

Notes for an Address

by Paul Heinbecker*

The US, Canada, and Having a Choice to the Vancouver Branch of the CIIA

Vancouver

May 4, 2004

Check Against Delivery

*Paul Heinbecker is Distinguished Fellow, International Relations, at the Centre for International Governance Innovation, and Director of the Centre for Global Relations, Governance and Policy at Wilfrid Laurier University. He served as Canada's Ambassador to the United Nations (2000- 2003) and Germany (1992-1996). He was then Prime Minister Brian Mulroney's chief foreign policy advisor and speech writer. This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions above

The U.S as Empire

The U.S., the aspirations of latter day Gullivers notwithstanding, is not an empire.

The U.S. was born anti-imperial and its body politic remains so.

Remember candidate Bush's admonitions about a modest foreign policy.

Countries do not occupy land any more.

A combination of modern values and modern communications preclude the use of tactics necessary to pacify resistance.

Canada and Values and Interests

Foreign policy is the expression of national purpose abroad.

Ours is a values-based, interests-oriented foreign policy (as is that of the U.S.).

The decisions the government makes in foreign policy derive from the people we are, from the values we share and the interests we

pursue.

The goals we set at home frame the decisions we make externally.

At the same time, events abroad and our reactions to them help shape decisions at home and, over time, affect our national character.

We send our soldiers abroad to keep the peace and to enforce order because we believe we are our brother=s keeper and because we feel a responsibility to protect the innocent.

We also have an interest in the preservation of peace and stability because we know that they are preconditions to our living our lives in untroubled security and prosperity in Canada.

We promote trade and investment liberalization abroad because

we want others, not least the billions caught in a poverty trap that affords them a dollar or two a day on which to live, to participate in the prosperity we have experienced in the past half century.

We are also persuaded that a more prosperous world is in our interest because the better off people abroad become the better off we will be and the more we will be able to afford a 21st century health care system for Canadians, to lift Canadian children and families out of poverty and to assure ourselves a world-class education system.

We give development assistance and humanitarian relief to the poverty-ridden abroad because we believe we have an obligation to help those less fortunate than we.

We also help them because we know that well-governed, successful societies abroad generate peace and prosperity for their peoples and regions and eliminate the conditions that incubate terrorism and disease and that generate refugee flows.

We negotiate international environmental agreements because

we believe the protection of our common natural heritage is a universal value.

We also know that the decisions we make domestically to meet the challenges to our own environment, and to protect our own health, notably from global phenomena like climate change, will be undermined without the cooperation of others.

We promote the rule of law abroad, e.g., the International Criminal Court, because we believe all people should enjoy the same liberties and rights and protections as we do.

We also know that the wider the ambit of the law, the more our own liberties and rights and protections are secure and the more Canadians working and travelling abroad are safe.

Success in foreign policy, more than in most walks of life, depends to paraphrase Robbie Burns on our ability to see ourselves as others see us.

How do others see us?

What does the world think when it thinks about Canada?

When our representatives abroad speak, they are listened to first and foremost because of who they represent and who we are.

For the most part, others consider us a successful, bilingual, multi-ethnic, law-abiding, cultivated and compassionate society, one that really does value diversity and that integrates diversity into unity of purpose as well as or better than any one else.

We are seen as a country that tries and, mostly, succeeds in respecting human rights and protecting minorities.

We are considered to be a society that produces an enviable quality of life and standard of living for our citizens.

We are admired as a culture that generates remarkable

excellence in literature, the arts and science.

And we are respected for putting the security of people everywhere B human security B at the heart of our foreign policy.

At the same time, foreign policy is also what we do and, sometimes, what we do not do.

The Iraq war is one of those times.

The Iraq War

Rarely in life, is a decision so quickly and thoroughly vindicated as Canada's decision to opt out of the war in Iraq.

A year later, the stated casus belli has evaporated.

No weapons of mass destruction have been found despite the best efforts of 1600 American weapons inspectors with free rein.

No connection to Al Qaeda has been established.

No persuasive argument endures about the urgency of the U.S. need to act.

The United States has not, Secretary of State Colin Powell's assertions on the eve of the war notwithstanding, earned the world's trust.

! 2003 State of the Union

! Secretary of State of the United States misleads the U.N. Security Council

! The Vice-President of the United States misleads the American people

It is no clearer today what Washington's purposes were in invading Iraq than it was a year ago.

What is clear is that the U.S. and its posse are caught in a morass.

They cannot end the occupation precipitously without triggering a civil war and undoing the good they have done in removing Saddam

Hussein.

But they cannot stay in Iraq without losing more soldiers and more money.

Echoes of Vietnam.

Meanwhile, the Iraqi toll also rises, as does the animosity of the Iraqis towards the occupiers.

As one Arab Ambassador at the United Nations put it, the Americans have swallowed a razor and nothing they do now will be painless or cost-free.

The cost to American interests is catastrophic and extends well beyond Iraq.

In December, the U.S. Advisory Group on Public Diplomacy for the Arab and Muslim World, headed by former U.S. Ambassador to Israel and to Syria Edward Djerejian, reported that "the bottom has

indeed fallen out of support for the United States".

According to a poll released a month ago or so by the Pew Research Centre, international discontent with the United States and its foreign policy has intensified rather than diminished since last year.

The Transatlantic drift has become the Transatlantic rift, as the gulf widens between the Americans and almost everyone else, the product of diverging values and Washington's "exceptionalism".

What is not yet clear is whether the emerging conflict between the propagation of American principles and the revival of Islamic fundamentalism is morphing into a new security paradigm, the West against Islam.

I doubt that there is more than a minimal common threat perception internationally and I am sure there is no consensus on how to respond.

In declaring war on terrorism, that is, on a tactic, rather than on, for example, al Qaeda and related or discrete fundamentalist terrorist groups and networks, and in conflating the Israeli-Palestinian issue with the Iraq issue and the war on terror, the U.S. has put itself in a no-win position.

Nor are all the critics foreign.

Richard Clark called the Iraq war a diversion from the war on terror.

A report of the U.S. Army War College called the war a strategic error, a distraction from the war on terrorism.

The Carnegie Endowment for International Peace found that Weapons of Mass Destruction were not an immediate threat, inspections were working, the terrorism connection was missing and war was not the best or only option.

Whatever Washington's motivation, some welcome self-

correction appears to be underway insofar as Iraq is concerned, (but not, however, vis-à-vis the rest of the Middle East),

a belated recognition that even U.S. power does not create its own reality and that even the revolution in military affairs is not an adequate response to asymmetric action.

What lessons should Canada learn from the Iraq experience?

First and foremost that values matter in foreign policy.

Reduced to its basics, participation in the Iraq war would have meant sending young Canadians to kill, and be killed by, young Iraqis for the sake of maintaining friendly relations with Washington.

Second, going along to get along has never made good public policy, or good politics, either.

The Canadian government looked at the evidence Washington presented and voted its conscience.

Another government, the Spanish, looked at the same evidence, and voted its interests, specifically its interests with Washington.

One is in office and the other is not.

There has been no significant cost to Canada from staying out of the war.

Third, the Iraq war demonstrates the limits of intelligence.

You cannot run a policy of prevention with flawed or cooked intelligence.

Time, and enquiries, will tell whether the intelligence in the U.S., and U.K., was just catastrophically bad, politically manipulated, or both.

Fourth, Canada does not have to choose between the United Nations and the U.S..

To be respected in Washington, we need to be effective in the world, including at the U.N.

! Senators Luger and Biden

The converse is also true; effectiveness in New York depends on visible influence in Washington.

Finally, we should not shrink from disagreeing with American administrations when they are wrong any more than we should shrink from agreeing with them when they are right.

We should call them as we see them.

We did so on Iraq, and we have been vindicated.

Against the background of lessons learned, the following are 10 do's and don'ts for a successful, or at least self-respecting, modus operandi with the United States, especially with the Bush administration.

1. Do recognize and respect the USA's qualities and strengths

the Economy

the Arts

Education

Science

the Military

as a benign neighbour,

2. **Don't be Anti-American;**

! anti-Americanism is unworthy

! But do be cautious and don't presume that there will be a second Bush term, and certainly don't do anything to facilitate that result.

! Bear in mind that there are many Americas ;
USA is profoundly divided

! name calling is cheap

3. **Do every thing reasonably possible to cooperate on home land security**

! safeguard the Canadian border and the perimeter

4. **Do not let Canada be identified with U.S. foreign policy**

Big Country = Big Successes

WW II

Korea

Containment/Defeat of Communism

Stability in NW Pacific

First Gulf war

But also Big Mistakes

- **Iran**
- **Chile**
- **Central America, Dominican Republic**
- **Vietnam**
 - **Middle East**
- **Iraq II;**

5. Don't Blame Canada

- **Values are diverging**
 - ! **Not your father's Buick; these are not the Republicans of Gotlieb's time**
 - ! **Neo-Cons -- radical; No conspiracy; open --New**
 - American Century Project**
 - ! **see what you are seeing; Richard Perle's advice on Soviet weapons**

6. Do Manage Relations

- ! **Don't let matters just take their course**

**! Cabinet Committee on US affairs good, but...
subjecting foreign policy objectives to bilateral filters
undermines both
! U.S. National Security doctrine could be a real
problem; preventive wars and dominance wars.**

7. Do Understand What Works With Washington

**An effective foreign policy gets respect; do be
useful**

- ! Sycophants are taken for granted--UK**
- ! But, limits -- French—psychotic reaction**
- ! Do Invest in Personal Diplomacy**

**24 Hours in the President's day
good relations are exceptional**

8. Do not ignore the rest of the world

! Cdn officials—one big ear, one blind eye

9. Do communicate

10. To Thine Own Self Be True

! don't disagree for the sake of being different

! don't scare yourself

! we do have a choice (Choice vs Price)