

Human Security and EU-Canada Relations

(C) 2005 by the author. First draft, please don’t quote without permission.

O Introduction

The purpose of this contribution is to sketch out the framework and the content of the dialogue on HS between Canada and the European Union as well as to ask for the perspectives of this dialogue.

1. Framework

1.1. General Framework

Since 1996 HS has been high on the agenda of Canadian foreign policy. Under Lloyd Axworthy’s service as Foreign Minister it was called a leitmotiv of Canadian foreign policy. This concept is reflected by the Canadian activities in the area of de-mining, which led to the Ottawa Convention of 1997, the Canadian initiatives for children in war , the Canadian concern for small and light weapons, the creation of a peace-building fund, the Canadian engagement for the creation of an International Criminal Court as well as by the Canadian participation in the Kosovo conflict in 1999. Since Axworthy left the office in 2000 the weight of HS in Canadian foreign policy doesn’t appear that clear (cf. Axworthy 1997; Claas 2003)

Lloyd Axworthy’s direct successor John Manley stated in June 2001, that the HS agenda would not be given up, but would be put in a broader - mainly economic - perspective. When William Graham became foreign minister in 2002, he argued, that especially after 9-11 human and national security would reinforce each other and that Canada’s contribution to HS would become stronger and stronger(cf. Graham 2002). The current foreign minister, Peter Pettigrew, repeated this by saying:

“Since the mid-1990s, Canada has advocated a new approach to international relations focusing on human security. The need for a broader approach to security stems from the changing nature of armed conflict and from the unfortunate consequences of globalization...Canada’s promotion of human security is a response to these new global realities. Human security is a condition or state of being characterized by freedom from pervasive threats to people’s rights safety or even their lives. Our human security agenda is ultimately aimed at developing new concepts, adapting diplomatic practice and updating the institutions on which the international system is based, with a view to enhancing the security of all people” (Pettigrew 2004).

As far as the EU is concerned, the adoption of HS as a conceptual goal is even more complex. The scope of the common foreign and security policy has been a topic of intense discussion for many years. This discussion concerns nearly all aspects of CFSP , from the rights of the member-states to their relations with the EU Commissioner for External Relations and the

High Representative for the Common Foreign and Security Policy. The US intervention in Iraq 2003 showed the European governments openly split on this important issue of a common foreign policy. The draft for an European constitution doesn't mention HS explicitly, but contains a number of paragraphs dealing with relevant issues, such as humanitarian intervention, conflict prevention and peace-building activities. The EU recognises that it has obligations concerning the HS of people outside its borders (Articles I-40, Articles III-210). Canada has been a founding member of the Human Security Network. Some EU members are HSN members, others are not. The non-EU member-states of the HSN are Chile, Jordan, Mali, Norway, South Africa (as an observer), Switzerland, and Thailand. EU-members in the HSN are Austria, Greece, Ireland, the Netherlands, and Slovenia. In this context it should be noted that EU Commissioner for External Relations Ferrero-Waldner was very active in her former function as Austrian foreign minister in setting up the HSN.

In 2004 the Kaldor Report was published by the EU. As Wilfried von Bredow just told us, the Kaldor Report proposes a "Human Security Doctrine for Europe" comprising three elements: (1) a set of principles for operations in situations of severe insecurity; (2) a human security response force; (3) a new legal framework. It has to be seen whether the EU will implement these suggestions, which are made at a critical moment. The Union has expanded to include ten new members in 2004, is dealing with even more new applications, and waits for the approving of a new constitution (cf. Kaldor 2004).

Another general point of reference, which has already been dealt with by Stephen Clarkson, is the strategic relationship between Canada and the U.S. It is noteworthy that Ottawa signed an agreement with Washington last summer to expand the mission of the North American Defense command, or Norad, but has apparently refused to take part in a new North American missile system. "Norad evaluates a threat", Bill Graham, the Canadian defense minister, said. "Making a decision to launch missiles is a whole other story" ("International Herald Tribune", February 25, 2005). A day later PM Paul Martin added that Canada would definitely not participate in this initiative - in spite of the fact that President Bush had privately urged Martin to join the system (ibid.; and "Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung", February 26, 2005).

And it should be mentioned that this discussion is taking place at a time, when the United Nations' reform discussion has led to the establishment of a Human Security Unit in the United Nations Secretariat. The overall objective of this unit is to place HS in the mainstream of UN activities. This is done by combining the management of the United Nations Trust Fund for Human Security with the dissemination and promotion activities of the Advisory Board on Human Security into concrete activities and highlighting the added value of the human security approach as proposed by the Commission on Human Security (source: <www.ochaonline.un.org/webpage.asp?site=hsu.2/26/2005>).

1.2. The Overall EU-Canada Relationship

The overall EU-Canada Relationship is based on three main documents:

- The 1976 Framework Agreement for Commercial and Economic Cooperation. It created the Joint Cooperation Committee that meets once a year.
- The 1990 Transatlantic Declaration on EU-Canada Relations. It sets out the basis for summit meetings and ministerial meetings (twice a year).

- The 1996 Joint Political Declaration on EU-Canada Relations and Joint EU-Canada Action Plan. This is structured in four comprehensive chapters: economic and trade relations; foreign policy and security issues, including HS; transnational issues ; fostering links.

The picture is completed by several sectoral agreements. They include - inter alia - the agreements on peaceful use of nuclear energy, on science and technology cooperation, on education and training as well as health and consumption. The long-standing fisheries problem was solved by 1999. The EU is Canada's second trade partner after the US. Investment has become the most significant element of the EU-Canada economic relationship. Canada is the fourth investor in the EU after the US, Switzerland, and Japan. The EU is the second investor in Canada (source: <europa.eu.int/comm/trade/issues/bilateral/countries/canada/-2/19/2005>). The high degree of consensus is demonstrated by the remarkably similar voting patterns enjoyed by the EU and Canada in the United Nations (voting together more than 95 % of the time during the last session of the UN General Assembly).

2. Contents of the HS Dialogue between the EU and Canada

The EU and Canada summarized the contents of their HS dialogue in Lisbon on June 26, 2000. They issued a joint statement on Human Security.

They stated that peace-building and conflict prevention will be accorded increasing priority in their external relations. They also want to integrate peace-building and conflict prevention into the respective dialogues with their partner countries and in multilateral fora. Furthermore, the EU and Canada will enhance the capacities of the UN, regional organisations as the OSCE as well as civil society organisations. They both recognise the potential of the private sector to contribute to peace and democratic stability.

2.1. De-Mining

In the field of de-mining, the EU and Canada have been leading the way towards the Convention on the prohibition of the use, stockpiling , production and transportation of personnel mines and their destruction.

Canada had been a champion of this process under Lloyd Axworthy's tenure as foreign minister. He had linked the issues of human security and de-mining in the mid-90s as a response to the challenge of land mines, which had increased during the 80s and early 90s:

“When a mine is stepped on, a chain reaction is set in motion. It begins with the mechanical pressure that triggers a detonator , igniting a booster charge of high-quality explosive material. The booster charge then sets off a more powerful explosion of trinitotulene , better known as TNT. Shock waves explode outward faster than high-velocity bullets, often at speeds of around 6,800 metres per second, driving metallic fragments, broken bones, bacteria, earth , and burning plastic into the victim's body” (Cameron 1998,p.2).

Canada succeeded in getting 74 states and a multitude of international organizations and NGOs to attend a conference “Toward a Global Ban on Anti-Personnel Mines”, which started the “Ottawa Process” . Currently 141 states are members of the agreement on the ban of Anti-Personnel-Mines. This success has to be seen as relative in the light of the still high number of victims (between 15 000 and 20 000 annually), but it shows the possibilities of a new kind

of diplomacy combining “middle-sized” states such as Canada and NGO’s efforts (Kreft 2003).

The EU has been a strong partner in this de-mining process. Until 2003 the European Commission spent more than 200 million € on de-mining, including at least 33 million to develop new de-mining technologies. More funds will be allocated to this priority until 2007. EU research projects focus on the development and testing of new detection tools to improve de-mining techniques. Canadian and EU experts have worked all over the world and particularly in Afghanistan, Angola, Cambodia , Iraq , and South-East Europe (cf. <europa.eu.int./comm/external_relations/mine>).

5

2.2. Small Arms and Light Weapons

In the area of small arms and light weapons the EU and Canada share a common concern to combat their spread and to destabilize accumulation.

In 2001 the EU and Canada issued a joint declaration on non-proliferation , arms control and disarmament. In this they stated:

“ The EU and Canada reaffirm the importance of combating destabilizing accumulations and uncontrolled spread of small arms and light weapons. They agree that this year’s UN Conference on illicit trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects should provide a new impetus for collective action on this front. Canada and the EU will continue their close and fruitful co-operation in this field , in particular under the framework of the joint Work Group on Small Arms and Light Weapons” (Source: <europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/canada/sum06_01/arms.htm>).

Whereas there seems to a limited success in the area of de-mining, this cannot be said for illicit trade in small arms and light weapons. On June 14, 2004, the EU Presidency Statement on this issue was:

“Three years after the adoption of the UN Programme of Action to Prevent, Combat and Eradicate the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All its Aspects, the problem of small arms and light weapons worldwide has, unfortunately, not diminished in any significant way . While statistics on this issue vary , reliable estimates show that the global stockpiles of these weapons amount today to over 600 million units. The European Union remains convinced that the excessive and destabilising accumulation and transfer of small arms and light weapons threaten international security, as well as socio-economic stability, and have very serious humanitarian implications” (source: <europa-eu-org/articles/pt/article_3604_pt.htm>).

2.3. Conflict Prevention

Conflict prevention has been added to the agenda of the EU-Canada dialogue since 2004. During the Irish EU presidency the EU stressed the importance of conflict prevention as a holistic concept covering not only security factors, but also humanitarian , human rights , political, and economic factors (cf.

<www.europaworld.org/week160/irishpresidency16104.htm>.) When the EU department of External Relations tried to summarize the political dialogue between the EU and Canada in 2004, it stated that “bilaterally, our foreign policy cooperation focuses on human security

questions” (<www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/canada/intro/5/14/2004>).

However, after the EU-Canada summit in March 2004 (the first with PM Paul Martin) neither human security nor conflict prevention were mentioned. The official overview of EU-Canada Relations issued by the EU department of external relations now presented a “partnership agenda” which contains four areas:

- foreign and security policy, effective global governance;
- justice and home affairs;
- reinvigorating global economic growth through multilateral trade talks;
- global challenges including climate change and poverty in developing countries.

(Source: <www.europa.eu.int/comm/external_relations/canada/intro/2/19/2005>).

3. Perspectives and Questions

Even though the discussions about HS and global governance are intertwined, this seems to indicate a reduced stress on HS, similar to the statement by the former Ambassador to Germany, Marie Bernard-Meunier: “...Canada is proud to be associated with the Human Security Agenda. But not at the exclusion of any other agenda” (Bernard-Meunier 2003, pp. 309-310).

This leads to the question, whether the dialogue on HS should be restricted to certain defined issues, such as de-mining, or whether it should be broader and understand HS more as political goal including strategic, social, and cultural aspects following the definitions of the HSN and the UN. This seems to be especially topical at a time at which the EU is more recognized as a transatlantic partner than ever and when leading EU politicians like Federal Chancellor Gerhard Schröder call repeatedly for an understanding of European integration not as an economic and political, but predominantly cultural project (cf. “Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung” (February 26, 2005).

4. Literature

Axworthy, Lloyd : Canada and Human Security. In: International Journal, No.2 /1997.

Bernard-Meunier, Marie : “The World has changed and Canada has changed with it” .In: Bredow 2003.

Bredow, Wilfried von (ed.) : Die Außenpolitik Kanadas. Wiesbaden (Westdeutscher Verlag) 2003.

Cameron, Maxwell et al., To Walk Without Fear. Toronto (Oxford UP) 1998.

Claas, Oliver : Human Security - Außenpolitik für ein neues Jahrhundert? In: Bredow 2003.

Graham, William: Notes for an Address by the Honourable Bill Graham, Minister of Foreign Affairs, to the Ambassadors of the Human Security Network, June 7, 2002 . In: <<http://webapps.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/minpub/publication.asp>>.

Hampson, Fen Osler / Dean F. Oliver : Pulpit diplomacy. In: "International Journal" , No. 3 / 1998.

Kaldor, Mary (convenor) : A Human Security Doctrine for Europe. Presented to the EU High Representative for Common Foreign and Security Policy, Barcelona, September 15 , 2004.

Kreft, Friederike : Das Abkommen über das Verbot von Antipersonenminen. In: Bredow 2003.

Larrinaga, Miguel de / Claire Turene Sjolander : (Re)presenting Landmines from Protector to Enemy: The Discursive Framing of a New Multilateralism. In: "Canadian Foreign Policy", No.3 / 1998,

Pettigrew, Pierre : Remarks by the Honourable Pierre Pettigrew, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Kimberley Process Plenary Meeting, Gatineau, Canada, October 27-29, 2004.

Tehrani, Majid (ed.) : Worlds Apart. Human Security and Global Governance. London / New York (Tauris) 1999.

./. Gransow.EU-CDN