

Dr. Abiodun Williams

**Keynote Address to the Annual Conference of the Association
of International Education Administrators
Washington, D.C., 20 February 2012**

Ladies and Gentlemen,

I am pleased and grateful to join you today for the Annual Conference of the Association of International Education Administrators. I would like to congratulate the Association on its 30th Anniversary. Your work has advanced the international dimensions of higher education over the past three decades.

Let me say how much I applaud the theme of your conference: *Building a Secure World through International Education*. Building a Secure World is a field in which I am a practitioner. As a former peacekeeper and United Nations official, and in my current capacity as Senior Vice President at the United States Institute of Peace, it is my

calling and duty to work for peace and stability within and among nations.

I am both a beneficiary and a proponent of international education. As a teenager I attended the Lester B. Pearson College of the Pacific in Victoria, Canada, one of 13 United World Colleges. The UWC movement, now in its 50th year, is dedicated to the promotion of peace through the international education of young people. As a professor at the Edmund A. Walsh School of Foreign Service at Georgetown University I help to prepare students for leadership and service in international affairs.

We are all here because we share a deep commitment to international education. We are all here because we recognize that international education can have a transformative effect on individuals, nations and the world. We are all here because we believe that what binds us together is stronger, much stronger, than what divides us.

Today, I would like to share with you some of my thoughts on three main issues: the nature of security in the 21st century; the work of the U.S. Institute of Peace in promoting global security through international education; and the role of institutions of higher education in building a secure world through international education.

The Nature of Security in the 21st Century

If building a secure world is a goal, or rather *the* goal, of international education we must first ask: what does security mean in the second decade of the 21st century? Where is security to be found?

For centuries security was defined in narrow terms of national security and military might. A nation's security was measured primarily by its military strength. The historians among you will readily recall that in two earlier epochs security over a considerable area of the world depended on the Roman legion and the British gunboat. And our

histories predominantly focus on wars, victories and defeats. Perhaps this is because as Thomas Hardy observed: “War makes rattling good history, but Peace is poor reading.”

Our definition of security must change and needs to be broader. A nation’s security is not determined by its military strength alone, but by its commitment to good governance, democracy, the rule of law, human rights, social justice, environmental protection, and poverty eradication. Building security at the national and global levels means working to achieve these interrelated goals. A secure world has to be understood in these fundamental terms before institutions of higher education can develop international programs of relevance. And relevance must be our first guide, though not our last, in a complicated world.

Of course, it is not easy to change national priorities especially in nations making the difficult transition from war to peace. When I served with the UN Mission in Bosnia and Herzegovina a decade ago, one of

our most formidable challenges was persuading the three constituent peoples of the country and their armies to take a realistic approach to military planning. The military forces were too large for their budgets, and the excessive spending on the three armies was bankrupting the state and impoverishing the population. In short, the costs exceeded the benefits.

We live in a world in which security is both divisible and indivisible. That security is divisible is evident in the intra-NATO debates about defining the threat in Afghanistan and how to respond; in the divergent views among the five Permanent Members of the UN Security Council about Iran; and in the vigorous debates about the Responsibility to Protect, the humanitarian imperative, and the role of sovereignty.

That security is indivisible is evident in the interlinked nature of the threats our world faces. The security of prosperous states can clearly

be threatened by the lack of capacity of poor states to contain emerging diseases. The ability of non-state actors to traffic in nuclear material and technology is aided by ineffective state control of borders and transit through weak states.

The indivisibility of security reflects the reality of interdependence; today, the world is interdependent to an extent it has never been before. Globalization, economic integration, migration, and technology are increasing interdependence, but also bringing about collision. We need cooperation between nations, between faiths, between cultures and between peoples to solve our common problems and fulfill our common needs.

The Work of USIP

The U.S. Institute of Peace is playing a vital role in building a secure world through international education and training. We act in

accordance with our mandate from the U.S. Congress to prevent and mitigate international conflict peacefully, and to “strengthen the education of emerging generations.” The Institute trains professionals in conflict prevention, management and resolution techniques, both in the United States and in conflict zones.

The Academy for International Conflict Management and Peacebuilding is the education and training arm of USIP. Our Academy offers over 25 practitioner courses in Washington, preparing government and military personnel, civil society leaders, and NGO and international organization staff for work in and on conflict zones. These in-house courses cover a wide variety of topics, including conflict prevention, economic reconstruction in conflict-affected states, governance and democratic practices in war to peace transitions, gender and peacebuilding, and overseas religious engagement.

USIP's Universities for Ushahidi or U4U training program, in partnership with Ushahidi, brings young people from conflict zones around the world to Washington to train them in the use of crowd sourced mapping tools like Ushahidi, as well as in the skills of conflict management. With these skills trainees will be able to use mapping technologies to address community needs in-country, train others, and join a growing community of global crisis mappers and technology-enabled peacebuilders.

We also provide distance-learning programs, featuring online courses on conflict analysis, and simulation exercises such as the Strategic Economic Needs and Security Exercise (SENSE). SENSE, originally developed by the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA), is a computer-facilitated simulation that focuses on negotiations and decision-making in a post-conflict environment. SENSE simulates the challenges confronting national and international decision-makers regarding the allocation of resources. Its sophisticated computer support provides participants with rapid feedback on the results of their time-

sensitive decision-making in terms of political stability, social justice, and economic progress.

In recent years, the Institute has significantly increased the number of trainings provided within conflict zones, like Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iraq, Libya, and South Sudan. Our peacebuilders try to empower local communities through training-of-trainers programs in mediation and facilitation, and establishing networks of local trainers that are best positioned to translate our expertise into training that fits local circumstances and customs. In Pakistan, we have worked with ulama and madrassa administrators to prepare teaching modules for madrassas on subjects relating to peace, tolerance and pluralism.

Our Offices in Baghdad and Kabul which I oversee serve as useful local platforms to coordinate these programs, and link our analytical and training work in Washington with our field activities. A concrete example is our support of the State Department's Africa Contingency

Operations Training and Assistance program or ACOTA, which teaches conflict mediation and negotiation techniques for African security personnel in peacekeeping missions across the continent. Through its education and training activities, USIP has trained approximately 35,000 individuals in more than 170 countries.

Later this year, USIP will open its Global Peacebuilding Center. Through this new initiative, the Institute will extend its longstanding educational work to new audiences, especially young people and educators, through multimedia exhibits and educational programs in our new headquarters on the National Mall. Young people will be able to join discussions, ask questions to USIP experts, and become part of a community of peacebuilders. They will learn about the connection between study abroad and peacebuilding, and about the value of international experiences and exchanges for young peacebuilders. Educators will find a dedicated section to support their work, featuring the new Peacebuilding Toolkit for Educators and other activities and

resources to help bring peacebuilding into the classroom. In total, we expect an additional 300,000 to 500,000 visitors per year once this new Global Peacebuilding Center opens its doors. I hope that many of you and your students will visit the Center.

The Role of Institutions of Higher Education

I believe that institutions of higher education in developed and developing countries have an indispensable role to play in building a secure world. No department, no school, no college, no university is ultimately exempt from such a responsibility for our world today. Three things are essential: knowledge; an international outlook; and sensibility.

Knowledge: It is important to recognize that building a secure world is a broad, indeed an all-encompassing enterprise. It is not the special preserve of professional politicians or diplomats. Economists, scientists, lawyers, engineers, doctors, financiers, industrialists, and of course, educators, should all play a very active and important part in it.

The knowledge required cannot be confined to political science or economics. The project is much too important and complicated for that. It requires innovative interdisciplinary education and scholarship, and greater openness across the boundaries of disciplines. And we need a new generation of dedicated people who understand not only the societies in which they live, but also other cultures, as well as the political, economic, strategic and social currents of the wider world.

What is urgently needed in the curriculum of many institutions is Conflict Prevention. The moral, strategic, and economic imperatives of preventing deadly conflict are undeniable. The idea that violent conflict can be prevented is an old one. It is a foundational concept of the United Nations, and is a feature of the charters of most regional and sub-regional organizations.

The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict did path breaking work on conflict prevention. The Commission made three significant observations in its influential 1997 report: first, deadly

conflict is not inevitable; second, the need to prevent such conflict is increasingly urgent; and third, successful prevention is possible. It identified conflict prevention as including actions and policies to prevent the emergence of violent conflict, prevent ongoing conflicts from spreading, and prevent the re-emergence of violence.

The UN Preventive Deployment Force (UNPREDEP), the first peacekeeping mission in which I served, was deployed in Macedonia from 1992 to 1999 and is generally regarded as one of the more successful UN operations. In an unprecedented move, UN peacekeepers were deployed before the outbreak of violent conflict, instead of after hostilities had erupted. This ground breaking preventive deployment mission in Macedonia, ensured that war did not spill over into that fragile republic. It also helped to manage the internal threats to the nation's stability, especially the tensions between ethnic Macedonians and ethnic Albanians. UNPREDEP demonstrated that with the right political context, the right mandate, the right timing, the right level of

political commitment and the right resources, UN preventive deployment is much more likely to succeed than to fail.

The upsurge in action to head off a potential conflict around the Sudan referendum in January 2011 was notable. The U.S. government, the United Nations, the African Union, civil society groups, and others exerted tremendous energy with the explicit goal of averting a return to major violent conflict. While it is too early to assess the ultimate value of these efforts, the case of Sudan is notable for generating much high-level attention and activity in advance of a potential conflict, rather than responding belatedly after a crisis has erupted. Three main factors contributed to the preventive push in Sudan. First, there was a clear, discrete event that was feared could trigger major violence, namely the referendum. Second, the history of conflict in Sudan raised fears that if war was not averted, it could be extremely long and bloody. Third, atrocities in Sudan's Darfur region over the last several years have

generated sufficient public outcry and forced Sudan onto the international political agenda.

The recent violence in Libya, Syria, Yemen and elsewhere underline the difficulty of managing crises once they erupt, and the importance of improving conflict prevention efforts. Even though not every war can be prevented, a more effective use of the conflict prevention toolbox can reduce the number of new conflicts.

International Outlook: Building a secure world is also about shaping the attitudes and outlook of a new generation. Institutions of higher education should make every effort to give their students a sound international outlook. Ideally all institutions should have foreign students – many of them – as their presence makes a significant difference. All students should be encouraged to spend at least six months of study or work abroad before graduation; learn a foreign language; and take a core course on a foreign country. And major

universities, as some are already doing, should establish overseas campuses in partnership with local universities. Of course, as many of you in the audience know internationalization is not free of difficulties, but resisting it is not an option in a globalized world.

Sensibility: Building a secure world is not just about producing educated people with the skills and outlook required to meet the challenges of a changing world. I submit that knowledge and outlook are not enough. Future peacebuilders must have the sensibility which underpins the idea of civilized life. In the 16th century Spenser called that idea “Courtesy”. In 18th century thought it was called “Good-nature”, which Fielding not only illustrated in his novels but defined in an essay: “Good-nature is that benevolent and amiable temper of mind, which disposes us to feel the misfortunes, and enjoy the happiness of others; and consequently, pushes us on to promote the latter, and prevent the former; and that without any abstract contemplation of the beauty of virtue, and without the allurements and terrors of religion.” Education

that develops this sensibility helps to promote understanding among nations, peoples, and religions.

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The agenda established for the next three days reflects many of the critical issues in international education, and the processes needed to formulate substantive and relevant programs. It also underlines the important fact that academic detachment from the world is not an option for higher education in the 21st century. I wish you every success in your deliberations and commend you for your efforts to build a secure world through international education.

Thank you.