

carried forward by a coalition of the willing seeking a solution to an international humanitarian crisis that ignored national boundaries” (Axworthy and Taylor 1998, 193). Yet Canada’s response to those who have become disabled as a result of landmines illustrates a much less positive picture of Canada’s internationalism. It is a picture of practices which enhance dependency rather than autonomy, and identify victims instead of independent rights-bearing human beings.

In many ways the landmines process was one that emphasized Canada’s ability to put a human face on foreign policy. Security was not simply about states fighting war, it was about the protection of those who suffered the long-lasting effects of war. Canada’s strategy was to feature landmine victims in their policy speeches to attract more countries to sign the treaty. “The forces who favored a landmine ban used landmine victims as the priming tool with the assumption that the frequency, prominence or feature of the international community’s humanitarian impulse would lead to increased international attention to this issue” (Rutherford 2000: 92). Larrinaga and Turenne Sjolander suggest that by highlighting the effects of landmines particularly on women and children, who are not the primary victims of landmines, the Ottawa Process supports a very traditional role for governments as protectors of those who are vulnerable, passive and dependent (1998, 376-7). Their argument holds even more true when we consider Canada’s response to people with disabilities.

Once the landmine Convention had been signed, the Canadian government announced a five-year \$100 million Canadian Landmine fund. Its objectives included providing assistance to landmine victims (described as survivors in more recent documents). From the description of