Future Japan-Canada Cooperation in the New Security Environment

Toshiya Hoshino
Osaka School of International Public Policy
Osaka University

Introduction

The terrorist attacks that happened on September 11, 2001 in the United States have significantly altered the discourse on peace and security both in national and international contexts. It was indeed a shocking event by which the "impenetrability" of America's homeland was so easily proven a myth. In fact, the terrorists had taken advantage of all the virtues that the people in the United States proudly offer—a free and open society, equal opportunities, technological prowess, and economic prosperity, etc.—for their vicious ambition. Those who lost their lives in the attacks, and countless others who were severely injured, were nationals from more than eighty countries. They will be remembered, together with the empty space of "Ground Zero" in lower Manhattan, where the twin towers of the World Trade Center were, as the most tragic testimony of the threat of international terrorism.

Much has been said about the world changing since the "9-11" attacks. Indeed, many governments have reviewed their security threat priorities, the scope of their security strategies, and the mode of operations that employ military assets. Today, anti-terrorism is seen at or near the top of many agendas and it is viewed as a matter of war fighting instead of crime fighting. The United States' military campaign in Afghanistan has entered a new stage, after the defeat of the Taliban regime, of further pursuing and curtailing the remaining terrorist network. Japan, departing from its previous tendency of responding with "too little, too late" to international crises, has quickly taken a pro-active role by enacting the Counter-Terrorism Special Measures Law, which enabled Tokyo to dispatch its Maritime Self-Defense Forces to the Indian Ocean to supply fuel to the US and UK naval vessels operating in the region. This action should be interpreted as Japan's own initiative to join the war against terrorism, well beyond the usual rationale of "supporting its principal ally, the United States," and to move away from the perceived "fear of entrapment." Japan and Canada, two important members in the Asia-Pacific region as well as in the G-8, have been instrumental in building consensus on measures to be taken to promote anti-terrorism. Canada's G8 presidency in the years 2002-2003 will provide an excellent opportunity to demonstrate leadership in a global scope.

This paper is mainly intended to do two things. One is to identify the nature of today's "new security environment," particularly after the "9-11" tragedy. The other is to look at areas of potential Japan-Canada cooperation for promoting peace and security. Based on their common alliances with the United States, commitment to multilateral diplomacy in regional and global arenas, and strong interest in promoting humanitarian perspectives in pursuing peace and security agendas, Japan and Canada will have a number of areas of collaboration and complementation. In this paper, the author will be looking at five broadly defined areas: anti-terrorism, arms control and non-proliferation, human

security, peace building, and others. It is to be hoped that many practical ideas are presented in the course of this one-and-a-half-day symposium that will eventually help widen our bilateral ties in the areas of peace and security.

Nature of New Security Environment

It is probably too much to say that every fundamental aspect of security environment has changed since the "9-11" attacks. Many signs of new developments were taking shape during the decade after the end of Cold War. Therefore, in my view, what we are seeing as the new security environment in the wake of "9-11" is the convergence of forces, both positive and negative, that have been characteristically developing mostly during the last decade or so since the end of the Cold War. What, then, are those forces of change? Here I would like to discuss five of them: (1) the growing depth and scope of globalization, (2) the increase in failed and rogue states, (3) the escalation of international terrorist activities, (4) the renewed attention on the human aspect of security, and (5) the combined forces of unipolarity and unilateralism in the US' external relations.

Under these five forces lies the changing status of the sovereign nation-state in the international system. There is no denying that states will remain the fundamental unit/actor in international relations. It is true that, as Stephen Krasner rightly points out, state sovereignty has never been absolute, and it is for this reason that he called sovereignty, in a somewhat cynical sense, an organized hypocrisy. However, it can be said, in this era of globalization, that state sovereignty can be pressured both from within and from without. For instance, the impact of non-state actors' activities would characterize a challenge to state sovereignty from within. Other pressures come from outside state sovereignty not only from trans-national non-state actors but also from other state actors. What I am referring to is the debate over "international intervention," the right, duty, and responsibility to alter what used to be considered as strictly the domestic/internal affairs of a state. No conclusion has been reached, but there is a growing awareness of the practical "necessity" of intervention in extreme situations in spite of the legal demand to observe the sanctity of state sovereignty.

With these as background factors, let us quickly review the salient points of the above five forces.

<u>Globalization</u>: There are a number of definitions of globalization. Moreover, it can be seen both from optimistic and from more cautious perspectives. Here I would borrow Stanley Hoffmann's interpretation of the concept, in which he identifies its three forms: economic globalization, cultural globalization, and political globalization. Economic globalization is the product of recent revolutions in technology, information, trade, foreign investment, and international business. It creates profits, but it does entail questions of unequal distribution of those profits. Cultural globalization poses the choice between uniformization (often termed "Westernization" or "Americanization) and diversity. While it would not be correct to reduce the matter of cultural globalization to the like or dislike of Western culture, it can present a perception that threatens (or even challenges) people as much as it attracts them. Political globalization,

in Hoffmann's view, can take two forms. One is characterized by "the preponderance of the United States and its political institutions," and the other by "a vast array of international and regional organizations and transgovernmental networks." I would like to discuss the power of the United States more below. What we need to be aware of is the rise of political forces of various natures that can easily overwhelm the power of an individual state, i.e. sovereign state prerogatives. No further discussion of globalization is necessary. We can simply emphasize here that globalization has become a fact of life today more than ever.

Failed and Rogue States: In the past, we witnessed with sadness the tragedy of authoritarian and even tyrannical rule in a number of countries. It all happened within the wall of state sovereignty. Many criticisms were made, but not much was done, partly due to excuses derived from the convenient principle of "non-intervention in internal affairs," convenient in terms of justifying the maintenance of the status quo on the part of the regime in question and of rationalizing inaction on the part of outside actors. The Cold War environment prevented outside forces from intervening in domestic controversies because, in such a competitive and confrontational rivalry between East and West, any intervention to alter the delicate balance could escalate into a direct collision between the two superpowers, the US and the Soviet Union, with the worse case scenario involving the use of nuclear weapons.

The end of the Cold War has significantly transformed the big picture of the international system. Out of the transformation have come states (or their regimes, to be precise) that are either too weak (to sustain their governing authority/mechanisms, thus "failed states") or too strong (in terms of wielding dictatorial power domestically and violating international standards, thus "rogue states.") Today, there said to be seven such failed states: Afghanistan, Angola, Burundi, the Democratic Republic of Congo, Liberia, Sierra Leone, and Sudan. Similarly, rogue states would include Iraq, Iran, North Korea (the three so-called "Axis of Evil" states as depicted by US President George W. Bush) together with Cuba, Libya, and others. These states have now become a serious source of concern as they (mainly the failed states) are likely to become a breeding ground for international terrorists, while rogue states (particularly Iraq, Iran, and North Korea) are watched closely so that they do not use or transfer to others their WMDs (weapons of mass destruction such as nuclear, biological, chemical and radioactive weapons as well as missiles and other delivery systems).

International Terrorist Activities: I will not go into much detail in this section as this entire symposium is devoted to the emergence of these intractable non-state groups, but a couple of points still need to be stressed. First, they have accumulated their current power and resources in the process of globalization (particularly the economic, technological, and informational sides of it) that they demonize. Second, the intensity of their violence has become virtually limitless, with no respect for moral constraints. Nothing more explicitly demonstrates the latter point than the premeditated catastrophic attacks by the Al Qaeda group.

Human Security: Human security is the idea of giving the question of human dignity first priority when contemplating a policy to enhance security. In actuality, "putting

people first" in security is supposed to be the prime concern in the making of every security policy. However, human history is filled with tragedies in which people were the first victims. Recent history has been no exception. The last decade was a period of instability in many parts of the world, during which a myriad of violent conflicts and incidents took place: genocide in Africa, "ethnic cleansing" in Southeast Europe, religious intolerance in Asia, and most recently, the devastating terrorist attacks in America. All of them constitute what may be called "complex humanitarian emergencies," complex in terms of their consequences as well as their root causes.

As is well documented, the government of Japan has incorporated the concept of human security into the pillars of its foreign policy since the late 1990s. The Japanese government describes human security as "a concept that focuses on the viewpoints of individuals to protect them from those threats to human lives, livelihoods, and dignity and to bring out the full potential of each individual." It was late Prime Minister Keizo Obuchi who first employed this idea, albeit in a somewhat informal manner, during the so-called "Ottawa Process" for international efforts to eliminate anti-personnel land mines, and then more formally in his efforts to help restore the security of people in East Asia following the shocks of the 1997 Asian economic crisis. The Human Security Trust Fund was created within the United Nations, with Japan serving as the only donor to the fund, to help promote humanitarian/human security-related projects conducted by UN organizations and agencies. Also established was the Commission on Human Security headed jointly by Dr. Sadako Ogata (Former UN High Commissioner for Refugees) and Dr. Amartia Sen (Nobel Laureate in Economics) to direct global policies to promote human security interests.

The human security idea strongly echoes UN Secretary-General Kofi Annan's 1999 discussion on "the two concepts of sovereignty", one obviously being state sovereignty and the other the sovereignty of the "individual" human being. One note of caution is that virtually no experts on human security say that human security will replace state (national) security. It should be noted that most frequently human security interests are protected when national governments sufficiently maintaining their governance structure.

There is no secret that the human security concept is taken rather differently in Japan and Canada in the sense that the former places more stress on policies related to "freedom of want" and the latter on "freedom from fear." Nevertheless, there should be a consensus that both of these aspects of security are an indispensable part of enhancing the security of individuals. Therefore, combined and complementary efforts are required between those interested in pursuing this policy, which certainly include Japan and Canada.

<u>US Unipolarity and Unilateralism</u>: It was still in the early days of the post-Cold War era that one article in the Winter 1990/91 issue of *Foreign Affairs* caught the attention of a large number of readers across the world. At the time, the crisis in the Persian Gulf, triggered by Iraq's invasion of Kuwait, already dominated daily news and international press coverage. The article had a simple but highly eye-catching title that seemed to seize the atmosphere of the time: "The Unipolar Moment," written by Charles

Krauthammer, a syndicated columnist. It was a strong statement stressing that "(t)he most striking feature of the post-Cold War world is its unipolarity. …Now is the unipolar moment." No elaboration was necessary to get the message: it was the United States that was at the center of gravity in the unipolar world.

Today, just over a decade has passed since the original article was published, and even after "9-11," empirically speaking, the United States has maintained the mightiest position since the end of the Cold War in terms of both its economic prowess and military projection. If indeed Krauthammer's characterization of US foreign policy practices is correct, however, what we have witnessed in George W. Bush's presidency can be taken as yet another twist in U.S. unipolarity in dealing with international issues, namely, "the unilateral moment," a time in history characterized mostly by unilateral actions by Washington. Examples of the "unilateral" pursuit of foreign policy initiatives of global relevance (or withdrawal from multilateralism) were evident even in the early months of the Bush presidency, from the promotion of a proposed missile defense (MD) system and a revision or abandonment of the Anti-Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty with Russia to facilitate the MD initiative, to the rejection of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Then came the US-led military actions in Afghanistan. Operation Enduring Freedom began on October 7, 2001, targeting Al Qaeda terrorist training camps and military installations of the country's Taliban regime. Since the demise of the regime, Washington has shifted its attention to closely monitoring developments in Baghdad and has publicly referred to the necessity of "regime change" in Saddam Hussein's Iraq.

Today, President Bush has taken a discreet position of respecting multilateralism by obtaining UN Security Council Resolution 1441, adopted unanimously on November 8, 2002, and providing Iraq a "last opportunity" to change its attitudes, even while formally reserving all the rights and options for unilateral and pre-emptive actions (if needed) in his *National Security Strategy* document released September 20. It should be remembered that the unipolar-unilateral option is not the only one that Washington can take. It would be useful to contemplate how best we can convince the US to pursue the wisdom of unipolar-but-multilateral, thus more legitimate, options.

Agenda for Japan-Canada Cooperation

Having reviewed all five forces that are jointly at work to form the post-"9-11" security environment, I would like to discuss concrete issue areas and policy options in which Japan and Canada can cooperate to effectively counter international terrorism and address associated issues. During the discussions in the present symposium, we have learned that our fight against terrorism on a global scale requires comprehensive efforts. Professor Naofumi Miyasaka called the battle the "New Total War," covering all such areas as diplomacy, law enforcement, military, and intelligence. Also pointed out in the sessions was the necessity of coping with terrorist challenges in a seamless fashion from crisis prevention to consequence management, and further down to reconstruction and rehabilitation. In a realistic sense, it is not possible to eliminate international terrorism,

but that should not deter us from collaborating further to create a world that is highly resilient to insidious acts of terror. The matrix below is a basic framework of policies that Japan and Canada should take, in a collaborative or coordinated manner, to effectively respond to future terrorist challenges.

We can identify a number of concrete policy options that will fill this matrix. The ideas behind this framework may be simple, but it is still very important to reflect upon them as they explain why Japan-Canada collaboration is useful. Three features can be identified. First, both Japan and Canada share basic policy orientations. Admitting certain differences in emphasis, no other two countries share so many interests in arms control, human security, and peace building in addition to the immediate objective of countering international terrorism. We should realize that our two nations' policy interests have far more similarities than differences. Second is their commitment to multilateralism in the G8 and in regional (such as ARF and APEC in the Asia-Pacific region) and global (such as the United Nations) settings. There can be many avenues by which Tokyo and Ottawa can collaborate in navigating the discussions at these multilateral forums. Last but not least

Framework of Japan-Canada Cooperation in Counter-Terrorism

Forum / Policy Areas	Individual	Bilateral	Multilateral		
	Japan/Canada	Japan+Canada	At G8	Regional level	Global level
Counter-Terrorism	A	B	C	D	E
Arms Control (WMD and Small Arms)	F	G	H	I	J
Human Security	K	L	M	N	O
Peace Building	P	Q	R	S	T

are their close alliance relationships with the United States. As seen above, there is a strong tendency on the part of Washington recently to keep all options open, including taking unilateral and preemptive actions in the unipolar international system. However, the fact that the world is unipolar does not guarantee the automatic success of everything the United States aspires to achieve. The fight against terrorism is the best example. It would be the role of Japan and Canada to collaborate with the United States in engaging in this difficult task on a multilateral basis (thus lending it more international political legitimacy) as the situation allows.

Back to the matrix, Japan and Canada can initiate various policy options. Since colleagues from both sides have expressed many ideas, I will simply enumerate some basic menu items for cooperation. This is by no means an exhaustive list, but Japan and Canada can pursue these options in bilateral and multilateral (G8, regional, and global) settings.

<u>Anti-terrorism</u>:

- Law enforcement cooperation (including the curtailing of financial links)
- Operational (military-to-military) cooperation
- Information/intelligence sharing (on terrorist groups and rogue states)
- Public awareness and information dissemination on anti-terrorism activities

Arms Control:
- Non-proliferation efforts (esp. on CBRN and missiles)
- Control of small arms (cf. a new regional arms registry system to foreclose the black market)

Human Security:
- Elaboration of the "responsibility to protect"
- Elaboration of the "responsibility to empower"
- Reinterpretation of the notion of "international intervention"

Peace Building:
- Bridging the gap between the post-conflict phase and the development phase
- Disarmament, Demobilization, Reintegration, and Rehabilitation (DDRR) programs
- Transitional administration of weak states (for reinstituting governance and the rule of law)
- Promoting "endogenous democratization"
- Media training
- Capacity building of local technocrats
- Education for reconciliation and toleration + dialogue among civilizations

Others
- Overall defense cooperation (particularly navy-to-navy cooperation)
- Exchange of security experts
- Track II expert research projects on relevant policy issues

Conclusion

Our fight against terrorism will require many efforts. It certainly involves immediate actions to pursue those perpetrators who may be conceiving their next conspiracies. Stringent measures have to be employed to let them know that their acts of terror will not pay. A united front against terrorism is required most of all. No space for driving a wedge into our coalition should be left open. For this purpose, I believe it extremely important to devote our resources to dealing with more structural and human security-related agenda items as well. I say this not because those questions of human insecurity would constitute root causes for terrorism but because terrorists can easily exploit these human grievances to justify their deadly agendas. We should not give excuses to those who are waiting for "a clash of civilizations" to actually happen and for social injustice to go out of control.

It will take additional leadership, ownership and partnership to break new ground in our fight against the global chains of terrorist networks. Japan and Canada have ample power to exercise their leadership roles both intellectually and materially. Each has a

distinctive identity and policy traditions that would characterize its respective ownership. At the same time, though, we should be encouraged to see that Japanese and Canadian views are close enough to allow mutually complementary or collaborative roles as partners in pursuing a common goal. In this spirit, Japan and Canada can make effective differences in the new security environment.