

Speaking Notes prepared by H.E. Mr. Paul Heinbecker  
for the Learning Event for Assistant Deputy Ministers  
hosted by the Partnership for International Co-operation  
of the Canadian Centre for Management Development (CCMD)  
Ottawa, May 16, 2002

---

**Simple message:**

World is a dangerous place.

We need to help influence the course of events in our own interest.

We can do so, even (especially) in Washington.

But for want of a nail...

**I - Where the World is Going**

**1) America Ascendant; or, the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Also Belongs to the USA.**

i) hard power and soft power

- soft power - others admire, want to emulate you, align their goals/interests/values with yours
- British empire; French, Ottoman empires, too, to a degree.
- Hard power and soft power not alternatives.

ii) U.S. militarily, a “hyper power”

a) militarily without peer

- \$396 billion > Next 25 countries \*
- 26 times the combined spending of rogue states
- 40 billion increase this year
- Revolution in Military Affairs

\*Centre for Defence Information

iii) economically, just a superpower

GDP - USA \$ 9,612,680\*  
Japan \$4,841,584  
(China \$5,019,396 on PPP basis)  
Canada \$687,882

iv) Culturally - merely predominant

- enormous popular influence
- English language
- communications technology/Internet
- but much cultural cross-fertilization
  - croissants conspiracy?
- when will Canadian short order cooks attack French pastry chains?

v) USA Exceptionalism, Unilateralism and Plurilateralism

Or, we can so why shouldn't we?

a) Exceptionalism; or Rules are for Others

1. U.S. power confers unique responsibilities and demands unique exemptions from international rules e.g., International Criminal Court, (Treaty on the Rights of the Child)
2. Protectionism - steel
  - softwood
  - Farm bill (impacts on Canada, developing countries, DOHA/WTO - next trade round).

b) Unilateralism - Won't Please Any of the People,  
Any of the Time.

1. ABM/BMD/CTBT/BTWC/Small Arms
2. Kyoto
3. Cuba, (Venezuela - old time religion?)
4. The axis of evil

\*World Bank

c) Plurilateralism vs Multilateralism

1. Unilateralism a misnomer;

Posse analogy is best

e.g. Gulf War, Afghan War.

d) But sometimes multilateral instruments are inescapable

- UN (potential rival), but 1373, East Timor
- NATO did Kosovo but entangling
  - lesson learned by U.S. military;
  - simpler if you do it yourself, e.f., Afghanistan
- Treaties: instruments of Lilliputs.

Fundamentally, this Administration especially (every administration) wants followers not allies or partners.

- the U.S. is literally abrogating more treaties than it is joining.
- but NATO/Russia; nuclear warheads treaty is progress (even if it entails just the separation of warheads from delivery vehicle, not their destruction)
- but, but - the more nuclear arms in storage, the greater the chance one falls into the wrong hands

e) The world according to the Congress, the Pentagon, the Treasury, the State Department, the NSC and the White House: or pick a foreign policy you like.

2) **Towards War with a Billion Moslems**

i) 9/11: Why do these people hate us?

- The forest and the trees.

a) Who we are, US success, excites jealousy,  
The flawed nature of Islam  
the wrong answer, mostly; absolves responsibility;

b) What we do - U.S. foreign policy, especially in the Middle-East:  
1) Propping up the oil tyrants; human rights and democracy be damned.  
2) Backing Israel unequivocally; ignoring Palestinian claims  
the right answer, mostly; engages responsibility;

3. Amateur Night on Air Force 2.

- The Cheney visit as evidence of monumental arrogance,  
incompetence or both.  
Or, "it's the occupation, stupid".

4. Congress loves a winner, backing the overdog,

- undercutting the Secretary of State

5. Neo-McCarthyism:

- protests about coverage, including in some cases, subscription  
cancelling campaigns, against the New York Times, the  
Washington Post, the LA Times, the Chicago Tribune, the  
Philadelphia Inquirer, the Miami Herald, the Sacramento Bee,  
ABC's Nightline.

- internet campaigns.

- pall on debate, even in the think-tanks - people cognizant of  
their next confirmation hearing.

ii) And, Beyond the Beltway

- 1) benign neglect: Kishore's paradox
- 2) polls show marked preference for Israelis over Arabs
- 3) but polls do also show public preference for fair/balanced policy
- 4) and believe terrorism is terrorism; Israel's fight no different than USA's.
  - no context - no core, cause, examination
  - suicide bombers - morally repugnant; also strategically self-defeating
  - (but resisting occupation not proscribed under international law)
- 5) In democracies, especially in the U.S., intensity of political interest is more important than size.
- 6) but some stabilizers in public opinion kicking in

iii) Meanwhile In the Moslem World

- 1) The war on terrorism is seen as a war on Moslems
- 2) The Al Jazeera effect
  - American complicity in Israeli occupation
- 3) The Teenage cohort
  - a generation of animosity

iv) Meanwhile, in other parts of the forest...

v) Europe

- 1) Future as a supra-state?
- 2) Economic powerhouse - larger GDP than the USA
  - i) capital )  
       ) deep pools Canada can attract
  - ii) technology )
- 3) Military power - less than the sum of its parts
- 4) Un-American
  - culture )
  - traditions ) cohesion of values
  - education )
- 5) But also Un-Canadian
  - Canada mostly ignored /U.S. shadow
  - ISAF vs Op Enduring Freedom as watershed?

vi) China

- 1) big, but a long way to go
- 2) Assuming 2% U.S. + 6% Chinese growth, economies equal in size in 2020 \*
  - but would be equal in per capita income only between 2056 and 2095.\*
- 3) militarily much weaker - but 40 nuclear warheads
- 4) little “soft power” - who wants to emulate China?
- 5) will they solve the Capitalism/Communism contradiction?
- 6) still, for Canada, a huge trade/investment opportunity for generations to come

vii) Japan

- 1) economically, superpower
- 2) militarily, 2<sup>nd</sup> strongest conventionally
- 3) but culturally?
- 4) soft power - who wants to emulate Japan?
- 5) coming out of a long recession

viii) Africa

- 1) conflict
- 2) HIV / AIDS
- 3) NEPAD + G8 - a long term investments with short term returns.

ix) Globalization

- 1) Integration just beginning
- 2) 50% have never made phone call
- 3) 90% have never travelled
- 4) DC's share of global world product has almost doubled since 1950

\* Nye: The Paradox of American Power

## II - What Does it Mean for Canada ?

- 1) The World is a Dangerous place
  - i) has World War III begun?
    - asymmetric war - aircraft as cruise missiles
    - suicide bombers as “smart” bombs unconventional delivery platforms - walk & talk.
    - U.S. homeland a target?
  - ii) thinking the thinkable
    - a) a radiological bomb in Manhattan
    - b) a container bomb in Newark (or anywhere) paralyzes international commerce - and Canadian prosperity takes devastating hit
    - c) a nuclear station attacked
      - Southern Ontario becomes Chernobyl
  - iii) thinking the unlikely - Canada as a terrorist target
    - CSIS says 50 plus terrorist organizations operating in Canada
    - coming to a theatre near you, or a shopping mall or hockey game (if we are perceived to be a US puppet)
    - take the Maple Leaf’s off the back packs
  - iv) impact on Canadian prosperity
    - a) the “porousborder” effect  
WSJ & NY Times, ‘60 Minutes, West Wing
    - a) Americans naturally care immeasurably more about their security than our prosperity.



2) Foreign Policy Matters (More than Ever)

- i) One lesson of 9/11 everyone has learned - security comes from engagement, not from isolation.
- ii) the Smart Border initiative/30 point plans, etc., are timely, intelligent responses to the risks we face - we are ahead of the curve - it is a success we should build on and must communicate
- iii) but on broader foreign policy goals, we have not assimilated the significance of the change we face
- iv) nor is our policy/capability in line with our values - too little compassion, too little money
- v) and on our primordial relationship with the USA, we can and must do better.

3) What is Foreign Policy?

- i) aid, defence, diplomacy, intelligence
- ii) Canada's forward defence - forestalling, avoiding, solving problems "over there" before they come "over here" - terrorism, drugs, crime, refugees, disease, environmental degradation.
- iii) (definition) (Pearson, Trudeau, Mulroney, Chrétien).
  - foreign policy is the deliberate, integrated, government-wide effort to control/influence events, situations, trends abroad to serve Canadian interests and values. (Heinbecker)

- iv) Little Canada? Out of 190 countries, Canada ranks 8-10 in GDP terms, 16<sup>th</sup> in gross in defence spending and 34<sup>th</sup> in population.
  - we are literally not a “middle power” by any of these measurements.
  - the U.S. is a hyper power: Canada, a “principal” power.
  - Regional Power without a Region (Acheson)
  
- v) Human Security - putting people first
  - a genuine paradigm shift
  - essence of Canadian values
  - growing acceptance internationally, especially at the United Nations, in Africa
  - integral to Canada’s international “brand”

### III- How Are We Doing ?

#### 1. Getting Relations with Washington Right

The two golden rules of Canadian foreign policy:

- 1) Don't get too close to the United States
- 2) Don't get too far from the United States

##### i) On substance

###### a) Bilateral substance

- making Canada secure, and the U.S. too
- border security, developing the new paradigm
- the 30-point plan, the smarter border
- immigrants, refugees, visas-harmonization
- Northcom?

###### b) International

- i) - the White House, State, DOD do foreign policy; not interested in bilateral issues unless a major problem for them
- so if you want influence in Washington, give yourself capability that is helpful to them
- make a difference to them on their agenda and you might earn their attention on yours.
- be effective on their terms
- no need to pander
- don't disagree with the USA for the sake of differentiation
- but do differentiate yourself when you disagree, e.g. Iraq
- of the United Kingdom

##### ii) Personal diplomacy

- 24 hours in any President's day
- and Congressmen & MP's
- civil society?

- iii) Communications (especially in the US)
  - 1) When a Canadian tree falls in the forest do Americans hear?
    - a) 35,000 Americans (mostly) sheltered September 11
    - b) 100,000 Canadians attend a memorial service on the Hill September 13
    - c) 20,000 Canadians visit New York December 1
    - d) 750 Canadian forces deploy to Kandahar
  - 2) None of these things was widely reported in the U.S. media.
    - a) because Americans are insular and self-absorbed
    - b) because we cannot communicate to save our lives; we talk to each other and hope others overhear
  - 3) We need a cultural revolution in Canada
    - beyond 49<sup>th</sup> parallel, CBC, the Globe and Question period.
  - 4) Specifically, we need to:
    - a) recognize we have a major communications problem
    - b) give ourselves a communications strategy and budget to get sustained exposure in the USA and abroad (e.g. Germans are major potential investors)
    - c) give the ad hoc Committee on Border Security a communications mandate
    - d) enlist the private sector
    - e) hire professional help
    - f) exempt foreign news bureaux from our punitive tax regulations
    - g) make a basic knowledge of communications a prerequisite for promotion in DFAIT
    - h) make a basic knowledge of foreign policy a PQP/ADM qualification.

## 2) Getting Relations with the Rest of the World Right

- i) An effective foreign policy globally pays dividends in Washington and delivers benefits in relations with others.
- ii) an effective foreign policy helps differentiate ourselves from the Americans, which matters
- iii) how are we doing ?
  - a) On ODA\*, we currently rank (ODA/GNI) three from the bottom of the OECD league, tied with Japan
    - only Italy, Greece and the USA rank lower
    - in volume terms, Canada ranks 10<sup>th</sup> at \$1.57 billion US
    - ODA does good, for the most part
    - e.g. global illiteracy halved since 1970
    - girls' primary school enrolment rate doubled since 1990
    - child mortality rate halved since 1960
    - small pox, polio
    - and ODA buys Canada short-term influence and long term stability
    - it also buys Canada definition, differentiation, foreign policy pluses
    - our performance is widely criticized but our commitment to increase by 8% per year will help - if we keep it
    - and our support for NEPAD at Kananaskis, including our trade liberalization (both make a difference to the well being of millions of people and pay us substantial political dividends.
  - b) On defence expenditure as percentage of GDP, we rank 138<sup>th\*\*</sup> in the world = 30% reduction since 1988 \*\*\*
    - i) - in terms of UN peace keeping missions we rank 34th.
    - and yet we build monuments to Canadian peace-keeping
    - overall, all military ops abroad, we rank about 15th

\* OECD/DAC figures for 2001

\*\*IISS: The Military Balance 2001-02

\*\*\* Standing Senate Committee on National Security and Defence

- ii) there is a persistent demand from the UN, from NATO and from various coalitions of the willing for high quality ground troops for operations abroad
  - requests for Canadian troops are foreseeable in
    - the Middle East
    - the Congo / Burundi
    - Colombia
    - Iraq
    - Sudan
    - Uganda
  - we are asked to stay on in
    - Bosnia
    - Afghanistan
    - Golan Heights
  - our help was sought in
    - Sierra Leone
    - Congo / Eastern Zaire
    - Rwanda
- iii) Participating effectively in these missions raises our credibility at the UN, at NATO, and in allied capitals especially Washington. CF Britain as USA's best ally.
- iv) - need to maintain armed forces of high quality
  - using a ratio of one battle group abroad to four at home (recently returned, normal training, operations specific training), we need to increase Canadian ground troops by 12,000-15,000 soldiers (43,500 total ground forces)
  - absent a defence spending increase, if we are to maintain our capital budget/total budget ratio of 23% to keep our forces well enough equipped, we will have to reduce our forces by 12,000-15,000 soldiers

- (JFT2/Special forces in particular demand - got \$119 million over five years)
- cost for 15,000 troops = \$2 billions or puts Canadian expenditure up to 1.375 percent of GDP; (which would move Canada up from 17<sup>th</sup> in NATO to 16<sup>th</sup>)
- Senate Committee wants \$4 billion/1.69 of GDP = 12<sup>th</sup> place in NATO
- Air Force - needs to be modernized/as per plans - strategic lift?  
- 2 Aurora sovereignty flights over Arctic per year!
- Navy - best shape of all- strategic lift ?  
- but Seakings!
- Canada's capability for CBRN response is feeble

c) On diplomacy, we are threadbare in dollars and pound foolish in delivery.

i) Representative examples:

- we have fewer embassies abroad than any other major country; over half of those missions have 3 Canadians or less
- no Embassy in Kabul (dropped from Budget); other coalition partners do; Canada is making enormous military/ODA investment; no eyes and ears
- no/little money for forward-defence funding for Kabul Embassy dropped from 2002 budget
  - 1,000 Canadian soldiers on the ground
  - \$100 million aid fund
  - no Canadian eye/ears in Kabul
- no funds to train Afghan army; others contributing
- no funds to train judges anywhere (Supreme Court willing)

- no funds for small arms and light weapons destruction
  - no/little funding for counter-terrorism, for capacity building
  - no funds to assist Turkey lead ISAF
  - no capacity to help countries write anti-terrorist legislation
  - no significant visitors program for any purpose
  - self-circumscription; we do not even contemplate opportunities to advance Canadian interests if there is even a small price tag.
- ii) it used to be said that DFAIT was out of touch with the town - 9/11 shows that the town was out of touch with the world.
- contempt for the “life style”
  - FS salaries - worst in Government, worse than all multilateral organizations, worse than most foreign governments of comparable wealth
  - \$10 million Human Security Fund (3 visits to Cabinet)
- iii) We can do better; others do
- Norway has a discretionary foreign policy funds said to be +/- \$200 million annually
  - not ODA
  - has underwritten the Oslo peace process; mediation of civil war in Sri Lanka, etc.
  - MFA Director for Humanitarian Assistance is said to have \$100 million envelope
  - granting process can take as little as 1 week
  - but then Norway is a big country
  - Sweden has about \$40 million annually for conflict prevention and multilateral cooperation
  - The Netherlands has a “Foreign Policy Support” program worth about \$10 million annually
  - U.K. has a “Conflict Prevention Fund” worth about \$220 million annually
    - most valid from Canadian perspective
    - objectives are: conflict prevention, remediation, etc
    - funds are not necessarily ODA’ able
    - horizontal management and program delivery chaired by Cabinet Office and including Foreign Office, Ministry of Defence and Department for International Development (DFID)
  - other departments can make proposals



- each fund has eligibility criteria

iv) All of these countries spend more on defence and development assistance than Canada does

All of these countries have major social welfare programs, including health care and public education

v) Not to mention Public Diplomacy. On information, culture, advertising, branding, we are vastly outspent by our competitors (for investment, technology) e.g. German budget +/- \$1 billion, Canadian budget +/- \$100 million

UK OBJ - Highligh UK excellence across a range of fields, through British Council, BBC, etc. Public diplomacy ensures that “UK views and interests are taken into account in international decision making:.

**IV- CONCLUSION**

- i) In Canada, foreign policy has come to be regarded as an afterthought, a luxury for fat times, an elective. We are parochial, provincial inwards
- ii) Over the past 40 years, approximately, spending on the components of foreign policy (ODA, defence, diplomacy, to a lesser extent intelligence) has progressively diminished
- iii) as a consequence, our importance in the eyes of our allies, especially Washington, but also NATO, and in Africa and Asia too has diminished
- iv) if we cannot help on the White House agenda, they will not help on ours (might not anyway - but they will think about it)
- v) we do not have to follow Washington; but we have to be an effective partner when we choose/need to be
- vi) what people (U.S. people especially) don't know, does hurt us; we need a communications revolution in Ottawa
- vii) foreign policy costs money; but pays dividends
- viii) urgent need for increased spending on ODA, military and diplomacy; equally urgent need for much better horizontal management of the three entities and for participation of other players
- ix) for Canada, at a time when the country has never been richer, when our federal finances are in good shape, not adequately funding ODA, defence and diplomacy is a policy choice.
- x) is it not time to reconsider?