

“To Serve and Protect:
The changing dynamic of military and policing functions in Canadian foreign policy”

Tami Amanda Jacoby, Ph.D.¹
Centre for Defence and Security Studies
Department of Political Studies
University of Manitoba

Introduction:

In the post-Cold War era, Canadian foreign policy has adopted alternative methods and philosophies of engagement in international zones of conflict. New forms of armed conflict and new sources of insecurity in the international system have necessitated broadening of the responsibilities of the Canadian armed forces from monitoring borders and cease-fire agreements between states at war, to more typically defined policing functions within conflict-ridden communities undergoing ethnic/civil strife. The increased need for policing in armed conflict situations has resulted in new relations between the Canadian armed forces and the RCMP (Royal Canadian Mounted Police) abroad. Changes in the scope of demands on Canadian peacekeeping operations are mirrored by the transformation of military-policing relations in counter-terrorism policy at home since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. Both in peacekeeping operations and counter-terrorism policy therefore, Canadian civilian-military relations have undergone a profound transformation.

This paper explores the interface of military and policing roles in Canada's foreign policy. The main argument is that functions typically associated with national security have been merged with functions typically associated with criminal investigations and law enforcement. The purpose of the analysis is to determine the constraints and opportunities this new military-police relationship entails for security,

democracy and the future of the military profession in Canada. This project employs an integrated approach, drawing concepts, debates, and policy implications from a number of disciplines including political science, international relations theory, criminology, and peace studies. Research was conducted on the basis of a series of interviews of governmental officials in Ottawa between April 30 and May 5, 2002, along with the use of secondary literature, archival and Internet sources.

The first section of the paper provides a theoretical foundation for the study, probing conventional definitions of military and policing functions and determining their contemporary relevance. The second section discusses new roles occupied by police, intelligence, and the military in the international arena on account of new forms of conflict and insecurity in the international arena. The third section evaluates military and policing functions in two major initiatives in Canadian foreign policy: the new human security agenda and post-9/11 counter-terrorism policy. The paper closes with a number of concluding remarks about the compatibility of Canadian foreign policy with the liberal democratic process both in Canada and internationally.

The Military:

The traditional (realist) definition of the military that evolved during the period of the Cold War viewed the military-industrial complex as the primary foreign policy instrument of the state. The military's purpose was to defend against foreign attack, conduct operations overseas, and preserve the state's national security. National security has been defined as the territorial integrity of the state, and the security of its boundaries and government. With the establishment of the modern state system since the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, the principles of sovereignty and non-intervention

¹ Many thanks to the Canadian Forces Leadership Institute for its generous funding towards presentation

have admonished states to refrain from interfering in the domestic affairs of other states as a means to uphold international peace and stability. When states do resort to coercive diplomacy to negotiate and achieve their international objectives, the military is the immediate source of capabilities to draw from to impose their national interest, providing an arsenal of conventional and unconventional weapons to deter, threaten, coerce and/or punish potential or actual military adversaries. This approach follows Clausewitz's well known dictum that war is an extreme but natural continuation of policy by other means (Clausewitz, 1968).

Dominant perspectives hold that military capabilities provide the most important short-term source of national power, measured by the size, composition, preparedness and effectiveness of a state's armed forces, including the army, the navy and the air force. States invested vast resources, research, and technological development in their armed forces, augmenting their capabilities both qualitatively and quantitatively throughout the Cold War era. The American-Soviet arms race and subsequent arms races in diverse parts of the world can be traced to this period of military competition.

Critics have argued that inherent in this approach is an inclination by states to increase their military capabilities to offset the expected growth of the capabilities of their adversaries. The international arena is viewed as an anarchical system wherein states are motivated first and foremost by the rational pursuit of their self-interests. The never-ending need for security in a system without global governance leads to an infinite accumulation of weapons, an upward spiral known as "the chain reaction arms race cycle" (Kegley & Wittkopf, 1999: 403).

As an extension of conventional military doctrine, conventional functions associated with UN peacekeeping missions overseas since 1948 have further emphasized the role of states and militaries as third party arbiters in inter-state war. Since 1948, the function of peacekeepers was generally limited to physical positioning between hostile parties, mediating, bringing groups to the negotiating table, and helping to monitor a negotiated settlement. This was the dominant approach in peacekeeping operations in Lebanon, the Golan Heights, Israel, Cyprus, India-Pakistan, and Iraq-Kuwait. Peacekeepers were dispatched to conflicts such as these, caused by the threat or use of force by one state against another, although many dilemmas arose during the course of their duties such as hostage taking, casualties and other serious offenses against them. Critics of traditional peacekeeping have pointed out the overwhelmingly limited nature of the military in UN missions as peacekeeping forces are generally unable to make peace and are caught in the cross-fire when cease-fires break down.

Current peacekeeping forces are faced with modes of international conflict that are waged in fundamentally different formats and over issues other than territorial and/or military dispute. Civil/ethnic conflicts, the predominant mode of international violence today, are characterized by conflict within rather than among states and motivated by ethnic, religious, tribal and other ideological factors. The causes of civil/ethnic conflict are numerous including but not limited to poverty, discrimination and human rights violations, ethnic tensions, religious prejudices, historical enmities, movement of peoples, changing borders, and competition for depleting natural resources. This catalogue of causes for conflict poses “complex security challenges both for individual states and for regional and global security alliances” (De Rover, 1999: 637). Indeed, peacekeepers face a much more dangerous and uncertain environment today as they embark upon international missions. The dilemmas

accompanying new forms of conflict have resulted in vast reforms in the United Nations organization and have led to revised understandings about the role of armed force in international conflict situations.

Homeland defense has also undergone a profound transformation in recent years. Military analysts have noted that the probability of physical invasion and/or air attack against states by a military aggressor are far reduced. The prominent security threat on the Western agenda today is terrorism. Terrorists function through transnational networks, using unconventional weapons (such as chemical and biological materials), and unconventional tactics (hijacking, arson, bombing, ambush, etc.). While lacking the material resources of today's modern armies, terrorist organizations have been able to mount large-scale attacks against urban industrial centres followed by the onset of immense fear in civilian society. Jonathan White argues that "terrorism is too complex and too insignificant to be controlled by nation-states" (1998: 8).

In addition to terrorism, the new menu of threats on the international agenda are related to humanitarian crises and natural disasters, nuclear smuggling and proliferation of chemical and biological weapons, cyber-warfare, illegal migration, the spread of infectious disease, the global drug trade, illegal trafficking and transnational crime. These problems constitute the "new security dilemma" (Cusimano, 2000). They are transsovereign in nature and cannot be resolved by the use of coercion by any particular national military against another. Maryann Cusimano argues that "even if organization, training, and equipment priorities are changed to better prepare for the type of conflict that now predominates, military force is not well suited to these conflicts" (Cusimano, 2000: 33). The new security dilemma, which involves a combination of military and other social, economic, environmental and political dimensions, stands as a major challenge for the future of the military profession in all states including Canada.

The new security dilemma also provides a major challenge to the ethical principles underlying international law. An understanding of war as natural or inevitable, and the military as destined to warfare, is a dangerous obstacle to collective security and global peace. In the absence of authority higher than the state, international law sets out specific guidelines about how wars should be fought if avenues for peaceful conflict resolution fail. The doctrine of just war (see Chesterman, 2001; Elshstain, 1992), for example, is a centuries-old legacy drawn from numerous European religious and secular sources. Just war doctrine establishes that only aggression justifies the use of military force. In particular, according to international law, it is legal to forcefully resist attack or punish an aggressor, but not to change the government or policies of another state. Just war has been rendered increasingly problematic by the preponderance of civil/ethnic conflicts in today's world in which "aggressor" and "victim" are not necessarily simple to identify, and actors are not limited to state structures and national militaries. As a result of changes in contemporary forms of international conflict and insecurity, dominant thinking about the appropriate roles and functions of the military has been undermined and faced with the need for radical revisioning.

The Police:

As opposed to the military, the police are an organized civil force. The role of police is to maintain order, prevent and detect crime, and enforce the law within a state. This means that police forces deal on a regular basis with criminals in society. The modern era of policing is generally dated from Robert Peel's legislation in 1829, which established principles for modern urban policing for the London Metropolitan police force. According to Peel: "The basic mission for which the police exist is to prevent

crime and disorder as an alternative to the repression of crime and disorder by military force and severity of legal punishment” (Forcese, 1999: 3). Over the centuries, the institution of the police underwent significant changes. The British became dissatisfied with the ascribed role of police officers as serving the crown or those who ruled, rather than the law. This, they argued, positioned police as a threat to political opposition and a potential menace to society as a whole. As a result, the ideal of policing services developed the democratic principles of public control and responsibility to the people.

Following British philosopher Jeremy Bentham, the British model emphasized prevention of crime over punishment and conviction (Sewell, 1985: 26). British ideas about policing were adapted to a large degree in the Canadian context and thus provide insight into the evolution of the role of the RCMP in Canada. Canada sought to incorporate many of the democratic principals of policing, which originated in Britain. As encapsulated in the motto of the Metropolitan Toronto Police Department, the goal of the police is “to serve and protect” (Tepperman, 1977: 29). At least in theory, the ideal of policing in Canada is to enhance the quality of democratic social life and provide assistance during times of need. As a democratic society, Canada is cognizant of the need to balance the fundamental contradiction in policing. On one hand, police require social support and public respect in order to perform their functions effectively. On the other hand, it is ultimately the police’s responsibility to enforce the law and maintain public order. For purposes of the latter, policing in democratic society involves the goal of social control, the basis for which is ultimately the use of force (Forcese, 1999: 2).

In order to achieve that balance, policing in Canada has undergone a transition from the crime control model dominant in the 1960s to a more collaborative approach referred to in criminology as “community policing” (Forcese, 1999; Kenney &

McNamara, 1999; Palango, 1998). The RCMP defines community-based policing as “shared responsibility for problems and solutions between the police and members of the community to help them identify and solve their problems rather than simply target the symptoms. Partnerships are formed in a network format rather than hierarchical structure, with many agencies within the community, who all work together to ensure safe homes and safe communities” (*RCMP Peacekeeping Annual Review 2001-2002*, 2001, 26).

In one important respect therefore, the military and police serve a common function in democratic society. They are entrusted with protecting their constituency while at the same time upholding order and punishing offenders that break the law. As conventionally understood, the military protects society from external threat while the police protect society from internal threat. The external/internal axis that has traditionally divided the jurisdictions of the military and the police has been fundamentally obscured on account of new functions associated with peacekeeping and counter-terrorism policy.

Canadian Peacebuilding and Human Security

Canadians have long been active in international conflict resolution with a reputation as “neutral arbiter”, supporting a more democratic, equitable and stable world. As a result of the changing nature of international conflict, Canadian contributions to international conflict resolution efforts have undergone a radical transformation.

Canadian foreign policy has recently experienced two major paradigm shifts. The first is a transition from peacekeeping to “peacebuilding” under the umbrella of the new human security agenda (Stephenson, 1998: 65). The peacebuilding initiative draws

from a history of human rights and development practices as developed by international law and international organizations such as the United Nations and other international development agencies (DFAIT, 1999; Owens & Arneil, 1999; Heinbecker, 1999).

The philosophy of conventional deterrence, i.e., containing, managing or moderating hostilities through the threat to use military force, has been replaced in Canadian foreign policy with international conflict resolution efforts based on the notion of peacebuilding rather than peacekeeping. Peacebuilding is an effort to respond to the more complex nature of current missions of Canadian armed forces in war-torn societies. The strategy promoted by peacebuilding is proactive insofar as it addresses the root causes of conflict in addition to reacting to the immediate crisis (Hay, 1999). Canadian efforts to prevent a renewal of hostilities in conflict zones have extended far beyond cease-fire agreements between states, to such activities as participation in broad-scale democratic institution building such as observing elections and democratic transitions (Haiti, Western Sahara, Namibia). Peacebuilding has also focussed on civil society empowerment, inter-communal cooperation, and the promotion of long-term stability in ethnically divided societies. In short, peacebuilding is “the effort to strengthen the prospects for internal peace and decrease the likelihood of violent conflict.... to enhance the indigenous capacity of a society to manage conflict without violence”² The peacebuilding paradigm, therefore, involves local institution building and support for greater participation of civilian actors (for example, civilian police) in the political process. In other words, local communities, moderate leaderships, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), youth, and women are encouraged to contribute to the diplomatic resolution of conflict through cooperation and

² *Strategic Framework for the Canadian Peacebuilding Activities*. 1997. Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade & The Canadian International Development Agency.

Peacebuilding involves a parallel transition from national security to a human security agenda. Despite its critics (see Nossal, 1998), human security is a broad policy and philosophy of engagement in the international arena.³ Human security shifts the focus from states as the primary actors of international affairs, to human beings, taking individuals and their communities, rather than states and national boundaries, as the central point of reference for global peace and security. The main objective of human security is to broaden the agenda of security by including non-military issues such as human rights, sustainable development, gender equality, cultural diversity, and the environment.⁴

Both the military and the police have unique contributions to make towards peacebuilding and human security. However, adapting to the needs of current missions requires a major reorientation of institutional goals, skills, and expertise both for the military and the police. In essence, peacebuilding involves a blurring of previously absolute task distinctions between the police and security forces, on the one hand, and armed forces, on the other, with one readily taking on the apparent responsibilities of the other” (De Rover, 1999: 637)

In current peace support operations, the deployment of civilian experts has taken on greater significance (Parkinson, quoted in Small, 2001, 82). Some would argue that the participation of non-military actors in missions overseas balances the civilian-military component of Canada’s presence abroad and promotes the human security ideal of democratizing foreign policy. A more democratic foreign policy involves broader representation of Canadian society as a whole in foreign policy making, bringing a wider range of political perspectives to bear on policy.

³ “Human Security is most closely associated with the goals of Foreign Affairs Minister Lloyd Axworthy.

⁴ Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World, DFAIT, 1999.

On account of their training in law enforcement and crime prevention, police forces are well suited to dealing with new functions associated with ethnic/civil conflicts, as they require intervention in and between communities. In essence, peacekeeping and peacebuilding deal with crime prevention on a global scale (“RCMP Directional Statement 200”, *Gazette*, 2000, Vol. 62, No. 1, 3) and crime is ever more prevalent in societies undergoing civil/ethnic conflict. With its model of community policing, Canadian police forces are said to be particularly suited to restoring order in conflict zones while at the same time developing democratic institutions and civil society. The RCMP and other Canadian police departments have been instrumental in training, reforming, professionalizing and democratizing foreign police services in peace-support missions in post-conflict situations. In addition, in missions ranging from Rwanda, Sierre Leone to Kosovo and East Timor, the Canadian police has been involved in investigating war crimes, human rights violations, and trafficking of small arms (*RCMP Peacekeeping 2000-2001 Annual Review*, 2001: 12).

On one hand, Canadian civilians have increased their participation in activities abroad, which have hitherto been the exclusive reserve of the military. On the other hand, the Canadian armed forces have been increasingly involved in operations other than fighting wars. For example, Canadian forces perform search and rescue operations, disaster relief, international humanitarian assistance, territorial surveillance for prevention of illegal activities such as drug trafficking and proliferation of weapons, and institution building abroad (*A Wake Up Call for Canada*, 2001, 12). These activities involve an ever-increasing policing role for the military in foreign societies. As the police have increasingly recognized, policing a society from within is a complicated task that requires special training and sensitivities to the collective identities and enmities of the target population. The changing role of the military and

police in contemporary international affairs has impacted the function and understanding of the boundaries of civilian-military relations both in Canada and abroad.

An important dilemma accompanies the transformation of current peacekeeping missions. On account of the increased level of hostilities and danger faced by peacekeepers and the need for rapid reaction, the UN secretary-general aired the idea of UN peacemaking or peace enforcement units. Enforcing peace requires dispatching ever more heavily armed troops as their immediate presence involves them directly in combat. The peacemaking approach is more akin to traditional war fighting than peacekeeping although it retains a policing function since it involves intervention within states. Certainly, no moral argument can minimize the need for coercive intervention to prevent impending disasters (as in Rwanda in 1994 and Burundi in 1995). However, heavily armed peacekeepers render problematic the original claim of UN forces to be neutral arbiters in conflict situations between states and their goal of creating consensual alliances with members of civil society towards a range of political, social, economic and other tasks. Indeed, the idea of peacemaking has not gained widespread support and until the establishment of the UN Standby High Readiness Brigade (which participated in the UN mission to Ethiopia-Eritrea in 200-2001), UN member states did not provide peace enforcement units.⁵

Canadian Counter-Terrorism:

The second shift in Canadian foreign policy has resulted directly from the 9/11 terrorist attacks on the United States. Canada's most significant responses to 9/11 occurred in the military, legislative and policing arenas. In the military sphere, Canada

devised Operation Apollo. Immediately following the attacks and with very little public debate, Canada took decisive actions to support the US-led campaign. With the exception of its commitment to humanitarian assistance, the bulk of Canadian action coincided with the predominantly military response exhibited by the United States in forming a coalition to fight global terrorism by war. The response to terrorism differed greatly from the human security agenda's movement away from militaristic models of conflict resolution in peacekeeping missions.

In the legislative sphere, the Government of Canada introduced Bill C-36 in the House of Commons on October 15, 2001. Bill C-36, the proposed Anti-Terrorism Act, offered a package of sweeping legislative measures, which "takes aim at terrorist organizations and strengthens investigation, prosecution and prevention of terrorist activities at home and abroad".⁶ The Anti-Terrorism Act aimed to prevent terrorists from entering Canada, protecting Canadians from terrorist acts, and thereby providing the tools to identify, prosecute, convict and punish terrorists.⁷

As in the military sphere, Canada's legislative response to terrorism was largely punitive. With the exception of a vague acknowledgment of the underlying causes for terrorism and the need to address them (which Canada dealt with through a commitment to providing humanitarian assistance), the lion's share of legislation was designed to criminalize activities associated with terrorism.

The package did include a set of checks and balances to ensure that anti-terrorism legislation would be consistent with Canada's legal system, in particular, the Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. However, Operation Apollo and Bill C-36

⁵ For example, the UN experimented with a combat-ready rapid reaction force in Bosnia in 1995. But due to problems in the mission, NATO-led forces took over.

⁶ Anti-Terrorism Act Received Royal Assent, December 18, 2001, http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/news/nr/2001/doc_28215.html

⁷ Government of Canada Introduces Anti-Terrorism Act, http://canada.justice.gc.ca/en/news/nr/2001/doc_27785.html

establish clear boundaries for fighting terrorism by seeking to capture and punish the enemy whether at home or abroad in a manner that raises a number of important questions about the democratic process.

Liberal democracies face a complex dilemma when responding to terrorism. On account of their dependence on electoral support, democratic governments must simultaneously maintain order and stability while preserving democratic institutions and ways of life. Democracies provide a range of rights and freedoms in their constitutional arrangements for citizens to enjoy and use to fulfill their personal goals. In cases where citizens disagree with government policy, a certain level of civil disobedience and political protest is tolerated and even encouraged to contribute to public debate and satisfy the public desire to influence policy.

However, during counter-terrorism campaigns, states impinge more heavily on their citizens and require that individuals and groups cede a degree of their freedoms in order to provide leverage in combating terrorism. This may involve a greater role for police services or intelligence units. Democratic states must mobilize public support to maintain legitimacy during counter-terrorism campaigns, particularly if the campaign against terrorism extends over a long period of time.

Three main governmental agencies that deal with threats to public safety play a major role in responding to terrorism in liberal democratic countries: law enforcement, the criminal justice system, and intelligence services. These agencies must cooperate and coordinate their policies during counter-terrorism campaigns. This need for cooperation generally results in the centralization of command and control measures and a large degree of information sharing between the different agencies.

Legislation occupies a key place in defining terrorism in liberal democratic countries. The fight against terrorism is generally analogous to the fight against other

violent offenses insofar as both are considered a threat to public safety and the rule of law. In mounting counter-terrorist campaigns, it is the responsibility of the legal system to determine what activities fall within the realm of terrorism. Since anti-terrorist legislation defines the contours of legal and illegal actions, it is the initial onus of the legal system to define terrorism and its related activities as a crime to begin with.

Conventional definitions of terrorism differentiate between terrorist and criminal activity (Whittaker, 2001: 9). While both terrorists and ordinary criminals employ violence to achieve a particular goal, the different motivations for the act provides a key distinguishing factor. Terrorism is motivated by political goals that would serve a broader constituency such as transforming society, ending colonial rule, or struggling for national liberation. Criminals on the other hand, are motivated by sheer self-interest, usually material profit for themselves as a result of stealing money or committed other offenses such as fraud, bribery or murder. As well, criminal activity is self-contained insofar as it is not intended to have consequences beyond the immediate act. Once the profit is made, the criminal is satisfied. Terrorists may perpetrate the same acts as ordinary criminals, but their objective is for the act to have a longer-term effect, whether it is psychological intimidation of a target society or ultimately the desired political change. In this respect, the terrorist always supports a cause, a cause that may ultimately be just, but unjust means are to achieve it.

The criminalization of terrorism takes effect through a wide range of functions and objectives. For example, some anti-terrorist laws are preventative inasmuch as their goal is to address the underlying causes of terrorist activity and uproot them at their core. Generally, economic poverty and political alienation among certain sectors of the population may breed violence that leads to terrorist activity. Other anti-terrorist measures taken by the legislative system are punitive as their goal is to deter terrorists

by enacting severe penalties. Punitive laws provide the police with the powers needed to apprehend and convict those who commit terrorist acts. Other legislation may have a more symbolic or psychological effect, “expressing public revulsion at particular outrages and reassuring the public that something is being done” (Wilkinson, 2000: 113).

Once legislation concerning terrorist activity is in place, the task of implementing the law falls to the police services in liberal democratic countries. Indeed, the criminalization of terrorism then provides the police with a clear basis for action. The police have the tools for combating and containing terrorism. Generally, a package of counter-terrorist measures provides the police with more authority and autonomy to do their work effectively.⁸ As well, emergency legislation can allow the police to use extraordinary measures or methods they would otherwise not have access to for the surveillance and apprehension of suspects. For example, although terrorism has always been considered a serious criminal offense in Canada according to criminal code provisions, the new Anti-Terrorism Act (Bill C-36) is the first to define terrorism and terrorist-related activities as criminal offenses. Prior to Bill C-36, the application of other criminal codes was particularly problematic when attempting to link such activities as facilitating, providing skills, procurement, harbouring, funding and other criminal acts, to terrorism. As a result, Bill C-36 has given a broad mandate to law enforcement agencies to pursue their work proactively with such tools as investigative hearing and preventative arrest to facilitate their pursuit of terrorists.⁹

The intelligence services occupy an additional role in counter-terrorist activity. “The secret of winning the battle against terrorism in an open democratic society is

⁸ Interview with J. Wayne Pilgrim, Superintendent, OIC National Security Investigations Branch, Criminal Intelligence Directorate, RCMP, on May 2, 2002 in Ottawa with Tami Jacoby.

winning the intelligence war” (Wilkinson, 2000: 95). To enable the intelligence agencies to be proactive and prevent terrorism before it happens, liberal democratic countries have different types of intelligence services, some of which operate internationally while others are limited to operations within their own borders. The role of intelligence services is to monitor evolving threats to the security interests of their country, investigate their activities, and communicate this information to their respective governments. Intelligence involves perceiving a wide variety of threats to national security from the clandestine or intelligence activities of foreign governments, threats to a country’s social, political, and economic institutions, and increasingly a focus on cyber-based threats to infrastructure and communications systems. Although intelligence agencies are responsible to civil authority, they must, by necessity, operate under a certain degree of secrecy. As a result, much of the information generated by intelligence services is classified and thus not subject to public scrutiny. Even though national security is their primary goal, their secretive methods have created a certain aura around intelligence services that sits uneasily with democratic rights.

Counter-terrorism in liberal democratic countries follows a precarious path between the punitive and the democratic elements of its policy. Paul Wilkinson points out the risks posed by emergency anti-terrorist legislation for democratic systems. For example, the deliberate suspension or limitation of civil liberty on the grounds of expediency over the long-term may result in the erosion of civil liberties and may even play into the hands of terrorists by increasing the anger of their potential recruits. It is crucial that police act within the law in order to uphold public confidence and respect for the criminal justice system. As well, Wilkinson suggests a list of three safeguards during the enactment of special anti-terrorist legislation in order to combine the fight

⁹ Interview with representatives of the Department of Justice on May 1, 2002 in Ottawa with Tami

against terrorism with the upkeep of civil liberties and rule of law. One, anti-terrorism policy and its implementation should be democratically accountable and thus should remain under the control of civil authority. Two, government and security services must conduct their anti-terrorist activities within the law, ensuring to the best of their abilities that the normal legal process is preserved and those suspected of terrorist activity be charged and tried before the courts of law. Third, emergency legislation should be approved by the legislature only for a fixed and limited period and be subject to review, published as widely as possible and administered impartially.

Some key dilemmas arise when security and police forces cooperate in counter-terrorism policy, for example, in the institutional relationship between CSIS and the RCMP. The role of the police is to look for prosecution, while the role of security intelligence is to accumulate information. Because security forces want information on a long-term basis, they do not want people arrested and out of circulation. This is problematic in two ways. First, it leaves dangerous criminals to continue their actions out on the streets. Second, if criminals know they are being watched, they become less active and more clandestine. For purposes of counter-terrorism investigations, if suspects are prosecuted for lesser offenses such as money laundering (which are currently included as criminal offenses in anti-terrorist legislation), this may problematize the investigation of end results or intentions of that offense which may be a violent crime or terrorist activity¹⁰.

However, closer contact with the community and involvement in local activities allows the police to accumulate and increase their access to law enforcement intelligence and information management that may relate to terrorist support activities

Jacoby.

¹⁰ Interview with Alistair Hensler, former Deputy Director of Operations, CSIS, on May 3, 2002 in Ottawa with Tami Jacoby.

such as funding and harbouring terrorists both in Canada and abroad. If information is shared in a sensitive manner and in ways that promote the objectives of the military, intelligence services and the police, an integrated approach is the most effective means for protecting society from crime, whether that crime is politically oriented or motivated by profit.

Concluding Remarks:

This paper has argued that new forms of conflict and insecurity in the international arena have necessitated the allocation of new tasks for the Canadian military and police. The nature of international conflict resolution and humanitarian intervention in civil/ethnic conflicts is fundamentally different when compared to wars between states. As a result, conventional definitions of the roles, functions, organization and training of military versus police forces require radical revisioning. As traditionally understood, the military defends the state from external threat while the police protect society from internal threat. Ultimately, both the military and the police are institutions designed to safeguard and preserve democratic social life and the rule of law both within the state and in the international system.

However, conventional understandings of civilian-military relations have changed fundamentally in recent years. As dictated by the needs of contemporary missions abroad, the military has increasingly performed tasks hitherto reserved for civilian actors and the police are part of an increasingly civilian component of military operations. Some would argue that this merging of functions constitutes a democratization of foreign policy, one of the main goals of the human security agenda. However, it is pertinent to ask whether this move

towards greater civilian-military cooperation is merely a pretense for transferring the burdens of conflict onto society at a time of reduced military defence spending?

It is obvious that military and policing institutions must coordinate their tasks and work together for the most effective intervention possible in zones of conflict and counter-terrorism campaigns. In effect, this has required different training regimens and preparedness for all actors involves. Less obvious is that both the military and the police are at the very core, institutions based on coercive and punitive powers. Although, force is not always necessary, it is clear that the capacity to threaten or use force is a substantial source of power and influence for these institutions. Both the ill-fated move towards peacemaking and the US-led war against terrorism since 9/11 have indeed focused to a large extent on power and punishment. As a result, both processes have generated immense opposition by sectors of society that do not have full faith in military and policing institutions. It is essential that current operations conducted by both civilian and military institutions strive to “serve and protect” their target populations. However, they must never forget that serving and protecting society must always be synonymous with the goals of the democratic process.

Bibliography:

A Wake Up Call for Canada: The Need for a New Military. 2001. The Royal Canadian Military Institute: Toronto.

Chesterman, Simon. 2001. *Just War or Just Peace? Humanitarian Intervention and International Law.* Oxford University Press: Oxford & New York.

Cusimano, Maryann K. 2000. *Beyond Sovereignty: Issues for a Global Agenda.* Bedford/St. Martin's: Boston & New York.

De Rover, Cees. 1999. “A new interest for human rights and humanitarian law”,

International Review of the Red Cross, no. 835, pp. 637-647.

Elshtain, Jean Bethke (Ed.). 1992. *Just War Theory*. New York University Press: New York.

Forcese, Dennis. 1999. *Policing Canadian Society*, Prentice Hall Allyn and Bacon Canada: Scarborough, Ontario.

Goldstein, Joshua S. 2002. *International Relations*. Longman: New York.

Human Security: Safety for People in a Changing World, Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade (DFAIT), April, 1999.

Kegley, Charles W. Jr. & Eugene R. Wittkopf. 1999. *World Politics: Trend and Transformation*. St. Martin's/Worth: New York.

Kenney, Dennis Jay & Robert P. McNamara. 1999. *Police and Policing: Contemporary Issues*, Praeger: Westport, Connecticut.

Heinbecker, Paul. "Human Security", *Canadian Foreign Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, (Fall, 1999), 19-25.

Owens, Heather & Arneil, Barbara. "The Human Security Paradigm Shift: A New Lens on Canadian Foreign Policy?", *Canadian Foreign Policy*, Vol. 7, No. 1, (Fall, 1999), 1-12.

Palango, Paul. 1998. *The Last Guardians: The Crisis in the RCMP – and in Canada*, McClelland and Stewart: Toronto.

RCMP Peacekeeping 2000-2001 Annual Review. 2001. International Training and Peacekeeping Branch, RCMP Headquarters: Ottawa.

Sewell, John. 1985. *Police: Urban Policing in Canada*. James, Lorimer and Company Publishers: Toronto.

Small, Michael. 2001. "Peacebuilding in Postconflict societies" in Rob McRae & Don Hubert (Eds.), *Human Security and the New Diplomacy: Protecting People, Promoting Peace*, McGill-Queens University Press: Montreal & Kingston.

Stephenson, Carolyn M. 1998. "Peacekeeping and Peacemaking" in Michael T. Snarr & D. Neil Snarr (Eds.). *Introducing Global Issues*, Lynne Rienner Publishers: Boulder.

Tepperman, Lorne. 1977. *Crime Control*. McGraw-Hill Ryerson Limited: Toronto.

von Clausewitz, Carl. 1968. *On War*. Routledge & Kegan: London.

White, Jonathan R. 1998. *Terrorism: An Introduction*, West/Wadsworth Publishing Company: Belmont.

Whittaker, David J. 2001. *The Terrorism Reader*. Routledge: London & New York.

Wilkinson, Paul. (2000). *Terrorism Versus Democracy: The Liberal State Response*, London: Frank Cass.