

PEACEKEEPING AND FOREIGN POLICY IN JAPANESE AND CANADIAN CONTEXTS

INTRODUCTION

THANK YOU FOR THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK WITH YOU TODAY.

I ACCEPTED YOUR INVITATION FOR TWO REASONS. FIRSTLY, IT IS MY JOB TO UNDERSTAND JAPAN AND A GOOD WAY TO DO SO IS TO ENGAGE IN DIALOGUE AND DEBATE WITH SUCH IMPORTANT AND INFLUENTIAL ORGANIZATIONS AS THOSE REPRESENTED BY THE YOMIURI.

SECONDLY, I BELIEVE THAT THE MEDIA HAS A RESPONSIBILITY TO SHAPE PUBLIC OPINION. YOUR PRIMARY TASKS ARE TWO-FOLD: TO REPORT ON THE FLOW OF EVENTS IN JAPAN AND IN THE WORLD; AND TO POINT TO THE LESSONS UPON WHICH JAPAN CAN DRAW ON THE MARCH TOWARDS ITS FUTURE. YOUR EXPERIENCE AND PERSPECTIVES AS JOURNALISTS PROVIDE YOU WITH INSIGHTS THAT ARE RELEVANT TO PUBLIC POLICY. YOUR RIGHT TO REPORT FREELY IS BALANCED BY YOUR DUTY TO INFORM JAPANESE SOCIETY OF YOUR VIEWS. THE SAME THING APPLIES TO THE MEDIA IN CANADA.

LATE LAST YEAR, I MADE A PRESENTATION AT KEIO UNIVERSITY ON CANADA'S HUMAN SECURITY AGENDA. YOU HAVE BEEN GIVEN COPIES OF THIS SPEECH. I BELIEVE THAT IT BEST CAPTURES CURRENT CANADIAN THINKING ON INTERNATIONAL OBLIGATIONS TO THE SAFETY AND PROSPERITY OF INDIVIDUALS, AS AN ESSENTIAL CONSIDERATION IN PROMOTING THE HEALTH AND PROSPERITY OF STATES. THAT SPEECH OUTLINED BOTH THE INTELLECTUAL FRAMEWORK OF HUMAN SECURITY, AND THE MEANS THAT CANADA HAS UNDERTAKEN TO PROMOTE IT. I BELIEVE THAT THIS TEXT PROVIDES IMPORTANT INSIGHTS INTO CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY.

TODAY, I WANT TO DISCUSS PEACEKEEPING, ANOTHER VERY IMPORTANT COMPONENT OF CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY, ONE THAT IS ALSO VERY RELEVANT TO JAPAN. I WANT TO PROVIDE YOU WITH A FEW IDEAS EXPLAINING WHY CANADA CONTINUES TO BE IN THE PEACEKEEPING BUSINESS. INDEED, WE ARE NOW ALSO VERY MUCH IN THE PEACE ENFORCEMENT BUSINESS, AN AREA THAT JAPAN IS NOT CONSTITUTIONALLY OR POLITICALLY READY TO ADOPT.

STILL, YOU ARE ENGAGED IN AN ONGOING DEBATE ABOUT JAPAN'S INTERNATIONAL ROLE, AND THE NATURE OF YOUR CONTRIBUTION TO THE MAINTENANCE OF GLOBAL PEACE AND SECURITY. I THINK THAT THE

TYPES OF CONSIDERATION THAT LEAD CANADA TO EMBRACE PEACEKEEPING ARE RELEVANT TO THE JAPANESE DEBATE.

I MUST EMPHASIZE HOWEVER THAT WHAT I WILL DISCUSS ARE VERY MUCH PERSONAL THOUGHTS, AND DO NOT NECESSARILY REFLECT THE VIEWS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA. THEREFORE, I EXPECT THAT, SHOULD YOU FIND THESE IDEAS OF USE IN YOUR OWN FOREIGN POLICY DEBATES, YOU WILL NOT ATTRIBUTE THEM TO ME, BUT RATHER TO AN "INFORMED AND INTERESTED DIPLOMAT WITH EXPERIENCE IN JAPAN AND ASIA".

I WILL MAKE FOUR BASIC POINTS:

- POST-WAR CANADIAN AND JAPANESE FOREIGN POLICIES HAVE MANY POINTS IN COMMON, WHICH MAKES COMPARISONS BETWEEN OUR POLICIES RELEVANT AND INSTRUCTIVE.
- THE EVOLUTION OF CANADIAN AND INTERNATIONAL APPROACHES TO PEACEKEEPING EXPAND THE SCOPE OF POTENTIAL JAPANESE PARTICIPATION, IRRESPECTIVE OF THE NATIONAL DEBATES ON COLLECTIVE SECURITY OR CONSTITUTIONAL CHANGE.
- PEACEKEEPING IS A NATURAL OUTGROWTH OF FUNDAMENTAL CANADIAN REALITIES AND ATTENDANT FOREIGN POLICY PRINCIPLES.
- JAPAN CAN AND SHOULD SIGNIFICANTLY INCREASE ITS PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES. THE NATIONAL, PUBLIC DEBATE ON

PEACEKEEPING SHOULD BE INTENSIFIED, SO THAT PUBLIC UNDERSTANDING OF PEACEKEEPING EXPANDS, AND POLICY OPTIONS AVAILABLE TO JAPAN'S POLITICAL AND GOVERNMENT LEADERS ARE MULTIPLIED.

FIRST POINT: JAPAN AND CANADA HAVE IMPORTANT POINTS OF CONVERGENCE REGARDING FOREIGN AND NATIONAL SECURITY POLICIES

CANADA AND JAPAN ARE VERY DIFFERENT COUNTRIES IN MANY RESPECTS BUT THE FOUNDATIONS OF OUR RESPECTIVE FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICIES HAVE A NUMBER OF FEATURES IN COMMON.

1. FOLLOWING WWII, BOTH CANADA AND JAPAN HAD TO COMPLETELY REDESIGN THEIR FOREIGN AND NATIONAL SECURITY POLICIES. CANADA'S RELATIONSHIP WITH GREAT BRITAIN AS THE PRINCIPAL SOURCE OF ITS FOREIGN POLICIES AND ALLY IN TIMES OF CONFLICT COULD NOT SURVIVE THE SERIOUS WEAKENING OF THE UNITED KINGDOM AS A LOCUS OF INTERNATIONAL POWER. FOR ITS PART, JAPAN HAD TO ACCEPT OCCUPATION AND THE ABOLITION OF ITS MILITARIST STATEHOOD, IDEOLOGY AND FOREIGN POLICIES. BOTH COUNTRIES HAD TO

DESIGN ENTIRELY NEW SETS OF FOREIGN AND SECURITY POLICIES.

2. FOR VERY DIFFERENT REASONS, IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE 20TH CENTURY, BOTH CANADA AND JAPAN BASED FUNDAMENTAL ELEMENTS OF THEIR SECURITY POLICIES ON RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES, FOR THE PROTECTION OF THEIR NATIONAL TERRITORY. JAPAN HAS THE BILATERAL PEACE AND SECURITY TREATY. CANADA HAS THE BILATERAL NORTH AMERICAN AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND, REFERRED TO AS NORAD.
3. BOTH COUNTRIES UNDERSTAND THAT SECURITY ASSURANCES ARE TWO WAY STREETS: BOTH CANADA AND JAPAN MUST BE EQUIPPED AND READY TO ASSUME HARD SECURITY RESPONSIBILITIES, FOR SELF-DEFENSE IN THE CASE OF JAPAN, AND BILATERALLY, FOR CANADA, WHICH MEANS THE POSSIBILITY OF ENGAGEMENT, IN ONE FORM OR OTHER, IN DIRECT COMBAT OR COMBAT SUPPORT OPERATIONS.
4. BOTH COUNTRIES RECOGNIZE THAT THEY MUST ALSO BE PREPARED TO RESPOND MORE GENERALLY TO AMERICAN SECURITY CONCERNS, WHETHER IN “AREAS SURROUNDING JAPAN”, OR ON THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTINENT, FOR EXAMPLE IN RELATION TO PREVENTING AND RESPONDING TO TERRORIST THREATS.

5. BOTH COUNTRIES RECOGNIZE THAT THE MILITARY SECURITY PROVIDED BY THESE ALLIANCES WILL NOT BY THEMSELVES GUARANTEE EITHER ECONOMIC SECURITY, OR THE GLOBAL SECURITY THAT OUR ADVANCED SOCIETIES DEPEND UPON: INTERNATIONAL LAW, GLOBAL MARKETS, EFFICIENT AND EFFECTIVE GLOBAL COMMUNICATIONS SYSTEMS AND SO FORTH. A LARGE FAMILY OF INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, FROM THE UNITED NATIONS TO THE WTO AND SO ON HAVE BEEN ESTABLISHED. BOTH CANADA AND JAPAN ACKNOWLEDGE THAT THESE SYSTEMS MUST FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY AND WILL NOT DO SO WITHOUT THE ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT OF THE PRINCIPAL BENEFICIARIES. BOTH CANADA AND JAPAN GAIN IMMENSELY FROM THESE MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS AND IT WOULD BE SELF-DESTRUCTIVE NOT TO ENSURE THAT THEY FUNCTION EFFECTIVELY. IN OTHER WORDS, WE HAVE SYSTEMIC SECURITY RESPONSIBILITIES. IN THIS CONTEXT, JAPAN WISHES TO HAVE A PERMANENT SEAT ON THE UNITED NATIONS SECURITY COUNCIL. CANADA HAS EMBRACED MULTILATERALISM AND LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM AS A FUNDAMENTAL POLICY ORIENTATION FOR THE LAST 60 YEARS.
6. IN THE LONGER TERM, BOTH COUNTRIES BELIEVE THAT DEMOCRACY, HUMAN RIGHTS AND THE RULE OF LAW NOT ONLY SUPPORT THE FOUNDATIONS OF FREE AND ECONOMICALLY

ADVANCED SOCIETIES, BUT THAT THE SUCCESS OF SUCH SOCIETIES PROVIDES THE ULTIMATE GUARANTOR TO OUR ABILITY TO MAINTAIN OUR STANDARDS OF LIVING AND OUR WAYS OF LIFE. SHORT OF NEW ALLIANCES AND TREATIES, WE BOTH RECOGNIZED THAT MEANS MUST BE FOUND TO WORK TOGETHER TO BRING STABILITY TO THE INTERNATIONAL ORDER. PRIME MINISTER ABE STATED IN BRUSSELS ON JANUARY 12 THAT JAPAN IS COMMITTED TO REINFORCING THE STABILITY AND PROSPERITY OF THE WORLD BASED ON THESE FUNDAMENTAL VALUES.

7. EMERGING FROM THIS REALITY, BOTH JAPAN AND CANADA HAVE COMMITTED THEMSELVES TO PEACE KEEPING, AS A SIGNIFICANT FORM OF SYSTEMIC SUPPORT, IN PARTICULAR FOR THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY.
8. FINALLY, BOTH COUNTRIES MUST SET THEIR POLICIES AND DEFEND THEM THROUGH DEMOCRATIC MEANS, USUALLY THROUGH THE EXPLICIT SUPPORT OF OUR LEGISLATURES, AND OCCASIONALLY THROUGH ELECTIONS. THESE CONSIDERATIONS, ALONG WITH SUCH OTHER FACTORS AS JAPAN'S CONSTITUTIONAL CONSTRAINTS, PROVIDE THE ULTIMATE FRAMEWORK FOR OUR PROTECTION AND SECURITY.

SECOND POINT: CANADA HAS FOCUSED ON PEACEKEEPING AS ONE OF ITS PRINCIPAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE MAINTENANCE OF GLOBAL PEACE AND STABILITY.

PEACEKEEPING WAS NOT INVENTED IN THE 20TH CENTURY, BUT IT ACHIEVED PROMINENCE ONLY AFTER WWII AND THE CREATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS. PKO IS NOT MENTIONED ANYWHERE IN THE UN CHARTER, BUT IT HAS NEVERTHELESS BECOME A MEANS, AUTHORIZED BY THE SECURITY COUNCIL, TO MAINTAIN INTERNATIONAL PEACE AND SECURITY. IT HAS BEEN DEVELOPED AS “A WAY TO HELP COUNTRIES TORN BY CONFLICT TO CREATE CONDITIONS OF SUSTAINABLE PEACE”.

THE FIRST UN AUTHORIZED PEACEKEEPING MISSION DATES BACK TO 1947, AND THERE HAVE SINCE BEEN 61 UN SANCTIONED OPERATIONS, WITH 16 ONGOING TODAY. IN ADDITION, THERE HAVE BEEN MANY PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS UNDERTAKEN THROUGH OTHER INTERNATIONAL MECHANISMS, SUCH AS THE CURRENT NATO OPERATION IN AFGHANISTAN. MY FIRST TASK AS A NEW MEMBER OF THE CANADIAN FOREIGN SERVICE WAS TO PARTICIPATE IN THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR PEACE AND SUPERVISION IN THE FORMER REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM, A NON-UN SUPERVISORY MISSION CREATED BY THE PARIS PEACE AGREEMENTS OF 1973.

FURTHERMORE, PEACEKEEPING HAS EVOLVED IN MANY DIRECTIONS AND CREATED MANY VARIANTS: FROM OBSERVATION FORCES, TRUCE STABILIZATION OPERATIONS, NO-FLY ZONES, SAFE HAVENS, DEMILITARIZATION ZONES, TO SECOND GENERATION PEACE KEEPING, PEACE ENFORCEMENT, PEACE BUILDING, DDR (DISARMAMENT, DEMOBILIZATION, AND REINTEGRATION) AND POST CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION. FEW COUNTRIES HAVE PARTICIPATED IN ALL OF THESE ACTIVITIES, BUT WELL OVER 100 COUNTRIES HAVE PARTICIPATED IN SOME OF THEM.

CANADA HAS LONG BEEN ASSOCIATED WITH PEACEKEEPING. THERE ARE THREE REASONS FOR THIS.

FIRSTLY, TO BRING AN END TO THE WAR PITTING EGYPTIAN, ISRAELI, BRITISH AND FRENCH FORCES IN THE SUEZ PENINSULA IN 1956, UN SECRETARY GENERAL DAG HAMMARSKJOLD AND CANADIAN FOREIGN MINISTER LESTER PEARSON, THEN PRESIDENT OF THE UN GENERAL ASSEMBLY (TBC), SUCCESSFULLY IMPLEMENTED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE FIRST FORCE LEVEL PKO TO SEPARATE THE COMBATANTS AND END THE WAR. IN THE PROCESS, THE PEARSON-HAMMARSKJOLD MODEL AND PRINCIPLES OF PEACE KEEPING WERE DEVELOPED AND DOMINATED THE INTERNATIONAL SCENE UNTIL THE 1990s. THE NOBEL PRIZE COMMITTEE RECOGNIZED THE IMPORTANCE OF THIS INITIATIVE

BY AWARDING PEARSON, WHO WENT ON TO BECOME PRIME MINISTER, THE NOBEL PEACE PRIZE IN 1957.

SECONDLY, CANADA HAS KEPT PEACEKEEPING AT THE CENTER OF ITS FOREIGN POLICY. CANADA HAS PARTICIPATED IN OVER 60 MISSIONS SINCE 1947. THE CANADIAN MILITARY HAS BEEN AT THE FOREFRONT IN DESIGNING THE TECHNIQUES AND OPERATIONAL PRINCIPLES OF PKO, AS WELL AS RULES OF ENGAGEMENT. THE MILITARY HAS ESTABLISHED ITS OWN TRAINING FACILITIES, SUCH AS THE PEACE SUPPORT TRAINING CENTRE IN KINGSTON, ONTARIO, FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREPARING CANADIAN FORCES PERSONNEL FOR DEPLOYMENT ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD FOR ANY PEACE SUPPORT OPERATION. IN ADDITION, THERE IS THE PEARSON PEACEKEEPING CENTRE, AN INDEPENDENT BODY ESTABLISHED IN 1994, WHICH IS FUNDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF NATIONAL DEFENCE AND BY THE CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT AGENCY. IT IS THE WORLD'S FOREMOST CENTER FOR TRAINING OF INTERNATIONAL MILITARY, POLICE AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL. MOST RECENTLY, WE HAVE DEVELOPED INTEGRATED CONCEPTS FOR PEACE KEEPING AND PEACE BUILDING, INVOLVING THE CLOSE COORDINATION OF MILITARY, POLICE, DEVELOPMENT AND DIPLOMATIC ACTIVITIES, MOST NOTABLY IN THE PROVINCIAL RECONSTRUCTION TEAMS OPERATING IN AFGHANISTAN.

THIRDLY, CANADA HAS BEEN A LEADER IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE INTELLECTUAL JUSTIFICATION AND LEGAL UNDERPINNINGS OF PEACEKEEPING. WE HAVE BEEN AT THE CENTER OF THE DEBATES LINKING THE UN'S RESPONSIBILITY TO MAINTAIN PEACE AND STABILITY AMONG STATES, IDENTIFIED IN THE UN CHARTER, WITH THE RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT INDIVIDUALS, A NEW, EVOLUTIONARY CONCEPT SUCH AS HUMAN SECURITY, BEST ARTICULATED IN THE 1994 HUMAN DEVELOPMENT REPORT. HUMANITARIAN INTERVENTION AND, MOST RECENTLY, RESPONSIBILITY TO PROTECT HAVE BEEN AT THE CENTER OF CANADIAN FOREIGN POLICY THINKING, AND FOREIGN POLICY IMPLEMENTATION. FURTHERMORE, WE WERE A DRIVING FORCE FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LEGAL NORMS AND INSTITUTIONS THAT CANADA VIEWS AS RELATED TO THE MAINTENANCE OF INTERNATIONAL AND HUMAN SECURITY, SUCH AS THE PROGRESSIVE REDUCTION AND ELIMINATION OF LAND MINES, AND THE CREATION OF THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT FOR BRINGING AN END TO IMPUNITY OF THOSE RESPONSIBLE FOR THE MOST HEINOUS CRIMES COMMITTED AGAINST CIVILIAN POPULATIONS.

THIRD POINT: CANADA'S COMMITMENT TO PEACEKEEPING EMERGES FROM THE MIX OF FORCES THAT SHAPE OUR FOREIGN POLICY.

BEING THE PRODUCT OF POLITICS, INTERESTS AND LEADERSHIP, EVERY COUNTRY'S FOREIGN POLICY EMERGES FROM A WIDE VARIETY OF CONSIDERATIONS: POWER, INTERESTS, HISTORY, AND LEADERSHIP. NEVERTHELESS, THERE ARE CONSISTENT AND RECOGNIZED PATTERNS THAT INFORM AND SHAPE THEM.

IN THE CASE OF CANADA, WE CAN IDENTIFY THREE MAJOR FORCES THAT DETERMINE THE FRAMEWORK OF OUR FOREIGN POLICIES.

1. GEOGRAPHY IS THE FIRST DRIVER OF CANADA'S FOREIGN POLICIES. CANADA SHARES NORTH AMERICA WITH THE UNITED STATES. IT IS OUR ONLY LAND NEIGHBOR. THIS REALITY DETERMINES THE NEED TO DEVELOP OUR CLOSEST POLITICAL TIES WITH THE USA. OUR SECURITY AND ECONOMIC INTERESTS ARE ALSO DEFINED BY GEOGRAPHY. THE UNITED STATES ABSORBED 82% OF EXPORTS IN 2006, AND PROVIDED US WITH 55% OF OUR IMPORTS. NONE OF OUR OTHER TRADING PARTNERS REPRESENTS MORE THAN 3% OF OUR EXPORTS, OR 10% OF OUR IMPORTS.

THIS CONTINENTALISM ALSO EXTENDS TO MEXICO, THANKS TO THE WORKINGS OF THE NORTH AMERICA FREE TRADE AGREEMENT.

CONTINENTALISM IS BUTTRESSED BY A CONCERTED ARRAY OF DIALOGUES AMONG POLITICAL LEADERS FROM BOTH ADMINISTRATIVE

AND LEGISLATIVE BRANCHES, BROAD POLICY COORDINATION, HARMONIZATION OR CROSS-RECOGNITION OF TECHNICAL STANDARDS AMONG GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS, RESPECT AND ACCOMMODATION FOR EACH OTHER'S PRINCIPAL PRIORITIES AND CONCERNS. WE CONCENTRATE MORE OF OUR DIPLOMATIC RESOURCES ON THE NORTH AMERICAN CONTINENT THAN ANYWHERE ELSE.

2. IMMIGRATION AND EUROPEAN LEGAL AND SOCIAL TRADITIONS UNDERPIN CANADA'S DEVOTION TO LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM. AS IMMIGRANTS FROM EVERY PART OF THE PLANET, WE HAVE FAMILY AND FRIENDS IN EVERY PART OF THE PLANET. HAVING THE BENEFITS OF LIBERAL POLITICAL TRADITIONS, CANADIANS BELIEVE THAT OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS ARE BEST PROMOTED AND PROTECTED THROUGH A PROPERLY FUNCTIONING INTERNATIONAL SYSTEM, ONE THAT IS BUILT ON THE PRINCIPLE OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY, ON COMMON VALUES AND THE HARMONY OF INTERESTS, AN APPROACH THAT EMPHASIZES INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION, DOWNPLAYS NATIONALISM, PREFERS NON-MILITARY SOLUTIONS TO THREATS TO SECURITY, SEEKS LEGAL AND DIPLOMATIC SOLUTIONS TO INTERNATIONAL PROBLEMS, AND FAVORS PRAGMATIC COMPROMISE OVER RELIGIOUS OR POLITICAL IDEOLOGIES. DIPLOMATIC RESOURCES ARE THEREFORE ALSO DISTRIBUTED GLOBALLY, INCLUDING IN A WIDE VARIETY OF MULTILATERAL INSTITUTIONS SUCH AS THE UNITED

NATIONS, NATO, THE BRETTON WOODS INSTITUTIONS, THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE FRANCOPHONIE. PUT IN OTHER WORDS, WE CONSIDER THAT WE HAVE ESTABLISHED A FREE, STABLE AND PROSPEROUS MULTICULTURAL COMMUNITY AT HOME, AND THAT THIS IS PART OF OUR IDENTITY. MANY CANADIANS THUS BELIEVE THAT IT IS INCUMBENT ON CANADA TO PROMOTE SUCH AN ENVIRONMENT ABROAD AS WELL, USING THE TOOLS OF LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM. MANY NON-CANADIANS ADMIRE CANADA FOR BOTH POSSESSING AND PROMOTING THESE VALUES.

3. CANADIANS ALSO POSSESS A REALISTIC STREAK THAT TEMPERS THE FORCES OF CONTINENTALISM AND LIBERAL INTERNATIONALISM. CANADIANS ARE NORTH AMERICANS BUT WE ARE NOT AMERICANS. WE ARE OPTIMISTIC ABOUT THE POWER OF LIBERAL IDEAS, BUT WE ARE REALISTIC ABOUT THEIR LIMITATIONS, IN A WORLD WHERE POWER MATTERS A GREAT DEAL. THIS REALISM OBLIGES US TO CALCULATE CANADA'S STRENGTHS AND CAPABILITIES – OUR MILITARY AND INTELLIGENCE ASSETS, OUR SHARE OF INTERNATIONAL TRADE, AREAS OF TECHNOLOGICAL LEAD, OUR ODA CAPACITY, OUR WILLINGNESS TO ACT AND TO PAY FOR OUR ACTIONS – AS WELL AS OUR VULNERABILITIES – ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL. WE MUST, LIKE ALL COUNTRIES, ASSESS THE MEANS TO PROMOTE OUR NATIONAL INTERESTS IN THE PREVAILING INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENT, AND

DEVELOP FOREIGN POLICIES AND STRATEGIES ACCORDINGLY. THIS REALISM - OR NEO-REALISM, AS THE POLITICAL SCIENTISTS CALL IT – TENDS TO ARGUE FOR A MORE NARROWLY DEFINED FOREIGN POLICY, WITH A FOCUS ON MEASURABLE INTERESTS, AND THE COSTS AND BENEFITS OF PURSUING THEM. IT IS AN APPROACH TO FOREIGN POLICY THAT IS WELL UNDERSTOOD IN JAPAN.

AS CAN BE EXPECTED, CANADIAN POLICIES HAVE, AT VARIOUS TIMES AND OFTEN SIMULTANEOUSLY, REFLECTED EACH OF THESE THREE APPROACHES. ALL ARE RELEVANT TO CANADA'S EMPHASIS ON PEACEKEEPING, SINCE ITS INCEPTION UNDER UN AUSPICES IN 1947.

THUS, CANADA'S SUPPORT FOR THE UN TRUCE SUPERVISION OPERATION ON THE KOREAN PENINSULA IN 1947 AND SUBSEQUENT PARTICIPATION IN THE "POLICE ACTION" IN 1950 WAS CONSISTENTLY EXPLAINED AS RESPONDING TO THE NEEDS OF COLLECTIVE SECURITY UNDER UNITED NATIONS AUSPICES. CANADA PROVIDED 22,000 ARMY AND 3,600 NAVAL PERSONNEL IN WHAT BECAME A PEACE ENFORCEMENT BATTLE, LOSING 301 SOLDIERS.

CANADA'S DIPLOMACY AND PARTICIPATION IN UNEF AS A RESULT OF THE SUEZ CRISIS IN 1956, COMING AT THE TIME OF THE SOVIET INVASION OF HUNGARY, WAS LEAD BY A COMBINATION OF REALISM AND LIBERAL

INTERNATIONALISM IN THE FACE OF A POTENTIAL NUCLEAR CONFRONTATION AND WAS THEN AS NOW SEEN AS A SUCCESSFUL MEANS OF AVOIDING A MORE SERIOUS CHALLENGE TO PEACE AND SECURITY.

CANADA'S EVALUATION OF THE SUCCESS OF UN ACTION IN SUEZ AND DESIRE TO AVOID THE THREAT OF WAR BETWEEN GREECE AND TURKEY AGAIN BROUGHT CANADIAN DIPLOMACY TO THE FOREFRONT AT THE OUTSET OF THE CRISIS IN CYPRUS IN 1964, AND THE CONTRIBUTION OF OVER 1,100 CANADIAN FORCES IN UNEP.

CANADIAN INTERESTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST, INCLUDING THE POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT OF LARGE NUMBERS OF CANADIAN JEWISH AND MUSLIM COMMUNITIES, HAVE LEAD TO CANADIAN PARTICIPATION IN 11 SEPARATE UN PEACE KEEPING OPERATIONS THROUGHOUT THE REGION, INCLUDING EGYPT, ISRAEL, PALESTINE, THE GOLAN, YEMEN, IRAN AND KUWAIT.

GIVEN CANADA'S HISTORICAL AND ONGOING CLOSE TIES WITH THE UNITED KINGDOM AND WITH FRANCE, AND OUR ROLE AS THE SECOND LARGEST PLAYER IN BOTH THE COMMONWEALTH AND THE FRANCOPHONIE, CANADIANS FELT AN OBLIGATION TO ASSIST THESE TWO FORMER POWERS THROUGH THE PROCESS OF DECOLONIZATION.

THESE CONSIDERATIONS PROVIDED PART OF THE RATIONALE FOR CANADIAN INVOLVEMENT IN PKO IN KASHMIR, PALESTINE, EGYPT, CYPRUS AND INDOCHINA.

DOMESTIC CONCERNS ABOUT TERRORISM, OUR BROAD OBLIGATIONS ARISING FROM MEMBERSHIP IN NATO, AND THE A POLITICAL COMMITMENT TO THE SURVIVAL AND EVENTUAL SUCCESS OF THE LEGITIMATE GOVERNMENT OF AFGHANISTAN EXPLAIN CANADA'S CURRENT ROLE IN THAT COUNTRY. DIPLOMACY, DEVELOPMENT, POLICING, PEACEKEEPING AND PEACE ENFORCEMENT, HARDLY DISTINGUISHABLE FROM COMBAT, ARE ALL PART OF A CONCERTED RESPONSE THAT CANADA CONSIDERS ESSENTIAL TO ACHIEVING SOME PROGRESS IN THAT COUNTRY. IT IS ALSO TIED TO OUR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES WHICH, DISAPPOINTED THAT CANADA DID NOT BECOME A MEMBER OF THE US COALITION IN IRAQ, AS A RESULT EXPECTS CANADA TO ENGAGE IN HARD SECURITY IN OTHER AREAS OF IMPORTANCE TO THE USA.

WHAT ALL OF THESE EXAMPLES ILLUSTRATE IS THE FACT THAT, FOR CANADA, DECISIONS ON PARTICIPATION IN PEACEKEEPING MISSIONS HAVE CONSISTENTLY BEEN GROUNDED IN FOREIGN POLICY. IN A DEMOCRACY, THEY HAVE TO BE. THE GOVERNMENT OF CANADA MUST EXPLAIN TO THE PUBLIC HOW THE DISPATCH OVERSEAS OF OUR

YOUNG WOMEN AND MEN SERVES CANADIAN INTERESTS. CANADA'S PARLIAMENT MUST APPROVE THE FUNDING, FOLLOWING DEBATE.

THESE POLITICAL AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS DEEPLY INFLUENCE OUR RELATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES. DESPITE INTENSE AMERICAN PRESSURE TO ENGAGE IN VIETNAM IN THE 1960s, AND AGAIN IN IRAQ IN 2003, AND DESPITE OUR STRONG CONTINENTAL TIES, CANADA DID NOT ENGAGE IN EITHER OF THOSE CONFLICTS. QUITE SIMPLY, PARTICIPATION WOULD NOT HAVE BEEN CONSISTENT WITH OUR FUNDAMENTAL POLICIES.

FOURTH POINT: JAPAN CAN AND SHOULD EXPAND ITS PEACEKEEPING ROLE AND ACTIVITIES

SINCE PRIME MINISTER TAKESHITA ANNOUNCED JAPAN'S NEW POLICY OF COOPERATION FOR PEACEFUL PURPOSES IN MAY OF 1988, AND THE SUBSEQUENT DISPATCH OF THE FIRST FOREIGN MINISTRY OFFICIAL TO AFGHANISTAN IN JUNE OF THAT YEAR, TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PKO MISSION TO THE BORDER AREA OF AFGHANISTAN UNDER UNGOMAP, JAPAN'S ROLE AND ACTIVITIES IN PEACEKEEPING HAVE EXPANDED SIGNIFICANTLY. THE PASSAGE OF THE INTERNATIONAL PEACE COOPERATION LAW IN 1992, FOLLOWING THE DIPLOMATIC DEBACLE OF THE GULF WAR, AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ANTI-TERRORISM

SPECIAL MEASURES BILL LESS THAN TWO MONTHS AFTER 9-11, AND THE LIFTING OF THE “FREEZE” ON THE CORE FUNCTIONS FIRST AUTHORIZED IN THE 1992 LEGISLATION HAVE PROVIDED A MUCH BROADER LEGAL AND POLITICAL FRAMEWORK FOR JAPAN’S PARTICIPATION IN PEACEKEEPING. THE EXPERIENCES GATHERED UNDER UN SANCTION IN CAMBODIA, RWANDA, THE GOLAN HEIGHTS, TIMOR LESTE, AND NOW NEPAL, AS WELL AS GROWING COOPERATION WITH NATO AND THE UNITED STATES IN THE ARABIAN SEA AND INDIAN OCEAN, IN AFGHANISTAN AND IRAQ PROVIDE THE REAL WORLD EXPERIENCE THAT THE LEGAL AND CONSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORKS CAN ONLY DEFINE. BOTH PRIME MINISTER ABE AND FOREIGN MINISTER ASO HAVE SPOKEN IN RECENT WEEKS ABOUT FURTHER EXPANDING JAPAN’S ROLE.

THIS IS ENCOURAGING. STILL, IT IS DIFFICULT FOR ME, AS AN OUTSIDE OBSERVER, TO CONCLUDE THAT JAPAN IS DOING ALL THAT IT CAN OR ALL THAT IT SHOULD.

LEAVING ASIDE ENTIRELY THE RESTRICTIONS ARISING FROM THE UNFINISHED DEBATE OVER COLLECTIVE SECURITY AND CONSTITUTIONAL REVISION, AND WORKING ENTIRELY WITHIN THE CURRENT LEGAL FRAMEWORK, IN MY VIEW, JAPAN COULD SIGNIFICANTLY EXPAND ITS ROLE. THIS IS THANKS TO THE EVOLUTION OF “SECOND GENERATION PEACEKEEPING”, WHICH PROVIDES GREATER

IMPORTANCE TO PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS, SUCH AS STABILIZATION THROUGH POST-CONFLICT RECONSTRUCTION AND CIVILIAN POLICING, ELECTION MONITORING, MILITARY AND POLICE TRAINING, ESTABLISHING LEGAL INSTITUTIONS, CAPACITY BUILDING IN REGIONAL INSTITUTIONS THAT SUPPORT PKO, AND SO FORTH. JAPAN CAN ALREADY DO THINGS.

IT IS TRUE THAT JAPAN TAKES PART IN MANY ELECTION MONITORING MISSIONS, BUT OFTEN ONLY SENDS ONE OR TWO OBSERVERS. SENDING MORE STAFF WOULD RESULT IN THEIR PARTICIPATION HAVING GREATER IMPACT. IN THE AREA OF CIVILIAN POLICING, WHERE JAPAN COULD ALSO MAKE A DIFFERENCE, FOR ALL PRACTICAL PURPOSES JAPAN DOES NOT DEPLOY POLICE OFFICERS, PREFERRING TO PAY FOR TRAINING OUTSIDE JAPAN, OR SOMETIMES BRINGING POLICE TO JAPAN FOR TRAINING. BY COMPARISON, CANADA NOW HAS SOME 150 CIVILIAN POLICE PARTICIPATING IN UN MISSIONS ACROSS THE WORLD, HAVING DEPLOYED MORE THAN 2000 SINCE 1989. FOLLOWING PRIME MINISTER ABE'S RECENT ADDRESS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC COUNCIL, WHERE HE PLEDGED CLOSER COOPERATION WITH NATO IN AFGHANISTAN, JAPAN IS MAKING US\$20 M AVAILABLE FOR HEALTH, MEDICAL AND EDUCATION PROJECTS IN NATO'S PRIORITY AREAS, SUCH AS SOUTHERN AFGHANISTAN. HOWEVER, JAPAN WILL NOT BE SENDING ANY DEVELOPMENT PEOPLE TO NATO PRT'S, AND WILL HAVE TO RELY ON

NGO'S OR OTHER AGENCIES TO IMPLEMENT THEIR PROJECTS. THE PRT'S RESOURCES ARE ALREADY OVERSTRETCHED, AND THERE IS A PRESSING NEED TO DEPLOY MORE PERSONNEL TO THEM, ESPECIALLY IN ORDER TO MANAGE OR SUPERVISE DEVELOPMENT AND RECONSTRUCTION PROJECTS. FOR THIS REASON, CANADA HAS IN THE PAST INVITED JAPAN TO SEND A DEVELOPMENT OFFICIAL TO JOIN OUR PRT IN KANDAHAR. THIS POSITIVE, YET STILL LIMITED STEP BY JAPAN, IS A GOOD EXAMPLE OF WHERE JAPAN COULD ACTUALLY DO MORE WITHIN ITS EXISTING LAWS, BUT FOR POLITICAL REASONS BELIEVES THAT PAYING FOR THE PROJECTS IS THE MOST THAT IT CAN DO.

MUCH COULD ALSO BE ACHIEVED WITH CHANGES TO JAPAN'S TAX LAWS, SO THAT CONTRIBUTIONS TO JAPANESE NGOs INVOLVED IN PEACE SUPPORT OPERATIONS BECOME TAX DEDUCTIBLE. THIS WOULD GREATLY EXPAND JAPAN'S ROLE AND VISIBILITY, RAISE PUBLIC PROFILE AND ENGAGEMENT, AT VERY LIMITED COSTS TO THE FISCAL FRAMEWORK.

AS I HAVE SAID, I BELIEVE THAT JAPAN, IN ITS NATIONAL INTEREST, SHOULD RATHER DO MORE AND FOR THE FOLLOWING REASONS.

FIRSTLY, SUCH EXPANSION IS CONSISTENT WITH CURRENT JAPANESE POLICY. JAPAN IS ACTIVELY SEEKING TO EXPAND ITS INTERNATIONAL

PROFILE, IN ORDER TO CONTINUE THE PROCESS OF BUILDING ITS POST-WAR LEGITIMACY, BUILD NEW PARTNERSHIPS, ENHANCE ITS VISIBILITY AND COMPETE WITH THE NEWLY RISING POWER OF CHINA. THE IDEAS PUT FORTH BY PRIME MINISTER ABE, REGARDING JAPAN AS THE NEW PACIFIC GATEWAY AND AS A PARTNER OF NATO, AS WELL AS BY FOREIGN MINISTER ASO ON THE ARC OF FREEDOM AND PROSPERITY, THE OPENING OF NEW DIPLOMATIC MISSIONS ABROAD, THE INCREASE IN FUNDING FOR PUBLIC DIPLOMACY, EVEN SENDING MANGA ARTISTS ABROAD, ARE ALL PART OF THIS THRUST.

SECONDLY, A MUCH MORE VISIBLE PEACEKEEPING PROFILE WILL INCREASE THE LEGITIMACY OF JAPAN'S ARGUMENT IN FAVOUR OF OBTAINING A PERMANENT SEAT ON THE UN SECURITY COUNCIL. PEACEKEEPING HAS BECOME ONE OF THE UN'S PRINCIPAL BUSINESSES. JAPAN SHOULD BE ONE OF THE BIGGEST PARTNERS IN THAT BUSINESS.

THIRDLY, ACTIVE PEACEKEEPING PROVIDES JAPAN WITH MORE OPTIONS IN ITS SECURITY RELATIONSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES. FROM WHAT I CAN OBSERVE, THE DIVISIVE DEBATE WHICH BEGAN IN THE 1950s, THE DEBATE BETWEEN THOSE JAPANESE WHO FEAR THAT THE SECURITY TREATY RISKS ENGAGING JAPAN IN CONFLICTS WHICH IT DOES NOT SUPPORT, AND THOSE WHO CONSIDER THAT JAPANESE

HESITATION TO SUPPORT THE USA IN ITS CONFLICTS CAN WEAKEN USA COMMITMENT TO JAPANESE SECURITY, THAT DEBATE IS ONGOING. IT IS A DILEMMA THAT WE CANADIANS FULLY UNDERSTAND BECAUSE WE TOO ARE CAUGHT ON ITS HORNS. JAPAN, LIKE CANADA, CAN INCREASE ITS MARGIN OF MANOEUVRABILITY WITH OUR MOST IMPORTANT BILATERAL PARTNER WHEN WE CAN POINT TO THE OTHER MEANS THAT WE CONTRIBUTE TO PEACE AND SECURITY. THE AMERICANS MAY NOT ALWAYS BE HAPPY WITH YOUR RESPONSE – THEY WERE NOT HAPPY WHEN CANADA REFUSED TO PARTICIPATE IN IRAQ ABSENT A UN MANDATE – BUT THEY HAVE ACCEPTED OUR CHOICE OF FOCUS ON AFGHANISTAN. JAPAN SHOULD ENJOY THE SAME POLICY FREEDOM.

AN EXPANDED PEACEKEEPING ROLE CANNOT BE ACHIEVED HOWEVER ABSENT THREE FACTORS:

1. A BROADENING OF THE SUBSTANTIVE, PUBLIC DEBATE ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN JAPAN'S FOREIGN POLICY AND THE PLACE OF PEACEKEEPING IN THE PURSUIT OF JAPAN'S NATIONAL OBJECTIVES;
2. GREATER PUBLIC EDUCATION SO THAT THE HUMAN COSTS OF PEACEKEEPING, INCLUDING CASUALTIES, BECOMES MORE ACCEPTABLE TO THE JAPANESE PUBLIC. THE FACT IS THAT ALMOST 75% OF JAPANESE CONSIDER THAT JAPAN IS DOING ENOUGH PEACEKEEPING AS IT IS, AND ONE THIRD OF THOSE

- BELIEVE IT IS ALREADY DOING TOO MUCH. ONLY 25% CONSIDER THAT MORE SHOULD BE ACCOMPLISHED. THESE NUMBERS WILL NOT CHANGE WITHOUT MORE DEBATE;
3. STRONG SUPPORT FOR GENERIC PEACEKEEPING LEGISLATION THIS YEAR SO THAT EACH ONGOING AND FUTURE PKO INITIATIVE DOES NOT REQUIRE A REPEAT OF PAST DEBATES.

CONCLUSION

THESE FINAL COMMENTS RETURN ME TO THE OPENING LINES OF MY PRESENTATION. SHORT OF THE EXERCISE OF POLITICAL LEADERSHIP THAT IS NOT CURRENTLY VISIBLE ON THE HORIZON, THE YOMIURI AND OTHER MEDIA ARE THE PRINCIPAL VEHICLES TO PROMOTE A MORE ACTIVE PEACEKEEPING AGENDA.

IF YOU SHARE MY VIEW THAT JAPAN'S BROAD FOREIGN POLICY OBJECTIVES ARE WELL SERVED BY A MUCH MORE VISIBLE SET OF PEACEKEEPING ACTIVITIES, THEN IT IS YOUR TASK TO ENCOURAGE FUNDAMENTAL AND SUSTAINED DEBATE ON JAPAN AND PEACEKEEPING.

FROM A CANADIAN POINT OF VIEW, A MUCH MORE ACTIVE JAPAN IS OF BENEFIT NOT ONLY TO THE WORLD COMMUNITY, BUT MORE NARROWLY TO CANADA AS WELL, BECAUSE THE BURDEN OF PEACEKEEPING WILL

LIKELY BECOME HEAVIER AND WE NEED SIGNIFICANT PARTNERS LIKE
JAPAN.

THANK YOU.