

Introduction

The issue of security has probably been one of the most discussed, developed, supported and critiqued features of international relations since the beginning of the academic field of International Relations. As different notions of security have risen and evolved, it has become increasingly difficult to make a definition of its reach and impact both at the International and National levels. In a broad sense, “security implies the *state* of being protected that is achieved through various measures; *measures* aimed at guaranteeing protection from hazards; the *absence* of hazards and threats; the *qualitative* level of stability that has been attained.”¹

But the concept of security has become so multifaceted and intertwined that it currently comprises fields as different as “food security” (security from famine and malnutrition), “environmental security”, and “human security” as opposed to the traditional military security, which all seem to function both at the national and international level. As well as the security concept has changed and evolved, new threats to security have been identified, being Terrorism one of the world problems most discussed recently due to the difficulties it presents in regards to the way to prevent it or even to face it.

As a natural development of this surge of new security conceptualizations, new literature and theories have risen to explain and support such issues. This has also become true about new ways to assess traditional military security, since after the 9/11 attacks in United States territory, this concept of security has been challenged at levels it hadn't been challenged before due to the Terrorism variable. As Col. V.V. Bruz

¹ Col. V.V. Bruz, “Historiography of Security Problem Studies” (in Military Thought 2004) p. 149

acknowledged on the journal of *Military Thought*, “[a]nalysis of numerous sources and literature on the problem of security reveals that various theoretical and methodological approaches to studying this complex and multiaspect phenomenon have emerged. This is easy to see even on the level of definitions of the very notion of security.”² After the 9/11 attacks in the United States, National Security became the new hot topic to asses.

While the Cold War lasted, there was a clear path in which American foreign policy was directed towards pursuing the security goals and interests of the United States. There existed a traditional sense of military or armed security that seemed would prevail in American foreign policy, as William O. Chittick expressed at the time: “...the armament culture will have undue influence in making United States foreign policy.” The use of force in American foreign policy as a means to achieve national security seemed to be deeply rooted in American politics as “the politicization of security policy within the government manifests itself both in the militarism among all groups that deal directly with security policy and in the disproportionate number of Republicans and Independents in security positions...we cannot depend on civilians, partisanship, bipartisanship, or even professionalism to check or balance excesses in the use, or threat, of force.”³ This was especially true in an international arena in which the United States security depended largely on its confrontation with an opposing superpower: the USSR.

With the end of the Cold War the concept of security started to change as a response to a world that ceased to be bipolar to become the stage for the interaction between one major superpower and a collection of regional alliances, non-governmental

² Ibid

³ William O. Chittick, “The Politicization of Security Policy” (in *The Journal of Politics*, Vol. 50, No.1 (Feb., 1988), URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0022-3816%28198802%2950%3A1%3C180%3ATPOSP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Q>) p.180

actors and international organizations amongst others. The relation between economics, politics and security began to be questioned and studied in a world where militarism had been the sole concern. According to George Bush Senior's "New World Order", the stage for international relations gave way to possibilities of coalitions and cooperation for collective security that seemed to be feasible after the Persian Gulf War. However, at the beginning of the new century all those beliefs became suddenly challenged by one major event: the terrorist attacks on the World Trade Center on American soil. After the 9/11 attacks the whole concept of security seemed to have to be reconsidered, and take into account the very real possibility of security being breached from the inside. The United States engaged then in a kind of war that hadn't been under consideration before; the war on terrorism.

This situation is also affecting complementing concepts, such as International peacebuilding and peacekeeping, which are being revisited and their strategies are being redesigned in order to fulfill a greater role in international security. Peacekeeping and peacebuilding have ceased to be supported merely on the grounds of humanitarianism to increasingly become tools to prevent future conflict and thus contribute to international security. Peacekeeping had become very important in terms of international security to several countries, particularly for Canada, once it was established that UN peace operations are "positively correlated with democratization processes after civil war, and multilateral enforcement operations are usually successful in ending the violence,"⁴ contributing to stability and enhancing the prospects of security in a world of perpetual

⁴ Michael W. Doyle, and Nicholas Sambanis. "International Peacebuilding: A Theoretical and Quantitative Analysis" (in *The American Political Science Review*, Vol. 94, No.4 (Dec., 2000), 779-801. Available online URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0003-0554%28200012%2994%3A4%3C779%3AIPATAQ%3E2.0.CO%3B2-7>) p. 779

conflicts and confrontations. Canada was, therefore, one of the first and foremost advocates of peacekeeping and peacebuilding as one of the first governments to recognize their relationship with security, stability and development, and launched the Canadian Peacebuilding Initiative in 1996.

The Canadian government thus developed a more active foreign policy as well as new strategies to deal with world peace and world security problems. One of the concepts that became preponderant in the Canadian security agenda was that of Human Security. The decade of the 1990's then marked the beginning of Canada's mandate to protect the individual and construct Human Security, emphasizing on the individual's security and well being in contrast with the more traditional view of security which makes the security of individuals secondary to that of the State. However, after the 9/11 attacks and the new emphasis on Terrorism, pursuing a human security agenda has become increasingly difficult for Canada, since human security implies allocating resources that should-according to human security detractors-be better spent on the War on Terrorism.

This concept has also been questioned and criticized by politicians as well as scholars who consider human security to be contradictory to the national interest, or even counterproductive due to its notorious clash with more rooted concepts such as sovereignty, and they worry that this initiative might “encourage unwarranted interference in the internal affairs of other states, issuing a ‘blank cheque for virtually limitless UN interventionism.’ In fact, the potential for greater human insecurity may be fostered, ‘as governments fortify against a possible intervention by repressing their populations into servility’.”⁵ Needless to say, acceptance of the human security concept

⁵ Walter Dorn, Human Security: An Overview 2001
(URL: http://www.rmc.ca/academic/gradrech/dorn24_e.html)

amongst other nations has also faced difficulties since many of them consider that it might interfere with their national interests and sovereignty by giving the United Nations greater faculties to intervene in internal conflicts.

The United Nations and the importance of international cooperation, however, have not gone unscathed after the 9/11 attacks either. After the United States unilateral decision to invade Iraq, opinions seem to be divided between those who consider that the UN charter and the whole concept of collective security is being ripped apart, rising questions about the role of the Security Council and the relationship between collective security and self-defense and the impact of the latest US actions in the development of international law, while other scholars critique such a pessimistic outlook and sustain that the US themselves seem to be recognizing and reconsidering the need for multilateralism and collective security,⁶ this particularly being true on the war on terrorism. Either way, the whole concept of security and its international and national implications has been challenged and is experiencing changes throughout the world.

This new scenario and concern for international and national security has given birth to new strategies such as the Proliferation Security Initiative (PSI), an attempt to control illegal distribution of weapons of mass destruction via aircrafts or sea vessels with the cooperation of the signatory countries.⁷ However, not all approaches and strategies respond to the same interests and commitments. While the rest of the world seems to be still intent on collective security and the use of international organizations

⁶Carsten Stahn, "Enforcement of the Collective Will after Iraq" (in The American Journal of International Law, Vol.97, No.4 (Oct., 2003), 804-823. Available online URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9300%28200310%2997%3A4%3C804%3AEOTCWA%3E2.0.CO%3B2-E>) p.822

⁷ Michael, Byers. "Policing the High Seas: The Proliferation Security Initiative" (in The American Journal of International Law, Vol. 98, No.3 (Jul., 2004), 526-545. Available online URL: <http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9300%28200407%2998%3A3%3C526%3APHTSTP%3E2.0.CO%3B2-U>) p.528

such as the United Nations, there seems to be certain ambivalence on the United States' security strategy for the future, based on preemption and the war on terrorism abroad but also reconsidering the implications of security at home; calling for world cooperation against terrorists and rogue states but unilaterally deciding to invade Iraq. At the same time, Canada's already difficult position as an advocator of human security and peacebuilding becomes more problematic since "humanitarian efforts that are not immediately connected with national interests could be regarded as a diversion from pressing new security challenges,"⁸ not to mention budget restrictions.

Moreover, this new crisis of security seems to be challenging the traditional security agendas that had been successfully pursued by specific countries, such as Canada and the United States, forcing them to re-establish their security agendas in terms of this new security outlook. However, this transition is by no means unproblematic: the United States and particularly Canada face the challenge to adapt their new security strategies and policies to the goals and interests they had traditionally pursued. For the United States it has meant to run over civil liberties and confrontation with the international community; whilst for Canada it has meant to pursue a human security agenda without becoming or representing a high security threat for its southern neighbor.

The changes that both foreign policies have experienced seem to have confronted the traditional partners at some points of the security arena. Canada has a domestic interest to pursue the human security agenda and continue with its political asylum and refugee policies, but for the United States the prospect of having unchecked foreign nationals admitted virtually unchallenged in Canada has raised serious concern for their

⁸ S. Neil Macfarlane, Thielking, Carolin J and Weiss, Thomas G. "The Responsibility to Protect: is anyone interested in humanitarian intervention?" (in Third World Quarterly (Vol. 25, No.5,2004)) p.977

national security. The once largest unprotected border of the world is now part of a border-security strategy as the United States attempts to prevent further attacks coming from inside American territory, but Canadian foreign policy and security strategies seem to have become more relevant for U.S. foreign policymakers as well.

As experts have encouraged “closer military-to-military relationships and other forms of nation-state cooperation”⁹ to ensure the United States security in the past, in the Age of Terrorism bilateral cooperation with its northern neighbor has become even more relevant. Meanwhile, Canada acknowledges the need to cooperate with its southern neighbor on hemispheric security issues, but is still intent on distinguishing itself from the United States and its policies, as has been demonstrated by Prime Minister Paul Martin’s decline to participate in the 'Star Wars' missile defense system proposed by the United States. After 9/11 both countries have redefined their security agendas in order to respond to both domestic and foreign interests, but it has yet to be assessed how these changes have affected, if so, the bilateral relation.

The significance of this research, therefore, relies on the better understanding of the United States and Canada bilateral relation in terms of foreign policy and international security in a post 9/11 world, as well as of the developments their security agendas have gone through from the Cold War and the end of the bipolar conflict to the era of international terrorism. In terms of hypothesis and sub-hypothesis, we will seek to reveal that after the 9-11 attacks both the United States and Canada have been forced to make substantial changes in their post-Cold War security agendas that present some inconsistencies with previous interests and objectives. In addition, changes after the 9/11

⁹Douglas Johnston Ed. Foreign Policy into the 21st Century: The U.S. Leadership Challenge (Washington DC: The Center for Strategic & International Studies, September 1996.) p.21

attacks have hardened US foreign policy towards Canada in terms of security and the war on terrorism has forced Canada to reformulate its foreign policy in terms of human security due to US exigencies on the bilateral relation and the war on terrorism. Lastly, we will see that even though Canada has moved towards greater cooperation with the US in security issues, its domestic interests will prevent it from fully complying with its southern neighbor's security agenda.

With this purpose, Chapter I will examine different concepts and notions of security, ranging from national and collective security to analyzing the concept of human security, necessary to understand the Canadian security agenda. Chapter I will also address Terrorism as a threat to security and its implications both in its older inception and the new meaning it has attained after the 9/11 attacks.

Chapter II is an overview of United States foreign policy from the end of the Cold War to the post-post-Cold War era or the Age of Terrorism. We will broadly examine major trends in US security agenda and its evolution to George Bush's National Security Strategy. At the end of Chapter II we will examine the changes undergone in US foreign policy due to the 9/11 attacks and we will analyze some of the aspects in which US foreign policy towards Canada has changed in order to serve its interests for waging the War on Terrorism.

Canadian foreign policy is dealt with in Chapter III, in which as in Chapter II, Canada's security agenda in the post-Cold War period is outlined. Chapter III analyses human security through the Canadian foreign policy agenda and examines Canada's limits and challenges as well as the critiques that have been made towards its position in world issues. Lastly, we will also examine the way in which US foreign policy towards

Canada has changed but from the Canadian perspective, as well as the way in which US pressure have managed to shift Canadian foreign policy from its traditional posture.

The conclusions sum up the changes that Canadian foreign policy and its security agenda have gone through as a result from the transformations in the international arena after the 9/11 attacks, particularly due to US pressures.