

Each of these options involves a different basic approach, different strengths and constraints, and different types and levels of resource commitment. Clarity of objective is fundamental. When we are contemplating action to handle a current or potential conflict, it is important to know whether we are sending our troops for preventive deployment, peacekeeping or peace enforcement. Each involves different risks and costs, training, equipment and rules of engagement.

This being said, real life is not political science. Realities on the ground rarely lend themselves to definitions as clear as I have described. Conditions in Bosnia have never been those that would allow a classic peacekeeping operation -- and yet we are participating because the reality of human suffering is so compelling. If the Security Council decides to enforce the no-fly zone, this will mean an overlapping of preventive deployment, peacekeeping and peace enforcement missions within the states of the former Yugoslavia. As well, situations evolve: Somalia (like the Congo) began as a peacekeeping operation and moved to enforcement when that was judged necessary by the Security Council to fulfil the humanitarian and other goals that it had set.

Experience has made it clear that one kind of action used in isolation may well lead to partial, short-term or ineffective conclusions. We have been peacekeeping in Cyprus for almost thirty years, without a political solution coming noticeably closer: peacekeeping has become a permanent fixture rather than the means to an end. This is one reason for Canada's announcement that it would no longer contribute forces to this operation. Peacekeeping is not an end in itself, but part of a larger process: when that process breaks down or is never engaged, peacekeeping is ineffective -- or even part of the problem.

The international community is seeking new approaches to crisis management. We have at our disposal a full range of potential actions, but we need to apply them more coherently. Better early-warning mechanisms, triggering earlier international responses, should be a priority. Human nature, ethnic rivalries, internal power struggles, border disputes, aggression in the name of religion, are as ancient as recorded time. We are unlikely to change them. What we can do is attempt to order our affairs in such a way as to minimize human suffering in areas of conflict and work toward the universal acceptance of peaceful settlement of disputes. This can be discouraging, indeed, because Canadian policy on global crisis management is conducted in an increasingly menacing environment. In this context, we are