

Official response to eDiscussion on Security
Policy Research Division, Foreign Affairs Canada
April 15, 2005.

Over the past few weeks policy makers within Foreign Affairs Canada (FAC) have reviewed statements made by Canadians during the eDiscussion on security. Many of the points raised during the discussion are at the forefront of current debate on how best to ensure the safety of Canadians. The upcoming International Policy Statement will present a cross-governmental approach to Canadian defence and security. It represents the culmination of a far-reaching process to renew Canada's approach to security in response to many of the dilemmas and emerging threats highlighted during the eDiscussion.

Root causes of terrorism

There is a complex interplay of factors that can render individuals and groups vulnerable to exploitation or attack by terrorists. It is impossible to draw a causal connection between terrorism and any one factor or set of factors. Hence, there are no clear 'root causes' of terrorism. With this in mind, Canada has adopted a multidisciplinary and integrative approach to combating terrorism, as articulated in the 2004 National Security Policy.

Several participants identified **poverty** as a cause of terrorism, yet, the link between the two remains indirect and uncertain. Indeed, many poverty-stricken groups do not resort to terrorism to resolve their grievances, while some studies suggest that those who perpetrate terrorist acts are often of a higher socio-economic background than the majority of those in their community. Canada's efforts to prevent terrorism have therefore focused on promoting good governance and the rule of law, to ensure that those with grievances have non-violent channels through which their concerns can be addressed. Nevertheless, Canada continues to contribute to global poverty reduction initiatives through its support for the Millennium Development Goals, multilateral agencies such as the United Nations Development Programme and through the work of a number of government departments, most notably the Canadian International Development Agency. Canada is also a leading proponent of debt forgiveness and has worked aggressively through the [Canadian Debt Initiative](#) since 1999 to eliminate the debt owed to Canada by all of the Heavily Indebted Poor Countries.

The **Arab-Israeli conflict** was also cited as a root cause of terrorism during the eDiscussion. While the conflict has contributed to political instability in the Middle East, it would be dangerous and inaccurate to portray the political conflict as in any way justifying terrorism. Canada rejects any claim that terrorism can legitimately serve as a means for achieving political ends. As reflected in our longstanding [Middle East policy](#), Canada is strongly convinced that the conflict can only be resolved through negotiations between the parties, leading to two states, Israeli and Palestinian, enjoying mutual peace and security. Information on Canada's voting record on Middle East resolutions in the General Assembly can be found in Ambassador Rock's [November 30 statement](#).

It was also suggested during the eDiscussion that Canada disassociate itself from the US fight against terrorism and the war in Iraq to avoid serving as a target of terrorist attacks perpetrated by those who disagree with either of these. Yet, engagement in the global fight against terrorism is critical to the security of Canadians and requires a

cooperative effort with the United States; a country with which we share important geographic, economic and innumerable other ties. Canada therefore continues to work closely with the US and other partners as part of Canada's comprehensive approach to preventing and combating terrorism. Furthermore, while Canada did not participate in war in Iraq, we believe that reconstruction efforts in this country are vital to the creation of a stable and secure environment throughout the region.

The potential for **failed and failing states** to act as incubators for terrorism was addressed during the eDiscussion. The 2004 [National Security Policy](#) acknowledges that failed states pose a potential threat to Canadian security and identifies this phenomenon as one of several focal points for Canada's approach to security. Canada's engagement to tackle this issue was clearly signalled in the [2005 budget](#), which earmarks \$500 million for global peace and security initiatives (as part of a \$3.4 billion increase in international assistance to promote international security) and \$12 billion for the Department of National Defence. These commitments will support Canada's 3D approach (diplomacy, development, defence) and enable related initiatives aimed at preventing state failure or assisting in the reconstruction of failed states.

The role of multilateral institutions in security

Multilateralism is a central aspect of Canadian foreign policy, through which Canada is advancing a vision of collective security that acknowledges the international [responsibility to protect](#) and reflects the integral relationship between security and development.

During the eDiscussion, it was suggested that the **integration of NATO into the UN** would afford the latter greater military capacity with which to ensure international security. There are, however, important institutional barriers to a combined NATO-UN entity: NATO is a transatlantic alliance. This entails not only benefits but also responsibilities for the 26 Allies (including collective defence under Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty). In contrast, the UN is an international organization with a global vocation. There is, nevertheless, a robust and ongoing co-operation between the two institutions, demonstrated by NATO's current involvement in Afghanistan, which is being conducted under the auspices of a UN mandate.

On the issue of Security Council reform, support was registered for replacing veto-holding EU member states with a single **EU Security Council veto**. On this question, Allan Rock, Canadian Ambassador to the UN, has provided the following response:

"There is no chance of France and the United Kingdom agreeing to cede their Security Council seats to a common EU seat in the foreseeable future. And now Germany is seeking a permanent seat for itself, but is opposed by other EU member states. As it stands, the UK and France make strong efforts to consult with the EU to achieve common positions on the vast majority of issues. There are proposals on the table now for enlarging the Security Council, but as yet there is no consensus. This issue may come to a vote in the General Assembly this year. The Government of Canada believes there should be no expansion of permanent seats, as this creates a problem of accountability."

One participant expressed concern that the proposed **L20** (Leaders 20) would not differ substantively from an enlarged UN Security Council. While similar issues might, on

occasion, be addressed by the two bodies, the L20 and the Security Council would be governed by distinctive constitutions and mandates: The L20 would be a deliberative forum, aimed at fostering consensus and cooperation. It would treat a few - largely economic - global issues, for which collaboration between developed and developing countries is required. In contrast, the Security Council is a decisional global governance institution with operational capabilities, concerned solely with questions of international peace and security.

It was also suggested that Canada should favour **ad-hoc multilateral coalitions** with like-minded states over existing multilateral institutions. As a leading actor in the creation of the G-20 and the primary proponent of an L-20, Canada has shown that it is willing to create multilateral processes where existing ones are unable to meet global needs. Canada has also supported the creation of ad-hoc multilateral coalitions such as the [International Campaign to Ban Landmines](#); an association of states which has helped curb the use of antipersonnel landmines worldwide. However, the creation of new institutions is a resource-heavy and time-consuming process that should be undertaken only where existing institutions are unable to reform or assume new functions. The Canadian government therefore views existing multilateral institutions as the preferred venue for addressing issues of relevance to Canadian and global security, while recognizing that ad-hoc multilateral processes are sometimes required.

The transnational and often global nature of modern security threats renders international and regional cooperation essential. Multilateralism is thus not “self-marginalizing,” as described by one participant, but is, instead, a basic tool for the projection of Canadian influence onto solutions which are necessarily multilateral. Regarding corruption in the UN, Canada welcomes the determination of Secretary General Annan to strengthen the management and oversight functions of the organization while enhancing coherence throughout the UN system. These measures are detailed in the Secretary General’s recent report, *In Larger Freedom*, and stand to improve the effectiveness and credibility of the UN. Canada will continue to play a significant role in the process of UN reform and to champion multilateralism as an essential component of global security.

Full service military vs. robust peacekeeping force

There was some debate during the eDiscussion on whether Canada should develop a full-service military or focus on creating a robust peacekeeping force. However, proposals that Canada should develop two distinct types of military unit do not reflect the nature of modern day peace-support operations. Canadian “peacekeepers” deployed overseas typically operate in complex and highly volatile situations amid simmering or even continuing conflict. Their ability to maintain peace and stability, and their personal safety, hinge on being able to deter violence through their credibility as combat-capable troops, and to act decisively against all threats to the peace or to vulnerable civilian populations. Canada’s international reputation as an outstanding peacekeeping nation largely reflects the fact that our troops are trained for war as well as peacekeeping.

Internal Security

A number of suggestions on how to strengthen domestic security were submitted during the eDiscussion. Many of these suggestions are addressed in the **National Security Policy** (April 2004), which outlines Canada’s integrated approach to domestic security.

Measures discussed in the document include the streamlining of the refugee determination process, improved threat and vulnerability analyses to defend against cyber-attacks and the creation of a cross-cultural Roundtable on Security.

Global Trends

A number of emerging trends were cited in the eDiscussion as potential sources of future insecurity. Canada is acutely aware of major shifts in the international environment which are likely to affect the security landscape in the coming years. Issues such as demographic changes, increasing migration flows and the long-term impact of HIV/AIDS on African states (all mentioned in the eDiscussion) are amongst the many global trends being studied in think tanks and universities throughout the country as well as in numerous government agencies and departments. The Canadian government is committed to understanding the policy implications of these and other phenomena and to ensuring that Canada is well-positioned to address any consequent security threats.

BMD

Suggestions made during the eDiscussion that missile defences should be “shared” between countries echo developments currently taking place. There are several stated objectives of a limited, ground and sea-based US missile defence system. The US aims to develop the capability to defend not just its own territory and deployed American forces, but also its friends and allies, from hostile or accidentally launched ballistic missiles. At present, Russia and NATO are actively cooperating in the area of defence against short range missiles, and the US is engaged in discussions with Russia regarding broader cooperation in missile defence. Though Canada has chosen not to participate in the US ballistic missile system and instead to focus on other defence and security priorities, we support missile defence cooperation between NATO and Russia, as well as between Russia and the US.

Drafted: CPC/Naidoo

Approved: CPC/Padbury/Garson

Consulted: AGC/Bryden, IDR/Buchan/Poupart/Martin, IMOP/Caddell, GMR/Lorre/
Flanagan Whalen/McIntyre, EER/Thurlow, REU/Viau/Trottier, BREU/Henderson,
Finance/Saravanamutoo