

CANADA, THE U.S. AND THE WAR ON TERROR

Do we need to “shape up”?

Jonah Goldberg, Associate Editor of the U.S. weekly, *National Review*, certainly thinks so. In his article, “A little invasion is what Canada needs,” he likens Canada to a “whining kid” who should start “acting like a man.” After some unflattering comments about “Canadian anti-Americanism,” Goldberg criticizes Canada’s health care system, describes its governance as a dysfunctional democracy and questions Canada’s stand on the war against terrorism as well as its commitment to international security.

Clearly, Goldberg is not only attacking “Canadian values” but is also touching on two extremely sensitive questions: “What should be the relationship between Canada and the US?” and “What should be Canada’s role in the war against terrorism?” Should Jonah Goldberg mind his own business? Or does he in fact have something to

say? These were some of the questions posed by the *Forum* to the members of UW’s Departments of History, Political Science and Philosophy (over 30 invitations were sent). The replies to “A little invasion” received from UW faculty members appear on Page 5.

Some interesting opinions on Canada’s role in international affairs are to be found in a recent article by Michael Ignatieff entitled, “Canada in the age of terror” (Page 6, reprinted from *Policy Options*). Ignatieff, a former UW Hagey Lecturer, is concerned with the little influence that Canada wields on the international scene. He recommends that for Canada to demonstrate leadership, it must increase its military capacity as well as its international assistance capability, thereby matching “rhetoric with resources”.

U OF T LOSES \$400-MILLION ON MARKETS: FALLING FUNDS THREATEN PROGRAMMES

University officials have said that U of T is facing program and staff cuts because of poor investment returns from its endowment fund. Two articles are reprinted from the *Globe and Mail*. (Page 10)

FAUW FORUM

The FAUW Forum is a service for the UW faculty sponsored by the Association. It seeks to promote the exchange of ideas, foster open debate on issues, publish a wide and balanced spectrum of views, and inform members about current Association matters. Opinions expressed in the Forum are those of the authors, and ought not to be perceived as representing the views of the Association, its Board of Directors, or of the Editorial Board of the Forum, unless so specified. Members are invited to submit letters, news items and brief articles.

If you do not wish to receive the Forum, please contact the Faculty Association Office and your name will be removed from the mailing list.

ISSN 0840-7320

Inside this issue:

Letters to the Editor	2
A Little Invasion Is What Canada Needs	3
Replies from Faculty	5
Canada in the Age of Terror	6
University of Toronto Losses	10
President’s Message	12

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Academic Tundra?

Jeanne Kay Guelke's review of *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra* in the previous *Forum* (#119) asserts, as if it were a fact, that "women are still disproportionately under-represented in senior regular faculty ranks." One hoped that statistically-challenged claims like this were no longer standard in this area, but unless she has something unusual in mind as her standard, the claim is false. Women are over-represented, in comparison to the pool of earned doctorates (especially) that is the only really relevant standard.

For a pretty full display of the figures, see Grant A. Brown, *The Employment Equity Empress Has No Clothes*, (Faculty of Management, U. of Lethbridge, 1992). The situation since 1992 has been increasingly, not decreasingly, favorable to women. (How many of us have not commiserated with worthy PhD students whose big problem in getting a job is that they are of the wrong gender?)

The book Dr. Guelke reviews is "a collection of personal narratives", as she points out, and of course we have to expect such narratives to be affected by subjectiveness of many kinds. Few of us in academia cannot claim to have been turned down for this or that, or turned a cold shoulder to, because of factors other than the merits (especially as perceived by ourselves!) of our work. But so far as the most nearly objective criteria we can muster are concerned, the story of the "academic tundra" in Canada is just false. It's the other way around, if anything.

Jan Narveson
Department of Philosophy

Comments on a proposed two-year review cycle

The Faculty of Arts has a standardized computer form for annual Activities Reports, and it is no big deal to keep a copy on one's own computer and to enter publications etc. as they occur. It is also easy enough to have a special file folder (non-computer) into which one puts teaching evaluations, letters of appreciation etc. ready for the next evaluation. There should be no need to spend a couple of days rounding up information for the entire past year.

Jennifer Ashworth
Department of Philosophy

The pro's heavily outweigh the con's, re issues raised on page 12 of *Forum* no. 119.

Everybody is engulfed with reviews, and everybody who has to solicit reviews tells the same story – it's getting harder and harder to get faculty to agree. That holds for journal editors, the OGS people, and SSHRC program officers alike in my experience. Anything which reduces the amount of reviewing is therefore good.

In my department productivity is regarded as a rolling average anyway, so the lag issue is not a problem. Two year reviews would also damp down the bruised feelings that accrue to people coming out on the low end of their department (and someone has to!).

John Goyder
Department of Sociology

Recently, Catherine Schryer requested feedback with respect to increasing the review period for faculty members. I feel that it is a terrific idea to have a review period of two years for Full Professors and maintain a review period of every year for Assistant Professors. For Associate Professors, I would suggest an annual review period for up to ten years (after being hired) and a review period every two years after ten years. This is a special case because not all Associate Professors become Full Professors.

It would also be reasonable for anyone eligible for the two year review period to opt out and receive a one year review cycle at any time.

The review process must be arduous at the Deans' level. Any reasonable way to reduce the administration load should be explored. The above plan seems reasonable.

David A. Clausi
Department of Systems Design Engineering

FAUW Office

Room 4002, Mathematics & Computer Building

Phone: 888-4567, ext. 3787

Fax: 888-4307

E-mail: facassoc@uwaterloo.ca

Website: <http://www.uwfacass.uwaterloo.ca>

The following article is reprinted with permission from the November 12, 2002 edition of the National Post.

A LITTLE INVASION IS WHAT CANADA NEEDS

*Jonah Goldberg
Editor-at-Large, National Review*

WASHINGTON – It's quite possible that the greatest favour the United States could do for Canada is to declare war on it. No, this isn't a tribute to South Park, the TV cartoon that popularized a song – Blame Canada – calling for an outright invasion of America's northern neighbour. A full-scale conquest is unnecessary; all Canada needs is to be slapped around a little bit, to be treated like a whining kid who's got to start acting like a man. Why would such a war be necessary? The short answer is: to keep the Canadians from being conquered by the United States. In effect, it would be a war to keep Canada free. But first some background.

Five decades ago, historian Frank Underhill wrote that the Canadian is “the first anti-American, the model anti-American, the archetypal anti-American, the ideal anti-American as he exists in the mind of God.” In a sense this isn't really true. Philosophically and politically, the New Soviet Man was a superior anti-American: He not only hated America but had a blueprint for its replacement. After all, the perfect anti-American must be pro-something else; he must offer a viable alternative to that which he detests.

Canadian anti-Americanism does none of this. It is anti-American by reflex, which is to say that when America goes about its business, Canada flinches and calls this tic “the Canadian way.”

Virtually all of Canada's public policies were born out of a studied contrariness to U.S. policies, real or perceived. Canada's disastrous health-care system survives because of three things: vast sums of (poorly spent) money, the limitless patience of Canadian citizens who are regularly willing to wait between four and eight months for necessary surgeries, and the widespread fear that any reform might constitute “Americanization.” There's every reason to believe that Canadians would embrace at least a few market reforms – which might, for example, reduce the wait for an MRI from a national median of 12.4 weeks – if only it didn't seem like capitulation to “American-style” health care.

Health care is only the most prominent example of the Canadian ethos being frozen in the headlights of anti-Americanism. The dysfunctional state of Canadian democracy is partially attributable to Canada's fears of seeming too American. Preston Manning has spoken

about the need to permit cross-party coalition building in Parliament – yet he is very quick to caution that Canadians don't want “American-style” politics. But Canada is barely a functioning democracy at all: Its governmental structure, if described objectively, is far more similar to what we would expect in a corrupt African state with decades of one-party rule.

In fact, nothing would be better for Canada than a rabble-rousing, American-style democracy.

It's not as if Canada had no conservatives: The western region, for example, is remarkably similar to America's in its laissez-faire attitude, but the stagnant political system simply doesn't permit the expression of such regional differences at the federal level. Canada's Senate was intended, like America's, to represent regional interests – but because Canada's is appointed by the Prime Minister, its Senators tend to be geriatric cronies appointed as a reward for sycophancy.

One reason Canadians are reluctant to reform this bizarre system is that Canadian culture confuses its quirks with its character. Feeling swamped by U.S. culture, Canadians have stitched together a national identity from whatever's lying around. They try to plug leaks by restricting foreign ownership of bookstores and mandating huge quotas for homegrown cultural products. Canadians cling to this barely seaworthy raft, and are loath to untie a single plank from it. This explains the famous Canadian radio survey which asked listeners to complete the phrase, “as Canadian as ...” (looking for something like “as American as apple pie”). The winning response was: “as Canadian as possible, under the circumstances.”

Given all of the above, it's not surprising that when you talk to ordinary Canadians – who are, by and large, a wonderfully decent and friendly bunch – they have a ready vocabulary to explain the U.S.-Canada relationship. They talk about how America is Canada's “big brother” and how, like any younger sibling, Canada is naturally inclined to find fault with its more accomplished elders. But this metaphor leaves out an important part of the dynamic: Kid brothers normally express their objections not to their big brothers, but to their parents. “He failed his report card!” “He's guilty of 400 years of racism and oppression!” And so on.

For much of Canada's history, its parents could be found in the British Empire. Canada was founded largely by loyalists who rejected America's rebelliousness toward King George; it was never the prodigal son to England, but rather the good son who never left home. With independence, the Canadians were left without a parent to suck up to and with a resented brother who was now their only real protector. Indeed, the U.S. has supplanted dear old Dad as the most important player on the world stage; this new circumstance has prompted Canadians to find a surrogate parent in the United Nations. And that's a real problem, for both Canada and the U.S.

It is no exaggeration to say that Jean Chrétien is no friend of the United States. Shortly after 9/11 he made a series of idiotic remarks about how America essentially deserved what it got from al-Qaeda: We were attacked because we are too rich and arrogant, and the rest of the world is too poor and humble. He's never backed off those remarks and has even reiterated them. Chrétien's view is the settled opinion of most of Canada's intellectual class.

The Chrétien government believes that the war on terrorism is basically illegitimate. Hence Chrétien's mortifying foot-dragging before visiting Ground Zero; his insistence that it wouldn't be right to outlaw Hezbollah on Canadian soil; and his government's absurd hissy-fit over America's attempt to police its borders against immigrants from terrorist states who try to come through Canada. These policies are partly the product of a long-standing Canadian desire to be the UN's favourite country: Breaking with its immediate family – the U.S. and Britain – Canada has found a new family in the "international community." Canada has internalized the assumptions and mythology of UN-ology: not just anti-Americanism but also the belief that Western nations don't need military might anymore. As a consequence, Canada is simply unarmed.

Canadians have long talked about how they are a "moral superpower" and a nation of peacekeepers, not warriors. While they were never in fact a moral superpower – when was the last time a dictator said, "We'd better not, the Canadians might admonish us" – Canadians were at one time a nation of peacekeepers who helped enforce UN-brokered deals around the world (Suez 1956, Congo 1960, etc.). Today, Canada ranks Number 37 as a peacekeeping nation in terms of committed troops and resources, and it spends less than half the average of the skinflint defence budgets of NATO. Chrétien talks about not sending troops to Iraq; in truth, even if Chrétien wanted to join the Iraq invasion, Canada's role would be like Jamaica's at the Winter Olympics – a noble and heartwarming gesture, but a gesture nonetheless.

Despite Canada's self-delusions, it is, quite simply, not a serious country anymore. It is a northern Puerto Rico with an EU sensibility. Canada has no desire to be anything but the United Nations' ambassador to North America, talking about the need to keep the peace around the world but doing nothing about it save for hosting countless academic conferences about how terrible America is. It used to be an equal partner in NORAD, but now chooses to stay out of America's new homeland-defence plans – including missile defence – partly because it reflexively views anything in America's national-security interest to be inherently inimical to its own, partly because it draws juvenile satisfaction from being a stick-in-the-mud. In a sense, Canada is the boringly self-content society described in Francis Fukuyama's *The End of History*, except for the fact that history continues beyond its shores.

Naturally, America is going to defend itself with or without Canada's co-operation, but this self-Finlandization has serious consequences nonetheless. If, for example, al-Qaeda launched a September 11-style attack from Canadian soil, we would have only two choices: Ask Canada to take charge, or take charge ourselves. The predictable – and necessary – U.S. action would spark outrage.

We certainly don't need the burden of turning "the world's longest undefended border" into one of the world's longest defended ones. And that's why a little invasion is precisely what Canada needs. In the past, Canada has responded to real threats from the U.S. – and elsewhere – with courage and conviction (for instance, some say more Canadians went south to enlist for war in Vietnam than Americans went north to dodge it). If the U.S. were to launch a quick raid into Canada, blow up some symbolic but unoccupied structure – Toronto's CN Tower, or perhaps an empty hockey stadium – Canada would rearm overnight.

Indeed, Canada might even be forced to rethink many of its absurd socialist policies in order to pay for the costs involved in protecting itself from the Yankee peril. Canada's neurotic anti-Americanism would be transformed into manly resolve. The U.S. could quickly pretend to be frightened that it had messed with the wrong country, and negotiate a fragile peace with the newly ornery Canadians. In a sense, the U.S. owes it to Canada to slap it out of its shame-spiral. That's what big brothers do.

This is an excerpt from Jonah Goldberg's cover story entitled, "Bomb Canada", that appeared in the Nov. 25, 2002 issue of the National Review.

© Copyright 2002 *National Post*

REPLIES RECEIVED FROM UW FACULTY MEMBERS TO “A LITTLE INVASION”

This article confirms a general principle: if you see a two-word title beginning with “National”, you should be reading only for laughs ... *National Post*, *National Review*, *National Enquirer*, *National Lampoon*.

Dave DeVidi
Department of Philosophy

About Jonah Goldberg’s article in the *National Post*: Why bother?

Seriously. I read the article when your note first came around, and it was so fabulously stupid – there’s no other word for it – that I just forgot about it. Indeed, it was so stupid that there are just two types of reader: those who will find it hilariously stupid, and those who will not be interested in anything as highfalutin and fancy-pants as a “refutation” of it. Either way, there’s no point in carefully dismantling Goldberg’s inanities.

I am a firm (and active) believer in bringing philosophy into the public sphere. And I have a pretty catholic conception – ironically, this means “not very immaculate” – of the applicability of my discipline. There may well be some value in philosophizing about professional wrestling, taken as a social phenomenon. But this doesn’t mean that I should pull on a set of tights and jump into a wrestling ring, nor that, if I did, wrestling would suddenly count as a form of rational discourse. Goldberg’s piece is every bit as sweaty, contrived, and hoarse-voiced as pro wrestling, though.

Surely there are other ways to fill white space in the FAUW Forum than by analyzing the dumbest of the dumb-ass articles in the *National Post*. (An honour for which there is very stiff competition.) In my view, any other way will be a better way.

Tim Kenyon
Department of Philosophy

Jonah Goldberg has a point or two, I’m sure. My favorite example is our recent ratification of the Kyoto Accords, at the insistence of Prime Minister Chrétien who imposed it on his MPs as a matter of party loyalty. That is Canada in a nutshell. The Kyoto treaty is based on scientific

fabrication. Everything it claims as the basis for policy is either refuted or so questionable as to be completely unacceptable as a basis for public policy. (It is interesting that the basis of Kyoto was totally refuted in a prominent article in the *Globe and Mail* on Nov. 19, just a few days before the government bought Kyoto – an article that was ignored by the politicians and most writers on public affairs in Canada.) We may be sure that a main reason the Accords were so popular in Canada is that Mr. Bush refused to commit America to its draconian provisions – thus justifying us in jumping on this ludicrous bandwagon. Jonah Goldberg’s thesis that Canada’s foreign policy is largely based on the desire to be looked on with favor in the UN is, frankly, only too plausible. One might add that it is not surprising that little states try to gang together to stand up to big states – but what standing up together with a bunch of phony dictators is supposed to do for us, I don’t know.

Mr. Goldberg’s barbs about our health system are well deserved, too. No sport is more popular among contemporary Canadian academics than to compare our health system favorably with the Americans’ which they ignorantly classify as free enterprise medicine in action. Meanwhile, as Goldberg notes, we pay by waiting in line for important services, or by going to the U.S. – where you can get them tomorrow. His barbs about our armed forces would be well taken, if we suppose that we really need armed forces; but that isn’t too clear, at least for the near future. Meanwhile, our “juvenile satisfaction from being a stick-in-the-mud” would also be saving us a lot of money, were it not that in Canada, a dollar not spent by the government for X is automatically regarded as a dollar that the government really must spend for Y – the sheer idea that maybe people should be able to spend their own money the way they want is not popular with our pundits these days.

Thanks to Mr. Goldberg, then, for his barbs. They won’t do any good, but they’re amusing and well-taken, and will be shrugged off mostly with good-humour by our “wonderfully decent and friendly bunch” of people – a point on which he’s wonderfully right, and makes most of us import glad to live here despite our abundance of absurdities.

Jan Narveson
Department of Philosophy

Michael Ignatieff, who delivered UW's Hagey Lecture in January 2001, thinks that if Canada wants to be taken seriously in international affairs, it should be prepared to "walk the walk".

CANADA IN THE AGE OF TERROR – MULTILATERALISM MEETS A MOMENT OF TRUTH

*by Michael Ignatieff
Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University*

The following article is reprinted with permission from the February 2003 issue of Policy Options, published by the Institute for Research on Public Policy, www.irpp.org.

As a pluralist, secular, liberal democracy aligned with the United States in the war on terror; Canada is a secondary target of terrorists. The new realities of the post 9/11 world present multilateralism with a moment of truth – if Canada actually believes in the UN and the rule of international law; and the Iraqi dictatorship is flouting that law by possessing deadly chemical weapons and other forbidden arms of mass destruction, then we must be prepared to step up to the plate and defend those principles if necessary, argues renowned Canadian scholar, Michael Ignatieff, of Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Moreover, he suggests that Canada has something America needs – the moral authority of a reliable ally that is nevertheless a proven independent voice in the international community. But Canada's defence capacity is sorely neglected, our self-perception as peacekeepers dangerously out of date.

Are we a target? Is Canada and are Canadians targets in a war on terror?

There was a story in the *New York Times* recently, which is one of those semi-funny, semi-not-so-funny, stories that helps us to focus this issue.

An American diplomat was assassinated in Amman, Jordan. The *Times* sent several reporters to Amman to ask the Americans who remained how they felt about their security now that an American had been gunned down in a terrorist attack. At least one American, an academic on leave, teaching in Amman, said what he did about his security dilemma: when he got into a taxi and they asked him where he came from, he said "I'm from Canada," but the taxi driver, a Jordanian, turned around and said, "where from?" and the guy began to make it up and said, "well, I'm from Montreal," and the taxi driver said, "I was 10 years in Montreal myself and the American, now in big trouble, figuring that a display of local knowledge was called for, said "those Expos are a great team, eh?" Which was, of course, the giveaway, because if you have got local knowledge, it has got to be the right local knowledge, and as Canadians know, there are many things

true about the Expos, but a good team is not one of them. So that is the story and let me interpret it a little bit for you.

This American thinks that Canadians are not targets, which it is why he is telling the taxi driver that he is a Canadian, and a lot of Canadians think that. They think really that 9/11 happened to people somewhere else, even though Canadians died in the Twin Towers. There is a very strong reflex in all Canadians, it's as strong in me as it is in you, to think that they are not after us. "Don't attack me, I'm a Canadian," is a very, very strong reflex in our country and always has been, and to be blunt, it is naive narcissism. It is also a serious mistake, because after the Bali attack – where a student of mine at Harvard had been in that very bar two months before – nearly 200 people died who happened to be Australian, but they could have been Canadians.

We are not primary targets but we are secondary targets. And why? I believe we are secondary targets because we are a secular, liberal, democratic state in the North Atlantic region and we stand for everything that al-Qaeda doesn't like. We are part of a particular civilization and tradition which is in the gun-sights of a small and determined group of people who, self-evidently, don't speak for Islam, but speak for a lot of angry people in the world, and we might as well understand that we are in someone else's gun-sights. Let's not forget that taxi driver, because that is a hidden part of this story. We need to hope, as a society, that taxi drivers like that guy have a happy memory of Montreal. We need to be very sure that people from the Islamic world, from wherever in the world, who come to our society, stay for a while and then go home. take home to that part of the world. a memory of this being a decent, inclusive place. It is suddenly very important to us that we do a good job and that a cab driver in Amman, in Cairo, in Islamabad, all over the world, thinks well of this country. I don't think we will fail to meet that challenge. But suddenly the connection between our domestic policy, what kind of a multicultural society we actually are, actually tolerant, actually welcoming, is important. That is

how I see the meaning of that story, what we are abroad and what we are at home are one. The influence we project abroad depends on the kind of society we are at home.

One of the great foreign policy challenges facing Canada is staying independent in an age of empire. This is a question about how we maintain national independence and an independent foreign policy in an era in which our neighbour to the south is an imperial power engaging in a particularly unilateral definition of its foreign policy.

The post-Cold War world has given Canada an opportunity for much more independence in its foreign policy. There are many examples of the ways in which the country has run an independent foreign policy, which I think we can be proud of. The ones I always pick are things that we tend not to take for granted, but look very salient when you live in the United States, as I do. We have diplomatic relations with Cuba. Our foreign policy is not held hostage to the Cuban exiles. We have good business relations with that regime, we have human rights difficulties with it, but we are engaged with it. That foreign policy decision, taken some 35 years ago, something that is a vector of our independence, the Americans don't like it, tough!

The second example is that we have taken a lead on land mines. The Americans don't like it, but we lead across the world on that issue, and Canadians, I think, can take justified pride that if fewer kids are having their legs blown off, it is partly because of a lot of hardworking people in our Department of Foreign Affairs.

The third thing we have taken a leadership role on, obviously, is the International Criminal Court, towards which the Americans are totally allergic, but we have led, we have persisted, we now have a functioning court in the Hague, and I think we can claim a strong degree of Canadian ownership in that initiative.

And we have examples of Canadian independence every day of the week. Recently, Foreign Affairs Minister Bill Graham said to the Americans: "Do not subject Canadian citizens whose countries of origin are in a set of suspect countries to scrutiny at your border, please." The key issue here is the indivisibility of Canadian citizenship, a bedrock issue: it doesn't matter where you are born, if you have a Canadian passport, you are entitled to the full protection of our country, our sovereignty and our political will.

In Washington, I live my working life in a policy environment in which Canada is a kind of well-meaning Boy Scout. We are not taken seriously. The problem is that there is actually an increasing gulf between our vision of what the world should look like and an American vision. The problem of influence is not just a problem about Canada, it is a problem about the influence of Britain, the

European powers. They increasingly have the same vision of the world that we do, and our problem of influence is set within this larger problem, that the European allies have a vision of a multilateral world in which the legitimacy for the use of force must reside in the UN; sovereignty is not unconditional, it is limited and bound by human rights agreements, by multilateral engagements, which limit and constrain the sovereignty of states in the name of collective social goods. That is the Canadian vision of multilateralism, to which Europe also largely subscribes. We have aligned our foreign policy with that multilateral vision of the world and our neighbours to the south don't like it one little bit.

That's our influence problem. It is not just that we are the friendly Boy Scout to the north, it is that they actually don't agree with the substance of the foreign policy that we defend along with a lot of other countries. It is not just the problem with the Bush administration, it runs through administrations back some years now: they are multilateral when it is to the advantage of the United States, unilateral when they can get away with it. It is a vision in which world order is guaranteed by the power and might and influence of the super power, as opposed to the spreading influence of international law.

The challenge for us is to find a multilateral vision that is robust, that has the following properties: it is able to stand up to the Americans and disagree frankly when we disagree, but at the same time is willing to put teeth into multilateralism. Iraq is an issue, unfortunately, where multilateralism meets its moment of truth. If we actually believe in international law, and that is the crux and heart of Canadian foreign policy, we don't want to have Iraq defying UN Security Council resolutions on a vital issue. Why is that an issue? Because there is a regime that has just about the worst human rights record on earth and is in possession of weapons of mass destruction. It is not just the weapons, lots of other people have the weapons, it is the combination of a rights-violating regime that has an expansionist record in possession of deadly weapons. You can't believe in multilateralism, international law, unless you are prepared also to believe that occasionally you have to step up to the plate and defend it, and by force if necessary. So I am as multilateral as any Canadian, but you can't talk the talk unless you are also prepared to walk the walk.

If you are a multilateralist who believes in the UN, believes in the rule of law internationally, then you can't pretend that this isn't going on; you can't pretend that the United States invented this problem; you can't pretend that it is going to go away if the Bush administration could be persuaded otherwise. That is the test of a multilateralist, don't just beat your gums about it, there are moments when people define international law and you have got to decide what to do about it. This doesn't make me, by the

way, a rooting branch supporter of bombing Baghdad tomorrow morning. I am not convinced that military action is justifiable in this case, but I don't want to shy away from the possibility that we may have to go down that route, it seems dishonest to pretend otherwise.

The problem we have got in terms of maintaining influence, and if you talk to people at NATO they feel this very strongly, is that we have built our institutional influence in the world by getting into alliances, long-term alliances, of which NATO is the best example. Our international security ideal is tied to these alliances. But they are Cold War institutions that have had a lot of trouble adjusting to a post-Cold-War world and the Americans are saying to the Canadians, "we don't really think alliances are very interesting, what we like are coalitions of the willing." The difference between an alliance and a coalition of the willing is that the coalition of the willing is driven by the strongest power, it is an ad hoc thing, assembled for a particular operation and dissolved afterwards, but its key property is that it is dominated by the coalition leader. An alliance structure gives smaller powers like us much more influence at the table; in coalitions of the willing, we are much smaller players. In a world of coalitions of the willing our institutional place in world order is much less certain and much more troubling to us, but again we have to be honest about this problem. One of the reasons that Americans are fed up with places like NATO, and institutions like NATO and alliances is that they have to carry all the water. The NATO multilateral bombing campaign to compel a human rights violator to stop abusing one of his minority groups only occurred because the United States stepped up to the plate and used military power. All the rest of the allies were very secondary players. So the American impatience with alliances, where they bear all the burdens and we come along to provide intellectual and moral legitimacy, that bargain strikes the Americans as being a poor one.

So what do we do to leverage the assets that we have got? We have got independence, how do we get influence in this situation? I have said one thing we have to do, we have to put our money where our mouth is, if we believe in international law, we believe in multilateralism, we have got to support efforts to make sure that UN Security Council resolutions are not just passed, but obeyed and complied with. In our relations with the Americans, we have got to understand something about this. We have something they want. They need legitimacy. It is not the case the Americans are comfortable, either domestically or internationally, *a projecting* force abroad unilaterally, they don't like it, they feel exposed, they want friends to come along. Our presence in Afghanistan may seem symbolic, but it is extremely important in producing legitimacy for the operation. So we have got legitimacy to sell and if we have got legitimacy to sell then we shouldn't sell it cheap, we should be proud of what we bring to the table and we

should tell them "if you want our support, here are the conditions." We have, it seems to me, a much too deep inferiority complex to operate effectively in an empire. We have to be tougher.

The other thing that we have got is that we have got a lot of experience in one of the emerging fields in foreign policy, which is simply reconstructing devastated societies. The other thing Americans need allies for is simply to reconstruct, to rebuild, to fix, to create order. Americans are very good at knocking the doors down, very good at smashing the place up, very good at punishing rogue states. They are much less good, and have much less resources for the postoperation reconstruction, they need allies to do that.

The idea of influence derives from three assets: moral authority as a good citizen, which we have got some of, military capacity, which we have got a lot less of, and international assistance capability. Moral authority, military capacity and international assistance capability. We have got some of the first, and very little of the second and third. We have got to wake up, we cannot go on being a good citizen unless we pay the price of being a good citizen.

So the question is, what we are doing about the military and what are we doing about development aid? Canadians tend to argue that you can have one or the other: the constituencies who like spending money on the military and the constituencies that like spending it on development, and they tend to be different constituencies, some are more conservative, some are more liberal, and it seems to me a foolish and divisive debate. We can either have development assistance or we can have a capable military, but we can't have both. What kind of country are we; is this a great country? What is the *misérablisme* that says we can't even defend ourselves, we can't project power overseas, and we can't do a decent job at good citizenship? We have got to get out of the mind set that says that we have got to choose military stuff or development assistance stuff, because the reality of the dirty world out there, that I see when I walk out there, is that you cannot help in a dangerous and divided world unless you have military capacity.

It is just one of the realities, it is a painful and difficult one and it is not just the capacity to be peacekeepers, it's the capacity to have combat-capable lethality. There is something very curious about the way the military spine that was a part of a central national identity of our culture has just slipped away, so that when you make a claim in defence of national defence and military expenditure, you are ultimately regarded as some kind of foaming-at-the-mouth war monger. It is a very odd thing and literally incomprehensible to my parents' and grandparents' generation, like my uncle who landed in Italy in 1943 and

fought to the very gates of Berlin. That is part of the Canadian tradition and it is something we should be intensely proud of.

What does this have to do with now? It has to do with the difficulty we have in raising a consensus and constituency in Canada in support of the Canadian Forces. We can raise some consensus on behalf of peacekeeping, but the peacekeeping we celebrate in the Peacekeeping Monument statue is over, it is peacekeeping of Sinai in 1956, the war is over and you are just standing in between two sides who have agreed not to fight.

The use of military power that I saw through the Balkans, all through the 90s, that I saw in Afghanistan in the summer, is you are patrolling much, much meaner streets. You are providing basic security so that girls can go back to school in Afghanistan; so that people can shop in a marketplace without being shot; that's the kind of patrolling in the mean streets you have got to have the capability to do, if you want to serve the interests of peace and security in the world out there now.

We think, again with a kind of narcissism that is not caught up with the realities, that we are still the leading peacekeeping nation in the world. Wake up. The chief contributor to peacekeeping in the world is not Canada, it is Bangladesh. Of all the people contributing to UN peacekeeping, Bangladesh is at the top, India number two. Where do we come? We come 34th. Do you know who is ahead of us? The United States. We are living off a Pearsonian reputation that we no longer deserve. We not only don't contribute enough to peacekeeping, we are not planning training to do the right kind of peacekeeping, which is combat-capable peace enforcement in zones of conflict, like Afghanistan and the Balkans.

A lot of the human rights challenges we face, in shattered states, in states like Afghanistan that have been taken over by terrorists and then taken down, is providing basic, existential security for ordinary human beings just like you and me. You can't do any development, you can't get any order in these societies unless you have combat power on the ground. This is the new reality we are in and this is the reality we have to do something in Canada to fix, and you can't fix it by spending 1.1 percent of GDP on national defence, you can't do it. You can't do it on an US\$8 billion defence budget. We've got to spend more, if we want to have any influence in Washington, if we want to have any legitimacy as a multilateralist, if we want to keep any of the promises that we are making to ourselves in the mirror and to people overseas.

Another thing to look at is development aid. When Lester Pearson, retired as prime minister, did a report on development in 1970, he asked what was the baseline standard for being a good citizen in the world today? He suggested

contributing 0.7 percent of GDP to international overseas development assistance. That is the number all countries should shoot for, and for 30 years that has been the benchmark. Has this country ever met it? Never. There is a gap between what we think we are doing as good citizens and what we actually do.

One of our great strengths as a country is that we are a well-ordered and a well-governed society. By international standards, we are relatively free of corruption, relatively honestly governed, we have made federalism work between two national communities for 135 years which is a huge international achievement in which we can take great pride. We have run a multicultural society now for 40 to 50 years in ways we can take some pride in. Peace, order and good government is what we always stood for as a country.

We need to focus Canadian foreign policy on governance. We are very good at police. We have got some of the most famous police, the most trusted police in the world, these countries need help with the police. We have a great constitutional court, the Supreme Court of Canada, a tremendous constitutional tradition. These countries need constitutions. We have a mostly honourable, though always unpopular, legal profession. These folks need rule of law. We have got strength after strength after strength in what it takes to get governance working in a society. Good constitution, good rule of law, good courts, good cops. We should focus much more on our strengths as a country.

We have enormous strengths as a country, enormous achievements in the foreign policy of the country, but we fail to match the good-citizen image with the resources to justify it, and the challenge for us, as citizens, and for Canada's leadership is to match rhetoric with resources, to close the gap between who we think we are and what we actually do. That is a dilemma in our private lives, are we what we seem to be? Are the images we have of ourselves true in the world? This is true for individuals, it is true for countries and the challenge for citizens is to know who we are, to be proud of that and, above all, be willing to pay the price. Moral identities and moral examples don't come cheap and neither does our security.

Michael Ignatieff is the author of the critically acclaimed The Warriors' Honor: Ethnic War and the Modern Conscience. This article has been adapted from a lecture he gave at Carleton University.

The following articles are reprinted with permission from the Globe and Mail (issues dated Thursday, 20 February and Friday, 21 February, 2003).

U OF T LOSES \$400-MILLION ON MARKETS

Andrew Willis and Paul Waldie
Globe and Mail Staff

TORONTO – The University of Toronto is parting company with a highly touted money manager after losing \$400-million on its pension and endowment investments in two years.

The changing of the guard at U of T is happening at a time when foundations across the country are struggling with poor investment performance. Many are cutting the programs they finance, including scholarships and faculty positions at universities, though U of T has yet to announce such measures.

Donald Lindsey is a US money manager who the U of T poached from the University of Virginia with great fanfare three years ago. At the time, the school trumpeted its hire by announcing that it was making “a precedent-setting move that has other Canadian schools taking notice.” Mr. Lindsey spearheaded creation of a separate division called University of Toronto Asset Management, or UTAM, and was given responsibility for almost \$4-billion.

The money that UTAM oversees includes employee-pension funds and donations from business, alumni and other friends of the school. U of T has been aggressively fundraising for the past decade.

Mr. Lindsey was paid \$333,000 a year as UTAM’s president and chief executive officer, making him the second-highest-paid person at the school. Only president Robert Birgeneau earned more, at \$363,000.

Mr. Lindsey’s job was to diversify the school’s investments into a number of sectors, including hedge funds. Like many money managers, Mr. Lindsey could not keep out of the bear market’s claws. UTAM’s assets are down by \$400-million since it was created, to around \$3.6-billion.

Mr. Lindsey told colleagues this month that he is leaving at the end of March for a similar position at George Washington University. Sources at UTAM said that though Mr. Lindsey was not pushed out, few are sorry to see him go. Mr. Lindsey was unavailable for comment Wednesday.

UTAM’s performance has been among the worst of major university endowment funds. The organization posted a loss of 9.6 per cent on its endowment fund last year and 3.2 per cent in 2001.

By contrast, the University of British Columbia lost 8 per cent on its \$600-million endowment in 2002, and 1.3 per cent in 2001. McGill University, which has yet to calculate its 2002 results, posted a 3.5-per-cent gain on its \$730-million fund in 2001. It expects to report a loss in 2002.

Officials at several foundations said poor returns are forcing them to reconsider how much money they can pay out this year. By law, foundations must dole out at least 4.5 per cent of the value of their assets annually. Most foundations base the payment on a three-year average value of their total assets. With two bad years in a row, several face cuts to annual payouts.

“We have a number of departments that are looking closely at the return on the fund,” said Roger Polishak, UBC’s associate treasurer. “The budget in 2003-2004 will take a hit.” University endowments are not required to make annual payouts, but most have a policy of handing out 5 per cent of the value of their assets. That money is used to pay for a variety of programs, including scholarships, awards and faculty positions.

Derek Drummond, vice-principal of development at McGill, said that if the stock market does not recover this year, McGill, too, may be forced to cut payments.

“One worries, obviously, that if this continues, can you continue to payout that 5 per cent,” he said.

It is not only universities that face a difficult time because of the volatile stock markets. “We are terribly concerned about it,” said Carol Oliver, president and chief executive officer of the Toronto Community Foundation, which finances a variety of programs in the city. The \$90-million fund lost 5.5 per cent in 2002, the first annual loss in its 20-year history.

“We are just doing everything we can to continue making grants to the community,” she added, noting that the foundation has met its commitments.

Claire Fortier, a vice-president of Toronto’s Hospital for Sick Children’s foundation, said the \$425-million foundation posted a positive return last year. But she added that some foundations are experiencing their worst returns yet after posting 10 years of positive results.

“I know that some foundations are negative and some are probably right on the line,” Ms. Fortier said Wednesday. “It’s very very difficult and it is causing some real problems.”

The University of Toronto is searching for Mr. Lindsey’s replacement. However, sources said that it may be difficult to recruit a CEO, as UTAM cannot match the compensation offered by top private-sector money managers who make \$500,000 and up in a good year.

One Toronto-based fund manager said: “Unless they find someone who has made a lot of money and will do this as a quasi-philanthropic exercise, they will have a tough time hiring top talent.”

U OF T'S FAILING FUNDS WILL HIT STAFF, PROGRAMS

*Caroline Alphonse, Andrew Willis and Paul Waldie
Globe and Mail Staff*

The University of Toronto is facing program and staff cuts because of poor investment returns from its endowment fund, university officials said Thursday as questions mounted about the fund's \$400-million bath in the stock market.

"The way this works is that endowments are supporting the expenditures of the university," said a university source familiar with the finances. "So if you're having less money from your endowments, then you have to cut expenditures."

University of Toronto president Robert Birgeneau confirmed that cuts are likely but added that the endowment fund accounts for just 3.5 per cent of the school's operating budget. "There will be less resources available for financial aid and programs," Mr. Birgeneau said, adding he is counting on the provincial government to increase its support.

But the poor performance of the \$1.13-billion endowment fund, which lost 9.6 per cent last year, has raised concerns among faculty and some major donors.

"I'm just sick about this," said a donor who asked not to be identified.

"They should have caught it much faster, after all – I mean they are teaching business in the business school," said Leslie Dan, founder of Novopharm Ltd., who donated \$15-million to create the Leslie L. Dan Faculty of Pharmacy. "Something just doesn't look right."

George Luste, president of the University of Toronto Faculty Association, said the university should have changed its investment strategy as the markets crumbled. He said that salaries likely will be hit or the university may not hire as many professors. "Everything will be affected."

U of T created the University of Toronto Asset Management Corp., or UTAM, in 2000, to oversee the school's pension fund and donations by alumni, businesses and others. It was hailed by the university as an innovative move, and it marked the first time a Canadian university set up a separate asset-management division. Before 2000, U of T used outsiders to manage the funds.

However, UTAM's assets have fallen sharply. The combined pension and endowment assets fell to \$3.04-billion last year from \$3.49-billion.

UTAM's performance has been the worst among major Canadian university endowment funds, dropping 9.6 per cent in 2002 and 2.2 per cent in 2001. The University of British Columbia's endowment fund lost 5.8 per cent in 2002 and 1.3 per cent in 2001. The University of Alberta's fund was down

4.4 per cent in 2002, but it gained 2.3 per cent in 2001.

Donald Lindsey, an American recruited in 2000 as UTAM's chief executive officer, resigned this month to take a job at George Washington University.

Mr. Birgeneau defended Mr. Lindsey's performance, saying UTAM's results compare favourably to other North American universities.

"We're obviously very upset about [the losses]," he said. "But that's not Lindsey's fault. That's the fault of the market over the past two years."

However, Mr. Birgeneau added that the university is reassessing UTAM. "We're in the process of reconsidering our investment strategy. The university is looking very carefully at how risk averse we are."

A source familiar with UTAM said it was created with a mandate to be aggressive, and to invest up to 80 per cent of the endowment in stocks. The source added that senior university officials raised few concerns about the strategy, even as stocks tumbled. The University of Alberta, in contrast, has about 60 per cent of its endowment in stocks, and McGill University about 68 per cent.

Felix Chee, the university's chief financial officer who is replacing Mr. Lindsey until a new CEO is found, said UTAM has surpassed internal benchmarks, and McGill, for example, has a different mandate and asset mix.

He added that an independent U.S. survey of U.S. and Canadian university and college endowment funds shows that over the past year, UTAM's performance ranks 50th in 150 funds surveyed.

"In view of these bear markets, we think our performance was damn good, and we're sad to see Don Lindsey leave," Mr. Chee said. He added: "We're investing funds for perpetuity. You can't get fazed by one bad year."

Barry Sherman, founder and head of Apotex Inc., and a major donor, said he doubts UTAM's troubles will hurt the university's fundraising.

"Everybody has been hit by the bad market," Mr. Sherman said. "They've taken corrective steps, and I don't think it will adversely impact on their ability to raise funds. It's just one of those things."

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

*by Catherine Schryer
Department of English Language and Literature*

Greetings and Salutations!

A good part of my working life both as an academic and as a member of the Faculty Association involves using the Internet. My research involves much online use of databases as well as online collaboration with a number of research partners. And, of course, I belong to an array of online discussion groups in my field. I find they can be effective ways to keep up with current research.

As President of the FAUW, I also automatically receive scores of online communications from our national organization, CAUT, and from our provincial organization, OCUFA. Throughout the week I pass relevant messages on to members of the Board and to members of the Council of Representatives.

Over the past month and particularly over the past two weeks, the Internet has simply been alive with concern about events in the Middle East. My academic discussion groups which deal with issues of communication and rhetoric are focussed on analyzing the wide ranging arguments that characterize the debate. Most of these interlocutors (Americans and Canadians) have concluded that President George Bush and his allies (often called the 'Bush Team' in online venues) have not made their case. They have not provided the substantial kind of evidence required to launch a war. And yet, such a war seems to be fast approaching. An e-mail from CAUT noted that CBS News reports that:

One day in March the Air Force and Navy will launch 300 and 400 cruise missiles at targets in Iraq, more than the number that were launched during the entire 40 days of the first Gulf War. So that you have this simultaneous effect, rather like the nuclear weapons at Hiroshima, not taking days or weeks, but minutes (CBS News, Jan 27, 2003).

CAUT, of course, has been expressing its active opposition to any notion of a unilateral declaration of war against Iraq. And from CAUT, I have been receiving heart rending accounts of the desperate plight of the Iraqi people as well as an amazing array of proclamations from groups opposing the war. The most powerfully written was a copy of an ad published in the New York Times entitled "A Statement of Conscience: Not in Our Name." Written by some of the most respected artists and intellectuals in the United States, the proclamation begins:

Let it not be said that people in the United States did nothing when their government declared war without limit and instituted stark new measures of repression.

The piece is far too long to quote in its entirety. But another section has direct relevance for us as academics and scholars. The authors observe:

In our name, the government has brought down a pall of repression over society. The President's spokesperson warns people to "watch what they say." Dissident artists, intellectuals, and professors find their views distorted, attacked, and suppressed.

The piece ends with a stirring insistence that these writers will not accept that this war will be fought in their names. They state, "We will not hand over our consciences in return for a hollow promise of safety. We say NOT IN OUR NAME."

I have also become aware that a great deal of the opposition to events in the United States is occurring on the Internet itself. During the last week I have received numerous online petitions as well as requests that e-mails be sent to embassies of the countries opposing the war. The Internet is also being used to co-ordinate a day of action on March 5. The Canadian Federation of Students, for example, is holding events across Canada on that day.

In my view, the possibility of the war in Iraq and the current suppression of civil liberties should deeply concern all of us. Over the last week, I have sent several e-mails expressing my personal opposition to the war. But each time I did so, I really had to think about my decision. I have to travel to the United States for several conferences during the next few months, and I wondered about the implications of letting my views be known. Academic freedom might not be a high priority for the current government in the United States.

For anyone who has not had access to this kind of information or who wants to send expressions of their views, we are posting some of the relevant messages on our web site (www.uwfacass.uwaterloo.ca).

Possibly the Internet, ironically originally designed as a military communication system, will become a way to co-ordinate resistance to a war, a war which to me seems irrational.