UNSETTLED BALANCE
Ethics, Security, and Canada's International Relations

Edited by Rosalind Warner

UBCPress · Vancouver · Toronto

Contents

Ethics and Security
New Issues and Contexts for Decision Making

ROSALIND WARNER

This book was prompted by a wave of international changes over the last few years that have profoundly influenced Canada's international relations. The wars on terror, economic crises, climate change, and humanitarian emergencies have challenged decision makers to think clearly about the ethics of ensuring security. The force of events has pushed decision makers in unexpected, sometimes even unimaginable, directions. This book is an effort to make sense of these changing circumstances by applying the analytical lens of ethics and security to Canada's international relations. It looks back to the debates of the 1990s and carries the discourse forward in entirely new ways suited to the present state of flux.

The literature on Canadian foreign policy often describes a broad opposition between ethics and security. This book takes a somewhat contrary view, arguing that the two are closely linked. Within the literature on Canada's international relations and foreign policy, these concepts have been given a variety of treatments. Ethics have been discussed in terms of values (Geislerova 2001; Lee 2002; Michaud 2011); moral vision (Pratt 2001); norms (Howard and Neufeldt 2011; Knight 2001); and even myths, mirages, or brands (Turenne-Sjolander and Trevenen 2011). Opinions on the role of ethics in foreign policy decision making have been celebratory, critical, and even dismissive. Nevertheless, clear thinking on the ethics-security nexus remains necessary and vital, given its importance. In contradistinction to some views, this book begins with the observation that ethics and security

are intimately linked in processes of decision making. This is because policies are not made in an ethical vacuum; rather, decisions in a democracy call for elaboration and justification. Human relationships are necessarily developed within an ethical soup of interpretation, judgment, and expectation. Analysts are tasked with the job of making sense of these contexts. To this end, the following book presents three general reasons for adopting an ethics-security lens on Canada's international relations: the need for attention to the scope of ethics, the need for multilevel approaches, and the necessity of addressing the purposes of decision making.

First, the scope of ethics impinges on decision making. Some analysts and decision makers, steeped in the academic paradigm of realism, might argue that only considerations of national interest should be used to determine or study policy, with minimal or no reference to ethics. Others argue that ethics are unavoidable, and largely implicit, elements of decision making (Smith and Light 2001). Another approach asks not whether there are "more" or "less" ethics in a given decision but how means, ends, and relationships are determined through the process of decision making. Given a particular decision, are the ethics coherent and comprehensible? Whose ethics are represented? In some ways, framing the question as an "either-or" proposition sheds little light on the matter. Framing the question in more complex ways recognizes that ethics might be circumscribed by events and capacities but also takes account of the implicit, interpretive, and constitutive nature of human interactions.[1]

Canada's scope for action is sometimes viewed as circumscribed by its size and structural position relative to other actors. As analysts have asked, what capacity does Canada have to effect change, and what ability does it have to respond effectively to shifts in circumstances (Hawes 1984; Molot 1990, 77; Stairs 1994, 13–15)? At times, Canada has surprised analysts by expanding its influence, revealing that the country's "range of motion" for acting in the world has been wider than anticipated. At other times, it has seemed that ethical action has been heavily limited by international constraints. In addition, there have been times when Canada's stance on human rights, the environment, equity, and democracy, for example, has been received more favourably than at other times. There have also been times when Canada has appeared more circumspect in the face of perceived "crusading" by the United States. Canada has variously been both a decision *maker* and a decision *taker.* Ethical considerations are at the heart of explanations for these varying stances. For example, it is difficult to explain how and why Canada was able to advance the acceptance of the International

Criminal Court without referring to evolving international and domestic norms, the values of human rights, changing notions of impunity, and the principle of the rule of law (Knight 2001 and this volume). A focus on ethics can inform an analysis of how and why Canada has apparently been able to "climb out" of limiting circumstances and move the international community in new, different directions. Canada can take advantage of opportunities where they arise and choose to accept or reject limitations on the scope of ethical behaviour. Ethical arguments and considerations have consequential impacts on Canada's identity, capability, and positioning (see, e.g., Wendt 1992).

A parallel, though less prominent, debate in the literature concerns to what degree policy should (or can) reflect values per se (Lee 2002). In this debate, values are sometimes framed in an instrumental fashion as a kind of *lever* exercised through the use of soft power (Michaud 2011, 435). Following Michaud, one might explore values in terms of their properties: are they elite focused, public, longer term or shorter term, core or peripheral, et cetera? However, such a description of values and their role should be distinguished from an exploration of the *ethics* of decision making. Explaining and labelling the values at work in a given decision can provide a better understanding of the context for decisions. However, the ethical questions that swirl around so-called Canadian values arise not from their explanatory power but from their essential incompatibility. For example, Michaud (2011, 436) suggests that Canadians value human rights and diversity as a goal of foreign policy. They also value, he argues, the rule of law and international consensus over "the rule of power" (437). What is one to make of decisions that put these values in conflict? An ethical analysis requires the scholar to inquire into the essential dilemmas of choosing one priority over another. Evaluating the ethics of decisions is therefore both an empirical process and a normative process. Although there is often a broad conflict between national capabilities and ethical actions (between what *can* be done and what *should* be done), analysts should avoid a kind of essentialism that reduces genuine ethical dilemmas to a predetermined conflict between idealism on the one hand and realism on the other.

Questions of capability are relevant to an ethical analysis. Decision makers must be pragmatic and prudent as well as "good." However, this is not the same as saying that ethics should be excluded from consideration (Smith and Light 2001, 1–2) or that they have no relevance. Describing the relationship between ethics and security as a "balance" suggests that managing the poles of ethics and security involves making trade-offs and confronting "win

or lose" dilemmas. This can oversimplify and lead to overgeneralization (see Wark 2006, 1). However, seeing ethics in terms of trade-offs can also reveal much about the dilemmas facing decision makers. The framing of security in one way or another, the identification of one threat or another, activates a particular set of ethical considerations that apply to that circumstance. Security can be defined narrowly and lead to a focus within the field of action on specific concerns and issues. However, this can also bind actors into set patterns of decision making that risk neglecting threats and vulnerabilities that emerge from outside this field of action. Focusing on one set of problems might allow other threats to develop. A lack of imagination can lead to rigidities and inflexibilities in policy that violate the call for prudence. At the same time, pursuing one priority over another can also lead to more ethical questions concerning focus (see Black and Tiessen, this volume). Invoking a wider scope for ethical decision making allows for a more flexible response. Yet a wider scope can mean that priorities are spread too thinly and purposes become muddied, sacrificing ethical coherence. The presuppositions, and their ethical variants, that inform decision making have consequences for the scope of action and the ability to address problems as they arise. In sum, ethical considerations have an important impact on Canada's capabilities, the assessment of values, and the calculation of threats. An analysis of the scope for ethical action involves taking the linkage between ethics and security seriously.

A second important reason for using an ethics-security lens on Canada's international relations is the necessity of managing governance at multiple levels. This remains an enduring analytical, ethical, and practical problem. The borders between domestic and international spheres of governance are porous, with lines of demarcation that are heavily contested. This is apparent in the emergence of new vocal actors, networks of intergovernmental agreements, and shifting international norms. Transnational advocacy networks now operate globally and are increasingly visible, articulating new norms and challenging states to respect established norms and laws (Keck and Sikkink 1998). With the growth of global civil society actors, the number of voices (if not the votes) that confront governments has grown exponentially. The intervention of more actors raises ethical questions about the standing of groups, their legitimacy in representing various populations, and their ability to impact events. These interventions (and sometimes partnerships) invite questions of whom and what interests are legitimately represented in decision making. If civil society actors claim to hold states to "higher" ethical standards than those of the national interest, then it remains to be

answered which causes and ethical projects will be taken up (Glasius 2009, 161). People and governments are affected by agenda priorities in various ways. Managing political issues of representation and legitimacy at multiple levels remains an ongoing challenge for decision making, one in which ethics occupy an increasingly prominent place because of the potential for self-defeating actions and cross-purposes.

States find themselves enmeshed in multiple transgovernmental relationships requiring management and monitoring in which the traditional state imperatives and functions are increasingly outmoded. The pursuit of national security means addressing a foundation of cross-cutting international rules, laws, institutions, and norms (Wendt 1992). States are confronted with new vulnerabilities such as fiscal crises and environmental threats, which the infrastructure of defence and national security is ill equipped to solve. Evolving new threats are not well addressed by a conservative, inward-focused, state-based system because these threats often emerge from the networked relationships that states themselves construct. Identifying risks, addressing threats, making priorities, and responding effectively involve a mix of ethical and practical judgments that cuts across the domestic and the international. Addressing these complexities need not mean a diminishment of sovereignty but can mean a realignment of sovereignty (see Knight, Stoett, this volume). The emergence, advocacy, and acceptance of the responsibility to protect (R2P) norm constitute one example of the effort to reconcile new humanitarian intervention norms with state sovereignty norms (see Knight, this volume). The system increasingly involves trade-offs among domestic demands, national imperatives, and evolving and sometimes conflicting norms and ethics of international stability and security.

A third reason for examining ethics and security arises from the need to consider the purposes of policy decision making. A wider scope and more complex layers of decision making can imply greater selectivity among priorities. Selectivity in turn implies some criteria for determining the relative value of different goals and purposes. Even when made up of specific decisions, policies must attract some degree of coherence and "fit." If Canada is to have an impact on the world, then action cannot be purely reactive or reflexive but must involve some degree of rationalization, explanation, and planning for the longer term. What degree of coherence can reasonably be expected is an open question given the nature of world events. Yet by no means is there agreement about how decisions are actually made. Theories that expound the notion of a unified rational actor, organizational

or bureaucratic processes, or ideational factors abound (see Allison 1971; Jervis 1968; Waltz 2001). Nevertheless, when the view from inside the country and the view from outside the country are starkly at odds, or when past and present policy stances depart from each other too much, it is more difficult to sustain an effective national purpose. Ethical coherence is important, however, for more than just the sake of appearance. For example, Canada might claim to be *focusing* its development assistance while simultaneously *weakening* its effectiveness (see Black and Tiessen, this volume). If aid becomes less effective rather than more effective, then there can be a loss of support for such efforts and an erosion of confidence among donors and recipients. Ultimately, the original decision to change focus becomes self-defeating. The government might claim to be enforcing strict environmental regulations on companies, but if it ignores violations it risks undermining itself and future efforts to make new environmental laws. Incoherence across many levels increases vulnerability to unexpected shocks or events. Inconsistency across many fields can effectively incapacitate the functional abilities of the state to maintain security, or accomplish other goals, over the long term. In addition to considering the scope for ethics and the implications of multiple layers of governance, then, governments are increasingly called upon to maintain coherence across short-term and long-term purposes.

Clear thinking on the questions of ethics and security is essential to the study of statecraft. The agenda since 2001 has changed in scope, character, and framing. New security challenges, from terrorism to climate change, are posing ethical dilemmas that (despite their importance) are not fully appreciated in the study of Canada's international relations. The context for decision making is fundamentally different. However, there remain perennial questions facing Canadian international and security policy. The chapters in this book address three of these questions. What are the meanings of "ethics" and "security," how are they linked, and how should they be linked? To what extent have considerations of ethics and security changed in the twenty-first century? What are the implications of a shifting historical context for Canada's international relations? *Unsettled Balance* carries the discourse that began in the 1990s through to the present day. It prompts attention to a relatively neglected dimension of Canada's international relations: the relationship between ethical concerns and security concerns. It considers the "practical politics" involved in decision making in a rapidly changing global context. All of the contributors share a concern that improving Canada's relationship with the rest of the world involves consciously and

systematically considering the linkage between ethics and security. The contributors develop their work based upon a common premise – that decision making will be shaped as much by ethical arguments about rights, obligations, norms, and values as by national interest. The chapters demonstrate as well that questions of ethics and security are not esoteric intellectual discussions but central considerations in thinking and acting in the world.

The Changing Meanings of Ethics and Security

One of the most enduring philosophical questions of statecraft concerns the sources of ethics. In international relations thinking, positivists claim that the most robust ethical codes emerge from state agreements, treaties, written judicial opinions, international organizations, and an enduring set of national laws and practices. Such codes evolve over time in response to changing circumstances and norms but tend to change slowly and offer relatively conservative options. A competing view (but not necessarily a contradictory one) focuses on the sources of ethics in natural law or human conviction (see Edgar, this volume).[2] In human rights, for example, civil society groups and states often appeal to larger universal notions of "human dignity" to make their arguments. These notions can be described as a kind of natural law to the extent that they draw on and allow for the application of ethical codes outside the system of positive laws and rules buttressed by the historical and foundational norms of state sovereignty. In the event, natural and positive laws are continually intermingled in the processes of decision making.

In a democracy like Canada, governments are expected to pay attention to the prevailing values and priorities of Canadians, including respect for human dignity, environmental sustainability, and equal application of the law. The 1995 *Canada in the World* report identifies "the promotion of Canadian values and culture" as one of its three key objectives (along with prosperity and security) (Canada 1995; Hampson, Oliver, and Molot 1996). The 2005 *International Policy Statement* implicitly referenced values when invoking human rights, democracy, and the rule of law (Canada 2005, 11). Ethical principles can also be found in the common and long-standing practices and norms that inform Canada's international behaviour, such as support for multilateralism. Appeals to conservative institutions and long-standing ways of acting exist alongside calls for change through the continuing efforts of norm entrepreneurs and revolutionaries. Whether derived from an ethics of conviction, an appeal to human dignity or natural law, or an appeal to positive laws such as treaties, decisions inevitably arise from a mixture of ethical considerations.

In a series of academic discussions since the end of the Cold War, theorists and decision makers alike have debated the nature of security as a subject of international law, diplomacy, and national policy. Traditional notions of security that focus on the national interest continue to hold currency and animate discussions on a wide variety of topics, from national economic development to treatment of minorities. Nevertheless, there is growing awareness that national security remains highly contested and that it espouses particular forms of ethical content. A significant body of international law, including the UN Charter, emphasizes self-defence, non-intervention, state sovereignty, and autonomy. A significant group of states, especially those from the developing world, prioritize national sovereignty and national interests and resist intervention. Sovereignty norms, also replicated in diplomatic practices, are confronted by a growing and cross-cutting set of norms around human rights, multilateralism, and development that has emerged within the international community. To various degrees, these sets of laws are constructed by states. Although states often jealously guard their sovereign privileges against challenges from other actors and forces, they have simultaneously confounded these privileges by producing and supporting institutions and laws that work at cross-purposes to national sovereignty.

As a result of the developments discussed above, the effort to invoke national security confronts a measure of incoherence in both the international sphere and the domestic realm. As Chandler (2009, 123) argues, "the demand to forward claims in the terminology of human rights reflects a world in which the international legal order orientated around the constitutive rights of sovereign states is under challenge." Invoking national security means favouring an insular notion of ethics and calling upon a conservative set of norms that is in flux and, arguably, less sustainable in the face of changing circumstances. In addition, a focus on national security potentially narrows the scope for ethical discussion by instrumentalizing other policy goals in the service of security. As a result of states' actions, and despite its persistence in decision-making circles, the idea of national security is now widely questioned in the international community. Few in intellectual or decision-making circles now support without equivocation the unmitigated rights of states to uphold and defend their versions of national security. Those state governments that most strongly insist on unrestricted autonomy find themselves marginalized by the international community, even as they demand privileges and recognition. Such "rogue states" find that the claim to national security can no longer be used to override the demand

for democracy, respect for human rights, or the provision of life necessities. These issues, which might have been considered purely domestic matters in the past, are now central questions for international relations as a whole.

Such dilemmas of national security are precisely what push states to broaden the focus of security policy beyond borders and to expand the scope for national action into newer, more innovative, areas. A broader view of national security can be less confining and constraining as well as more flexible. Adopting such a view also means broadening the notion of national interest to incorporate alternative notions of ethics that extend the moral community beyond state borders. As Cranford Pratt (2001, 61) has stated, "ethics intervenes when the motivation is no longer centrally focused on national security and national interests ... [but] when it responds significantly to a concern for the welfare and well-being of foreigners ... in response to sentiments of human solidarity and to an awakening acceptance of obligations towards those beyond its borders." Such an extension is less instrumental than a traditional focus on national interest but is not purely or solely altruistic. An appeal to duties beyond borders necessarily draws on a different, more normative, orientation to ethics but one that, as suggested above, is increasingly accepted by states as a legitimate and robust basis for the conduct of international relations. This acceptance is evidenced by the growth of positive law in the form of international laws, institutions, and procedures for addressing the needs and rights of individuals.[3]

What has driven this shift is the subject of some discussion in the international relations literature. The rise of global civil society, technological changes, and movements for democratization have provoked an "ethical turn" of some consequence for international relations and foreign policy studies. Issues such as climate change, human rights, and gender equality have emerged with much greater force than many anticipated. In addition, a "post-materialist" cultural trend in advanced industrial democracies has made these issue areas more central to public concerns in Western liberal democracies (see Inglehart 1990). Social media and information technology make people all over the globe instantly aware of state transgressions. The future of decision making will likely be shaped in a context of moral arguments about rights, obligations, and values, not only because democratic and deliberative politics demands it, but also because international circumstance demands it.

Canada has been and continues to be affected by these changes. In response to and as part of the changes precipitated by the end of the Cold War, Canada was an early champion of human security as an alternative

discourse to that of national security. Canada's prominent minister of foreign affairs, Lloyd Axworthy, picked up on trends within the United Nations to argue that issues such as crime, pollution, drugs, and human rights abuses posed security challenges that implicated multilateral responses to otherwise internal questions (Axworthy 1997; see also Knight, this volume). Working closely with global civil society groups such as the Coalition for the International Criminal Court and the International Campaign to Ban Landmines, Axworthy followed up with a program of action: material support for the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, an Anti-Personnel Mine Convention, action on small arms, and protection of women, children, and refugees.

How Have Things Changed?

The concept of human security tied ethical considerations to security considerations in specific ways. Human security as an idea shifted considerations of ethics from the state to the individual, a focus further extended and given weight by the *Responsibility to Protect* report in 2001 (ICISS 2001). This report set down the responsibilities of states and the international community with respect to a variety of threats to individual security, especially gross and systematic violations such as those encountered in Rwanda and Srebrenica (Kofi Annan, quoted in ICISS 2001, vii). Although they have lost some currency in the time following 9/11, debates over international and human security persist. What follows is a discussion of the intervening years from the height of the discourse of human security in the 1990s up to today. The changes are characterized in terms of three broad shifts. The first shift is a focus on capabilities rather than purposes. The second shift is the deepening association of security with national economic prosperity. The third shift is the move toward a more disaggregated international community, which affects the ability to articulate a coherent ethical stance.

The first shift involves a move toward capabilities and away from purposes. The ethical dimensions of this shift involve a narrowing of the scope for ethical discourse and a retrenchment of focus to national security, together with an expansive application of policy in specific geographies, issue areas, and projects. The roots of this shift toward capabilities lie, among other things, in the claims and criticisms made by early realist critics of the Axworthy doctrine. Some of the most prominent critics of Canada's foreign policy direction during the 1990s sought to redirect the national discussion on ethics away from "human security" and toward a more constrained view of the scope for ethical deliberation in foreign

policy. Hampson and Oliver (1998) labelled the Axworthy doctrine "pulpit diplomacy." Bain (1999, 85–86) argued that Canada should avoid "preaching" and "excessive moralism" lest key international norms be upset by a too enthusiastic embrace of alternative views of security. As Hampson and Oliver (1998, 381) stated, Canada had become "a charter member of what we might call the 'moral minority,' that distinguished (and self-styled) group of states and organizations whose 'moral multilateralism' is predicated on their faith that the enunciation of a new set of global norms will lead inexorably to the creation of a just and more equitable international order." At the root of these criticisms were two claims: (1) even if the goals of human security are good ones, Canada is incapable of living up to its commitments because of a constrained and limited foreign policy budget and its relatively small population; (2) Canada's overtly "ethical" approach might distract from more prudential norms and practices that underlie the international system (e.g., national security) and in themselves are valuable and necessary for protecting security and avoiding counterproductive outcomes (Bain 1999).

In retrospect, and recognizing that the "target" of these criticisms was a moving object with many nuances and variations, these criticisms generally embraced an "ethic of responsibility" rather than an "ethic of conviction" (see Edgar, this volume). The attacks on human security as a foreign policy doctrine questioned its outcomes and consequences rather than its underlying purposes. Questions swirled around whether lofty goals can be achieved with insufficient resources. In the 1990s, Hampson and Oliver (1998) emphasized the critical deficiencies in resources that undermined Canada's ability to foster change in the international system, while Nossal (1998, 88) similarly pointed out that "pinchpenny diplomacy" would not succeed without the concerted investment in new capabilities to support it. Peace building, democratization, and some of the other programs of human security (critics argued) might require hard power and military force or simply be beyond our capability to address. The years following 9/11 were characterized by a resounding refrain that Canada was asleep and a country "in decline" (Cohen 2003; Hiller and Molot 2002). Governments responded to these criticisms with new spending on defence and an active and interventionist foreign policy proclaiming a new willingness to contribute, and even to lead, in Afghanistan and other areas of international policy.

As capability and commitment became stand-ins for ethical internationalism and what Nossal (1998) had earlier termed "good international citizenship," some of the original objections to the purposes of human security, which focused on "preaching," faded into the background or took on more

limited meanings. The realists' caution against broad mandates was ignored when the Harper government described Canada's goals in Afghanistan in broad terms as a defence of Canadian values and democratic ideals and as an effort to "build a stable, peaceful and self-sustaining democratic country" (Bratt 2011, 318; see also Harper, quoted in Nossal 2013, 25). With a shift in the security discourse toward questions of capability, any ethical questions raised by such an ambitious and expansive agenda were diminished. Canada's mission in Afghanistan moved progressively from a rather narrow support mission to assist NATO and enforce UN resolutions to a wholesale nation-building exercise involving development, diplomacy, and defence (Bratt 2011). Canada's provincial reconstruction teams involved themselves in rebuilding schools and roads, providing jobs, and bolstering education. With the announcement of an additional $5.3 billion in new defence spending by the Harper government in 2006, and with a cost of some $7–10 billion on its military operations in Afghanistan and some $750 million–$1 billion on all other forms of aid and development (Bratt 2011, 530; Moens 2011, 147; Edgar, this volume), Canada's foreign security policy can no longer be accused of being "pinchpenny" or "cheap."

However, together with the Harper government, the critics of Canada's human security doctrine have fallen silent about the ethical implications of these new capabilities and the accompanying willingness to use force to achieve security. Indeed, it is puzzling that the sanctimonious use of hard power to achieve better enforcement of laws "to bring those who are in non-compliance into line" (Hampson and Oliver 1998, 404) is accompanied by such an ethical silence. Having discredited and banished the language of human security, including "soft power" (Nossal 2013, 30), "hard power" is effectively the default language of security. The issue of how to square the use of force with humanitarianism and international law loomed large over the Kosovo action in 1999 but has had little impact on subsequent interventions in Afghanistan and Libya (see Edgar, this volume). With the normative agenda of human security overshadowed by a variety of conflicting and sometimes contradictory sets of policy goals and norms, the lack of explicit attention to ethical considerations is troubling. These developments throw new light onto the statist critics' invocation of the need for prudence and respect for international boundaries. Indeed, the call to end "preaching" now seems to have been selectively targeted only at proponents of soft power approaches. With an increasing willingness and ability to intervene to achieve humanitarian goals, it seems *more* important, not *less,* to subject decisions to ethical and critical scrutiny.

Reflecting on the arguments of the realist critics of human security, one sees that one of their central concerns was the way in which the concept created an assault on traditional statecraft by focusing on public diplomacy and individual rather than state security (Hampson and Oliver 1998, 397; see also Bain 1999). This "assault" would be corrected by governments' foreign policy decisions over the next few years. Axworthy's human security doctrine had identified a variety of threats to security: environmental catastrophe, economic decline, famine, and large-scale human rights violations. The *Responsibility to Protect* report (ICISS 2001) emphasized the principle that states must not threaten their own populations. However, the 2004 *National Security Policy* emphasized a traditional approach, focusing on "risks to the state." It also added the necessity of protecting Canadian values, institutions, and Canadians abroad and not just the physical security of Canada (see Falk, this volume). Similarly, the types of threats identified had subtly shifted by the time of the 2005 *International Policy Statement.* The statement focused on rogue states, failed and fragile states, international criminal syndicates, weapons proliferation, and terrorists (Canada 2005, 3). With a renewed focus on threats to international order and national security, the *International Policy Statement* foreshadowed the marriage of a state-oriented policy stance with a new interventionist approach to ensuring security.

A second trend of the past few years has been the deepening association of security with national economic prosperity. As Michaud (2011, 438) claims, economic and security considerations remain closely linked in discussions of Canadian values, and at times (as when Canada-US trade was affected following 9/11) economic considerations have even driven measures to improve national security. The 1994 *Human Development Report,* instrumental in advancing the notion of human security, argued that security should go beyond civil and political rights to include security of work, income, and food, protection against threats to public health, and protection against environmental degradation, pollution, and disaster (Irwin 2001, 6).

Although generally conservative in policy approach with respect to economic concerns, economic questions were addressed within the Axworthy agenda. Implicit (though not emphasized) within the notion of human security was an awareness that economic globalization and open borders could undermine local economies and create or worsen resource conflicts and repression. For example, Axworthy commented on the disruptive impact of highly valued commodities such as diamonds in Sierra Leone. Globalization also implied a heightened ethical responsibility for states, according to

Axworthy (2001, 20), since "globalization has made individual human suffering an irrevocable universal concern." The Axworthy doctrine included economic security as a component of human security, but it did not effectively address the ethical dilemmas of prioritizing civil, political, and physical integrity rights over broader economic, social, and cultural rights (Irwin 2001). Critics of both the Axworthy doctrine and the 1995 *Foreign Policy Statement* have noted that development and economic security issues occupied a less prominent position in discussions of economic threats and vulnerabilities and that economic concerns remained firmly within the narrow confines of the national interest and the goal of national prosperity (Crosby Denholm 2003). The further overshadowing of economic and development questions, already noted by critics of the Axworthy doctrine during the 1990s, is emblematic of this larger shift toward state-based conceptions of security.

Together with the impact of 9/11, the bursting of the financial bubble in late 2008 and the consequent slowdown and debt crises have had a complex impact on these discussions. On the one hand, the economic slowdown transformed the anti-globalization movement that had arisen to critique free trade, development, and elite forms of multilateralism. In response to economic crisis, new mass movements against austerity and in support of human rights and democratization arose abroad in Africa and Europe. In North America, the Occupy movement followed in 2011, with a larger agenda of issues that went beyond free trade and cross-cut domestic and global concerns, including social and economic inequality, financial accountability, and unemployment. The complexity of these movements is striking, for they occupy what Rao (2010, 4) has termed a "bifurcated" position with respect to the state. On the one hand, such movements are critical of unfettered sovereignty; on the other, they desire a state robust enough to withstand globalization and neoliberalism. The position of governments in this more complex environment has been contradictory. In Canada, the government's response to the global economic collapse was hesitant, lurching, and minimal, considering the economic damage experienced in the manufacturing and retail sectors (McBride 2011). Yet the uncertain global economic environment has prompted a renewed focus on national prosperity goals, discursively linked to freer and more open trade relations. The government's close association of security with economic prosperity has had more resonance to date with the Canadian public than the critiques of the protestors, and though it did not initiate this shift the Harper government in particular has mobilized this global uncertainty to

forward a political agenda oriented toward prioritizing Canadian prosperity and national interests.

There are some ethical dilemmas in conflating national security with economic well-being and national prosperity. First, whether the measures promoted (e.g., free trade and economic growth) will enhance security remains an open question. There is little doubt that Canada remains a country highly vulnerable to changes in the global economy and particularly the American economy. Growth from trade implies interdependence and engagement with the world economy that can actually increase vulnerabilities to external shocks. Second, there remain real differences, as suggested by the Occupy movement and the anti-globalization protests, over the meaning of prosperity and whether it will achieve genuine economic well-being. As Stiglitz and others argue, the meaning of well-being remains highly contested. Well-being is multidimensional and can include health, education, and environmental conditions, among other factors (Stiglitz, Sen, and Fitoussi 2009, 14–15). Third, policy priorities can become distorted in ethically inappropriate ways when national interests are the central concern. As Pratt (2001, 16) has argued, humane internationalism involves the recognition of an obligation *beyond* the state. When understood in this way, humane internationalism is in tension with the idea of national security. Worthwhile programs and goals, such as gender equality or climate adaptation (see Tiessen and Tuckey, and Stoett, this volume), might become instrumentalized and securitized as a result.

The last important shift is really a series of shifts both in policy and in the international order that has impacted the capacities of all states (not just Canada) to articulate effectively coherent stances on a range of international issues. The difficulty of doing so in an increasingly disaggregated international community lacking clear leadership on key questions of human rights, development, trade, and security has intersected with the tendency to vacate the ethical field of contention. The US focus on national security and an accompanying retreat from multilateralism, international law, and human rights norms have left an ethical void. Perhaps surprisingly, then, the sometimes stark contrasts made in the 1990s between individual security and state security have resolved into a patchwork continuum, with variations of sovereignty coexisting with degrees of concern for individual protection. As Chandler (2009, 122–23) argues, the result is an ironic search for values and meaning in a form of humanitarianism that neglects an "ethics of responsibility" in that the welfare of the object of intervention is not the primary focus. Rather, intervention becomes little more than an "act of power

without meaning" since responses are necessarily ad hoc and arbitrary. One characteristic of this "light" level of commitment is a low tolerance for ambiguity. This has boosted the premium on short-term action, shallow and deft attitudes to international commitments, and decisive (rather than deliberative) decisions and actions. Prime Minister Harper articulated a profound suspicion of ambiguity, for example, when he recently stated that "moral ambiguity ... [and] moral equivalence are not options, they are dangerous illusions" (quoted in Payton 2011). Nevertheless, ethical ambiguity intervenes in unexpected ways. When decisions respond to domestic and state imperatives, they necessarily impact the effectiveness and legitimacy of efforts to achieve international goals. Neither side of the ethical equation can be definitive. To ask ethical questions is to open a door to critical insights about the motivations, purposes, and consequences of policy decision making.

The events of 9/11 posed a unique set of challenges for conventional notions of national security in that they both undermined and reinforced the traditional national security paradigm. Although the ease and coordination of the attack demonstrated a new vulnerability, the response reinforced a focus on military organization as an appropriate component of national protection. Counterterrorism demanded nimble, technology-based, and intelligence-based approaches to security. At the same time, by invoking a politics of necessity and crisis, it undermined the movement (implicit within the human security discourse) toward a broadening of security threats to include economic, cultural, personal, and environmental threats. The Harper government has continued and deepened this trend to focus on national threats, often invoking the necessity of preventing countries such as Afghanistan from posing a threat to the security of Canadians (Bratt 2011, 319). Furthermore, securitization and instrumentalization have affected other areas of decision making, such as aid, trade, and environmental policies. The prioritization of domestic and state imperatives constitutes a tectonic shift from the 1990s. Whether these trends result in a fully formed and lasting departure from Canada's storied historical commitment to liberal internationalism remains an open question (Smith and Turenne Sjolander 2013, xiv).

The questions tackled by the contributors to this book are informed by an awareness of this changed context and by its ambiguity and complexity. The questions posed here remain perennial in the sense that ethical dilemmas are unavoidable, yet they also provoke new thinking about the changed circumstances in which decision making happens. Although the contributors do not represent a consensus on the meanings of these terms, nevertheless

they share recognition that considerations of ethics are inseparable from the actions and words that guide Canada's international relations in the twenty-first century and that ethics lie at the heart of decision making.

The Plan of the Book

Revisiting the three research questions posed in this introduction enables the contributors to extend the conversation begun in 2001 on human security and ethics. The context of decision making has been shifting from broader to narrower notions of security and national interest. The meaning of ethics and its linkage with security have also been changing. Although it is less conscious and conspicuous, considering ethics and security together is no less relevant or important than it was in the 1990s. Indeed, in an age when Canada is raising its profile and adding to its capabilities, an ethical discussion is even more vital. This discussion begins in Part 1, "Freedom from Fear: Humanitarianism and Military Security." The focus is on the international level of action, with Andy Knight, Alistair Edgar, and Chris Hendershot analyzing the pattern of ethics expressed through international norms, laws, and policies. In general, this section offers a complex and nuanced account of the changes in the international environment with respect to security and the normative context impacting humanitarian action in the years since 9/11. These changes can be summed up generally, as described below, as a retreat from the norm of multilateral humanitarian action accompanied by a seemingly contradictory embrace of interventionism in the service of narrower security goals. Part 2, "Security across Borders," looks at the questions raised by anti-terrorism policy and issues of "law and order," both domestic and foreign. The linkage between the domestic and the international occupies centre stage for the contributions in this section, as do the themes of securitization and militarization. Part 3, "Freedom from Want: Development, Gender, and Environment," broadly gathers together chapters within the theme of "freedom from want," using an ethical frame to explore how policies designed to address poverty, gender mainstreaming, and environmental adaptation have evolved over the past decade. Part 4, "Regional Security: Countries and Areas," focuses on Canadian international relations in specific regions and countries, highlighting the unique features of an area or country to explain the interaction between theory and action. By addressing practical questions and cases, the contributors wrestle with the dilemmas of ethics and security, the changing international trends that impact decision making, and the effects of these changes on Canada's international relations. Several broad themes emerge from the

chapters and intersect with the above discussion: (1) the scope for ethical decision making, (2) the impact of multilevel governance, and (3) the challenge of ethical coherence.

The above discussion suggests that there is a narrowing of the scope for an explicit discussion of ethics in a rapidly changing world. Andy Knight begins the account with an outline of the historical struggle to strengthen norms of humanitarian protection and achieve their acceptance and enforcement within the international community. Tracing the development and debates that shaped the responsibility to protect doctrine, his narrative explains how changes to the international legal and normative architecture have been advanced by norm entrepreneurs such as Canada, working within the United Nations. Using the ideas of norm development, acceptance, and challenge originally developed by Finnemore and Sikkink (1998), Knight emphasizes that R2P represented a move from "normative clash" to "normative fit" between state sovereignty and human rights protection. He focuses on the modern efforts to strengthen the protection of civilians against genocide, war crimes, ethnic cleansing, and other crimes against humanity, through key international instruments such as the International Criminal Court and the R2P norm. Knight's discussion of the ethical debates and history of protection has implications for humanitarian actions in Libya, Somalia, Syria, and other countries where populations face widespread violations and attacks.

Alistair Edgar continues the discussion with an examination of the more circumscribed scope for humanitarian action. He addresses the ethics of "militarized humanitarianism" and raises questions about the dilemmas of using military means to achieve humanitarian ends. Considering the shift from humanitarian action to war fighting, Edgar argues that the result has been a "shrinking" of humanitarian space. The move toward securitization and militarization had its roots, in his view, in the disillusionment with UN-led peacekeeping in the 1990s but was reinforced by the complexities of the ethical calculations confronting both state and non-state actors post-9/11.

One of the factors contributing to a shrinking scope for humanitarianism was the closer association of private and public actors, a factor also highlighted by Chris Hendershot. Hendershot considers how commercialization of operations and support of the Canadian Forces by commercial military security companies (CMSCs) might contribute to a narrow utilitarian ethic that omits larger considerations (e.g., of equitable distribution). He also confronts the tendency for CMSCs to enclose and limit access to resources by reinforcing liberal and free-market-based "ways of living." The process of

enclosure thus has consequences for the scope of ethics as discussions grow around the activities of CMSCs.

Part 2 focuses on the theme of multilevel governance by addressing the various ways in which domestic and international crossover affects considerations of ethics and security. The question of ethical coherence and purposes also resonates through the chapters in Part 2. Barbara Falk explores the intersection of domestic and international law and the ethical incoherence that can result when these areas of law are in conflict. Transnational terrorist groups challenge both bodies of law by operating both inside and outside sovereign boundaries, and states are compelled to address both realms even though they might work at cross-purposes. A process of "verticalization" occurs: events at home have implications for Canadian actions abroad and vice versa. In her survey of recent anti-terrorism legislation and key Charter cases, Falk argues that an inability to address these legal conflicts can have deleterious effects, including a failure to protect security and prevent human rights violations.

In a similar vein, Veronica Kitchen addresses transnational linkages in her analysis of the dilemmas of "mega-event" security decision making. As such events become globalized and states are called upon to formulate security responses, spectacularization and securitization complicate the effort to balance civil liberties with the security needs of dignitaries and demonstrators alike. In particular, such events prompt consideration of how ethics and security are linked through such "exceptional" circumstances and how the lessons learned from mega-events can impact decision making more broadly. A more measured and conscious approach to considering these security dilemmas, Kitchen argues, will help to mitigate the escalation that occurs as a result.

Falk and Kitchen also develop the theme of ethical coherence when they address the "security dilemma." This dilemma occurs when actions designed to ensure security tend to have the opposite effect. For example, as Hendershot argues, Canada's actions in integrating CMSCs can contribute to the very conditions that make humanitarian intervention necessary. He outlines several ways in which intervention exacerbates problems, from exploitative labour relations to inequitable distribution of resources. In addition, as these writers suggest, efforts to advance one form of security can sacrifice other forms. For example, Canada's involvement in extractive industries in Latin America can erode the legitimacy of its moral identity there (Rochlin, this volume). Kitchen argues similarly that mega-events present such a security dilemma by increasing uncertainties and expanding the scope for

bureaucracies to define protests as security threats rather than social justice actions.

The chapters in Part 3 engage directly with the scope of ethics. David Black and Rebecca Tiessen examine the impact of an "agenda of aid effectiveness" in Ethiopia. The narrow constraints of this agenda have created ethical problems by making it difficult to engage with a new collaborative politics of aid and food security. As they note, these changes are emblematic of a waning of humane internationalism and the erosion of a core cosmopolitan ethic of assistance for the most needy. Their chapter discusses the evolving context of Canada's aid programs in Ethiopia and uses participant interviews to document the effects of these shifts on Canada's programs in that country. The authors argue that the aid effectiveness agenda and emphasis on "focus" are being driven by domestic considerations, evidenced by a concentration of decision-making power emanating from Ottawa. They note, among other things, that the shifting emphasis on governance priorities and the failure to mainstream gender and environmental factors have made Canadian aid *less* effective in alleviating food insecurity. A restricted agenda for aid, focused on effectiveness, might well leave less scope for the kind of ethical considerations that Black and Tiessen propose, including consideration of the views and experiences of the recipients of aid.

Similarly, Rebecca Tiessen and Sarah Tuckey take on Canada's ostensible commitment to gender equality and argue that there is a shrinking scope for ethics. Canada's willingness to "treat women as targets of Canadian foreign aid and security initiatives" rather than participants in development is emblematic of this narrowing scope. Tiessen and Tuckey note a move away from broader "humane internationalist" discourses and toward a security-focused orientation. They pick up on the tendency of well-meaning but weak efforts at change to create distortions or (worse) ethically incoherent and even self-defeating policies. As they argue, "technical fixes and cookie-cutter formulas" create contradictions in Canada's ethical obligation to gender mainstreaming. A transformational approach to gender mainstreaming holds the promise of achieving a better understanding of the security needs of conflict and post-conflict communities. Such an approach, they argue, will have a better chance of assisting stakeholders in "ensuring that men's and women's needs are understood and addressed" than the present shallow and narrow strategy.

Stoett argues that ethics are inextricably intertwined with the issue of climate change adaptation and raises several questions regarding the scope and coherence of ethics in this policy field. Broadening the understanding

of security even slightly, he says, reveals the necessity of addressing not only military or national security issues but also threats to environmental security. Echoing Hendershot's discussion of distributive ethics, Stoett argues that climate change creates dilemmas of distributive obligations with clear ethical implications, and he expands Hendershot's discussion of the colonial enclosure of resources when he raises the critiques of eco-feminists who point to the appropriation of women's work and nature (Isla 2009, cited in Stoett, this volume). Critics of "carbon colonialism" suggest that climate adaptation policies are creating new opportunities for the use of resources and labour in the South to the benefit of the North and that these efforts consequently might be not only environmentally dubious but also counterproductive. A "superficial sense of virtuous accomplishment" might well end up increasing the vulnerability of all to climate change by wasting opportunities and resources on ethically questionable carbon offset projects. Stoett concludes, therefore, that enlightened self-interest would recognize the need for a strong commitment of resources to support the adaptation efforts of the most vulnerable, balanced with a sense of environmental justice and a measure of awareness of our mutual vulnerability and need for security.

As in Part 2, the chapters in Part 4 examine transnational linkages at state and societal levels and their impacts on decision making. Like Falk and Kitchen, James Rochlin, in his chapter on Canada's free-trade agreement with Colombia, illustrates well the ways in which civil society activists play a role in policy making. From the Zapatista rebellion in response to the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) to the campaign for human rights in the Canada-Colombia Free Trade Agreement (FTA), Rochlin explains how "bottom-up" critical security discourses can have impacts when given higher profiles in trade negotiations. One of the outcomes of this effect has been the groundbreaking HRIA (Human Rights Impact Assessment) agreement, which Rochlin analyzes in light of its effectiveness in improving the human rights situation in Colombia.

In various ways as well, the authors draw attention to the silences and absences in discussions of security. Whether the issue is commercial military and security operations, secrecy surrounding mega-events planning, or gender mainstreaming, a lack of transparency raises ethical issues in a democracy. Civil society has a role to play in revealing and publicizing violations, which can have beneficial effects, as in the case of the Canada-Colombia Free Trade Agreement. Another "absence" noted by the authors is the tendency to overlook the voices and interests of recipients of protection,

aid, and trade. The question of "whose ethics" are being considered and represented is therefore crucial.

Edward Akuffo's chapter complements Rochlin's on trade in the Americas by looking at Canada's changing relationship with Africa. Noting that the retreat from a human security discourse coincided with a shift away from the region, Akuffo looks at the "disappearance" of Canada and the consequent decline in support for and engagement with the continent. In addition, he notes, the framing of Canada's moral identity is too closely reliant on particular visions of Africa (as poor and conflict ridden) that confine policy options and tend to create relatively narrow and unidirectional "self-fulfilling prophecies." As shifts in Canada's aid and peacekeeping budget reveal, the continuing paradoxical relationship with Africa can accommodate an interest-based approach when balanced with the goals of protecting human rights, maintaining the rule of law, and supporting poverty alleviation. The broad purpose of policy, therefore, should be to build upon Canada's moral identity in Africa with substantive efforts to enhance mutually beneficial partnerships.

The contributors to this volume examine these questions from a variety of viewpoints and apply their own conceptions of ethics and security to explain the complexity of the world in ethical terms. Although they have not agreed on a set definition of ethics or security, their findings address common themes and issues that point to the necessity of continuing inquiry on these vital questions. Whether it is the examination of mega-events, development assistance, or humanitarian intervention, action is always cloaked in a set of meanings that create and interpret the world in a particular way and so draw on ethical frames either to reproduce or to challenge existing frames. In general, the contributors have chosen to challenge rather than reproduce dominant conceptions of national security. In their critiques of "securitization" and "instrumentalization" processes, they invoke a critical paradigm and seek to reveal the underlying patterns and strategies of decision making. In the process, they show that the notions of security and ethics are inextricably linked, even when balanced, through a fulcrum of theory and action.

NOTES
I am grateful to Alex Elwood for research assistance.
1 International relations researchers operating within the constructivist school have developed these ideas and applied them to a variety of problems and contexts. However, ethics and decision making per se have occupied only part of the focus of constructivists (see, e.g., Finnemore and Sikkink 1998).

2 For an overview of how they relate, see Alderson and Hurrell (2000).
3 The development of laws to protect human rights and facilitate greater international concern over humanitarian violations is documented in Knight's chapter in this volume. The development of the International Criminal Court, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and the Convention on Genocide are prominent examples.

References

Alderson, Kai, and Andrew Hurrell. 2000. *Hedley Bull on International Society*. Palgrave MacMillan.

Allison, Graham. 1971. *Essence of Decision: Explaining the Cuban Missile Crisis.* Boston: Little, Brown.

Axworthy, Lloyd. 1997. "Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership." *International Journal (Toronto, Ont.)* 52 (2): 183–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/40203196.

Axworthy, Lloyd. 2001. "Human Security and Global Governance: Putting People First." *Global Governance* 19 (7): 19–24.

Bain, William W. 1999. "Against Crusading : The Ethic of Human Security and Canadian Foreign Policy." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 6 (3): 85–98. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/11926422.1999.9673187.

Bratt, Duane. 2011. "Afghanistan: Why Did We Go? Why Did We Stay? Will We Leave?" In *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas,* edited by Duane Bratt and Christopher Kukucha, 316–28. Don Mills, ON: Oxford University Press.

Canada. 1995. *Canada in the World : Government Statement.* Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade.

Canada. 2005. *Canada's International Policy Statement : A Role of Pride and Influence in the World: Overview.* Ottawa: Department of Foreign Affairs.

Chandler, David. 2009. "Ideological (Mis)Use of Human Rights." In *Human Rights: Politics and Practice,* edited by M. Goodhart, 109–25. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Cohen, A. 2003. *While Canada Slept: How We Lost Our Place in the World.* Toronto: McClelland and Stewart.

Crosby Denholm, Ann. 2003. "Myths of Canada's Human Security Pursuits : Tales of Tool Boxes, Toy Chests, and Tickle Trunks." In *Feminist Perspectives on Canadian Foreign Policy,* edited by Claire Turenne Sjolander, Heather A. Smith, and Deborah Stienstra, 90–107. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Finnemore, Martha, and Kathryn Sikkink. 1998. "International Norm Dynamics and Political Change." *International Organization* 52 (4): 887–917. http://dx.doi.org/10.1162/002081898550789.

Geislerova, Marketa. 2001. Canadian Centre for Foreign Policy Development. *Report from the 3rd Annual Academic Roundtable Canadian Foreign Policy: Interests and Values.* Toronto. http://publications.gc.ca/collections/Collection/E2-431-2001E.pdf.

Glasius, Marlies. 2009. "Global Civil Society and Human Rights." In *Human Rights: Politics and Practice,* edited by Michael Goodhart, 147–63. Oxford: Oxford University Press.