

Notes for a Presentation by Paul Heinbecker *

**The Canadian Forces in a World of Scarce Consensus and Uncertain
Global Governance,**

Canadian Forces College,

Toronto, October 20, 2006

Check Against Delivery

* Paul Heinbecker is Distinguished Fellow, International Relations, at the Centre for International Governance Innovation, Waterloo, and Director of the Centre for Global Relations at Wilfrid Laurier University. He served as Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations (2000- 2003) and Germany (1992-1996). This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions above.

I) Introduction

- **We live in a world where there is precious little consensus on what the most important issues are**
 - **National security or poverty alleviation**
 - **Nuclear proliferation or nuclear disarmament**
 - **“The War on Terror” or A War on Islam**
 - **A “New Middle East” or Dangerous Meddling**

- **We live in an era when the world’s faith in its institutions is flagging**
 - **The US, benevolent hegemon or malevolent menace?**
 - **The UN, irrelevant or indispensable?**
 - **NATO, out of area or over its head?**

- **We live in a time when Canadian foreign policy matters, and when we have consequential choices to make**
 - **Vis-à-vis the US**
 - **In Afghanistan**
 - **About The Middle East**
 - **On Human Security and Darfur**

- **Those choices have consequences**
 - **Foreign policy is not a freebie**
 - **Public peace and foreign policy**
 - **What Canadian policy looks like to Canadian Muslims**

- **Why all of this matters to the Canadian Forces**
 - **First of all as citizens**
 - **Second as soldiers**

II) The Absence of Consensus

1. National Security or Poverty Alleviation

- **With the end of the Cold War, international consensus about security began to evaporate.**
- **With the Iraq war, which was launched without Security Council authorization and over the objections of most of the international community, consensus on security matters receded further.**
- **Some differentiation on security is normal;**

where you stand on security depends famously on where you live.

- **Danger and vulnerability are different if you live in Kandahar or Copenhagen, or in Nyala or Netanya, or in New York, London or Toronto.**

But consider that:

- **Natural disasters killed nearly 240,000 people in 2004, the vast majority in poorer countries.**
- **Small arms and light weapons killed at least 300,000 people last year, predominantly in the poorer countries.**
- **Intra-state conflict caused the deaths of 100's of thousands more, notably in Africa.**
- **Pregnancy-related complications killed more than 500,000 women, 99% of them in the Third World.**
- **Malaria killed one million people last year, mostly in the poorest countries, and**
- **HIV-AIDS killed almost three million people last year, again overwhelmingly in the Third World**

- **It is not surprising in these circumstances that people in the poorer countries regard terrorism, especially terrorism directed at rich countries, as a second order concern for themselves, at best.**

- **For many of the poorer countries, the main issue is not security at all but rather development.**

- **A glance at the defence and development budgets of any developed country, let alone the most powerful country, is enough to know that the richer countries do not share that view.**
- **And this, despite the fact, as the response of Indonesians to American assistance during the Tsunami shows, a dollar spent on humanitarian assistance buys more security at the margin than another dollar spent on defence.**
- **Not to mention lack of consensus on climate change, etc., on the Doha Round of trade negotiations, etc.**

2. Nuclear Proliferation or Nuclear Disarmament

- **The one thing that President Bush and Senator Kerry could readily agree on during the 2004 presidential debates was that the nexus of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction was the most important problem the United States, and the world, faced.**
- **Since then, political divisions in the US have widened and fissures between the US and much of the rest of the international community have deepened, in some cases into chasms.**

- **From Afghanistan to Iraq to Palestine and Lebanon, the world has become more fractious and international consensus on security has become correspondingly scarcer.**
- **Not surprisingly, progress on the arms control and disarmament (ACD) agenda has foundered,**
- **its prospects are worsened by the nuclear programs of India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea and allegedly Iran**
 - **The apparent nuclear weapon test of North Korea, the alleged aspirations of Iran and the still-to-be-ratified US-Indian agreement on nuclear cooperation raise major questions about the continuing viability of the ACD treaty regime.**
 - **Its prospects are also worsened by the current American disregard for multilateral cooperation it cannot control,**
 - **and its preference for a US-led strategy focusing on enforcement and compliance,**
 - **and by virtually all of the nuclear weapons states' indifference to their disarmament obligations under the Non Proliferation Treaty (NPT), the corner stone of the arms control and disarmament regime.**

- **Meanwhile, rising oil prices and deepening climate change are causing more countries to become more interested in availing themselves of nuclear energy than ever before,**
 - **By 2030, the number of automobiles in the world will increase by 50%.**
 - **In 20 years the world will consume 40% more oil than it does today.**
 - **By 2100, global temperatures are expected to be 6.0°C warmer than they were in 1990, making the earth warmer than it has been in 50 million years.**
 - **Technology, especially nuclear technology will be part of the response.**
 - **India has a flourishing and largely indigenous nuclear power program and by some estimates expects to have 20,000 MWe nuclear capacity on line by 2020.**
 - **China has apparently announced plans to build 30 new reactors by 2020.**

- **A study in 2003 by a blue-ribbon American commission headed by former CIA director John Deutch, concludes that by 2050 China could require the equivalent of 200 full-scale nuclear plants.**

- **A team of Chinese scientists advising the Beijing leadership is said to have put the figure even higher: 300 gigawatts of nuclear output, not much less than the 350 gigawatts produced worldwide today.**

- **These developments will raise all the old unanswered safety and environmental questions and some new security ones as well.**

- **There are wide disagreements between the nuclear weapons states, principally but not exclusively the United States, on the one hand and much of the rest of the NPT membership, that is to say, most of the rest of the world on the other.**

- **These disagreements go to the heart of the NPT bargains, primordially that of disarmament.**

- **Some argue that disarmament by the nuclear-armed states has always been little more than a delusion on the part of the states without nuclear weapons,**

- **a necessary pretext that there would one day be a quid for the quo the latter were giving in renouncing their own nuclear weapons aspirations,**

- **a quid on which the nuclear armed states never really intended to make good.**
- **In this light, everyone would be better off just to drop the pretence.**
- **Moreover, the NPT's non-proliferation undertakings were in any case not just a bargain between those with nuclear weapons and those without but also a binding commitment among the latter, many of whom had ample reason to fear or distrust one another.**
- **They had, undertaken to each other as well as to the nuclear armed states not to acquire nuclear weapons.**
- **The argument holds, as well, that too much effort has been invested in obtaining signatures on treaties and not enough in ensuring compliance with them.**
- **Arms control agreements and export controls have been ineffectual with respect to India, Pakistan, Israel, North Korea and, prospectively, Iran.**
- **They, also neither deterred nor much delayed A.Q. Khan in taking his nuclear activities private.**

- **Counting on their effectiveness is delusional and downright dangerous.**
- **The counter arguments derive from the famous observation by President Kennedy, the only President to face a full fledged nuclear crisis, that “We must abolish the weapons of war before they abolish us.”**
- **These arguments hold that ridding the world of nuclear weapons was always seen as a goal for the very long term**
 - **but that that goal ought never to be abandoned, against the possible day that political attitudes and security perceptions might change.**
- **Near term action should be framed in such a way as not to preclude reaching the goal in the longer term.**
- **Further, non-proliferation could only be achieved cooperatively and treating the non-nuclear armed states as inherently and eternally inferior entities was unlikely to serve the goals of compliance and enforcement.**
- **As for the effectiveness of the ACD regime, particularly the NPT, there are half as many governments in 2006 with nuclear weapons programs as there had been in the Sixties and more countries have given up nuclear weapons than had illicitly acquired them.**

- **Not insignificantly, each arms control agreement codifies an additional global norm and augments the international legal framework for preventing and constraining weapons programs.**
- **Securing sensitive assets would be much easier in the descent to a zero-arsenal world than in one where multiple states maintained operational nuclear forces and large related infrastructures with little or no transparency and international monitoring.**
- **These differences have far-reaching implications.**
- **Countries make their decisions to acquire nuclear weapons for a mix of motives, including security, prestige and religion.**
- **Simple fairness probably enters into the calculation, as well.**
 - **President Ahmadinejad at the UN**
- **Weapons of mass destruction have considerable political value and nuclear weapons, in particular, are great equalizers.**
- **Countries with nuclear weapons command respect, even if only of the kind accorded to a well armed criminal.**

- **Were Iran to develop nuclear weapons, a “political chain reaction” could well follow, involving Saudi Arabia, Egypt and Turkey, at least.**

- **It could very well be the beginning of the end of the NPT, and potentially of the world as we know it.**

- **The dangers inherent in North Korea’s nuclear program could produce a similar chain reaction, involving Japan and South Korea.**
 - **US assurances to Japan and South Korea**

- **The India-US deal may be equally momentous if, as seems likely, it seeks to enshrine a double standard.**

- **As the NPT and Nuclear Supplier Group regulations preclude nuclear trade with non-signatories, a special dispensation for India would have to be given.**

- **Some argue that that would only be a welcome acknowledgment of reality.**

- **Others worry that in these fundamentally changed circumstances, it would be unrealistic to expect other near nuclear weapons states to forbear forever from developing their own arsenals.**

- **Once the NPT started to unravel, its collapse could be sudden and catastrophic.**
- **Then it really would become “a jungle out there”, a jungle full of well-armed inhabitants**
- **The entire regime is, thus, in jeopardy precisely when events suggest it needs innovation and reinforcement.**
- **It can be made to work but that will require greater recognition of common interest and shared fate in major world capitals, especially Washington, than has been evident so far.**

3. War on Terror or War on Islam

- **There are two competing narratives.**
- **The American/Israeli narrative is that the Wahabis/Salafists/Jihadis/Al Qaeda have embarked on a struggle to defeat the West.**
- **They hate democracy and cannot abide freedom.**
- **They want to recreate a Caliphate and dominate the world.**

- **To achieve these ends they will resort to asymmetric warfare, especially terrorism**
- **Israel is the first line of defence of the West in a struggle that will progressively draw us all in**
- **We are at the outset of a long war with Islamo-Fascism that will only end with the defeat of one side or the other.**
- **The Islamist narrative is completely the opposite.**
- **The US/West is involved in a latter day crusade.**
- **In virtually every respect, the West is putting pressure on the Islamic world**
- **From Coca-Cola to Microsoft to the internet to bikinis on the beaches, Western cultural dominance is pervasive**
- **Further, American military pressure is extensive, and includes**
 - **The war in/on Iraq**
 - **Uncritical support for Israel vis-à-vis the Palestinians, Hamas, Hezbollah,**
 - **Lebanon 2006**
 - **Afghanistan, Somalia, Darfur**

- **Nine, at least, American bases in the Islamic world, (737, big and small, outside of the United States**
- **Support for corrupt Arab autocrats, who keep their societies under control**
- **Pressure on Iran**
- **Double standards on nuclear weapons**
- **Discrimination between India and Pakistan**
- **Domination of Central Asia**

5. The New Middle East...

- **One of the many reasons given why the US invaded Iraq was to bring democracy and opportunity to the Middle East, so that the people can hope that they can grow and prosper in their own lands.**
- **But Iraq is a lesson in realism—Iraq Study Group of James Baker and Lee Hamilton**
- **As are the elections in Palestine and In Lebanon**
- **From Turkey to Iran to Saudi Arabia to Iran to Jordan and Syria, no one trusts the US or the West as a whole to launch another, border-drawing exercise like they did in Paris in 1919.**

- **If anyone tries there will be a very big fight.**
 - **American and Israeli support for Kurdistan against the Turks and Iranians**
 - **US maps showing Kurdistan covering most of eastern Turkey**

- **Even just discussing it is evidence of a profound naivete, hubris and historic amnesia**

III) Flagging Faith in Institutions

1. The United States as Benevolent Hegemon

- **The National Security Strategy of 2002/6**

- **9/11 shocked Americans, and Washington responded in 2002 with a new US National Security Strategy, which has recently been updated.**

- **Much of the strategy is readily acceptable, in fact commendable;**

- **much of it could have been written in other capitals, including in Ottawa.**

- **The strategy's problem lies, of course, in its preventive posture and the intent it expresses to predominate in perpetuity.**
- **Pre-emption is not prohibited by Article 51 of the UN Charter and is foreseen under customary international law.**
- **Prevention, however, is not.**
- **The difference is not just legalistic hair splitting.**
- **Pre-emption is acceptable only if it meets rigorous tests as regards the immediacy of the threat and the capability and intent of an adversary to do harm.**
- **In his recent book, "The One Percent Solution", Ron Suskind argues that some senior officials in the current US administration believe that after 9/11 mere suspicion of malevolent intent is enough to justify military prevention.**
- **In addition to prevention, the National Security Strategy expresses the intent to predominate indefinitely and to deter any challengers from emerging,**

- **a posture first seen in draft NSC guidance in 1992 in the George H.W. Bush administration, and rejected then.**
- **This thesis would, if carried to its logical conclusions, eventually generate major wars.**
- **Whether this theory will survive its skirmish with reality in Iraq and continue on into the next US Administration, only time will tell, but it seems unlikely.**
- **In the meantime, at least, prevention and predominance will remain recipes for record defence expenditures and the temptations that such capacity gives rise to**
- **Guantanamo, Abu Ghraib, Bagram and torture**
- **“Black” prisons, extraordinary renditions**
- **The 2006 extension of the National Security Act**
 - **NYT, October 19, 2006--... (The Bill) sets up a separate system of justice for any foreigner whom Mr. Bush chooses to designate as an “illegal enemy combatant.”**
 - **It raises insurmountable obstacles for prisoners to challenge their detentions.**

- **It does not require the government to release prisoners who are not being charged, or a prisoner who is exonerated by the tribunals.**
- **The law does not apply to American citizens, but it does apply to other legal United States residents.**
- **And it chips away at the foundations of the judicial system in ways that all Americans should find threatening.**
- **It further damages the nation’s reputation and, by repudiating key protections of the Geneva Conventions, it needlessly increases the danger to any American soldier captured in battle.**

- **US standing in the world**

Favorable Opinions of the U.S.

	1999/ 2000					
	2000	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
	%	%	%	%	%	%
Great Britain	83	75	70	58	55	56
France	62	63	43	37	43	39
Germany	78	61	45	38	41	37
Spain	50	--	38	--	41	23
Russia	37	61	36	47	52	43
Indonesia	75	61	15	--	38	30
Egypt	--	--	--	--	--	30
Pakistan	23	10	13	21	23	27
Jordan	--	25	1	5	21	15
Turkey	52	30	15	30	23	12
Nigeria	46	--	61	--	--	62
Japan	77	72	--	--	--	63
India	--	54	--	--	71	56
China	--	--	--	--	42	47

1999/2000 survey trends provided by the Office of Research, U.S. Department of State

2. The UN: Irrelevant or Indispensable?

- **Four points on the UN**
 - **First, the United Nations has served us better than most people realize, whatever its critics might say, not least in the development and promotion of international law.**
 - **International law, and order--Charter**
 - **No Armageddon—NPT**
 - **transitions from conflict to democracy — including Cambodia, Nicaragua, Namibia, Mozambique, South Africa, and, more recently, Bosnia, Burundi, and, with luck, Afghanistan.**
 - **Peace-keeping**
 - **Mid-wife to 140 countries**
 - **Sustainable Development**
 - **13 Terrorism Conventions**
 - **UNICEF helped inoculate 100's of millions of children against childhood diseases**
 - **UNHCR protected 19 million refugees last year and scores of millions more over the years.**
 - **WFP helped 113 million people in 2004 alone.**

- **More mundanely, the UN has regulated the world's air travel, coordinated its mail services, registered its patents, regulated its shipping and apportioned its electromagnetic spectrum, among many other unsung but necessary tasks.**
- **Second, the UN has manifestly not kept up fully with the times, and needs renovation.**
 - **ECOSOC**
 - **The Human Rights Commission**
 - **Bosnia and Srebrenica**
 - **Rwanda**
 - **Kosovo**
 - **The Congo**
 - **Darfur**
 - **Management Reform**
- **Third, the disappointments of last fall's UN summit notwithstanding, the UN has in fact made numerous and far-reaching innovations.**
 - **OCHA**
 - **Peacebuilding**
 - **The Responsibility to Protect**
 - **The ICC, ICTY, ICTR, Sierra Leone, Cambodia, Hariri**

- Security Council “legislation”
 - HIV-AIDs
 - Democratic transitions
- Finally, warts and all, there really is no ready and realistic alternative.

3) NATO, out of area or over its head?

- Waiting for Godot in Kandahar

III) Canadian Policy Choices and their Consequences

- **Vis-à-vis the US**
 - **Aligning with the US is dangerous**
 - **The War on Terror**
 - **Maher Arar**
 - **The longest formerly undefended border**
 - **Security certificates**

- **Vis-à-vis the UN**
 - **CF allergic to Africa**
 - **Vice Chief**
 - **My Experience**

- **Afghanistan**
 - **When good people meet bad circumstances**
 - **Mission impossible?**
 - **Earth to CIDA!**
 - **Is the Karzai government worth the investment**

- **Human Security**
 - **Darfur**

- **The Middle East**
 - **Lebanon “measured response”,**
 - **Pro-Israel and “pro’er” Israel; the Liberals are “anti-Israel**
 - **The politics of wedge issues**

- **Choices have consequences**
- **Foreign policy is not a freebie**
 - **What Canadian policy looks like to Canadian Muslims**
 - **Whatever happened to the old compact—come, but leave the old fights behind**
 - **Public peace and foreign policy**

IV) Why all this matters

- **To you as soldiers**
 - **Identification with the US**
 - **Tactically advantageous, strategically dubious**
- **To you as citizens**
 - **Security versus liberties?**