"Homeland" and Global Responses

'Security perimeters' deserve further policy attention. Since September 11, 2001, we have been attempting to build a security perimeter in a piecemeal fashion, but the institutional design of security perimeters needs to be considered in a comprehensive fashion. Factors to consider are the functional and geographic limits of the security perimeter, and which security factors (eg. energy) should be part of the perimeter, and which should be explicitly excluded (eg. culture). Given that polls demonstrate that Canadians are willing to sacrifice some freedoms for the sake of security, how should this affect policy development on security perimeters?

It was argued that Mexico must enter the common North American security perimeter, at least in the long-term. However, any discussion of integration of Mexico into the security perimeter has been met with resistance arising from concerns of a possible strain in the U.S.-Canada 'special relationship' and corruption in Mexican police and administration. It was recommended that the integration of Mexico and the rest of Latin America must be seriously considered as future partners in a possible hemispheric security perimeter.

In terms of global responses, it was felt that the priorities in our foreign policy are our relations with the U.S., and in the international sphere; peacekeeping, disarmament and human security. In particular, some lament the decline in Canada's contributions to international peacekeeping, an area in which Canada used to make strong contributions. Canada should enter into coalitions with allies to counter U.S. influence, because when Canada and allies are united, the U.S. pulls back. Furthermore, Canada should not shrink from emphatically stating its position to the U.S.

Perspectives on Terrorism

To understand the causes of terrorism, the nature of the changed international system in the aftermath of the Cold War must be taken into consideration. During the 1990s, the power of non-state actors increased to such a degree that global politics can no longer be centred on states alone. Furthermore, state governments are no longer able to contain violence perpetuated by non-state actors, as shown by the terrorist acts of September 11th, so states are increasingly going to have to enter into dialogue with non-state actors. This is not to suggest that the regime of states is over: the state system is alive, and virtually all states oppose organizations such as al-Qaeda because they cannot control them.

The causes of terrorism have also stimulated a rift within American policy circles. Some believe that terrorism results from a hatred of the West and, more specifically, Americans because they are 'western,' Christian, wealthy and have liberal values (the "Clash of Civilizations" argument). On the contrary, others maintain that terrorism stems from a hatred for American policies, such as sanctions against Iraq and support of Israel. If terrorism results from simple hatred of Americans and other Westerners, some feel there is not much we can (or would be willing to) do about it. However, if terrorism stems from the latter reason, then the West can go to lengths to