

**The United Nations:**  
**Irrelevant or Indispensable in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century?**

**Notes for a Presentation at NUPI**

**(The Norwegian Institute for International Affairs)**

**By Paul Heinbecker \***

**Oslo**

**January 28, 2008**

- *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). This paper does not necessarily reflect the views of the institutions above.*

**Check Against Delivery**

**Introduction**

**I am happy to be in Oslo, the city of the Nobel Peace Prize,**

**a city where people seem more interested in what can be than in what has always been,**

**a people that leaves it to others to talk about what can't be done,**

**a people for whom foreign policy is neither an afterthought nor a bridge too far, nor an expense that cannot be afforded**

**Oslo is the city where my career began, in a way.**

**I was one of many of my generation who pursued a career in international relations after Lester B. Pearson won his Nobel Peace Prize.**

**Winning that prize was a transformative event in Canada.**

**Canadians never again looked at themselves in the same way**

**I am here to defend the United Nations.**

**I know first-hand that the United Nations has all the problems one would expect a 60-year-old institution to have.**

**As a sixty something myself, I sympathize with the organization.**

**Even among its supporters, sometimes, the UN is respected more for the norms of international behaviour it develops than for the decisions it makes,**

**More for the ideals it stands for than for the political problems it solves.**

**Notwithstanding its problems, it is worth reminding ourselves that the United Nations remains the principal instrument of international governance.**

**Today, I would like to discuss three points.**

**First, that while the UN has real failings, most tragically on Darfur, in our impatience with the organization we lose sight**

- of its centrality to international relations.**
- of the considerable progress the UN has made in reinventing itself.**

**Second, that the odds are that relations between the UN and its most influential critic, the United States, are going to improve with the coming election.**

**And, third, that what happens in Afghanistan could either reinforce or undermine the UN's collective security vocation and its ability to carry out the responsibility to protect, the "doctrine" that all 192 member states endorsed at the 2005 Millennium Summit.**

### **The UN: indispensable or Irrelevant?**

**The UN's problems are not inconsequential.**

**There is division on even the most fundamental mission of the organization.**

**For most of the founding members, that is to say, for the West, the UN's central mission is collective security.**

**For the poorer countries of the South, however, economic and social development trumps all.**

**Further, for them even the security mission is different.**

**For the US, post 9/11, the priority is terrorism,**

**the National Counterterrorism Center to the US Congress, that there were a total of 14,338 terrorist attacks around the world, resulting in 20,498 deaths, the lion's share in Iraq.**

**[In the 29 OECD countries for which comparable data were available, the annual average death rate from road injury was approximately 390 times that from international terrorism. (Department of Public health, Wellington School of Medicine & Health Sciences, Otago University, Wellington, New Zealand) ]**

**Consider what the world looks like from the perspective of the poor:**

- **Natural disasters killed nearly 25,000 people in 2006, the vast majority in poorer countries. (Source: Red Cross, <http://www.ifrc.org/Docs/pubs/disasters/wdr2007/WDR2007-English.pdf>)**

- That figure was 240,000 people killed in 2004, most in the poorer countries.
- Small arms and light weapons were directly responsible for the deaths of about 100,000 people in 2003, and indirectly responsible for perhaps 200,000 more, predominantly in the poorer countries. (Source: Graduate Institute of International Studies, Geneva, Switzerland (Keith Krause; [smallarmssurvey.org/files/portal/issueareas/victims/victimcost](http://smallarmssurvey.org/files/portal/issueareas/victims/victimcost))
- Intra-state conflict caused the deaths of 100's of thousands more, notably in Africa.
- Pregnancy-related complications killed more than 535,000 women, 99% of them in the Third World. (Source: WHO Report [http://www.icrw.org/docs/Maternal\\_Mortality\\_2005.pdf](http://www.icrw.org/docs/Maternal_Mortality_2005.pdf))
- Malaria killed one million people in last year, mostly in the poorest countries, (Source: Centre for Disease Control & Prevention, World Malaria Report 2005, [www.cdc.gov/malaria](http://www.cdc.gov/malaria))
- and HIV-AIDS killed over two million people in 2005, again overwhelmingly in the Third World ( Source:UNAIDS/WHO AIDS Epidemic Update, November 2007)

Where you stand on security depends on where you live.

Beyond the mission of the organization is the profound lack of consensus that exists within the international community on particular issues.

and the consequent manifestations of that discord in New York.

New York is for the most part a mirror to the world's problems rather than their source.

This is particularly the case for the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts but also Kashmir and others, which impact discussions at the UN well beyond the immediate issues at hand.

What little common ground there had been shrank with the Iraq war.

But even before Iraq, there were the conscience-shocking failures in Cambodia, the Congo, the Balkans and Rwanda.

**In Rwanda, Security Council members played legal word-games while 800,000 people were being systematically slaughtered, in order not to trigger their obligations under the Genocide Convention.**

**Now it is the innocents of Darfur who wait on the unhurried conscience of key members of the UN, including the exasperating administration in Sudan, as well as its neighbours and G77 sympathizers, and China.**

**The UN secretariat,**

**and no one more than Jan Egeland,**

**has forced the world to confront the unfolding tragedy of Darfur but the reactions of some member countries have been, literally, unconscionable.**

**The attitude of some permanent representatives of the G77 has been particularly exasperating,**

**even denying that their own heads of government had endorsed the responsibility to protect doctrine at the Millennium summit in 2005**

**The old Human Rights Commission had become a caricature of itself, with human rights abusers seeking membership so they could deflect attention from themselves, often onto Israel,**

**but the performance of its successor has been underwhelming, feeding anti-UN sentiment in the US and Israel, and undermining support in countries like Canada.**

**The United Nations has had some management failures and scandals, too, although fewer and less serious ones than right wing American Senators and UN-bashing neo-cons would have us believe.**

**(And, in any case, they pale into insignificance compared to the disappearance of the \$9 billion that the UN Oil for Food program turned over to the Coalition Provisional Authority, who lost it.)**

**In these circumstances, virtually every issue at the UN, especially management and budget reform, become politics by other means,**

**proxies for these larger political and philosophical differences among member countries.**

**One consequence has been bitter division among the governors, a deepening distrust on the part of the member states of each other's motives, which makes effective governance of the institution difficult.**

**To quote a once-beloved American cartoon figure, Pogo, drawn by Walt Kelly, "we have met the enemy and he is us."**

**The UN has met its enemy, and its enemy is its member states.**

**It would be understandable, even easy in these circumstances to retreat into pessimism and cynicism.**

**Easy, but also short-sighted and not constructive.**

### **A Better Organization Than We Realize—and Perhaps Deserve**

**The world's aspirations for the United Nations have often exceeded the organization's grasp but it has, nevertheless, served us reasonably well, and sometimes, very well.**

**It was just a hundred years ago that peace depended on a balance of power, which collapsed with catastrophic loss of life.**

**The only protection against aggression then was power.**

**The only checks on would-be aggressors were the costs of fighting and the risks of failing.**

**With the lessons of two world wars in mind, the UN gave birth to a body of international law that stigmatized aggression and created an increasingly strong norm against it.**

**Although the Cold War saw international law breached by both sides, the norm against aggression gradually strengthened.**

**Since then, the legal force of the Charter has grown.**

**Since the end of the Cold War, according to the Human Security Report of 2005, the number of armed conflicts around the world has declined by more than 40% for which pro-active UN prevention efforts merit a large measure of credit.**

**Through the nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the UN has assisted East and West avoid a nuclear Armageddon, and limit the advent of new nuclear weapons states.**

**The UN has helped the world to feed its hungry, shelter its dispossessed, minister to its sick and educate its children.**

**According to UNICEF, there has been more than a 50% drop in child mortality.**

- **In 1960, approximately 20 million children did not live to see their fifth birthday,**
- **By 2006, that figure dropped to 9.7 million.**

**More mundanely, the UN has  
regulated the world's air travel,  
coordinated its mail services,  
overseen its patents system,  
regulated its shipping  
and apportioned its electromagnetic spectrum,  
among many other unsung but necessary tasks.**

**There is no doubt in my mind that the world would have been a less orderly and more bloody place in the last 50 years without the United Nations.**

**Overlooked in the recriminations stimulated largely by differences over the Iraq war and the Oil for Food Program, at least in North America, is the extent that the UN has re-invented itself.**

**Since the end of the Cold War, member countries have been much readier to authorize the use force to stop *internal* conflicts.**

**The statistics are pretty well-known but they are significant enough to bear repeating:**

**From 1945 until 1989, there were 17 UN military operations;**

**Since then, there have been 43 military interventions under UN auspices, and the UN's annual peacekeeping budget has grown to over \$5 billion.**

**The UN has served as mid-wife in the births of more than 100 countries since 1945, the great majority of which came into being peacefully.**

**It has also supervised scores of elections and otherwise helped many members make transitions to democracy;**

**According to Freedom House, over two-thirds of UN member countries are now full or partial democracies.**

**The passage of a half dozen core human rights treaties and their progressive assimilation into domestic laws has made it possible for an increasing share of the world's people to live in dignity and safety.**

**An extensive international criminal justice system has developed under UN auspices, a major innovation foreseen nowhere in the original Charter.**

**It is instructive, and in a way, encouraging, that Joseph Kony, head of the murderous Lord's Resistance Army of child soldiers, has attempted to negotiate immunity from prosecution by the ICC, as have Sudanese officials.**

**Impunity is not yet a thing of the past but the world's monsters are no longer sleeping as soundly in their beds, confident that they are immune to prosecution.**



**Further, it was to the UN that Lebanon turned for the investigation of the assassination of former Prime Minister Hariri.**

**The UN has given birth to concepts the world now takes for granted, most notably for this audience, “sustainable development”, the seminal contribution of the commission led by former Norwegian Prime Minister Brundtland.**

**Scores of environmental treaties have been concluded under UN auspices, from protecting the ozone layer to climate change.**

**The UN’s leadership in keeping the climate change issue on the international radar screen has been crucial, especially at a time when the major polluters are locked in disagreement.**

**Perhaps the most visible recent UN innovation has been the creation of the UN Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs.**

**In my judgment, Jan Egeland the former head of that office, deserves the gratitude of us all, and a Nobel Prize would not be too much, for his brilliant and courageous management of the response to the Asian Tsunami.**

**His performance almost single-handedly shamed the world community into grater generosity.**

**Although it is too early to chock them up as successes, the UN’s Peacebuilding efforts are innovative in their ambitions, at least, to help countries back from the abyss of failure and conflict.**

**A standing police capability for the UN is being created, to complement UN military actions.**

**And, at the 2005 summit, the UN meeting at head of state and government level, endorsed, “the Responsibility to Protect”, the Canadian initiated idea launched in the aftermath of Srebrenica and Rwanda.**

**A new office has been approved by the UN to give conceptual and operational translation of that idea into a functioning norm.**

**Thirteen counter-terrorism treaties have been concluded by the General Assembly, despite the UN's regrettable failure to agree to a definition of terrorism, and the UN Security Council has twice "legislated" the proscription of cooperation with terrorists by member countries.**

**All told, over 500 multilateral treaties have been concluded under UN auspices.**

**The point is that from counter-terrorism treaties,**

**to Peacebuilding,**

**to human rights conventions,**

**to the support of democracy and promotion of the rule of law,**

**to coordinating disaster relief,**

**to fostering sustainable development,**

**to rebuilding states emerging from conflict,**

**to assisting in the transition to democracy**

**the UN has taken very significant strides into the 21st century.**

### **The US and the UN**

**There are even grounds for cautious optimism that attitudes are changing in Washington, perhaps the UN's major, certainly its most influential critic.**

**President Bush who famously asked in his General Assembly address of September 12, 2002, "Will the United Nations serve the purpose of its founding, or will it be irrelevant?" will soon join some of the rest of us in retirement.**

**The odds are that he will be replaced by someone more open to working with the UN.**

**But what was presumed to be a cakewalk election for the Democrats, may yet be up for grabs because of the slowing US economy, which is rapidly becoming a major preoccupation.**

**Most of the would-be Republican successors to President Bush share his lack of enthusiasm for the UN.**

**It seems to remain a core belief of Republicans that the UN is somehow represents a challenge to American standing and the centre of Anti-Americanism in the world.**

**But, if their stump speeches and op-ed and journal articles are accurate indicators, the leading Republican candidates, at least, are likely to be pragmatic on multilateralism.**

**None sees the UN as more than one instrument among many of US foreign policy.**

**But most profess an intention to work with others, including the UN and to rebuild alliances.**

**Senator McCain takes the existence of the UN as a given, but foresees the creation of a League of Democracies, which he maintains would be compatible with the UN, but act where the UN failed to do so.**

**He would lead on Darfur, and would remind Khartoum that the ICC has jurisdiction to prosecute crimes in Darfur.**

**Governor Romney appears to have said little about the UN, beyond stressing the need for reform, but through his management of the Salt Lake City Olympics and his business travels has had significant exposure to other countries and cultures and countries.**

**Mayor Giuliani has been most harshly critical, saying that “the UN has proven irrelevant to the resolution of almost every major dispute of the last 50 years” and that “It has been weak, indecisive and outright corrupt”**

**But even he concedes that “the organization can be useful for some humanitarian and peacekeeping functions”, as does Governor Huckabee.**

**Both Mayor Giuliani and Governor Huckabee take positions on terrorism and on the Israeli-Palestinian issue, and in Giuliani’s case, on “Islamic Fascism” that would deepen the cleavages at UN headquarters.**

**The party of Wilson, Roosevelt and Truman, the Democrats, has tended to be more multilateralist, and that is likely to be the case again.**

**They have typically been less suspicious of the UN and take it as a necessary if sometimes wrong-headed or inadequate feature of the international order.**

**Senator Clinton, who represented the US at the UN Conference on women in Beijing, has not been sparing of the UN in her discourse.**

**But she has called the organization “a tool not a trap” and prefers on issues such as Darfur and the Human Rights Council not to abandon the UN but to bring it**

**“in line with the power realities of the twenty-first century and the basic values embodied in such documents as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights”.**

**Senator Obama has been most specific in his criticism of UN management practices, peacekeeping operations, the attitude towards Israel by the Human Rights Council, Darfur and Zimbabwe.**

**His solution, however, is for the US**

**“to rededicate itself to the organization and its mission”.**

**John Edwards tends to assume a functioning UN and stresses the importance of reengaging**

**“with our tradition of moral leadership on issues ranging from the killings in Darfur to global poverty and climate change... and on critical security issues, including terrorism, the Middle East, and nuclear proliferation.**

**All three Democrats endorse a version of the Responsibility to Protect, although Senator Clinton seems to prefer the term “atrocities prevention”.**

**All three Democrats support the Millennium Development Goals and Edwards has laid out detailed positions on what he would do to give effect to his commitment.**

**Three of the Republicans would support foreign aid; Huckabee would not go beyond humanitarian assistance.**

**Both Republicans and Democrats can be expected to be circumspect, at best, in bringing the UN into the Israel-Palestine peace process.**

### **Exceptionalism, Religion and Militarism: the US and the UN**

**Beyond the specifics of the primary campaigns, there are some deeper influences that shape the thinking and guide the actions of candidates from both sides of the political divide in the US—exceptionalism, spirituality and militarism.**

**All three are important clues to understanding US foreign policy, and the US relationship to the UN.**

**As a consequence of the leadership role that the US has assumed and that most others have readily conceded and even welcomed, and because of the considerable costs and risks of such leadership,**

**both sides of the political aisle in Washington have come increasingly to regard the US as bearing a disproportionate burden**

**and, partly as a consequence, as meriting exceptional dispensations from international law and norms of behaviour.**

**This sense of entitlement to exceptional treatment is a contemporary twist on a powerful sentiment in the collective American psyche, the creation of a new and better world.**

**The idea of exceptionalism likely dates from the Puritan migration in the 17th century, perhaps first recorded in John Winthrop’s sermon on the “Shining City on the Hill”.**

**US “exceptionalism” was given modern currency in the 1980’s when President Ronald Reagan evoked Winthrop and his “shining city”, a metaphor that evidently continues to hold a strong appeal for many Americans.**

**“The Shining City” metaphor is used, also, by Senator McCain.**

**The Clinton administration expressed the same idea differently when Secretary of State Madeleine Albright characterized the US as the one indispensable country.**

**Exceptionalism has been imbued with a righteous, religious quality.**

**President Lincoln spoke of “an almost chosen people”.**

**President Franklin Roosevelt spoke of America’s “divine heritage”.**

**President Reagan saw the Soviet Union as the Evil Empire.**

**President George W. Bush has said that “the advance of freedom is the calling of our time; it is the calling of our country.”**

**The influence of exceptionalism and religious conviction has been paralleled by the militarization of foreign policy.**

**The US military has recovered from the days of Vietnam.**

**According to Robert Bacevich of Boston University, a former military officer who has chronicled the rebuilding of the US military, the Pentagon’s long range plans call for a budget more than 20% higher than the Cold War average.**

**This spending level is in the absence of any obvious challenger.**

**All four Republican candidates would spend substantially more money on the US military, as would Democrats Obama and Clinton.**

**Only Senator Edwards would apparently not do so.**

**The enhanced standing of the US military and the scale of its resources,**

**the presumption of America's exceptional standing,**

**the presence of religious impulses in US foreign policy,**

**have all coloured American attitudes towards the UN in recent years and are likely to continue to do so for some time to come.**

**Afghanistan, the Responsibility to Protect and the Future of the United Nations.**

**(This is not a paid political advertisement!)**

**The Responsibility to Protect is likely to be at the heart of UN credibility in the 21<sup>ST</sup> Century.**

**Its first major test is in Afghanistan**

**In the 21<sup>st</sup> Century, states that believe in the rule of law and in the UN Charter,**

**whose peoples feel the most elementary sense of solidarity with those less fortunate than themselves,**

**and who have endorsed the Responsibility to Protect doctrine,**

**have a duty to contribute militarily, in armed combat if necessary, to the maintenance of peace and security.**

**The challenge for governments is to persuade their populations to support what in most cases will be regarded by people as elective wars,**

**often accompanied by an extended and sometimes spectacular and bloody counter-insurgency conflict.**

**Governments can meet that challenge, provided**

**that the decision to intervene is consistent with the principles of the UN Charter and international law**

**that military action will likely do more good than harm and have a reasonable prospect of success**

**and provided that their populations are convinced that the stakes warrant the costs required,**

**The key word, at least in Canada, is “convinced”.**

**Elective warfare, even elective warfare meant to protect the innocent and to preserve international peace and security,**

**means that populations/voters retain a choice to decline and, even once involved, to withdraw.**

**Whether the peoples of the world, especially the economically advanced world, will prove willing to sacrifice their sons and daughters in elective wars,**

**was and is the major question mark hanging over the Responsibility to Protect,**

**the doctrine that all UN members, including Canada and Norway endorsed at the 2005 UN Millennium Summit.**

**In Kandahar, Afghanistan the Canadian Government currently faces a major challenge.**

**It is clear that while the international attempt to help Afghanistan has not failed, it is in jeopardy, nowhere more so than in Kandahar.**

**The US, the dominant international partner, missed a golden opportunity to make a difference in ordinary Afghans’ lives by allowing itself to be distracted by Iraq,**



**Other donors and troop contributors, Canada certainly and Norway probably included,**

**raised few effective objections to these policies,**

**and committed far fewer funds themselves than needed,**

**and disbursed even less, sometimes through contractors and subcontractors who creamed off large overheads.**

**Similarly, thanks to the persistence of the idea of a “light footprint”, the international military forces allocated to Afghanistan were a third fewer in number than those assigned to Bosnia or even to Kosovo, a mere province of Serbia.**

**The Afghan Government, also, bears some of the responsibility for the situation the country is in.**

**The Afghan people want security from predators wherever they come from, inside or outside the country, but they are not confident of getting it, especially not from the Afghan National Police and the Ministry of the Interior.**

**But even if these problems were solved, the challenges facing the Karzai would still be daunting.**

**75% of the adult population is illiterate; (Source: UNDP Afghanistan Human Development Report 2007)**

**4% have post-secondary education;**

**25% are employed**

**and attitudes towards women are feudal, at best.**

**Despite the evident difficulties, all is not apparently lost.**

**If polling of the Afghans is to be trusted,**

**and that is not a trivial question in such a pre-modern, conflicted, poor country,**

**the world is not faced with mission impossible in Afghanistan.**

**According to an Environics poll of nearly 1600 people conducted face-to-face across the entire country in September, 51% of Afghans said the country was going in the right direction; 28% said it was not.**

**(In Kandahar, 43% said the country was going in the right direction and 43% said that it was not.)**

**Sixty percent of people said they were better off than they were in 2002 and only 14% said they were worse off.**

**Seventy-three percent, including 75% of the women interviewed, said that women are better off than they were five years earlier.**

**Seventy-three percent had a negative or very negative view of the Taliban and 54% saw Al Qaeda in negative terms.**

**Sixty percent regarded the presence of foreign countries in Afghanistan as positive and 43% wanted foreign troops to remain for “however long it takes to defeat the Taliban and to restore order”.**

**Only 14% wanted foreign troops out right away.**

**So all appears not to be lost, yet.**

**But it is very clear that much more needs to be done by the international community if even minimal objectives are to be reached.**

**The war will not be won by military means alone, of course, but it will not be won by ignoring security imperatives and abandoning the South to the Taliban**

**Afghanistan is a war of choice for Canada, or so it is seen by many Canadians.**

**Canadians appear to be skeptical of the idea, advanced by some political and military leaders, that Canada faces an existential threat from Afghanistan.**

**Few Canadians seem to lose sleep worrying that Mullah Omer is coming to get them,**

**Or even Al Qaeda, either, although they are less sure about that, especially after an apparent home-grown terrorist plot was foiled in Toronto a couple of years ago.**

**At the same time, however, Canadians are clearly uncertain of the purposes of our country's role in Afghanistan and on the prospects for success.**

**In the first place, among many (but certainly not all) Canadians there is nostalgia for simple peace-keeping and a distaste for combat.**

**Since Pearson and the Nobel Prize, Canadians have prided themselves on peace-keeping, seeing in it a source of our particular self-identity.**

**We have built a prominent monument in Ottawa to Canadian peacekeepers and have put a picture of them on our currency.**

**This self-image has carried with it a romantic notion of peacekeeping, something that good Canadians led the world in, to the enduring gratitude of the international community.**

**However much truth there ever was in such a self-image, little of it remains.**

**The nature of conflict has changed, as has the character of the UN's role.**

**Canadians are not ignorant of these developments,**

**but many still wish their armed forces were doing something a little less combative in Afghanistan,**

**a sentiment endorsed by all the opposition parties, including the official opposition party, the Liberals.**

**Canadians are, understandably, especially disturbed at the extent of the loss of Canadian soldiers.**

**On behalf of Canada when I was Ambassador to the UN, I accepted 107 medals that had been awarded posthumously to Canadian military personnel who died over the course of nearly 60 years of UN military operations,**

**the most, regrettably, of any troop contributing country.**

**In Afghanistan, in just six years, we have already lost 78 soldiers and one diplomat, who coincidentally had been my deputy in Canada's UN mission in New York.**

**According to the Canadian Forces, themselves, the death rate in Afghanistan for Canadian soldiers has ranged from 1.3 to 1.6 per cent, compared to 0.3 to 0.6 per cent for our allies in Afghanistan, and 0.5 per cent for the U.S. forces in Iraq.**

**The Canadian death rate in Afghanistan is higher even than it was during most years of the Second World War, albeit on a much smaller base.**

**There is no doubt in my mind that if Canada had the draft, i.e., if our soldiers were being conscripted, support for the Canadian mission in Afghanistan would have dried up long ago.**

**But as our military are professional soldiers, who have volunteered knowing the risks involved, the Canadian population is willing to contemplate a slightly higher degree of casualties than they would for citizen-soldiers.**

**At the same time, there is no doubt that Canada is bearing a disproportionate share of the burden and incurring a disproportionate share of the losses.**

**The losses are considerable, and Canadians do not understand why others do not help out more**

**and wonder whether we should continue in Afghanistan if they do not.**

**In an attempt to lift the issue above the partisan fray in a “minority” Parliament,**

**that is, a Parliament in which no party has a majority**

**and where there is no coalition, a highly vulnerable position for the government.**

**The government created a non-partisan panel of eminent Canadians to give it advice on how to proceed.**

**i.e., whether to change the location of Canadian forces,  
or change the nature of their mission,  
or leave Afghanistan altogether,  
or continue**

**Last week the high level panel recommended that Canadian forces stay on in Afghanistan**

**but with two major caveats—**

- 1. that the Canadian forces be better equipped with medium lift helicopters to reduce the number of casualties they are suffering in traveling by road, and to extend their reach,**
- 2. that ISAF allies agree to send a another battle group to help out.**

**The government is expected to accept these recommendations.**

**Whether Canada will be able to stay on will depend on its success in persuading allies that they should contribute just one more battle group.**

### **Conclusion**

**Partly as a consequence of the contribution that the UN continues to make to the preservation of international peace and security**

**Partly because of the innovations it has achieved with respect to economic and social needs, and criminal justice,**

**And despite its cleavages and evident failings, the UN will remain not irrelevant but indispensable.**

**Thank You.**

