a member will be crucial to this debate. Turkey is a great country that is trying very hard to put in place serious economic and political reforms. So I believe that Turkey should be encouraged and helped. Of course, I recognise that this is a long-term process (the development of better governance in the countries of the Arab League). Of course, I don't think there is any way one can bring democracy to countries with the tip of precision-guided munitions. It has to be built slowly from the grass roots up.

Thirdly, there is obviously in conflict prevention an important role for proactive diplomacy by bringing together a number of different instruments like trade, development assistance as well as trade for political cooperation. This is what we have been trying to do in Iran, which is a great pre-Islamic civilization and a country which will have an enormous impact not only on its region but on the world. We are trying to engage Iran in serious discussions on human rights and other political issues. We are negotiating a trade and cooperation agreement with Iran. But the Iranians know that they can only make progress on an issue like that only if one is sure that Iran's nuclear ambitions are purely for the civil use of nuclear power and not for military use.

Finally, we recognise as you do, the crucial importance of multilateral institutions in preventing conflict and dealing with causes of conflict. I referred earlier to the impact of globalisation. Globalisation of course, has on the whole benign economic effects, though its still a moral affront that so many people live in poverty in the world. We do need to ensure that the rules of the game, as far as globalisation is concerned, are fairer to the poor. But it is not only economics that is globalised, so are organised crime, trafficking of human beings, arms trade and drugs. The drug trade these days is bigger in economic terms than the sale of iron and steel or the sale of motor cars. All these threats have been globalised and perhaps most prominent among them is terrorism. Given the relationship between technology and the use of violence for political means, small groups of terrorists can do incalculable damage to civilised open society. And that poses a threat to all of us.

Let me conclude with a few words about Sri Lanka and my meeting with the Liberation Tigers of Tamil Eelam (LTTE) yesterday. I spent a lot of my career in British politics, as was said earlier, dealing with the problems of Northern Ireland and Irish terrorism. I've had to deal and negotiate during those years with people who had tried quite hard to kill me and had killed my friends. Two of my great political friends were murdered by the Irish Republican Army. I do think that therefore it is imperative that one should never ever fudge the distinction between the pursuit of political ends through the ballot box and the pursuit of political ends through semtex and kalashnikovs. There

is an absolutely clear and unbridgeable divide. At the same time, as we know, most problems of conflict around the world are only dealt with successfully by addressing the political quarters, by trying to involve the parties to the conflict in serious negotiation, and in the beginnings of the comprehension of the importance of compromise. I made four points yesterday, in my discussions with the LTTE.

First of all, that the international community will have nothing but hostility and contempt for the LTTE unless it makes it abundantly plain that it has turned its back forever on terrorism and violence as a political tool. We don't want to engage in debates about the past. What we want to see is a happier and more stable future.

Secondly, I said that I hoped that they had not gone back on their commitments in Oslo and that any negotiated political settlement to the future of Sri Lanka had to be within a commitment to the territorial integrity of Sri Lanka. It has in other words to be a federal solution, not a divisive attack on Sri Lanka's sovereignty.

Thirdly, I insisted that the LTTE should stand by the commitments they had made as part of the ceasefire agreement - commitments on issues like child soldier, commitments on armaments, commitments on not assassinating political opponents and so on.

Finally, I underlined the importance of involving the Muslim community directly in the talks about the future of Sri Lanka.

I recognise that for everyone involved in the peace process in Colombo, it will take political courage to see things through to a successful completion. In any peace process there are always some difficult times, some difficult passages to negotiate and to get through, but I very much hope that those who have started the process in Sri Lanka will be prepared to see it through to the end. We want to help them. We've made considerable resources available for the reconstruction of the country and I only hope that I am called upon in the next few months to start writing the cheques. It is in some respect the easiest part of conflict prevention, but its not unimportant.

Q1. The peace process in Sri Lanka is only for the Tamils and the Sinhalese. Involving the Muslim community is only a delay tactics. Due you agree on that? What is your reaction on that?

I think the Muslim community has every right to be involved in the peace process and the peace talks. The Chairman of the Sri Lankan Muslim Council, with whom I had a good discussion was extremely convincing on that point. To have any hope in democracy every community has the right to be heard. Successful communities, as Indians are familiar with, ensure that no body feels like a minority.

Q2. What is the role of UN? In recent times, all UN resolutions on peace are in a way diluted or overlooked by the Super Powers. What is your position?

I think that Kofi Annan raised a fundamental question in his address in the General Assembly in September. He said that we must find a way of legitimising interventions. And the only way we can do it, in his view and in mine, is through ensuring that the UN and its rules, conventions and institutions are at the heart of the legitimisation process. So in my view, the reform of the United Nations Security Council, for which Kofi Annan has appointed a panel to advise him on, and the strengthening of the UN as an institution is absolutely crucial for tackling some of the problems which are going to dominate the first some years of the coming century. And I hope that in the European Union we will be able to develop a common approach to this challenge. Its not perhaps easy, because foreign security policy goes right to the heart of what it means to a nation state and there are two nation-states in the European Union which both have permanent seats in the Security Council. My own view is that the UN is imperfect, but it is imperfect because of us. It's the only UN we've got and we should do more to ensure that it can be effective.

Q3. Looking back, retrospectively, do you think in your opinion, the action taken by the Super Power in Iraq and the support given to it by the European Union was correct?

The European Union was completely split on the arguments for military intervention in Iraq and I don't find that surprising because so was public opinion in European Union. Overall, public opinion in Europe was hostile to intervention. In the last few years the notion of international law based on the Treaty of Westphalia and the integrity and sovereignty of nation states has been challenged, it has been challenged by the point that Kofi Annan made. We argue today, it is not just sovereign states that have rights but human beings and citizens of sovereign states who have rights. Secondly, it is argued that intervention should be possible where a state is threatening to manufacture in a dangerous way or proliferate or use weapons of mass destruction. And thirdly, it is argued that a state should be able to intervene in the affairs of another state, where that state is using non-state actors such as terrorist organizations to threaten other states. All those issues in a sense came together in the case of Iraq. And if you add to that another factor namely the relationship which all of us have with the world's only super power, it easily explains the complexity and the drama of the problems surrounding Iraq. And I think it is difficult to look back on the justification for intervention and argue that we were all told the unvarnished truth. I am choosing my words with huge diplomatic care. I think a lot of mistakes have been made. We all have to face up to the consequences and the decision that we've taken in the European Union. The fact that had united us is that it is in all our interest to try and ensure that in Iraq we establish an open, prosperous, and stable, democratic society. If Iraq in a year or two's time is still a magnet for terrorists, if it is a focus for instability in the region, if it results in substantial clashes between Sunnis and Shias and Kurds, we will all suffer and suffer very

substantially. It is a matter of particular interest to us. Turkey is attempting to become a member of the European Union, and if Turkey is a member of the European Union, Iraq would be our next door neighbour. So we all, whatever we think about the arguments for the war, we all have an interest in trying to ensure that the peace produces a stable Iraq.

Q4. What did you say to the Sri Lankan government on peace talks because we are used to the things about what you said to the LTTE? We want to know the other side? And the second question is, in the Iraq issue European Union was divided. Italy and Spain, run by right wing governments supported the Americans. France and Germany did not support. Is it ever possible for the European Union to portray itself as a cohesive single entity in terms of defence or foreign affairs or economic issues?

My main discussion with the Sri Lankan government was the importance of having cross party support in the peace process. One of the things which eventually helped us to complete the Belfast agreement, the peace process in northern Ireland, was that both parties by and large over the years gave their whole hearted support despite the ups and downs, despite the problems, despite some of the extremely difficult political choices that had to be made. I think it is very important that when there is a matter which is so fundamental to the national interest, the parties should agree to it at the same time rather than as it were in sequence, because when in power or out of power, their views some times change. So I very much hope that there will be cross party consensus support for the peace process in Sri Lanka.

In my view, foreign policy and security policy are much more a reflection of national sovereignty and national interest than currencies. However important they may be people aren't on the whole prepared to risk their lives for adjustments in interest rates. They are prepared to die and will fight for fundamental issues of foreign and security policy. By and large, we have actually managed to develop more coherence in foreign policy in the last four or five years than ever before. I mentioned the success we've seen in the Balkans. In the 1990s Europe was completely divided over the Balkans. Some countries thought that we should try to prevent the dismemberment of Yugoslavia; some countries thought that we should try to manage the dismemberment of Yugoslavia; some other countries thought that we shouldn't bother ourselves with the subject at all. And the result was calamitous. So we've learnt from that experience. We've been much better at keeping our coherence in the Middle East and our other relationships but Iraq has shown our limits, the limits of sovereignty sharing in foreign policy.

Q5. For conflict prevention there should be a vision and a strategy. You mentioned the number of pieces of the jigsaw puzzle but did not put the pieces together, in my judgement. To my mind a coherent strategy for conflict prevention should consist of the following four important elements. 1. Accepting the primacy and supremacy of the United Nations as the arbiter with regard to any

contentious issue that arise. There should be no compromise on this. 2. For instance, regarding the ban on arms sale, you mentioned about African countries. You would readily agree that many of the situations that have arisen in developing countries especially in Africa, is because of the unscrupulous, unprincipled trade in arms. So a ban on arms sale could be a very important element of this strategy. 3. Ostracizing persons who do not play pals with regard to these matters. I am not going to mention Pakistan as part of an India-Pakistan hostile environment, but we put blinkers on situations such as in Pakistan where a government is deliberately bypassing decisions by encouraging local terrorist groups and we are putting on blinkers. Same thing with regard to the LTTE. By your visit, if I may say so we have legitimised people who have created conflict. So the third element may be ostracizing without any mercy of people who deal in these matters. And finally, this dangerous proposition that sovereignty has become stale and obsolete, I think we must respect sovereignty. I would even go so far as to say that if we have no right to pass judgement on whether a country is behaving or not behaving, whether human rights are being respected or not being respected, I think in the matter of sovereignty the ancient principle, to me, still holds good, and there must be universal respect for sovereignty.

Well I think if I may say so there is an inherent and rather substantial contradiction in what you are saying. I don't see how you can on the one hand say that one must accept the primacy of the UN and of UN authority and on the other hand say that you should never question national sovereignty. I actually think, and think very strongly, that sovereignty defined in a nineteenth century way as though it was a sort of great monument, which international lawyers crept up to and vandalized at night stealing a bit here and bit there. I think that's a very out of day way of looking at it. The notion is, if I may make the point in a biological way, I don't accept either that sovereignty is like virginity. Its there for one moment and gone for all time the next. I think very often you extend your sovereignty by agreeing to share it. And I know of no way in which we can promote greater cooperation in dealing with global problems other than by sharing sovereignty and other than by recognising that sometimes the national interest is best pursued by sharing responsibility with others, which is what I meant about a post-modern state.

How can you have a ban on small arms without disrupting a country's sovereign right to make what it wants and to sell what it wants. When we actually tried to ban or reach agreement on an international covenant on small arms, which is important, making the sale of them transparent and preventing the sale of them to anyone but a legitimate sovereign government. When we tried to do that, the American negotiator, Mr. John Bolton, withdrew from the talks on the grounds that the agreement would undermine an American's constitutional right to bear arms. So we respected American sovereignty and we didn't have an agreement.

On ostracism, I am certainly very attracted by the idea that we should make things like visa bans really effective sometimes. We have visa bans on officials

in Myanmar, we have visa bans on officials in Zimbabwe. But there is a general agreement that where those officials are travelling for international conferences they should still be able to have their visas to do so. But total ostracism, I have to say it if we had total ostracism of Jerry Adams and Martin McGuinness in Northern Ireland we'd never had our peace process, and we'd still have bombs going off in Belfast and Birmingham. So while I am totally ever opposed for fudging the distinction between the use of the ballot box and using violence for political purposes, I think you sometimes have to talk to people who use violence.

Q6. Even if the LTTE comes forward for a peaceful resolution in a federal set up will the government in Sri Lanka, any government, will they be able to contain the Sinhalese groups which are equally militant. I am drawing your attention to the Janata Vimukthi Perumana (JVP). What will be the position of the government in Sri Lanka if JVP doesn't come out of their underground tactics and violence? What is your opinion?

It was a point I made to the LTTE. At the end of the day any settlement that is negotiated has to be acceptable to the people of the rest of Sri Lanka and the government in Colombo has to be able to carry public opinion. At the moment most of the polls suggest that the overwhelming majority are in favour of a negotiated settlement. But the contents of that settlement will have to be those that can be sold successfully to the public opinion and there may well be extremists on both sides who will resist any sort of settlement. But if there isn't a settlement, if we see a return to violence, the main sufferers will be the innocents of Sri Lanka and not just directly because of the loss of lives but indirectly because of the lack of opportunity.

Q7. In the light of not using violence to achieve one's ends does the European Union have a single policy on human rights, human rights violations particularly, and more particularly about what is happening in Guantanamo Bay in Cuba?

We have a single policy on human rights and have a human rights clause in our agreements. Do we have a single policy on Guantanamo Bay? No. There are different countries in Europe which have their own citizens locked up in Guantanamo Bay. I very much hope that the Supreme Court will come to the conclusion that if you have responsibility for a part of the world, then the jurisdiction of your own country should apply to it as well. And the so called Pratt Amendment, I am going to the beginning of the last century, seems to me to create an extraordinary situation in Guantanamo Bay in which people are held out with that law. A simple answer to your question is yes in the first place. But no in the second. It doesn't mean that we don't actually raise the issue. We do raise, slightly to their surprise sometimes, human rights issues with our American friends. And we regularly raise the use of capital punishments in the US in our bilateral meetings.

Q8. Are you aware that the Sri Lankan constitution has got a kink in its apex, to the extent that of the two parties which you are trying to negotiate between, one of them doesn't have a chance at any time to become the President or Prime Minister. In such a case do you think a lasting peace can be achieved by one of the contracting parties or is it going to be only a temporary affair?

Well. I tried more or less successfully not to get drawn into the details of the discussion which will have to take place, if there is to be a constitutional settlement. And I also tried to avoid getting sucked into a role which in my view the Norwegians have played extremely well as facilitators of the peace process. But if there is a settlement it'll have to be a settlement in which both of the parties to this bitter dispute feel that their fundamental interests have been fairly treated. And it will have to be a settlement which at the end of the day will result in everybody being able to vote for their elected representatives. And they should be able to vote for representatives even if they are different from those who have helped to produce the settlement.

Q9. It is very interesting to listen to your proactive measures to prevent conflicts. May I know the European Union stand on terrorism encouraged against India?

I am against terrorism when it is used against anyone. When I was last in Pakistan, and when I more recently met the Foreign Minister of Pakistan, I raised our concerns about infiltration over the Line of Control. I raised our concerns when I was in Pakistan last year about training camps in Pakistan. These are issues that we have raised consistently and more vigorously. I also raised them with Gen. Musharraf.

Q10. I have three observations. 1. I for one would seriously hope that there is some kind of firm redefining of a consistent and cohesive European Union foreign policy with regard to giving asylum to those who have networks or connections with insurgent or terrorist groups in their homeland. We have Khalistani terrorists and LTTE bigwigs in different countries of the European Union, sitting there for years, developing their own networks there and creating a convenient environment for raising funds and sending it abroad to these groups. And this has been done with the full knowledge of the respective governments of those countries. 2. We had Stephen Cohen here last month. We said that every reason that you are all sighting, we don't agree with the invasion of Iraq at all. Every reason that you have sighted with regard to Iraq, is a clumsy case for Pakistan, a clumsy case but Stephen Cohen told us you cannot deal with Pakistan the way we dealt with Iraq, because Pakistan is a nuclear state. Now if you are going to give that as a reason, tell me one good reason why any country would not go in for weaponising. And if this is going to be stated openly, every country is going to attempt to nuclearise its military. 3. I have no more faith in United Nations as it is now than I have in American

good intentions when it wants to intervene on humanitarian grounds. The United Nations, if it is going to intervene now, is still extending the white man's burden, until the Security Council is reformed, because much more than the invasion it was the United Nations which was criminally responsible for the humanitarian tragedy in Iraq. 12 years of sanctions which didn't affect Saddam Hussein one bit but which destroyed the nation. If this is the track record of the United Nations I have no more faith in United Nations than I have in American good intentions.

Let me deal with those points briefly. The first concerns asylum. There is an international covenant on asylum which European countries seek to apply. There is the rule of law in each of our countries. And we have, in my own country for instance, put a number of organizations on black list including the LTTE. We found ourselves again and again challenged in our own courts about these decisions and taken to the European courts about these decisions. Now is this always convenient? Is it always comfortable for our national government? No, it isn't. Is it the rule of law? Yes, it is. And is it what that distinguishes between a plural open society and an authoritarian society? Yes, it is. Would I prefer to live in an authoritarian society? No, I wouldn't. And while I may agree with you about a more discriminating attitude to asylum, I certainly wouldn't agree with you that we should ignore international rules or national laws in doing that. Secondly, it would be as unwise as it would be provocative throughout south Asia for me to get drawn into a debate about India and Pakistan. We are regularly told and I understand this, that India does not want the involvement of the international community. But we hope that the recent confidence building measures by the Prime Minister will help to build the confidence and will help to ensure a peaceful resolution, not least in Jammu and Kashmir. I have absolutely no time for the covert support of terrorism. I have no time, as I said earlier, for the use of terrorist groups by a state for its own purposes. And I can't be more explicit than that. On the UN's role in Iraq, I wish that there hadn't been twelve years of sanctions on Iraq. There were twelve years of sanctions on Iraq, because Saddam Hussein refused to comply with the agreements that he reached after he was expelled from Kuwait. Was it the UN that marched into Kuwait? Was it the UN that involved itself in the most spectacular breach of sovereignty in Kuwait? Should we have allowed Iraq to stay there? Should we have allowed Iraq when it was expelled and to then break the agreements it had reached in order to end the war? Would that have been sensible and wise? Would it have been sensible and wise for us not to have tried through UN inspection to prevent the manufacture the weapons of mass destruction? If there are no weapons of mass destruction found in Iraq, I happen to think myself, that is partly because of the UN and UN weapons inspectors. So if you want to live in a world in which there are no attempts to create international rules and to implement those rules, if you want to live in a world in which it's a question of doggy dog in a Hobbesian state of nature, then good luck, it is not a world I want to inhabit.
