



www.departmentofpeace.ca

October, 2009

PROPOSAL FOR A FEDERAL DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

“Living free from the threat of armed violence is a basic human need. It is a precondition for human development, dignity and well-being. Providing for the human security of their citizens is a core responsibility of governments.” The Geneva Declaration on Armed Violence and Development, 2007

The Canadian Department of Peace Initiative (CDPI)

The CDPI is committed to the establishment of a Cabinet-level Minister of Peace and Department of Peace within the Government of Canada, as well as other peacebuilding activities within the federal government. In support of this initiative at the time of this writing, there are 12 chapters across Canada, and the endorsement of many prominent individuals, including two of Canada’s foremost peacebuilders, the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy and the Hon. Doug Roche. More than 30 peace and justice organizations in civil society have endorsed the CDPI, representing more than a million Canadians. (See complete list in appendices.) We are also part of a growing international movement for departments of peace, numbering more than 35 countries. Nepal declared a Minister of Peace and Reconstruction in 2007 and Costa Rica declared a Minister of Justice and Peace in September, 2009.

The mandate envisioned for the Minister of Peace is to reinvigorate Canada’s role as a peacekeeper and peacebuilder as follows:

1. Develop early detection and rapid response processes to deal with emerging conflicts and establish systemic responses to post-conflict demobilization, reconciliation and reconstruction
2. Lead internationally to abolish nuclear, biological, chemical weapons, to reduce conventional weapon arsenals and to ban the weaponization of space
3. Implement the UN Declaration and Programme of Action on a Culture of

Peace (1999) to safeguard human rights and enhance the security of persons and their communities

4. Implement UN Resolution 1325 on the key role played by women in the wide spectrum of peacebuilding work
5. Establish a Civilian Peace Service that, with other training organizations, will recruit, train and accredit peace professionals and volunteers to work at home and abroad, as an alternative to armed intervention.
6. Address issues of violence in Canada by promoting nonviolent approaches that encourage community involvement and responsibility such as Restorative Justice, Nonviolent Communication (NVC) and Alternate Dispute Resolution (ADR)
7. Support the development of peace education at all levels including post-secondary peace and conflict studies
8. Promote the transition from a war-based to a peace-based economy.

Some Recent Milestones

A Private Members Bill, the Department of Peace Bill, C-447, passed First Reading on Sept. 30, 2009, moved by Bill Siksay (NDP) and seconded by Jim Karygiannis (Liberal).

The 37-member NDP caucus supports the creation of a Department of Peace (DoP) . Some 24 Liberal members are in support, and the National Green Party supports a DoP in their policy statement. Our proposal has been presented to the Liberal Caucus on Canada in the World, April, 2008, at its invitation.

Many prominent Canadians, led by the Hon. Lloyd Axworthy and the Hon. Doug Roche, have shown strong endorsement. They sent open letters to all party leaders calling for a Department of Peace during the last two federal elections. Some 30 Canadian civil society organizations, most of them national in scope, have endorsed the initiative, representing approximately one million Canadians.

Rationale for a Department of Peace

The rationale for a DoP revolves around four key areas where greater federal government response is urgently required:

1. Lack of coherence and coordination of peace-related policies in the federal government
2. Decline of Canada's role in international peacebuilding, UN peacekeeping and peace diplomacy, including disarmament
3. Escalation of violent conflict, the risk of nuclear weapon use and the proliferation of these weapons
4. Growth of military budgets and Canada's war-fighting posture.

Further discussion on each point follows:

1. Although a beginning has been made with the creation of the cross-department Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force (START), it has a low profile within the federal government. There are several agencies that have peace-related responsibilities on both the international and domestic front, each toiling in its own sphere, often without much reference to, or knowledge of, the others. There is a resulting lack of coherence and direction in policy formation as well as problem of the timeliness of responses.
2. Canada's commitment to UN peacekeeping, a Canadian innovation, has sunk to an all-time low. The total number of Canadian UN peacekeepers today could barely fill a large school bus. Peace diplomacy is far less evident than during previous periods within the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Disarmament initiatives are increasing once again, but Canada is not prominent in this work. See below.
3. While, according to the Human Security Report (2005-6-7), violent conflict is on the decline world wide, the propensity to war-making by the major powers and the number of internecine wars has not declined.(1) With the failure of the Nuclear Non-proliferation Treaty (NNPT) negotiations (2007), the failure of the nuclear nations to disarm and new nations allegedly seeking to build nuclear weapons, the risks have increased. NATO retains a first-strike nuclear policy and military planners of nuclear states are including nuclear in their offensive strategies, for example, the US.
4. With the government's "Canada First" Defence Policy, there will be a massive increase of military expenditures from \$18B in 2008-9 to over \$30B in 2027-8 for a total commitment of \$490B, much of this going to combat readiness and interoperability with US and NATO forces. Here is an excerpt from the policy paper (2)

A Military with Stable, Predictable Funding

The *Canada First* Defence Strategy is supported by a strategic investment plan based on a commitment to provide predictable funding increases over a 20-year period. Building on Budget 2006, which increased defence baseline funding by \$5.3 billion over 5 years, the Government has committed through Budget 2008 to raise the annual increase in defence funding to 2 percent from the current 1.5 percent starting in fiscal year 2011-12. Over the next 20 years, these increases will expand National Defence's annual budget from approximately \$18 billion in 2008-09, to over \$30 billion in 2027-28. In total, the Government plans to invest close to \$490 billion in defence over this period. Most importantly, the infusion of reliable funding will provide the certainty required to conduct long term planning and meet future requirements.

Further, it actively encourages the armaments industry as follows:

The *Canada First* Defence Strategy will also have significant benefits for Canadian industry. The infusion of long-term stable funding it provides will enable industry to reach for global excellence and to be better positioned to compete for defence contracts

at home and abroad, thus enabling a pro-active investment in research and development and opportunities for domestic and international spin-offs as well as potential commercial applications.

<http://www.casr.ca/doc-canada-first-defence-strategy-1.htm>

There has been no corresponding increase in the areas of peacebuilding or UN peacekeeping, rather we have seen a significant decline in these areas, as described above. One exception we are aware of is START.

Canada's Stabilization and Reconstruction Task Force (START)

START is a component of the International Security Branch, housed within DFAIT, and headed by an assistant deputy minister (ADM). There are 4 teams within START:

- Conflict Prevention and Peacebuilding;
- Peacekeeping and Peace Operations;
- Humanitarian Affairs and Disaster Response, and;
- Mine Action and Small Arms.

START is responsible for administering the Global Peace and Security Fund of \$235 M (fiscal 2008-9). (3) The START Advisory Board taps expertise from various relevant ministries.

This is the major peacebuilding thrust within DFAIT. Beyond the \$235 M mentioned, its budget is unknown, but is tiny when compared to the estimated \$18 B cost for prosecuting the Afghan war alone. Further, START does not seem to be a major player within DFAIT or in the government generally. More discussion of the extreme imbalance between military expenditures and peacebuilding follows.

Canada's Security Envelope Expenditures

Project Ploughshares, in its update of Canada's expenditures on the security envelope, defined the manner in which expenditures are categorized as follows, (i.e., the 5 Ds): (4)

Development – Measures to end poverty that address the essential underlying causes of humanitarian emergencies and create economic conditions that are conducive to sustainable human security;

Democracy – Measures to promote good governance that emphasize political inclusiveness and participation, as well as respect for human rights;

Disarmament – Measures to prevent the transformation of political conflict into armed conflict by limiting the availability of weapons;

Diplomacy – Engagement in multilateral efforts toward the prevention of armed

conflict; the peaceful management of political conflict; the development of a rules-based international order; and the promotion of development, democracy, and disarmament;

Defence – The capacity to resort to the use of force in extraordinary circumstances in support of the full range of peace and security efforts, i.e., the other four Ds, including protection and compliance.

Based on the 5 Ds, the following table enumerates spending in each area through 2006-7:

Table 3: Canadian peace and security spending

	FY 03-04		FY 06-07 (A)		FY 06-07 (B)	
	(\$million)	%	(\$million)	%	(\$million)	%
Defence	12,414	76.3	15,885	78.0	16,080	75.0*
Diplomacy	187	1.2	325	1.6	1,171	5.5*
Democracy	320	2.0	487	2.4	489	2.3
Disarmament	197	1.2	218	1.0	235	1.0
Development	3,144	19.3	3,459	17.0	3,467	16.2
Total peace and security	16,262	100	20,374	100	21,442	100

*For FY 06-07 (B), Defence and Diplomacy include costs of CSIS and Diplomacy also includes costs of DFAIT overseas missions and proportional headquarter costs.

Canada spends a full 75% on defence with less than 9% on diplomacy, democracy and disarmament. This is a generous estimate, since diplomacy includes the overall costs of DFAIT overseas missions (embassies, consulates and related HQ costs), inflating the number and does not reflect any actual activity in peace diplomacy.

In 2007 the Canadian ratio of defence-to-development spending (as shown in Table 3, *FY 2006-2007 [B]*) (5) had climbed to 4.5:1. Internationally comparable figures, using the same US\$ sources as in 2004, show that in 2006 (the last year for which figures are available) all states except Canada had either held or reduced the defence-to-development spending ratio (OECD c.2007; IISS 2008, Table 37, pp. 443-444). According to these figures, the Canadian ratio moved to 4:1, compared with Denmark's 1.7:1, Germany's 3.6:1, Ireland's 1:1, Luxembourg's .9:1, the Netherlands' 1.8:1, Norway's 1.7:1, Sweden's 1.5:1, and the US ratio of 22.8:1.

If Canadian development spending had reached the declared target of .7 per cent of GDP

by 2006-2007, the Canadian defence-to-development ratio would of course have been closer to 2:1 and thus closer to the ratios in the Nordic and some other likeminded European countries. (John Siebert:Ploughshares Monitor, Autumn 2008, Vo. 29, No. 3). (6)

“For the current government, military power seems to be the primary ingredient in the exercise of international power. In “Canada First” we have this statement: “Projecting leadership abroad can take many forms. ... One thing is clear, however: Canada cannot lead with words alone. Above all else, leadership requires the ability to deploy military assets, including ‘boots on the ground’” (p. 9). The Prime Minister said as much when applying for his current job: “Right now, the brutal reality is it doesn’t matter to these countries what position Canada takes on these issues because our current government has left the country so weak” (The Chronicle Herald 2006). (7)

Canadian Public Opinion on Peace and Security Issues

Environics massive survey of 2001 Canadians in Jan. 2008, revealed the following:

- 88% stated that nuclear weapons have made the world a more dangerous place, while only 6% thought they made the world safer
- 88% also call for the elimination of all nuclear weapons
- 54% state that the use of NATO’s nuclear weapons is never justified.

Canadians, when asked what gives them pride in being Canadian, consistently state our pioneering and continuing role in UN peacekeeping, many perhaps unaware of its near demise. In relation to the invasion of Iraq, 75% of Canadians supported Canada’s position to not participate even if it annoyed the U.S. and cost some Canadian jobs. When asked if they think that sending troops now, after the major hostilities ended, would be a way of building better relations with the U.S., only 1/3 of Canadians support this position. (8)

The polling organization Ipsos-Reid conducted a poll between March 23 and 25, 2004 on various matters related to Defence policy. 77% of Canadians agreed with the statement that “Canada’s limited military spending should be used to enhance our abilities in peacekeeping and conflict resolution rather than trying to maintain multipurpose forces intended for heavy combat alongside US military forces.” 69% of Canadians *disagree* with the statement that “Canada should actively support the Bush administration’s missile defence system even if it may require dedicated military spending to the program or allowing US missile launchers in Canada.” (9)

In Environics Research Group’s 2004 survey of Canadian values, nearly 1/3 of Canadians said that Canada’s peacekeeping and peacefulness is our greatest contribution to the world, with humanitarian aid, at 14%, coming in second place. (10)

Public Opinion in Relation to the Afghan War

In December, 2008, an Angus Reid poll found that: a majority, of Canadians, 58% disagreed with the government's latest extension of the military mission in Afghanistan until 2011, up from 56% the previous month, and Canadians want a quicker end to the Afghan mission. A majority 53% of Canadians want the bulk of the troops to be withdrawn from Afghanistan before the year 2011, that is, before the government's announced withdrawal at the end of its latest extension into the end of 2011. Only a minority 30%, down from 33% the previous month, thought that the bulk of the troops should stay in Afghanistan until 2011 at which point they should be withdrawn

November 2008: Angus Reid poll: A majority 56% of Canadians disagree with their government's proposed extension of the military mission in Afghanistan until 2011, and a majority 53% of Canadians call for the bulk of Canadian troops to be withdrawn from Afghanistan even before 2011. 33% think the bulk of the troops should be withdrawn from Afghanistan in 2011. Only 7% would agree to any further extension past 2011.

September 2008: Strategic Counsel poll: The majority 61% of Canadians oppose sending troops to Afghanistan, while only a minority 35% support it. Forming the largest group of respondents, 33% of Canadians "strongly oppose" sending troops to Afghanistan. These numbers show the highest level of opposition and the lowest level of support in the 12 times that Strategic Counsel has asked Canadians this question since May 2006.

September 2008: Environics poll: The number of Canadians who disapprove of their country's military action in Afghanistan is at its highest point since Canada became involved in the war in 2002. The majority, 56%, of Canadians disapprove of their country's military action in Afghanistan, while only a minority 41% approve of it. Finally, only 34% think that the mission will be successful (presumably in defeating the Taliban) while 58% think that the mission will be unsuccessful.

Conclusions Regarding Canadian Public Opinion

There appears to be a significant mismatch between Canadian public opinion and Canadian foreign and defence policy. Most Canadians seem to not know that there has been a radical shift in those policies away from UN peacekeeping and peace diplomacy toward war-fighting and interoperability with NATO and US combat missions, a more belligerent stance in the world. This is not surprising since these major policy shifts occurred without either parliamentary debate (except six hours on continuing the Afghan mission) or public hearings. No White Paper was issued signaling the government's intentions, as has historically been the case.

Opportunities For Progress On Peace And Security Issues

Opportunities for Nuclear Disarmament

"...I state clearly and with conviction America's commitment to seek the peace and security of a world without nuclear weapons." President Barack Obama. Speech made in Prague, Czech Republic, April 5, 2009

There are several concrete opportunities for parliamentarians to advance key nuclear non-proliferation and disarmament steps arising from:

- The forthcoming 120th Assembly of the Inter-Parliamentary Union, and
- The release of the Parliamentarians' Declaration Supporting a Nuclear Weapons Convention.
- The United Nations Secretary-General's five point plan and the launch of Global Zero
- Initiatives being advanced by several nations as well as the new US administration.

One development that may have influenced the Obama speech the Global Zero disarmament initiative of former US Secretaries of State Schultz and Kissinger, with other former US high officials. It was announced on Dec. 10, 2008, the 60th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The abolition of nuclear weapons was supported, on average, by 76% of respondents in 21 countries, in a survey conducted by Global Zero. Their plan calls for the phased reduction of nuclear weapons achieving total elimination by 2025. At the UN Conference on Disarmament, March 2009, the Russian Foreign Minister stated that this is the right time for making progress on the global disarmament process and ensuring that space remains weapons free. Similar promising signals have come from the US Secretary of State.

Australian Prime Minister Kevin Rudd has announced, in June 2008, the establishment of a nuclear disarmament commission, to be chaired by former Australian Prime Minister Gareth Evans.

In 2007, Senator Romeo Dallaire, in an attempt to revive Canada's interest and role in this issue, made a presentation and introduced a motion in the Canadian Senate entitled, "Securing Our Survival: The Case for a Nuclear Weapons Convention."

In the late 1990s, Canada played a pivotal role in a group of middle power countries trying to break the deadlock at disarmament talks in Geneva. In 2002, Canada became the first NATO country to vote for the group's pro-disarmament resolution, despite strong opposition from the United States. Other NATO countries later followed Canada's lead.

Yet, given Canada's once prominent role in nuclear disarmament, a group of disarmament experts, led by former Canadian Ambassador for Disarmament and Chair, UN Disarmament Committee, Douglas Roche, met in Ottawa in February, 2008, in an effort to push the Harper government to resume that sort of leadership role - to no avail, or even media interest. Our Ambassador for Disarmament, Paul Meyer, based in Geneva, continues to work on nuclear weapons issues, but without noticeable support from the Canadian government.

Opportunities in Relation to Climate Change

"Global challenges call for global solutions and these solutions will require co-operation on a global scale unprecedented in human history. Peace is the essential prerequisite

because without peace we will be unable to achieve the levels of co-operation, inclusiveness and social equity necessary to solve these challenges, let alone empower the international institutions needed to address them.

Through creating an environment of global peace, nations will be better equipped to manage situations that potentially could lead to conflict. Co-operative and inclusive ways of managing global resources, economies and lifestyles will help to alleviate the potential for conflict that climate change could create.

It is clear that the impacts of climate change can be mitigated or greatly varied depending on the levels of co-operation that nations can achieve and the strength of our global institutions. (Vision of Humanity(www.visionofhumanity.org), originators of the Global Peace Index - 2007)” (11)

“...Extensive climate changes may alter and threaten the living conditions of much of mankind. They may induce large-scale migration and lead to greater competition for the earth’s resources. Such changes will place particularly heavy burdens on the world’s most vulnerable countries. There may be increased danger of violent conflicts and wars, within and between states.” Portion of the Citation awarding the Nobel Peace Prize, October, 2007, to Al Gore and the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). (12)

The potential for violent conflict is dramatically increased by: water, land, oil, and mineral depletion, food scarcity, environmental and economic migrants and the increasing disparities of wealth both within and between countries. Water wars and human displacement are already occurring and the scale is accelerating, with estimates of up to one billion climate change refugees. Water scarcity is already the most visible and profound climate change threat to developed and developing countries. If methodologies that mitigate against violent conflict are not utilized and, without an ethic of equitable sharing of the Earth’s resources and the redistribution of wealth, it will likely be impossible for responses to climate change to be effective. The entire project could well descend into a cataclysm of violence and destruction through competition over increasingly scarce resources and viable living space. This is well-recognized by the Nobel Peace Prize Committee in the quote above and the rationale for giving the peace prize to climate stabilization efforts.

In 2003, a Pentagon-initiated report entitled, *“An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for United States National Security* by Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall stated that “because of the potentially dire consequences, the risk of abrupt climate change... should be elevated beyond a scientific debate to a U.S. national security concern (p.3).” (13) It goes on to say that, “military confrontation may be triggered by a desperate need for natural resources such as energy, food and water rather than by conflicts over ideology, religion, or national honor. The shifting motivation for confrontation would alter which countries are most vulnerable and the existing warning signs for security threats” (p. 14). (14) More recently, the same concerns were voiced by Britain’s Chief of Defence Staff. (15)

These views reflect a traditional military risk assessment but would take on an entirely different cast when looked at through the lens of human security, with its emphasis on the

security of citizens, their communities and the Responsibility to Protect doctrine, rather than national security. What is needed are implementation strategies to achieve these objectives, of which the UN Millennium Development Goals are a beginning. A Minister of Peace would assist in establishing a framework of negotiations for the nonviolent implementation of climate change strategies.

It is ironic to note that the largest single emitter of greenhouse gases (GHGs) is the US military, with other militaries also being major emitters. Although, for “national security” reasons, the US does not report on GHGs and they are not included in US GHG annual estimates, some estimates, only considering the Iraq war, have been made by Oil Change International in a paper entitled, A Climate of War, that, “if the war was ranked as a country in terms of annual emissions, it would emit more CO₂ each year than 139 of the world’s nations do. Falling between New Zealand and Cuba, the war each year emits more than 60% of all countries on the planet.” (16)

Opportunities for UN Peacekeeping

The original model of UN peacekeeping was referred to as the Pearsonian model after its originator, Canadian PM Lester B. Pearson. This involved lightly armed international troops who were engaged to patrol a buffer zone between warring parties once a ceasefire was in place to allow for negotiations to create a permanent peace agreement.

Peacekeeping has evolved significantly over the past 6 decades and now describes a much broader field of peace operations, under the UN Department of Peacekeeping Operations (DPKO), that include a full range of activities from the prevention of violent conflict to nation building, reconstruction and the overseeing of elections. Peacekeeping assists in the development and implementation of a peace process by providing the necessary stability and support to create a window of opportunity for a peace process to succeed. This includes enforcement provisions under Chapter VII of the UN Charter that allows for the use of force when necessary to implement a UN mandate. For example, the use of force is authorized to protect civilians in imminent danger or to protect UN personnel when there are renegade forces on the ground attempting to disrupt the implementation of peace agreements.

As pointed out elsewhere in this brief, with more than 80,000 UN peacekeepers deployed around the world, the Canadian contribution has dwindled to 60-odd personnel on the ground.

Canada supports the Pearson Peacekeeping Centre (PPC) for the training of those who serve in conflict zones, although that support has declined in recent years. We recommend increased support for the Centre and for UN peacekeeping in general through greater troop commitments and the training of more Canadian peacekeepers, since the Centre, at this time, trains very few Canadians. The Centre also works with other similar bodies, such as the Chilean Joint Centre for Peacekeeping Operations, to increase its reach and effectiveness.

Opportunities for Civilian Participation in Peacebuilding

Closely affiliated with the CDPI proposal is a proposal for a civilian peace service in

Canada. The proposed Civilian Peace Service Canada (CPSC) would be a primary implementation vehicle for the minister. The goal is to build a sustainable peace at home and abroad, in partnership with local communities, through the recruitment, accreditation and training of qualified civilians to promote and facilitate the non-violent resolution of conflict. CPSC will partner with national and international educational and government organizations that educate and train practitioners in peace and conflict disciplines, thus building upon the existing mandates and strengths of other organizations. A set of important values and competencies has been developed by CPSC.

With this training CPSC will develop a cadre of peace professionals capable of entering conflict arenas to work toward nonviolent outcomes and the protection of civilians, often well before official diplomatic channels are able to operate. As repeatedly emphasized by the UN and other bodies, early intervention is critical to prevent escalation of violent conflict. CPSC envisions its establishment as a key component of Canada's international role in conflict prevention and transformation.

Our Quebec affiliate, Citoyennes pour Un Ministère de la Paix (CMPaix), has further elaborated a proposed system of training and recruitment of peace workers parallel to that of military recruitment in Canada. Parallel to the Armed Forces Cadet program, that spends at least \$200 M annually, (17) there would be various youth training programs in the peacebuilding field, perhaps through an expansion of Katimavik., Canada World Youth and Québec sans frontières, in part. Opportunities would be provided to youth tempted by gang culture, for example, now a potent recruitment model for some segments of the youth population.

Parallel to the Canadian Military Reserves would be a trained cadre of peace workers to be called upon, as required, both within Canada and abroad, with the same benefits: a guaranteed paid part-time job, fully-paid training weekends, guaranteed fully-paid summer jobs and 50% financing of tuition fees. Armed Forces Canada currently spends between \$1 -1.5 B annually on the Reserves. (18)

Finally, there would be the training and deployment of a full-time, professional civilian peace service (CPSC), as described above. Armed Forces Canada spends between 5\$-6 B on regular defence operations. (19)

Given the relative cost-benefit of nonviolent action in terms of lives lost, maiming, other injuries, infrastructure destruction, hospitalization and social dislocation, it is our view that a commensurate level of funding should be devoted by the federal government for this alternate civilian peace service program. In the long term, these investments should significantly reduce public expenditure on the military.

The Responsibility to Protect Doctrine (R2P), www.responsibilitytoprotect.org (R2P), is a Canadian initiative adopted by all member states at the UN World Summit in 2005. It is referred to in several Security Council documents with a view to justify, in part, certain interventions. This has proven to be extremely contentious for the UN or states to implement, given concerns over this policy as it impacts state sovereignty and concerns that R2P can be used to justify military invasion.

Often neglected in this discussion is chapter 3 of the document called Responsibility to

Prevent, that is the responsibility to prevent and ameliorate violent conflict within states before violence erupts to a level where external military intervention appears necessary. Cost-effective alternatives to military action must be considered and employed far earlier than is typically the case, in the process of review/analysis/evaluation of an emerging conflict. At the point of military intervention, much loss of life, destruction of property and socio-political dislocation will have already occurred and reconstruction efforts far more costly.

Civilian-based initiatives, as outlined above, are usually not given sufficient consideration early on in the evaluation and implementation of alternative responses to crises or emerging conflict. Were they given such consideration, it would become clear that they often represent the best method of intervention. This would involve monitoring and early detection of potential violent conflict and positive action to prevent the escalation of conflict to violence. Civil society actors, both within and external to a given country, have the best view of the situation on the ground in most cases. This field, sometimes known as Multi-Track Diplomacy (see www.crinfo.org), has shown that civil society organizations can successfully enter a conflict area long before official diplomatic channels. A trained, professional peace service, as described above, should be a critical component of monitoring, evaluation and, ultimately, intervention initiatives. Examples of such successful training and work in the field are given by Nonviolent Peaceforce, www.nonviolentpeaceforce.org, an evolution of Peace Brigades International, and Peaceworkers UK, www.peaceworkers.org.uk.

The field of professional peacebuilding methodologies has grown significantly and these methodologies have been successfully field-tested in conflict areas around the world. For example there is the work of Jean Paul Lederach and the Joan Krok Institute for International Peace Studies at Notre Dame University, the on-line training institution, Transcend, and the International Peace and Development Training Centre under Kai-Brand-Jacobsen of PATRIR. Although such methodologies, all developed within civil society, have sometimes been implemented by government, much closer liaison between civil society and government is needed to best capitalize on this work, especially as it relates to prevention, early intervention and post-conflict reconstruction. One example of cooperation between sectors is Peacebuild: The Canadian Peacebuilding Network, (www.peacebuild.ca)

Although DND financially supports strategic and “security” (i.e., with a military, war-fighting orientation) studies in universities across Canada, little funding is directly available to peace and conflict studies programs and institutes. Therefore, an opportunity exists for the federal government to enhance this crucial area of research, given the large potential practical benefits of the applications of such work.

Opportunities for Domestic Peace

Submitted by Theresa Dunn

Canada experiences violence in many forms, rural/urban competition for resources, inter-ethnic, criminal and gang violence, police violence, spousal and family, in sports and

entertainment and the news media, on a consistent and enduring basis. As a nation, there is much to do to implement peace and nonviolence as operational principles of our society. The anticipated role of a Department of Peace would be to address its mandate to build a culture of peace and work collaboratively with existing departments to research and recommend culture of peace approaches.

Some of the issues of violence in Canada that are requiring political attention at this time could be summarized as follows:

- Our history with the indigenous people of Canada requires a commitment to understand the foundation of prejudice and discrimination that has led to our relationship with our indigenous people. As a nation, we are committed to a renewed relationship and yet much work needs to be done to repair and heal the harm done and continuing to the present. This call to action would include eliminating institutional racism, and transforming our relationships with first Nations through a commitment to act with openness, integrity and accountability. The learning that would be obtained by this approach would assist the relationships with other cultures that now make up the Canadian fabric.
- Family violence is a major national illness. There is a Canadian historical context that requires consideration in understanding our current issue of family violence. Canada has been complicit in creating wounded people and brings wounded people into the culture. For example, between 1869-1938 there was a policy of the government to import, from Europe, over 100,000 children to be used as indentured labour. The hope was that children would gain a stable home and the farming community would gain needed help in the form of labour. A conference held in Kingston in 2002 suggested that 84% of these children lived in abusive conditions. As well, this practice of using institutions to meet political agendas was experienced by the thousands of indigenous children, spirited away to residential schools to acculturate them to the British culture deemed superior.

Further to these wounded lives is the story of numerous individuals and families who have found refuge in Canada from war torn countries. It would not stretch the imagination to assume the experience of these people affect an untold number of families in Canada today. Logistical needs are met through housing and work initiatives while little attention is provided in healing national emotional wounds.

How much this history of bringing and creating wounded people into the country has contributed to the social issues of family violence has not, to the writer's knowledge, been researched. Nevertheless, the current reality of family violence denotes how little attention is given to a very serious reality. In a 2005 Statistics Canada report on Family Violence, noted that 653,000 women and 546,000 men were victims of spousal abuse. Statistical findings of child abuse indicated that in 53% of total homicides were children under 18, 61% of sexual abuse victims were children and 21% of those were physically abused.

Until we heal the effect of the last century's wars and other social offenses we will not see the elimination of family violence. Yet, social services report that funding is being reduced and less attention is being provided to these issues.

- Communities concerned with the activities of their youth, gangs, school shootings, vandalism, and bullying, to name but a few, suffer from a lack of social resources and economic development that would assist these communities to meet the needs of youth as they arise. These lack of resources are particularly evident in areas experiencing lower socio-economic conditions. The seemingly arbitrary fashion of how dollars and resources are distributed prevents stable, creative and responsive services to be implemented and developed as the need for change occurs.

Inhibiting this innovative practice of meeting changing needs as they arise is the practice of using the military as a career path for the impoverished (sometimes referred to as “ the poverty draft”). This practice perpetuates an old tradition of using the underprivileged as a reserve army rather than meeting local social and economic needs. To meet these needs would require participatory research and citizen engagement.

- Work-related issues of conflict are ongoing. The role of unions is coming under greater public scrutiny while employees’ work conditions have only minimally improved in the last 30 years. In a 2005 document, Statistics Canada reports that the rate of unemployment for Canadians has increased from 6.1% to 8.6 in light of the current economic struggles but, more importantly, the status of economically vulnerable families has not changed or improved since 1980. In a study comparing vulnerable families from 1980 to 2004 even with increased education the single parent family, new Canadian and lower educated did not find employment providing more than minimum wage or less. These families are the most susceptible to these economic times and the least represented by a labour advocate. Yet, the traditional model of problem solving in labour issues is typically adversarial - pitting workers against the manager/owners.
- Finally there is the immigration system that brings into Canada thousands of people each year. The system itself has long been fraught with institutionalized discrimination that has created a love- hate relationship with many new peoples to Canada. For example, the current policies on fighting terrorism (public security since 2002) has motivated the treatment of many new Canadians from war torn countries as enemies (Mazigh, 2009) while immigration has allowed them into Canada to access a safe haven.

A Department of Peace would be front and centre of researching, proposing strategic directions and solutions to the issues of violence and those factors that promote violence within Canada. With the installation of a Federal Department of Peace the mandate would then flow into provincial and municipal agendas to build a culture of peace: developing policies and procedures that would be generated by community consultations with groups and individuals that have promoted living by peaceful means and undertaking conflict transformation.

Within civil society, there has been a veritable explosion of methodologies over the last thirty years that promote living by peaceful means. There are sustainable economic and social models being promoted. There are principles and models found within psychology,

sociology and education for personal development providing forms of communication that are based on the ability to communicate effectively, develop emotional competence, resolve conflict through understanding and strategic problem solving. There is: Restorative Justice (RJ), mainly generated by aboriginal justice models and now considered an alternative to the traditional criminal justice system; Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR), a means of settling disputes outside of the courtroom that can include mediation and conciliation; Nonviolent Communication (NVC) and Alternatives to Violence Projects (AVP), a means of resolving conflict using nonviolent, collaborative language and behaviour.

All of these innovations have been generated from within civil society as it comes to grips with violence. It would be a major domestic responsibility of the Minister of Peace to enhance these efforts by supporting such community-based initiatives.

References

MacDonald, B., 2008. The Canadian First Defence Strategy of 2008 and the 20 Year Defence Budget. *The Conference of Defence Associations. July 28, 2008.*

Mazigh, M., 2009. Presented in the Women Building Peace Conference February 2009. Saint Paul University.

Accessed on the Internet August 21, 2009:

Statistics Canada: Family Violence in Canada. 2005

Statistics Canada: Study: Low-paid work and economically vulnerable families, 1980- 2004. Reported in The Daily. Monday April 25, 2005.

Young, B., 2009. Essay on *My Father's Secret Past*. Thursday Globe and Mail Sept 24, 2009

Again, the engagement of various levels of civilian peace services, as described above, would be part of the Minister's domestic program.

Opportunities for Peace Education

On October 14, 2008, the International Herald Tribune (the global edition of the NY Times) indicated that, "more than 400 universities and colleges worldwide..." offer some kind of peace studies program. Canada, through DND, sponsors strategic studies programs in universities across Canada, but does not directly support peace and conflict studies.

Costa Rica has introduced BePeace, a peace education program, into all schools from pre-school through high school. (20) Some other jurisdictions do so as well. Although such programs exist sporadically across Canada, there is no systematic, all level program, as exists in Costa Rica.

Although education is within provincial jurisdiction, here is an opportunity for Canada to offer funds earmarked for peace education. Peaceful behaviour can be taught and the ultimate savings to Canadian society could be huge.

Prospects for a Department of Peace and the Minister's Mandate

In February 2009, Representative Dennis Kucinich reintroduced a Bill in the Congress of the United States (HR-808) calling for a Department of Peace and Nonviolence, with 62 co-sponsors. (21) This is the third time the Bill has been introduced and it stands a real chance of being adopted with a Democratic President and Congress in power. Nepal created a Minister of Peace and Reconciliation in 2007, after a decade-long civil war. (22) The small island nation of the Solomon Islands has a Minister of National Unity, Reconciliation and Peace. (23) Costa Rica, a country known for its innovation in peacebuilding, declared a Minister of Justice and Peace in September, 2009. As well, New Zealand has a long-time Minister for Disarmament.

Yet, where is Canada in these developments? In the Spring of 2009, and two years to go, we are mired down in a war in Afghanistan that the Canadian Prime Minister stated is unwinnable. The situation, in any event, has been described by British Brigadier General Richard Nugee as only 20 % military. (24) He stated that even if the military forces had been offered the money and troop commitments that they needed to cover the totality of military issues, there would still remain 80% to be done by someone else, that is nation-building in terms of development and democracy (Geneva Centre for Security Policy, May 21, 2008). On March 1, 2009, the Prime Minister of Canada stated publicly that, "we are not going to ever defeat the insurgency," the Afghanistan mission being the largest combat mission fought by Canada since the Korean war. In addition to the loss of life and the injured, it is estimated that Canada's expenditures on the Afghan war, by the end of 2011, ranges between 18 billion (Parliamentary Budget Office) to \$21 billion, (25) when military salaries are factored in, but still not counting such on-going costs of caring for the injured and pensions paid to survivors of deceased soldiers.

For an example of a different and successful strategy in Afghanistan, emphasizing development and peacebuilding, here is an excerpt from an article by Mike Blanchfield of Canwest News Service, March 16, 2009: (26)

"Canada's experience contrasts sharply with that of the Dutch in Afghanistan. The Dutch were operating in Uruzgan province, bordering Kandahar, where Canada's operations are located. Prior to military operations, the Dutch had tribal advisers in place for more than a year, sounding out locals, providing intelligence on the strength of the Taliban insurgency, and perhaps more importantly, hearing what the locals wanted done after the insurgents were driven out. After the Dutch forces had driven out the insurgents, they moved quickly to hold their military gain, establishing security outposts and giving the locals some key projects that they wanted, including construction of a new health centre. "It's not only a matter of winning hearts and minds through projects, but also allowing people to take their fate into their own hands and govern themselves rather than being governed by people like the Taliban," added Mollema".

This viewpoint is further supported by John McCoy in a paper entitled, “Two Strategies in Afghanistan: Canadian and Dutch Approaches to Counter-Insurgency.” (27) http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/3/1/2/8/5/pages312858/p312858-24.php

Our peacebuilding and peace diplomacy efforts have been seriously diminished in favour of a rising militarism as expressed in the Canada First Defence Policy. To review the highlights, if fully implemented, it will see an annual increase in defence spending of 2% of the federal budget and, over the next 20 years, it will expand defence spending from approximately \$18B in 2008-09 to over \$30B in 2027-28, representing a total investment close to \$490B over this period. (28) The policy statement also issues an invitation to Canada’s defence industries to avail themselves of “unprecedented opportunities.” Virtually none of this expenditure will go to UN peacekeeping, a Canadian innovation, albeit in need of revision in favour of more robust mandates. Rather, it will be devoted essentially to a war-fighting capacity and interoperability with US forces and participation in questionable NATO missions, thus severely restricting an independent defence policy for Canada.

Costs of War and Peaceful Conversion

Annual global military spending stood at US \$1,339 billion, according to the Stockholm International Peace Research Institute figures for 2007. This corresponds to 2.5% of world gross domestic product (GDP) and \$202 per head of population worldwide. Of this total, the USA accounts for around 45%. (29)

No one can learn of these numbers without imagining how this vast treasury could be used differently: to save lives, develop poor communities, protect the environment, promote renewable energy and much more. According to the UN’s Millennium Project, the reallocation of around 10% of this total (i.e. \$121bn) would be sufficient to achieve the MDGs [Millennium Development Goals]. In other words enough money would be available to ensure the access of all human beings to the fundamentals of life: drinking water, basic food, health care and relevant quality education.

The UN has a long history of drawing attention to the relationship between Disarmament and Development. As far back as 1987, the historic UN Conference on that topic declared:

Resources released as a result of disarmament measures should be devoted to the promotion of the well-being of all peoples, the improvement of the economic conditions of the developing countries and the bridging of the economic gap between developed and developing countries.

It added:

The military sector also consumes a significant proportion of world energy resources and non-energy minerals, and diverts skilled human resources and industrial production which could be utilized in other sectors, Moreover, the production and stockpiling of armaments, particularly of nuclear and chemical weapons, poses a significant threat to the environment.

However over the last decades almost nothing has been done to act on these important agreements and understandings, despite regular UNGA [UN General Assembly] resolutions and many fine declarations and speeches. (30) (The above is an excerpt from

the International Peace Bureau: A Global Call for Action on Military and Social Spending, 2008).

Military Conversion to Peaceful Purposes

The Minister of Peace would play a major role in nuclear disarmament and arms control as a necessary pre-condition to the peaceful conversion of the military. The recently failed Non-Proliferation Treaty Review in May 2005, and the failure of the nuclear nations to establish a timetable for the elimination of nuclear weapons, again points to the gravity of the situation.

The Minister would exercise leadership in the conversion of military expenditures to peaceful purposes. To give some indication of the possibilities of conversion, we cite some examples. Dave Hubert, in a discussion of opportunity costs in his book, Canada @ Peace, (31) estimates that, instead of spending over \$4 billion tax dollars on CF-18 fighter jets and related costs such as training pilots, maintenance, operating costs and fuel, an extra 4,133 Canadians could have been hired for 20 years in a variety of service occupations such as health care workers, conservation officers, teachers and up to 8,266 childcare workers, 27,500 homes could have been built, waterways and forests restored and infrastructure, such as roads, repaired and improved. (32)

Two examples of conversion come from the United Kingdom. Dr. Tim Wallis of the group Peaceworkers UK, in a paper presented at the Consultation on a Civilian Peace Service for Canada, February 7-9, 2005, stated that his organization could recruit and train 1000 civilian peace workers over 5 years at a cost of approximately \$1 million Canadian which is “less than the cost of maintaining UK troops in Iraq for a single day” (33)

“The British government currently provides subsidies to arms exporters of 426 million pounds per annum [2004]. For that amount we could: support the setting up of gun collection schemes in every single country where there is local killing...introduce effective boundary controls to gun-running, with severe and enforceable penalties; fully support the EU commitment to develop a ‘Civilian Crisis Management Capacity’ by providing training for civilians ready to join.” (34)

The Carnegie Commission on Preventing Deadly Conflict (1999) gives this example: the international community spent approximately \$200 billion on conflict management in seven major interventions in the 1990’s, but could have saved \$130 billion through a more effective preventative approach. (35)

Finally, the redirection of even 30% of the world’s annual military expenditure can significantly halt and reverse environmental degradation and achieve global sustainability. (36)

Costs of War ... and Possible Alternative Use of Funds

■ Background

- 2003 - the Pentagon says the war in Iraq will cost roughly \$50 billion
- So far, i.e., 5 years in, the cost is \$500 billion *
- Current projections – including indirect costs (e.g., health, increased oil

costs, replenish equipment), full costs will be \$2 trillion **

- **What Could Have Been Done With \$2 Trillion? *****
- Eliminate world wide poverty - \$135 billion / yr +
- Universal literacy - \$5 billion / yr
- Immunize every child - \$1.5 billion / yr
- Fight AIDS world wide - \$15 billion / yr
- Achieve MDGs* - \$40-60 billion / yr

*MDGs = UN Millennium Development Goals to be achieved by 2015, but not on track to do so in 2009.

SOURCE: Renner, M. World Watch Institute (2000)

Gender-based Initiatives

The Minister would actively support gender-based initiatives regarding women as peacebuilders, protectors of children affected by conflict and to reflect women's prominence in peace movements around the world. In particular, the Minister would support the implementation of UN Resolution 1325 in Canada and abroad. Gender balance would be a goal in senior positions of the department and throughout the public service and on the Commission on Peace referred to below.

Commission on Peace

The Minister would create an arms-length Commission on Peace headed by a Commissioner on Peace reporting directly to Parliament. The Commissioner would make annual reports to Parliament on the progress of peace work across the federal government. The Commissioner would be advised by: peace and justice organizations (NGOs), prominent persons reflecting the cultural and geographic diversity of Canada's peoples, experts in the various peace and security fields and government officials, for liaison purposes. The Commissioner would consult with the Minister and/or her delegates on the activities and effectiveness of his/her Department in meeting its objectives and, at such meetings, the Minister would suggest to the Commission relevant activities that the Commission could carry out. The Commissioner would table an annual report to Parliament on the Commission's activities and reviewing the Department's impact at home and abroad.

The Commission would facilitate consultation and collaboration between the Minister, NGOs and the general public and encourage peacebuilding at home and abroad. It would convene meetings and networking of peace workers worldwide and act as a forum on peace-related issues in Canada.

The Commission would be involved in promoting and funding international citizen exchanges and citizen diplomacy in peacebuilding activities. The consultative group to the former Ambassador on Disarmament functioned in this way with its recommendations often implemented by government. The Commission would be adequately resourced to meet its objectives.

Conclusion: The Major Opportunity

An extraordinary opportunity presently exists for Canada to return to, and amplify, its historic role as a leader in the exercise of peacebuilding, especially in light of the return of US foreign policy to multilateralism and peace diplomacy under the Obama administration. As has been outlined above, opportunities in the international arena exist in the areas of: nuclear disarmament, addressing climate change and professional civilian peacebuilding and conflict prevention work. Other areas to be focussed on are peace education and research and domestic peacebuilding.

Although the government of Canada carries out peace-related work, within at least 5 ministries, there is no overall coordination or coherence in these policies. Besides, DND receives at least 75% of all budgets within the peace and security envelope, as defined above. As Senator Doug Roche stated to us, in a private communication:

“One of the difficulties in a modern bureaucracy such as the Canadian public service is the coordination of policy between different sectors. Canada’s international policy, encompassing such diverse areas as trade, aid, foreign policy, defence, immigration and culture, has often suffered from incoherence in the objectives pursued by the various departments and agencies. A Department of Peace could play a meaningful role in coordinating Canadian international policies to ensure they serve the interests of peace. Its ability to play such a role will, however, depend on its skill in working with other government departments in the pursuit of common objectives.”

Only a full-fledged Cabinet-level minister and well-resourced department can meet the challenges of our time and provide the necessary direction of policy and timeliness of response to needs as they present themselves. We require such a department to act as a:

- Sensor for the detection and prevention of violent conflict and for early non-violent intervention to head violence off
- Incubator of creative solutions to violent conflict and to develop the long-range thinking required to address the root causes of violence
- Bridge between Canada’s Ambassador to the UN, Ambassador for Disarmament and the government for the implementation of UN policies and legislation
- Voice in cabinet representing alternative strategies to violent / military resolution to conflict

Cabinet needs to include a voice representing alternative strategies to violent approaches to conflict resolution, that is, conflict transformation by peaceful means. Such a point of view would balance that which DND might provide, in advising the Prime Minister. Similarly, on domestic matters, the proposed minister is necessary to balance the views of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness with its somewhat traditional security policy. At the present time in Cabinet, there is no Minister with a specific mandate for peace. Although seeking the peace is a mandate of Foreign Affairs, it is primarily concerned with compatibility with US policy and US security issues, not to mention maintaining its huge establishment of Canada’s foreign diplomatic presence. It does not and can not,

with its other responsibilities, focus on peacebuilding. A much greater emphasis on the life-supporting and practical and efficient aspects of peacebuilding is needed.

Canada's Gift to the World – a Minister and Department of Peace

The world is nearing the completion of the UN Decade for a Culture of Peace (2001-2010). Canada is a signatory to the Programme of Action for the Decade, but it has done very little to implement that agenda. It would be a fitting climax to the Decade for Canada to declare a minister of peace and to join Costa Rica and Nepal in that movement. Canada was an early creator of a Minister of Environment in the 1970s and has historically been in the forefront of UN peacekeeping, peace diplomacy, post-conflict reconstruction and nation-building. Here is another contribution that Canada can make to secure a positive peace, both internationally and at home, consistent with the often-repeated desires of Canadians.

References

- (1) Human Security Reports – 2005, 2006, 2007
- (2) The *Canada First* Defence Strategy [<http://www.casr.ca/doc-canada-first-defence-strategy-1.htm>]
- (3) START, Global Peace and Security Fund of \$235 M (fiscal 2008-9)
- (4) John Siebert: Ploughshares Monitor, Autumn 2008, Vo. 29, No. 3
- (5) Ibid.
- (6) Ibid.
- (7) *The Chronicle Herald* 2006
- (8) Macleans Magazine Annual Year - end Survey 2003
- (9) *Ipsos-Reid Poll*, March 23-24, 2004
- (10) *Enviro-nics 2004 Survey of Canadian Values*
- (11) Vision of Humanity [www.visionofhumanity.org], originators of the Global Peace Index - 2007)
- (12) Excerpt from the Citation awarding the Nobel Peace Prize, October, 2007 to Al Gore and the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- (13) Peter Schwartz and Doug Randall, “*An Abrupt Climate Change Scenario and its Implications for United States National Security*, 2003, p.3
- (14) *Ibid.* p.14
- (15) *Britain's Defence Chief of Staff*
- (16) Oil Change International, A Climate of War,
- (17) Citoyennes pour Un Ministère de la Paix (cmpaix.org)
- (18) Ibid
- (19) Ibid
- (20) www.academyforpeacecr.org
- (21) US Congress, Bill HR 808
- (22) Nepal MoP
- (23) Solomon Islands
- (24) Geneva Centre for Security Policy, Statement by British Brigadier General Richard Nugee, May 21, 2008)
- (25) Parliamentary Budget Office - Canada
- (26) Mike Blanchfield in Canwest service, March 16, 2009

- (27) John McCoy. "Two Strategies in Afghanistan: Canadian and Dutch Approaches to Counter-Insurgency."
[http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/3/1/2/8/5/pages312858/p312858-24.php]
- (28) Canada First Defence Policy
- (29) *Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2007 Report*
- (30) International Peace Bureau: A Global Call for Action on Military and Social Spending, 2008
- (31) Dave Hubert, *Canada @ Peace*, Self - published
- (32) Op.cit,
- (33) Dr. Tim Wallis, Peaceworkers UK, in a paper presented at the Consultation on a Civilian Peace Service for Canada, February 7-9, 2005
- (34) Hubert, Dave, *Canada @ Peace*. Self-published, 2004: pp. 199-201.²⁰ Wallis, Tim. Speech given at the Consultation on a Civilian Peace Service for Canada, St. Paul University, Feb. 7, 2005.
- (35) Elworthy, Scilla. *Cutting the Costs of War*, Oxford Research Group, Briefing Paper, March 2004, p.16.
- (36) World Game Institute, *What the World Wants*. World Game Institute, 1997.