

**Searching for the  
New Liberalism**



TORONTO • SEPTEMBER 27 - 29, 2002

## **Choices and Consequences in a Liberal Foreign Policy**

A Draft presented for discussion

**By Lloyd Axworthy**

It's a time for Canadian liberals to make choices and consider consequences on how to conduct our foreign policy in the post-September environment.

Let's begin by looking at two statements:

Last Friday in a report to Congress President Bush said the following:

“Our forces will be strong enough to dissuade potential adversaries from pursuing a military buildup in hopes of surpassing or equaling the power of the United States. To forestall or prevent such hostile acts by our adversaries, the United States will, if necessary act pre-emptively”.

This pretty much sums up the new prescription for a global Pax Americana solely determined by the military might of the of our super power neighbour. We are told by many in this country that we have no choice but to join the parade.

Consider the alternative.

“ These terrorist attacks are a further, horrifying indication of the pervasiveness of threats to people's safety, rights and lives. As the international community faces the implications of these tragic events, we must recognize that innovative international approaches are needed to address growing sources of global insecurity, remedy it's symptoms and prevent the recurrence of threats that affect the daily lives of millions of people”.

This, unlike many of the outpourings of feelings and official statements in the dark days that followed September 11, was not a rousing call to arms seeking retaliation or revenge. It did not uphold the right of an aggrieved country to protect its sovereign national interest. It did not assert the need to strengthen borders or amass overwhelming military power.

Instead, it recognized the widespread nature of the problem and called for innovative, international answers. Most important, it put the threat to people -- the risk to individuals -- as the central issue.

This was the statement of the Human Security Network, an association of 13 countries founded in 1999 out of an initiative by Norway and Canada. Its purpose: to collaborate and co-operate on concrete human-security matters on the international agenda at the time, such as a small-arms treaty, the international criminal court and the protection of children.

This group of like-minded nations worked from the premise that the basic right of people to live in freedom from fear was challenged equally by two overwhelming threats: the uncontrolled forces of state-inspired violence, and the newer, murkier dangers arising from a global underworld of human traffickers, arms traders, criminals and terrorists. As we all know, such advice was not heeded. The war on terrorism has become the dominant and over-arching objective of the United States and its allies. It has given license to a variety of interventions, a massive increase of expenditure on arms, a justification for severe limits on human rights and a cover for all kind of nasty suppressions of various groups and interests around the world.

As practised by its chief proponent, counter-terrorism is the new crusade. It is the litmus test of loyalty to the faith: you're either for us or against us. It's primarily a military response, non-collaborative in approach and defiantly opposed to most forms of international efforts at alternative solutions, as witness the recent attempt to undermine the International Criminal Court.

Giving renewed vigour to the apostles of realpolitik -- bringing out of the shadows all those who find notions of humanitarian co-operation, international justice and the rule of law to be anathema, it has given birth to a doctrine of pre-emption, which arrogates to the United States the right to be judge, jury and prosecutor against any country, or anyone it considers a threat, running contrary to half a century of international law and the Charter of the United Nations.

This assertion of pre-emption sets in precedent the right of any strong state to move against a weaker neighbour solely on the basis of its own calculation- otherwise known as the law of the jungle. As such it is leading inexorably into further crisis that will continue to expand the orbit of danger and accelerate the cycles of violence, such as the impending attack on Iraq.

I want to make the case today that this approach is a mistake. If we want to successfully combat the terrorists -- and all others who threaten the security of innocent people, whether they be commuters on a plane to Los Angeles, children in Northern Uganda, bomb victims in the Middle East or kidnapped civilians in Columbia -- then we need to apply the common sense and pragmatism of a human-security approach.

If we don't, any attempt to deter global criminal activity is doomed to failure. And unless and until we can strike a better balance and forge a different pathway based on human-security principles, we also face a serious regression in the level of international co-operation on a myriad of crucial global issues and the receding of hope of a more peaceable, secure world.

Attempting to beat terrorists into submission through military action cannot be effective. There may be a momentary restriction on the activities of terrorist organizations -- it may send them further underground and may eliminate some of their human resources. But the global reach and religious fanaticism that defines terrorist organizations such as al-Qaida make a successful, persistent military deterrent unlikely. More importantly, there are too many pre-existing tensions which military attacks exacerbate rather than quell. Military responses feed the anger, poverty, rhetoric -- the climate of grievance -- which create and sustain terrorist intentions.

Terrorism will never be eliminated, but its attraction can be significantly diminished by addressing causes: poverty, despair, disenfranchisement, religious fanaticism, absence of effective and meaningful democracy, etc. Some of these efforts have already been undertaken. They are complex, resource-intensive and require innovative international co-operation.

Furthermore, building an effective global network of law enforcement and justice that applies the same capacity for collaborative action that terrorists themselves often employ can substantially deter terrorism. Efforts to dismantle or ignore collaborative action only strengthen the terrorist ability to undermine an effective international response.

I don't come to these conclusions from any lofty philosophical heights. I write as a former practitioner, a survivor of 27 years in elected politics and 12 years as a minister of the Crown -- not occupations that usually lead to the kindly contemplation of the incongruities of life. As Canada's foreign minister for close to five years, I had to deal with the hard realities of living in a world of war, genocide, ethnic cleansing and premeditated violence. I was party to decisions on whether to engage in enforcement actions -- I'm no stranger to that dilemma.

As a neighbour and appreciative ally to the biggest kid on the block, I've also worked on numerous ways to co-exist and co-operate with the United States. I'm fully aware of the power of our partner on the North American continent to be a force for good. But I also come with a sense of apprehension about the present mood and dominant politics of that country.

It is because of that experience that I see the need to depart from conventional wisdoms and seek out new navigational guides to aid in the search for security. Not to replace the template of basic protection of national security, but to layer onto it new responses to global threats and risks which don't lend themselves to flexing biceps and going it alone. This is especially critical in scoping out answers to the dark side of globalization. The same information networks that allow capital to move around the world in seconds or

bring scenes of suffering into global living-rooms give international predators the capacity to establish integrated, world-wide connections that overwhelm the resources and capability of individual nation-states to protect their citizens. To give one example, drug-trafficking is a multibillion-dollar business that confronts police forces around the world with the most sophisticated tools of communication, transportation and organization.

Halting steps are being made at the UN, the G-8, OECD and other international forums to build a sense of teamwork to tackle such threats. But there is an opposite pull. The strong hold of beliefs in national sovereignty, and the increasing pressure of localism, generate substantial resistance from many governments to participate in multilateral co-operative ventures. The philosophy of "go it alone" is alive and well in the world, even in the face of a shared reality of common risk. Human security is the lens through which this changing international scene should be viewed. The security risk to individuals must be the focal-point of a strategy that sees like-minded countries, partnering with non-governmental organizations, working towards new standards of international behaviour based on protection of civilians.

What makes this idea of human security work is that it fits well with where we are as Canadians at the turnover from the 20th to the 21st centuries. Canadian efforts to forge a new diplomacy inclusive of civil groups point the way to a new era of democratic decision-making at the international level. Our push for treaties and institutions based on humanitarian values could be the foundation of an international rule of law that respects and protects the rights of the individual. Our experiments with the use of "soft power techniques", such as the Internet, open up ways of enhancing the delivery of public goods and public policy. Our effort to mobilize a coalition of states dedicated to co-operative international efforts creates a force for reform in the global system.

One such effort is the International Criminal Court -- the cornerstone of a global judicial system incorporating co-operation on investigation, forensic evidence-gathering, police and enforcement action, and prosecution, and all done according to the precepts of respect for rights acting as a balance against the capricious use of force in the hands of leaders.

But the ICC is not a stand-alone example -- there are other initiatives under way. One of the most important is the report of the Canadian-inspired, global Commission on Intervention and Sovereignty, an attempt to rethink and redefine the meaning of sovereignty in light of the experiences of the last decade with acts of genocide and ethnic cleansing around the world.

Last December, the commission proposed that sovereignty be redefined as the responsibility to protect -- shifting the perspective from what it endows to the state to what it obliges the state to do. To quote from the report: "Such a responsibility implies an evaluation of the issue from the perspective of the victim, not the intervener; if a state cannot provide the protection or is the author of the crime, then it forfeits its sovereign

right and the international community steps in, not just to protect, but to prevent and rebuild."

This fundamental shift of perspective to the view of the victim, not the intervener -- from the right of sovereign interest to the responsibility to protect -- has particular relevance as we contemplate the preparations for an attack on Iraq. This adventure is part of the emerging U.S. anti-terrorist policy which asserts the right of pre-emptive intervention at a time, place and target of its own choosing. It is not enough simply to oppose, wring hands and wail. There must be an alternative, based on the perspective of the victim -- in this case, the Iraqi people, who face double-jeopardy from their own government and now from the United States.

It's time to start fresh by asserting a strong interest by the international community in human protection. That can be done by requiring Iraqi compliance and disarmament based on resolution 1284 weapon inspections, backed up by robust enforcement, detailed intelligence gathering and severe limitations on procurement from other countries, along with a lifting of sanctions once full disclosure and disarmament are properly certified by respectable international observation and evaluation. A series of tasks to which Canada could well make an effective contribution

This is a human-security approach, not the scorched-earth strategy proposed by the U.S. administration. And it must be clearly stated soon, in the councils of government and the UN. It is a chance to present an alternative, rather than exacerbating the cause of terrorism and creating further resentments in the Islamic world.

One year after the tragic events of September 11, there is an opportunity to go the human-security route and find solutions based on the rule of law and the practice of justice. This we should think about one year after the sad anniversary of a terrible atrocity against the rights of innocent people.

The commission leads to a much broader strategy on how to insure the prevention, and protection of the rights of individuals. Canada, supported by a coalition of NGO's and other like minded governments is working towards having it appear as a General Assembly resolution in the next year- giving the Assembly the power to exercise a mandate of directing the Security Council, similar to what it did in defining the rules governing self-determination and colonial trustee ship. To have such a strategy succeed there will have to be the release of creative energy, in the civil gatherings, the chancelleries and the academies and the 52<sup>nd</sup> floor. It does offer an opening for a new process of renewal, giving needed energy and credibility to the UN for efforts at renewal and reform. It is not just an idea, but a catalyst for real action.

What's more it takes the concept of responsibility to protect beyond the realm of war and conflict, criminal activity into a basic re-think of the ways in which the responsibility must be applied in the risks to economic and environmental security- those root causes of inequity and humiliation that are part of the terrorist breeding ground.

In both cases the global architecture is non-existent, archaic or discriminatory. Let me relate to my recent trip to Mongolia: The IMF demanding a rescinding of wage increases for civil servants, and a reduction in care for children. Citing the mantra of today's new economic priesthood of macro stability.

The Gobi dessert- a product of economic imperative, climate change- that eats away the pasture land, cause of a dust storm that sweeps across East Asia, reaching the shores of north America- who is responsible, who has the right to impose sanctions, exercise protection.

Other examples abound- the hollowing out of Argentina, the smoke from Indonesia, the trade discrimination, the spread of aids, all being managed in an ineffectual and desultory way.

There is a recognition that the present system of economic and environmental governance isn't working. There are attempts to reform and change- Doha, Monterey, G-8 and Africa, Johannesburg. The problem is that there are the advocates of old fashioned power politics who want to enhance and keep their dominance and engage in a form of treaty-cide to abort and cleanse the global system of acts and institutions of cooperation, There are the apostles of the multi-lateral status quo, the diplomats and politicians who constantly ask if they dare to eat a peach. Do I dare disturb the universe? And convene meeting after meeting to repeat the same old nostrums with nary a thought to any new thinking. And, the wizards of the Iff's who swoon about in their hermetically sealed cocoons of fiscal orthodoxy.

There is one way to break down this resistance and inertia- the power of the people, the full rein of global democracy and its application to our forms of global governance. There is presently a dis- connect between where people are and the decision makers. A poll we conducted in eleven countries found most people concerned with personal safety, the threat of natural disaster and climate change, not Osama Bin laden and his terrorist groups. Yet, in western countries this is the preoccupation. The same disillusionment was setting in with international institutions and their relevance to real problems, an expression we see vividly portrayed in the streets at every international meeting. Unless there is serious reform of our political structures, nationally and internationally the credibility of our way of decisions will begin to crumble and then the terrorists will have really won the day.

It is, I believe a unique liberal task to help write the primer on global citizenship. The place to start is what we believe about our own social contract and how approach fundamentals such as cooperation and tolerance in our own society. A culture of rights, of social commitment of negotiation and compromise in a domestic political system translate into the same values internationally.

We have been leaders in using our federal system and our Charter of Rights to define sovereignty in other than traditional nation-state terms- authority can be shared by different levels of government, loyalties and attachments diffused to different centers of commitment. This in turn has given our citizens a sense of belonging to a broader community. Our civil groups in particular see themselves as belonging to a world- wide

network of activists and advocates. Now the pressure of changes in our own demographics, creating a situation where our ability to make a living and preserve our well being will depend increasingly on our participation in global constellations of cities, propelling us into taking that concept of global citizenship onto an ever widening and inclusive plain.

This plain stretches far beyond the shores of our own territory and continent. If there is one truth that will dominate the lives of the millennium generation it is the way their lives will be affected by people, events and actions from around the globe bound ever more tightly by links of commerce, information, travel and trade. Wherever one resides a sense of calamity will prevail unless there is a radical change in the way we do business globally. Just before the opening of the Sustainable Development Summit in Johannesburg, the World bank released a study which forecast a world twenty years out of 9 billion people and a global GDP of 140 trillion, staggering numbers, and ones leading to environmental disaster, social breakdown unless policies are dramatically changed.

It is not a doomsday scenario. It can be fixed by the appropriate levels of international collaboration, sharing of wealth and change in consumption by industry and consumers in the industrial world. That will be the acid test of global citizenship-are we ready to limit or change our present consumerism and levels of economic growth for the sake of cleaner air and water, security against violent climate change and a more equitable distribution wealth, as prescribed by international agreement and supranational regulation and decision-making. The contrast in positions was seen soon after Prime Minister Chretien made a commitment to ratify the Kyoto agreement during the Johannesburg meeting, followed by the denunciation by certain provincial premiers and business –based lobby organizations. Exercising global citizenship is not necessarily a universal commitment in Canada, especially with some provincial politicians and industry leaders.

The task we face is not only in changing the nature of citizenship to a multiple set of references and responsibilities, but to insure that as the role of global citizenship grows over the next fifty years it is a democratic one.

For that reason it is a priority that we seriously reform the way decisions are made at the national level in order to get things right in what we can accomplish globally

First, lets deal with what is now called the democratic deficit, a buzz- word that properly expresses a feeling of frustration that the opportunity for a full representation of views and public participation are limited.

One major problem is our electoral system-the first past the post, single constituency arrangement. This type of system can lead to gross representation-a small plurality of vote's results in a huge majority of seats. What should be looked at is a hybrid system that combines the constituency-based model with a modified proportional representation that reflects popular vote. That would be one means of further democratizing, thereby energizing our politics.

It would also be a way of improving the access and opportunity for more women to get elected and exercise their rightful role as full participants in the governing of the country, I believe that this inequity affects what we do or more accurately don't do globally. It has been my experience that women are more supportive of human security agendas,

especially so when it came to issues such as the protection of civilians and promotion of peace building matters a revised election system is one place to start in insuring that women will have a greater say in what Canada does in the world

Another way to improve our democracy in his new century is to reform the Senate. It is anachronistic to have an appointed body making decisions in this day and age. I grant there are a number of highly competent people serving in the Senate, bringing special talents to the job. The same people would have even greater influence if they were elected and accountable.

An elected Senate could come to have a special role and responsibility in the carrying out of debate and overview of Canada's global role. There is a potential in our parliamentary system that has only barely begun to be tapped. One limitation of our present system is the severe restrictions on time a, resources and range imposed on individual MP's by dint of their various constituency, caucus, and assembly duties. There needs to be some degree of specialization, where global, international matters would receive a more than passing glance. If the Senate were elected it could bring real credibility to that task.

One very important set of tasks would be to choose the representatives we send to represent us in global forums. Perhaps we should think of more direct election of key posts- ambassador to the UN, directors on the World Bank and IMF, our Environment ambassador could be designated as part of a slate for Senate allowing each party leader to choose very distinguished Canadians to be their nominees for certain posts, and have that explain and defend their views and qualifications during election. Think what it might do in engendering a serious look at international global issues, if each party had to nominate specific people with clear views on a global role for Canada discussed in a fully transparent electoral campaign and have those choices ratified by parliament.

Pending such fundamental changes to the Senate, making it an elected body, Parliament as a whole should have a much clearer, more direct advice and consent role for approving candidate's international postings, combined with a clear schedule of periodic reports to the appropriate committee. Parliament is a crucial cog in connecting people to the increasingly complex world of decision-making on global matters. It can continue to play an ever more valuable role, but until it is made substantially more democratic by changing the system of election and reforming the senate its possibilities will be limited and not sufficient to the task.

A third area of democratic reform is to further restrict the distorting influence of money in our national political system- both in the electoral process and in the party selection of candidates and leaders. Make no mistake big money resources are used to sway crucial decisions affecting Canada's international role. In the past this power was used with telling effect during the free trade election of 1988. To day, money is being channeled through a number of business-oriented think tanks to promote Canadian support of the right-wing policies of the Bush Administration including opposition to Kyoto and further military integration.

There is an antidote. The Doer government in Manitoba passed legislation limiting donations to individuals, excluding corporations and unions. Alberta has done he same. Such initiatives are a good beginning in reducing the need for the bagman and limiting the power of organizations with big financial resources. The Manitoba limitations on

political funding need to be replicated in other jurisdictions if we are to have a reasonably level policy playing field.

Another sure way to curb the mis-use of power and concentrated wealth is by increasing the influence and involvement of the public through a broad sharing of information. The water scandal in Walkerton, the revelations on corporate malfeasance washing over North America, the admission of neglect by intelligence agencies in the wake of September 11th are stark reminders of how disclosure and transparency are powerful and necessary tools in a modern democracy. The advent of the Internet creates a further breakthrough by shattering the control of the expert or the insider. The ability of ordinary people to exert influence on decisions through the glare of information is a substantial, perhaps quantum change in the nature of democratic practice- what Mary Graham of the Institute of governance calls techno-populism.

Techno-populism may have its greatest impact in the international arena. This can be affirmed by recent experience in developing a human security agenda. World wide populist campaigns for the Land Mine Treaty, the International Court were made possible to a significant degree through the power of information technology. The future scope of developing the use of information is limitless and should be one of the most serious undertakings of Canada in the years ahead. Perhaps its most potent use is in the development of a global civic culture that binds people into a global community. But, already we see efforts to curtail its use, limit the flow of information through intellectual property rights and limit access to sources of public private behaviour. The cause of openness internationally is one that that Canada should espouse.

Reform of our political institutions is one priority, but without a substantial investment in their global education structural reforms will not produce the level of involvement that is desired and needed. This is especially important for the education of today's young people. For these charter members of the Internet generation the idea of borders and boundaries has little meaning, their cyber universe encompasses the world, communicating in an instant with counterparts to play games, extract information, chat about music and alas peek at pornographic portals.

The Internet generation has access to any number of sophisticated, technically awesome means of entertainment -games, costing hundreds of millions for development and promotion, available from Mongolia to Sweden to Vancouver Island, Hollywood films extolling action, adventure, war and violence, a mass media controlled by gargantuan conglomerates that extol reality television, sports extravaganzas, and talk show diatribes. By comparison, the investment put into comparable tools for education using the best graphics and interactive techniques is paltry and pitiful-mindful of John Kenneth Galbraith's comment of private affluence and public poverty. In a time when we decry the great divides between cultures of the East and West, hear the plaintive wail of commentators in the United States about why Americans are not liked, watch the propagation of historic grievance, fanaticisms and hatreds, the bypassing of a potential tools to engage in an open educational exercise is irresponsible and foolhardy. We need to see a globally based system of educational program using information technology as a fundamental public good.

This has special meaning when we use the language of the Digital Divide, a gap that separates rich from poor, urban from rural and North from South. Everyone from the Secretary-General of the UN to the communication giants expresses their concern. Lost among all the talk of e-commerce, and e-government is the possibility of e-community- the potential for web based educational for connecting researchers around the world to look at our common problems of disease, literacy, and security, of training and educating in the vital fields of conflict or crisis management or environmental security, forging a global public network of information and interactivity that can spur the advance of democratic development.

Here is an exciting role for Canada to play with our information know how, the skill of our software companies and the “mentality for seeing a borderless world of our Internet generation”. We have a reservoir of good will good people and good public institutions to span the cyber atmosphere and jump over traditional stages of development, putting a public face on the Internet. We can fulfill the McLuhan prophecy of our being the foremost inhabitants of the global village.

Re-defining our democratic institutions is crucial to enabling Canadians to be able to participate fully in the debates and discussion that shape our international role. Recall the warning by Robert Dahl that we are in danger of forfeiting democracy by not finding ways to insure that there is a competence by citizens to be involved in making decisions on complicated contemporary matters affecting humankind such as the use of nuclear weapons. He still believes, however “that the ancient vision, now twenty-five centuries old, of a people governing itself through the democratic process, and possessing all the resources and institutions necessary on order to govern itself wisely can be adapted yet once again, as it has been in the past to a world drastically different from the world in which that vision was first put into practice” (Robert Dahl- Controlling Nuclear Weapons).

Democratic governance also must be effective governance. It has to be smart, efficient, coherent and adaptable. It needs to provide the openness and participation of citizens in decisions and implementation. It needs to set the proper funding to achieve its public goals. One of the recognized accomplishments of the Chretien government was to get the fiscal situation of the federal government in order and seek an incremental reform of the federal system.

Now the federal government needs to re-organize around a team concept for managing its global policies and activities. The purpose would be to insure compatibility of policies and avoid duplication and inter-departmental rivalry- in other words to see Canada’s global obligations and opportunities in all its dimensions, not in singular and uni-departmental terms The strategy group should be assigned a global budget envelope that is worked out between respective departments to reflect agreement on overall priorities, insuring against uneven and uncoordinated expenditures.

It isn’t, however only a matter of re-organization or strategy. The federal government has to spend more money on the tools it needs to play an effective global role. One place to start is the refurbishing of our diplomatic and trade services. There should be an expansion of the Canadian infrastructure into areas that are vital to us such as the United States and other posts in the western hemisphere. To maintain a global presence we have

open posts in areas where our representation is virtually non-existent such as Central Asia and strengthen presentation such as Central Asia. This needn't be expensive. The advent of sophisticated information systems opens all kinds of opportunities to extend the Canadian presence.

Development assistance is another funding priority. Our contributions presently hover around .4 % of GNP, a far cry from the .7% promised by Lester Pearson. Prime Minister Chretien is taking steps to increase foreign aid –committing to a doubling of funding by 2010. The recent focus on Africa and his support for the NEPAD exercise is a good demonstration of targeting resources and encouraging regional responsibility. Including the reduction trade barriers adds further value. What's missing from this Africa initiative is a complimentary effort to increase our diplomatic presence, a plan to provide military assistance to deal with breakdowns in security, help in policing the rules against small arm trading, provision skilled people in administration, a major effort to work with the African states to overcome Aids. There must be a much more of a comprehensive , integrated approach to development than simply handing out dollars to fund a series of discrete projects.

Then, there is Defence. Since September 11<sup>th</sup> the clamour of the pressure groups, the arms industry, certain editorialists, the senior military brass and the US ambassador have been in full throat, demanding increases in defence expenditure. And, I agree- it should be a priority, although I daresay for different reasons and for different purposes than the defence lobby would wish.

In my time in government I always supported adding to the defence budget when it was designed to improve our capacity for peacemaking, coastal surveillance, disaster missions improved living standards for personnel and special roles such as de-mining, military training for emerging democracies and service in international missions. What I objected to was the way in which hundreds of millions spent in development and research on weapons systems reflecting US determined military objectives such as space-based technology.

What I strenuously object to now is the slippery slope of integration that are embarked on, all in the name of battling terrorism, which step by step leads to a loss of choice. The immense amount spent by the Us on military matters , thirty times what the next thirty countries expend naturally leads to a overweening predominance of military anchored solutions to global issues, avoiding all the other tools in the kit. It also leads to the Us drawing other military forces into their orbit and making them dependent- witness the northern command proposals and the latest move at NATO to set up a US dominated rapid reaction group to go beyond NATO borders to fight terrorists. The implications for Canada are serious and far reaching in terms severely limiting what we may want to design as an alternative approach to security.

Where I would like to see increased expenditure for our defence forces apply is in the supply of equipment, personnel and logistics to actively support a human security policy. In particular, this means transport capable of carrying troops and, supplies on rapid reaction missions on behalf of conflict resolution efforts or in aid of internationally approved humanitarian assignments, modern naval capacity for sea-based peace keeping and coastal surveillance, especially in arctic regions, enhanced intelligence gathering

using Canadian technology of satellite sensing which we would be prepared to share with UN peacekeeping operations, efficient health and disaster relief units and the building up of a mobile well-trained reserve that can be used as fully competent supplement to regular forces.

What this would provide is the means to adapt to the changing nature of global conflict and security issues, to make decisions to act in concert with other nations in cooperative missions and untie some of the strings that presently bind us to US military systems and strategy. We should begin discussions with the European Union on how to work out joint plans for a rapid reaction force as part of our trans-Atlantic partnership. This would require more added investment on building such a capacity. In particular we must resist plans being put forward by the Bush administration for a US controlled rapid reaction force. Talk about becoming even further entwined in the web of military strategies set by an administration that shows no interest in peacekeeping or peace-making.

Another area where we need to substantially upgrade our military capacity is in providing surveillance, monitoring and patrol of our northern regions. Arctic ice is melting. Trade routes are opening. There is increased exploration and resource development. The dangers of pollution and disruption grow. The Arctic Council, a unique Canadian international innovation sets the stage for a model form of cooperation involving states and people in collaborative decision-making, leading to agreements on how to manage the region in the welfare of its inhabitants and its habitation. This will be frustrated by unilateral actions and assertions, particularly from the Russians and the Americans unless we have a capacity to affirm an independent position on behalf of cooperative circumpolar development. We need the appropriate military presence to insure that our preferred policy direction is respected.

Our military can also make a major contribution in the pursuit of new international agreements and collective action in dealing with the growing threats in the arena of biological weapons and cyber warfare. These will become increasing threats, especially in the possession of terrorists or criminals. There needs to be a continuing research into methods of detection, verification and control, and removal,- necessary requisites for any future agreements. The same requirements are necessary to pursue international agreement to control the use of weapons in space. In these ways, provided that freedom of action is maintained our military can make a positive contribution to advancing the human security agenda in the age of terrorism.

This then is the case for a made in Canada approach to security, designed to serve what I believe to be the interest of Canadians in seeing a world built on foundations rooted in our own respect for law, rights and the protection people. It is not an easy road. It will face the hostility of the present US administration and those in this country who want us to be their deputy sheriff. But, it is a role that would give support in the United States to those who decry the present war mentality, and want to see a restoration of US leadership around principles of international cooperation. It would also find friends and favour in many other parts of the world by many who see the disruption and danger of the Bush

doctrine. Most importantly, it would at least set out a direction for future generations to follow as they look to present leadership to strike a proper course.

Ferdinand Armesto, the Oxford historian has concluded in his massive study of the past millennium that "some small group of people have the ability to decisively influence the rest of mankind through the power of their ideas, to adapt technology and their willingness to explore. This is a role that I passionately believe Canadians can fulfill, even when faced with the implacable opposition of the world's powerful, and the indifference of the of so many who prefer their comfort to the joy of discovery. That I believe is what must draw people together in the healing circle of discussion and dialogue in this post- September 11<sup>th</sup> atmosphere, the kind of exercise that we are involved in to day where as true liberals our view should be unrestricted, and like the explorers of old we look to see great distances in every direction. And once we set our sights, it is important that we start our voyage. To quote the Spanish poet Antonio Machado

"Traveler there is no path, paths are made by walking"

Lloyd Axworthy  
September 24<sup>th</sup>, 2002