

Transcript of Jody Williams statement
Human Security Debate by UNIDIR
Council – Conference on Disarmament, Palais des Nations
Geneva, Switzerland
23 November 2005

I guess if being practical means accepting a male-centric point of view about security in the world, I'd much prefer being utopian. If being practical means that I have to be in a room where 99 percent of the time the people dealing with security debate are men and I'm the only woman in the room wondering about my security that you are all deciding as you declare war and I try to keep my family alive, label me a utopian. If the world we're living in of violence and terror is the world you propose for me and I'm supposed to accept that POV, label me a utopian. I don't want your world. I don't want a world in which men decide the biggest ballistic missile-and you know what I mean-is going to protect me from terrorism. Your biggest ballistic missiles did not save New York.

I regret that I've not had time or energy to prepare an academic debate. I was in Algeria working in the utopian dream of a world free of landmines so I'm just going to talk of my own experience because that is what we were asked to do as well. I prepared no debate. I am not going to rebut you because I grew up in *Fox America* where you're not really supposed to talk about how you feel. You're just supposed to scream at each other. I choose not to scream. I talk about my experience. You can think about it as you wish. You can stay in your little box of diplomacy and decide that you can only answer how you're supposed to answer, but this is supposed to be just a discussion about human beings and how we see our future.

I see my future as doomed if we continue to think the way we've been thinking. I see it as doomed. I may be called a utopian, but I'm a hell of a pessimist. I just keep trying to make it a little bit different, trying to make diplomats understand that changing the world means taking risks. It means not thinking that if you debate for four years in a room and change a comma in a treaty that you've done something grand and profound.

I'm going to talk personally. I remember Cuban missile crisis. I was twelve years old. I hid in terror under the desk in my grammar school wondering if the two great blocks of power were going to kill me over some absurd struggle for continued power. They didn't care one iota about my personal security. It wasn't about me as a human being; it was about which block of countries could have the most power. That is not my security; they didn't care in the least. They cared about which economic system could advance more in the world and control the world. If that is thinking about my security, I wish they had thought differently.

I noted that the millions marching in the streets in the 1970s calling for nuclear disarmament were not heeded by their governments. I still wonder what is the purpose of government if not to heed what its citizens want. I still don't get it. Once somebody is in government they suddenly think they're transformed and they have superior knowledge of what their people want. I actually believe that the government works for me and that they're supposed to do what I want. Not suddenly they become in charge and I'm some ignorant person who is not allowed to have a voice until I vote the next time for whichever two of the powerful blocs. Not my view of security in the world.

I would contend that with the end of the Cold War there were new opportunities. I remember vividly of course some utopians-and believe me I am not utopian or am I a pacifist-some actually had the absurd notion that suddenly the world would become a better place. Suddenly standing armies would be shrunk. Suddenly we would have less nuclear weapons and all of that extra money would go to making the world a better place.

Being from the United States, I had a different POV that in the unipolar world my sometimes benevolent country would in fact try would try to take over the world, not literally, but by virtue of having the most powerful military and ensuring nobody could catch up. would ensure economic dominance, If that's increasing human security I don't want it.

Some of us actually hoped however that in that new moment there might be a different way of thinking about security. There might be a different kind of leadership. Out of that environment came the landmine movement. It was actually a movement that managed to seize the public conscience. We were actually able to get governments to respond to what people wanted. We were actually able to get them to step-no offense to

the UN, I'm fond of the UN-to step out of the normal diplomatic framework and not be held hostage to what I believe personally is the tyranny of consensus. Where any one nation, no matter how powerful or how small, can stop change in the world. I call that dictatorship. That's dictatorship. What is so great about that? That any one nation can tell me that I can't change the world? Not the security that I want.

Out of that experience in the landmine campaign, where small and middle powers actually dared to stand up to the unipolar world and listened to civil society, we got a Mine Ban Treaty. I'm not going to debate whether or not it's an important treaty because the US, China, Russia aren't on board. If you want to talk about that come to the Landmine Monitor briefing tomorrow afternoon. We've been debating it for years. 147 nations are part of this treaty including almost of them where people are killed everyday with landmines. I think that's the measure of success in our treaty.

It was also out of the experience in which civil society actually had a place in the debate. This gave new power to the thinking that maybe we can actually think about security in a different way. I think one of the ways that those who are offended by the possibility of real change in thinking about security try to emasculate the thought is by saying it's either state-based security or it's this wimpy human security thing that only girls can like. I don't see them as mutually exclusive. I see them as complementary. I like to beat up my sister. I'm not going to say what she suggested I do to you when we were planning this little debate.

I don't think that human security is prioritizing the needs of individual over the needs of the state. And I don't know what the state is if it isn't dealing with my needs. I think they're complementary. When you talk about the great state being allowed to have human security if it has those big missiles protecting it so that it can allow human security for its individuals. I don't think that's the human security I'm talking about. I think about global security and justice. I know it's a horribly girley thing to think about.

When September 11th happened in my country-and I'm no fan of my current government and nobody doubts that, however I love my nation, I love my people-but when September 11th happened in the United States we were the most powerful nation in world, we had the biggest missiles in world, probably the most in the world, our security was assured. We have great human rights in our nation. Unless you're on death row.

Unless you're a woman. Unless you're in New Orleans and you get whacked by the hurricane and you're black. It's not the security I think we need in our nation. But despite all of our great advances, human rights, democracy we have in our nation nineteen men in four places whacked the United States of America.

What is our response? How many billions of dollars to make bigger missiles? To create Star Wars, which I still want to know how that's that going to defend me from the next plane that flies into a building?? Scuse my ignorance. I know girls don't really understand security, but I want to know how I'm made more secure by 44 billion dollars going to the intelligence industries of my country now. What has it done for me?

When that happened we were not allowed to ask the question why and yet rest assured that the people in the Pentagon were asking why. I mean nineteen guys fly planes into your buildings you ask why did these guys do it? But if we tried a rational debate about what led those men to fly into our buildings, we were traitors. That made me even more certain that I had every right to talk about human security. Not give me a bigger missile. It's why the hell do those people hate me so much that they want to fly a plane into my building?

Human security doesn't mean that the richest nations should be more powerful, have bigger weapons so that we can remain in fortress America, fortress north, fortress west and be more secure. While the people in poverty now have access to television, the Internet, etcetera and can look at me. Where twenty percent of the people of world control eighty percent resources of the world. I get a little mad. If I were the guy living in the country watching you guys take everything I might consider flying a plane into your building.

I do wonder what happened to enlightened self-interest? It doesn't mean you actually have to like those creepy little people. I don't like everybody for God's sake. I didn't become Mother Theresa with the Nobel Peace Prize. I hate a lot of people and those of you who've worked with me know it, but I have the good sense to attempt to make you think I think you're OK so that you don't want to kill me.

The great FDR in the United States, our president in the Depression and World War Two, is held up as the great hero of saving poor. A lot of people think he was just a smart rich guy who understood that the way he was going to save the country for the rich

was by giving those poor little working slobs enough money so they could mortgage their lives and work forever and pay the bank. It worked. Enlightened self-interest.

I don't get how the rich nations of the world don't understand if they make the poor little slob have a little bit of hope for the future maybe he won't want to strap on a bomb on himself and blow you up because you've got all the stuff and he doesn't. That's human security. That is human security in my book. That is not utopian in the least. It's not pretty, is it? Care about the future so that you don't kill me. If that's a girley point of view, call me a girl because I am. I do not want to change and I do not want to accept your point of view that I need bigger missile to make myself more safe.

I think that part of the issue is formal diplomacy is still terrified at having girl like me in the room telling you that you're dumb. Diplomats don't like people like me saying there's something wrong with what you guys are doing. Don't you care? And this really gets them, this is when I'm really accused of being a girl and I don't even have kids. Don't delude yourself that I want to protect my children. I chose not to have them. I'm not even maternal in the least. I am the evil stepmother. Right? Ask the children.

But I wonder about most of you who have children. When you go home from your government job and you look at your children. Don't you step outside of I'm ambassador-this or diplomat-that and look at your children in today's world and think what am I doing? How do you go home at night and think if you build a bigger ballistic missile you're making your children more secure or your children's children or your grandchildren. How do you divide the world in your head so that those children are bad, evil, worthy of death? My children are good. They live in my country they're OK. Your children because they look different, they talk different: bad. It's OK to shoot them. It's OK to kill them to protect my state. That's security?

I was in Algeria yesterday talking to the president, the minister of defense, etcetera. They all wonder about security in the world. They all wonder why you don't care about my people. You are willing to see my people die. We're willing to fight you back. Just like you tell me if I'm a girl and I want to be practical I have to accept your frame of view of the world and how it should be. They said to me sitting in my world I look at you and don't see the world the way you see it. I see it from my experience.

If I want you to at least talk me civilly I have to accept that. That's human security. It doesn't mean I don't have to have a gun to shoot the guy who tries to break into my house. It does mean that I have to accept that the other guy has a point of view. I may not like it. But if I want to be secure in the world, I have to accept that. Or I can nuke 'em all. I mean given the way things are going in the CD and the CCW? Impressive guys. What are you doing?

What are you doing? What are you doing?

You're not making my world better. There are six billion of us and I bet if you did a global vote most of us would throw you out of office and we would do it differently. I know I would throw most of the men out. Not all of them. Some of you can actually think like a girl. We need more women there. We need more women in the negotiating process. We need more women in the bureaucracy of the UN. What was that resolution that was passed that was supposed to make ten percent of the people in the UN bureaucracy women? How far are you now? Five percent? How much of the world are we? Over 50 percent? We're too wimpy to understand so we couldn't possibly have these powerful jobs.

I am no wimp, but give me some aspect of human security, just a little bit of understanding. Have the courage to understand that has a bigger missile made us safe. It hasn't worked yet, has it? Has a bigger missile made us safe? No, I can nuke you with my bigger missile, but then what? Then what? As it was pointed out to me in Algeria they just keep sitting there. Rome was a fantastic empire for how many centuries? Rome stretched from Italy all the way to Algeria. And what happened to it? People get mad when you keep them down and they didn't even have Internet to communicate. They couldn't even get on a plane and fly it into a building. They still got mad and took it down.

As China has pointed out on more than one occasion I recall one of my favorite stories about Henry Kissinger—I won't even go into how I feel about Henry--lecturing the Chinese and asking them how they felt about the French revolution. The Chinese said, "who knows? It's a little bit early to tell. It's only been a couple of hundred years. We've been around several thousand."

I really think that we need a different concept of security. It doesn't mean you can't have your big missile, but it also means that you have to meet the basic needs of the majority of the planet. I said that before and people said that I'm a socialist. I'm not a democrat, I'm not a republican, I'm not a communist, I'm not anything. I'm a person who thinks. You can't even try. Yeah, I have a Nobel Prize; my mom likes that one.

The world is different. In a globalized world if we don't do it differently we're doomed. To keep thinking the way we thought in the Cold War is absurd. To keep thinking that any one state can dominate forever is absurd.

I know you'll probably all vote for bigger missiles. You're all men in the room I realize it's a more comfortable vote. Scary to think out of the box. Scary to let girls into the debate. Scary to let NGOs into the room. It's impossible. You may try. Mr. Bolton tries to keep us out of the room. He hates us, but he hates everybody, unless you're American and inside the Beltway. We're not going away. And we're going to insist on a different security. Sorry, but let more girls in the room and we'll shake you up.

#