

Statement

Secretary of
State for
External Affairs



Déclaration

Secrétaire d'État
aux Affaires
extérieures

92/56

CHECK AGAINST DELIVERY

NOTES FOR AN ADDRESS BY
THE HONOURABLE BARBARA McDOUGALL,
SECRETARY OF STATE FOR EXTERNAL AFFAIRS,
TO THE
CANADIAN INSTITUTE OF STRATEGIC STUDIES SEMINAR
"ADAPTING FOR SURVIVAL: GLOBAL SECURITY
FROM SARAJEVO TO MAASTRICHT TO RIO"

TORONTO, Ontario
November 5, 1992

Not so long ago, an observer mused that the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe marked the end of history. Talk of victory, "peace dividends" and a "new order" quickly yielded to a sense of pessimism. The rise of authoritarianism and ethnic repression on a wide scale in some parts of the former Soviet Union and problems in Yugoslavia -- and the advent of a prolonged economic recession in the West -- led to comparisons with the world of the 1930s and even with 1914.

Victory celebrations seemed somewhat premature.

But there are some more encouraging forces at work. A network of international institutions, predicated on the rule of law and the art of compromise, has been carefully built since the end of the Second World War, and the end of the Cold War has increased its potential. Now the United Nations (UN) can proceed without threats of constant vetoes, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe (CSCE) can launch important fact-finding and confidence-building missions in the former Yugoslavia with the support of virtually all of its members. Canada is actively involved in this process as a reflection of the priority we put on international security.

The Emerging Security Environment

The global context -- the emerging security environment into which Canada fits and functions -- is, to a certain extent, a rather Hobbesian world of brutality and nastiness. We sense this most of all when we look at Europe and compare the hope and optimism of 1989 and 1990 with the reality of 1992.

Setting the unconscionable destruction and death in the former Yugoslavia aside for a moment, if that is possible, scanning a Russian daily finds the following headlines: "Nagorno-Karabakh: the war goes on"; "Radio-active accident in Belarus"; "Hostilities continue between Georgia and Abkhazia"; "Rouble falls to record low"; "Peacekeeping forces possible in Tajikistan"; and "Russia will continue to defend the rights of ethnic Russians in Baltic States."

It is apparent that the space of geography that once contained the Soviet Union is a source of festering and fierce conflicts, economic, social, and political. This focuses the minds of those who live close by -- from the new democracies of Central and Eastern Europe, and thus Western Europe, to China, Pakistan and India -- not to mention Turkey and Iran.

If we concentrate on this corner of the world for a moment, we find a microcosm of the emerging global security environment.

The key elements are all here --

- political establishments that cannot always be termed democratic, with the rule of law only tentatively in place;
- numerous actual or potential ethnic hostilities;
- unrestrained nationalism, rising xenophobia and racism;
- thousands of weapons -- conventional, nuclear, chemical -- often under less than rigorous control either in terms of storage and maintenance or in terms of sales and exports;
- decades of environmental abuse and neglect -- in places, almost total devastation of rivers, soil, forests and air;
- underpinning it all, economic frailty and underdevelopment, rising unemployment and growing economic disparities;
- leading to the potential prospect of uncontrollable mass migration of people to other parts of the continent or world in search of a better future --

in short, a spectrum of flashpoints looking for a spark.

Co-operative Security

None of the elements is in itself new. What is new is that any of the flashpoints can set off a chain reaction of effects that can implicate the entire world, within moments of their occurrence.

Social, economic, political and environmental links have become so complex and inclusive that no country can set itself outside the agenda of daily world events. A breakdown in one part of the matrix automatically engages countries outside the region in question and calls for a new form of co-operative security to protect basic ideals and individual interests.

Taking Action on the Co-operative Security Agenda

Facing such a difficult and volatile global co-operative security agenda, we are fortunate that there are some strong positive forces at work.

First, despite the chaos and instability, democracy is gaining ground globally. I have been to many corners of the world in the past 18 months, and I have seen for myself the progress of democratic traditions and the willingness of people to struggle for their rights where despots still linger.

Take Latin America, for example. With a couple of notable exceptions, the continent has taken enormous strides toward democracy. Around the table at the Organization of American States (OAS) and in places such as Haiti, the struggle for democracy is real -- and it will, sooner or later, succeed.

The same can be said for other parts of the world. There is a growing global consensus that democracy works -- politically, socially and economically. This is an important step forward. Canada must help to maintain that momentum.

Second, we are learning to use our international institutions more effectively, beginning with the United Nations.

This is the Canadian mantra of multilateralism.

The UN has been the focal point of Canadian diplomacy for many decades. For much of this time we were something of a voice in the wilderness -- preaching multilateralism while much of the world blustered about bilaterally.

However, when we look at the emerging security environment, a key and qualitatively new factor is the growing willingness of states to use multilateral institutions and, consequently, their enhanced effectiveness. This is perhaps the greatest single change in the global security environment. There have always been conflicts and insecurity; there has always been interdependence; but not until recently has there been a global willingness to act through multilateral institutions.

The United Nations

This opens up enormous possibilities for the international community to deal with its problems and resolve its conflicts through the United Nations and other multilateral organizations.

The UN remains the heart of the global political system and the focal point for conflict management. The Secretary-General's "Agenda for Peace" points the way forward for the UN: preventive diplomacy, peacemaking, peacekeeping and peace-building.

It is an ambitious agenda, but one that reflects both the new challenges and the new opportunities.

The Secretary-General suggests, and we agree, that the international community needs to become more active and interventionist in both preventing and resolving conflict. He also points out the need to be realistic about the extent to which the UN system can support the growing number of demands being placed upon its conflict management resources.

At the opening of the General Assembly this year, Canada called for a strengthening of the United Nations in order to meet new challenges. The member states of the United Nations must consolidate the base for its activities -- not least of all peacekeeping.

Between 1945 and 1987, there were 13 peacekeeping operations established. Since 1987, 13 additional peacekeeping operations have already been established.

The UN system cannot maintain this level of commitment if its members do not pay their dues or contribute their resources to UN sanctioned actions.

I do not want to dwell on this point yet again, but the recent decision to fund the second phase of UN Protection Force (UNPROFOR) by charging only those countries who have already decided to support the effort by providing troops, sets a dangerous precedent that goes directly against the UN principle of universality and collective responsibility.

Peacekeeping

The nature of peacekeeping itself is evolving. With each new requirement, new techniques and methods must be developed. However, some things will remain the same -- the need for a clear mandate from the Security Council tied to aggressive diplomatic efforts. Canadian experience in Cyprus has shown that the UN must be vigilant in ensuring that peacekeeping is seen as a tool in the peace process, not as an end in itself.

More basically, we must look critically and creatively at peacekeeping as a conflict management instrument. Is it the best tool for dealing with new types of ethnic, social and religious conflicts that we see in Moldova, Somalia, Nagorno-Karabakh and Cambodia? What about the future of peacekeeping in support of humanitarian assistance, as is the case in Sarajevo?

Canada has already responded to real needs in many of these places. But the international community needs to think its way through these new approaches in a more structured fashion, rather than on an ad hoc basis.

Rethinking the Limits of Sovereignty

Fundamental to these developments is the fact that international action often crosses over into areas previously considered off-limits for reasons of national sovereignty.

Many of the sources of tension and conflict are found in human rights abuses, persecution of minorities or political repression, which often lead to, or are compounded by, economic deprivation.

These are intrinsically internal matters, but they are also legitimate concerns of the global community. Indeed, they are a shared responsibility.

Sovereignty can no longer be absolute or exclusive. The world is too complex for absolutes. Cambodia, for example, presents a case where sovereignty and key elements of governance are temporarily separated.

New ways must be found to overcome boundaries that in themselves generate internal conflict.

The Role of Regional Organizations

One step is the strengthening of regional organizations in support of the UN, as called for by the Secretary-General. The London Conference process demonstrates how regional organizations can work with the UN to enhance its effectiveness.

Canada is uniquely placed to advance this approach as a member of a number of key regional bodies -- the CSCE, the Commonwealth, la Francophonie and the OAS -- and as a dialogue partner in Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN).

The same consistent themes must be addressed at all of these forums: democratization, respect for human rights, good governance and peaceful settlement of disputes. These discussions can go a long way toward building confidence and easing tensions.

Positive results are already being seen. In the ASEAN context, security was on the agenda for the first time at the ASEAN meeting in Manila this past summer. In the OAS, countries will be looking at ways of developing hemispheric security, including subjects such as the proliferation of weapons -- nuclear and conventional. These are first steps, but important ones on which to build.

European Security

We have, of course, been pursuing a broader European security framework through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and the CSCE for several decades.

NATO remains a cornerstone of Canadian security policy. Our political commitment to NATO and the transatlantic link remains firm.

NATO's new strategic concept and Canada's recent reassessment of how it could best contribute to that new role are not signs of diminishing relevance or interest. Rather, they reflect an

evolving institution whose members are responding to the realities of a changing political and fiscal environment.

But let me repeat -- Canada's commitment to European security remains strong. Witness 2,400 Canadian soldiers deployed in the former Yugoslavia and our contribution to the conflict management missions of the CSCE -- not to mention the millions of dollars we have provided in humanitarian assistance. These are not the signs of a country disengaging from Europe.

We welcome Europe's efforts to assume more responsibility for its security. The Western European Union (WEU) and the new European Security and Defence Identity complement NATO.

However, the WEU cannot replace the infrastructure, integrated command structure, assets and forum for privileged dialogue that NATO offers. Nor can it be a substitute for a security structure that derives strength and determination from a membership that encompasses not only Europe, but also Canada and the United States. The WEU can reinforce NATO, and, for its part, NATO can assist and support the WEU.

It is fashionable to criticize NATO and say that its time has passed. Canada does not share that view. A transformed NATO has a key role in European security. This becomes particularly obvious when speaking with our co-operation partners.

The North Atlantic Co-operation Council (NACC) is an effort by NATO to reach out to those who have really become its most ardent supporters -- the countries of Central and Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. These countries see the real need and value of NATO -- a uniquely effective collective security alliance -- at this time of upheaval.

The CSCE also has characteristics that give it an important role to play in European security. However, it has also become an easy target for criticism. People make facile arguments: the CSCE did not prevent Yugoslavia; therefore it is ineffective. In our view, these criticisms are premature.

The CSCE is the only regional organization that embraces all of Europe -- including the central Asian republics -- Canada and the United States. It is the only regional organization with a mandate that encompasses the co-operative security agenda -- from arms control and confidence-building to human rights, economic and environmental issues.

The CSCE played an important role in the twilight of the Cold War -- before NATO or the European Community (EC) had even begun to think about outreach. It was the institution that first embraced the new democracies and gave them a framework and a set of guidelines for moving forward with political and economic reform.

The CSCE has evolved as its membership has changed and grown. Canada has been instrumental in developing the CSCE's conflict management abilities -- from ad hoc fact-finding missions and good offices to CSCE peacekeeping with a link to NATO, the WEU and the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS).

The CSCE does not get much publicity. Few people know that CSCE missions have visited every new state in Europe and produced comprehensive reports on the process of democratization, with special attention to human rights issues.

Through the CSCE, Canada has sent representatives to Ukraine, Belarus and Moldova to look at human rights; we sent two Canadians on the recent CSCE mission to look at detention camps in Bosnia; and we headed a mission to Kosovo to see what further conflict prevention efforts could be made in that tense region of the former Yugoslavia.

As a result of that effort, longer-term missions were recently dispatched to three potential regions of conflict -- Vojvodina, Sandjak and Kosovo. A Canadian diplomat is on the ground in Kosovo and will remain there for at least three months as part of a CSCE team attempting to ensure that conflict does not spill over into the volatile Kosovo region. Similarly, we have just dispatched another Canadian officer to Skopje in the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. Canada will also participate in sanctions monitoring missions in Romania.

This involvement with the CSCE is not new for Canada. It was Canada that brought the conflict in Nagorno-Karabakh to the attention of the CSCE. We provided a military expert and an aircraft to a CSCE fact-finding mission to the region. We urged the CSCE to establish a peace process, which is now under way.

The CSCE has not yet achieved its full potential, but it has the capacity to deal with real problems in Europe today -- many of which find their origin in minority issues. The tools now exist within the CSCE. What we must now focus on is developing the political commitment and the will to use these tools.

The CSCE, NATO, the EC and the WEU all have a role to play in European security. The relationships between these organizations, like much in Europe, are in transition. But the important thing is that they move forward together to enhance regional stability.

Continental Security

But Europe is not the only focus for co-operative security initiatives. The changing global security environment is having a profound effect on all of Canada's multilateral and bilateral

relationships, including the special one we have with the United States.

The defence and security of North America are continuing priorities that require ongoing attention to ensure that they, like NATO, NACC, and the CSCE, are positioned to deal with the new political and strategic realities.

Together, Canada and the U.S. operate in more than 160 bilateral defence-related forums and have several hundred defence agreements for carrying out activities. These range from the 52-year old Permanent Joint Board on Defence, which meets twice a year, to regular, annual political-security consultations. The jointly commanded North American Aerospace Defence (NORAD), renewed for five years in April 1991, is a highly visible symbol of our continued commitment to bilateral defence co-operation.

Taken together, these mechanisms allow both countries ample opportunity to advance their respective points of view and to respond to a changing world.

Arms Control and Non-proliferation

While we have advanced our ability to deal with the reasons for conflicts, we have also made great strides in dealing with the means for conflict.

In the last year, we have seen significant reductions in the nuclear and conventional military capacities of the U.S., the former Soviet Union and the other major European powers. The U.S., France and Russia have declared moratoria on nuclear testing.

The Chemical Weapons Convention, successfully concluded after 20 years of painstaking negotiations, bans an entire class of weapons. Progress is being made toward finding more effective ways to verify the Biological and Toxin Weapons Convention. However, there is still much to be done.

The international non-proliferation agenda is far from exhausted. But there is a new willingness to work together on this agenda. For example, the international community's deep concern over Iraq's clandestine nuclear weapons program underlines the problems that still need to be addressed.

Canada is strongly pursuing the comprehensive non-proliferation agenda laid out by the Prime Minister last year. First and foremost, we must work toward achieving universal accession to the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT) and its indefinite extension at the NPT Extension Conference in 1995.

The road toward this goal would be smoother if the nuclear weapons states were to conclude a Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty, and we shall continue to advocate this. Better co-operation between industrialized and developing countries in peaceful nuclear technologies is another important building block toward a successful conference in 1995.

Regional co-operation still needs strengthening so that the causes of insecurity and tension motivating nuclear proliferation and military build-ups can be addressed. Stronger International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) safeguards and better controls on suppliers of nuclear technology are needed to cope with the possibility of covert nuclear weapons programs.

The break-up of the former Soviet Union again embodies many of the global challenges. Russia has entered into laudable undertakings to reduce its stockpiles of nuclear weapons. But they need help to dispose of certain fissionable materials, which also should be safeguarded in civilian facilities.

Economic dislocation and the slowness at legislating and implementing effective controls have encouraged the illicit movement of sensitive technology. We have supported the establishment of Science and Technology Centres in Moscow and Kiev to provide opportunities for those in the weapons industries to contribute to peaceful endeavours. But the governments, particularly of Russia and Ukraine, must fulfil their obligations to dismantle and destroy the nuclear weapons in Ukraine. Nuclear weapons must never be used as bargaining chips in political disputes.

Co-operative security in the 1990s is clearly not an easy task -- but it is not impossible. If problems are proliferating, so are the options for solutions. Direct bilateral engagement is one approach, but its effects can be limited. For Canada, the revitalization of multilateral diplomacy and action offers the best possibilities for success.

We must address the root causes, not the symptoms. Basic human rights, the development of democratic values and institutions, the rule of law, and the establishment of responsible and responsive governments and administrative infrastructures are critical to lasting peace and stability.

Our efforts in the coming years will be directed to enhancing these objectives at the individual country level and in the regional and global context.

We must not fall back to the old ways of waiting to see the fire when there is smoke all around us.