Presentation University of Toronto Debate with Senator Segal

Introduction

Prof. Farrar
Prof Cook
Prof Cameron
Prof Wright
President Hay
Ladies and gentlemen
Students

Pleasure and honour to be at the school with perhaps <u>the second</u> strongest international relations faculty in the country-- after Laurier

And arguably the worst football program

Senator Segal—the best Prime minister Canada never had... yet

- Some people you agree with, but don't want to
- Some people you disagree with, but don't want to
- Then there's Hugh Segal, with whom it's almost impossible to disagree
- I am sure we will find something to wrestle over so there should be at least some entertainment value and maybe, even, some "stimulating debate and discussion" the alleged purpose of the event.
- But remember, just because Hughie is nice does not mean he is right, except sort of right wing—
- he is the Conservative chairman of the Senate Foreign relations committee,

- and I am just a retired civil servant, who knows his place I will argue three points tonight
 - 1. That foreign policy can foster (unnecessary) conflict
 - But—caveat-- conflict is sometimes necessary—
 "Just War tradition"
 - 2. That Canadian foreign policy, with one or two exceptions, is probably not now fostering conflict and does help to resolve, even prevent, conflict
 - **■** The international Criminal Court
 - But, why not UN peacekeeping missions, especially in Africa
 - 3. But that, depending on the world view of the government, Canadian foreign policy could contribute to conflict in a major way
 - I. Can foreign policy foster (unnecessary) conflict?
 - US foreign policy can and does
 - The National security Strategy (of 2002 and 2006)
 - The United States and the "War on Terror"
 - The United States and Iraq
 - The United States and Iran
 - The United States and Lebanon
 - The United States and the Middle East
 - But, also, the foreign policies of North Korea, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Israel, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Serbia, Sudan, and China in Sudan

Conclusion: So, certainly, some foreign policies do foster conflict

II. <u>Does Canadian foreign policy foster (unnecessary) conflict?</u>

- For the most part, no
- But, the peace-keeping myth needs debunking
 - Peace-keeping <u>isn't</u> what it used to be
 - These days, classic peace-keeping missions usually start out as combat, e.g., east Timor
 - Peace-keeping wasn't what it used to be, either. The myth that it was peaceful was just that--myth
 - The Medak pocket
 - o 109 Post-humous UN medals to Canada
 - o Attacks on UNIFIL posts by the IDF
- The neutrality myth—
 - Canada has never been neutral (cf. Sweden)
- Sometimes conflict is necessary
 - to protect ourselves: WWI, WWII, Korea, Gulf War, (but not Vietnam or Iraq)
 - to protect others
- The Responsibility to Protect
 - Is a Canadian initiative, after Rwanda, Bosnia and Kosovo
 - Has been accepted as a norm by UNGA and UNSC
 - presumes forcible intervention in extreme cases
 - Where a population is suffering serious harm, as a result of internal war, insurgency, repression or state failure, and the state in question is unwilling or unable to halt or avert it, the principle of non-intervention yields to the international responsibility to protect.
 - The responsibility to react: to respond to situations of compelling human need with appropriate measures, which may include coercive measures like sanctions and international prosecution, and in extreme cases military intervention.

- [Parenthesis]
- DND doesn't want to do Africa, in fact, doesn't want to do UN missions at all
 - Canada ranks 32nd (but ahead of the 15 richest countries—tied with the USA (December 2005)
 - My own UN experience
 - Vice Admiral Buck
 - The Fort Hood, Norfolk syndrome
 - Interoperability uber alles]]
- But Lebanon (cf with Sri Lanka)
- But Afghanistan
 - Canadian soldiers doing the best possible job, but
 - o Prospects of success? King Canute?
 - o The law of unintended consequences
 - "Farmers say gangs of policemen, often their tribal rivals, have swept into Panjwai behind the Canadian troops to search for valuables. They have been described ransacking homes, burning shops and conducting shakedowns at checkpoints." Graeme Smith-Globe and Mail).
 - Fighting insurgencies is about winning over the local population
 - bombs don't win hearts and minds

<u>Conclusion</u>: Canadian policy is not yet fostering conflict in most places but might have begun doing so in Afghanistan

III. Is Canadian foreign policy going to foster conflict?

- Whose foreign policy—Liberal or Conservative?
- Liberals have a <u>liberal</u> international tradition but are not in office
 - Also, it was they who decided to go to Kandahar under US command
 - More generally, they let the military degrade
 - They were not honest on ODA
 - But Human Security
- <u>Conservatives have an honourable history</u>—Mulroney on Apartheid, on East Timor, on Tiananmen Square, on the unification of Germany, on the re-emergence of Russia, on the Gulf War, on Bosnia
- But "The New Canadian Government" is genuinely new and has very little on the record
 - Campaign literature
 - Bumper sticker statements
 - Campaign debate
 - o No questions at all
- But the Conservatives are becoming readable: it's not all a good read
 - Policy decisions since January
 - o Hamas
 - o Afghanistan extension
 - o Lebanon
 - Disregard of the importance of international law
 - $\circ \quad \text{The speech at the UN-B plus} \\$
 - The speech to the Economic Club of New York-A minus
 - o Defence spending-so far so good
 - o Aid?
 - Diplomacy, especially public diplomacydoubtful

- Ideology and foreign policy
 - Identification with the Americans in the "War on Terror"
- Religion and foreign policy?
 - **O What role for the Evangelicals?**
- Deputy Sherriff or independent player?
 - "... make no mistake, Canada intends to be a player." (Prime Minister Harper to the Economic Club of New York)
 - But will that be on Team Canada or Team USA?

Hugh?