

# Armed Intervention: Lessons from Afghanistan

**Group of 78 Annual Policy Conference**

September 28-30, 2012

Ottawa, Ontario



The Group of 78  
Le Groupe des 78

*The Group of 78 is grateful for sponsorship from Amnesty International Canada  
and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.*



## **Conference Organizing Committee**

Richard Harmston, Chair, Group of 78  
Gerry Ohlsen, Vice-Chair, Group of 78  
Manfred Bienefeld, Board Member, Group of 78  
Joan Broughton, Treasurer, Group of 78  
Mary Edwards, Executive Secretary, Group of 78  
Roy Culpeper  
Peggy Mason

## **Rapporteurs**

Coordinator: Erica Noordermeer  
Report Editor: Silke Reichrath  
Rapporteurs: Justine Gilbert, Jan Nitoslawski, Ashpreet Sangha,  
Justine Smith, Lisa Weighton

## **Contact**

Mary Edwards, Executive Secretary  
Group of 78  
206 - 145 Spruce St.  
Ottawa, ON K1R 6P1  
Tel. +1 613 230 0860  
Fax +1 613 563-0017  
Email: [group78@web.ca](mailto:group78@web.ca)  
Web: [www.group78.org](http://www.group78.org)  
Registered charity: 13056 2085 RR0001



The Group of 78  
Le Groupe des 78

# Table of Contents

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>Acknowledgements.....</b>   | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>The Group of 78.....</b>  | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Conference Conclusions and Recommendations.....</b>                                       | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Panel 1: The Road to Kandahar and Why It Was Taken.....</b>                               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Hon. John McCallum.....</b>   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Ernie Regehr.....</b>   | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Ghulam Farouq Samim .....</b>   | <b>13</b> |
| <b>Panel 2: Stuck in the Sand? Where is Afghanistan Now? .....</b>                           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Michael Byers.....</b>  | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Nipa Banerjee.....</b>  | <b>16</b> |
| <b>Sadiqa Basiri Saleem .....</b>  | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Panel 3: Afghanistan, Central Asia &amp; a Troubled World: Future Engagement</b>          | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Daryl Copeland .....</b>  | <b>20</b> |
| <b>Hussain Ramoz .....</b>   | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Peggy Mason .....</b>   | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Keynote Address: <i>Lessons Learned from Afghanistan &amp; Other Interventions...</i></b> | <b>26</b> |
| <b>Luncheon Address: <i>Iran - Current Crises and Regional Context</i>.....</b>              | <b>33</b> |
| <b>Speakers.....</b>   | <b>42</b> |
| <b>Program .....</b>   | <b>51</b> |
| <b>Conference Participants.....</b>  | <b>53</b> |

## Acknowledgements

*Our thanks must go first to the Speakers and Panellists who contributed their knowledge, experience, and vision toward investigating the lessons learned from Canada's recent armed intervention in Afghanistan:*

**Ferry de Kerckhove**, Former Canadian High Commissioner to Pakistan and former Ambassador to Egypt and Indonesia

**Hon. John McCallum**, Former Minister of National Defence

**Ernie Regehr**, Research Fellow, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Waterloo

**Ghulam Farouq Samim**, Physician and Communications expert

**Michael Byers**, Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, UBC

**Nipa Banerjee**, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa

**Sadiqa Basiri Saleem**, Afghan educator and women's rights activist

**Philip MacKinnon**, Former Canadian Ambassador to Iran and Egypt

**Daryl Copeland**, Author and consultant

**Hussain Ramoz**, Former Executive Director, Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission

**Peggy Mason**, Peace and Security consultant, former Ambassador for Disarmament

*Thanks also to the Panel Moderators:*

**Peggy Mason**, Chair, Peacebuild, former Chair, Group of 78

**Gerald Ohlsen**, Vice-Chair, Group of 78, and Chair, International Steering Committee, AFGHANISTAN: Pathways to Peace

**Manfred Bienefeld**, Board Member, Group of 78

*We extend our appreciation to our sponsors, Amnesty International Canada and the Canadian Union of Postal Workers.*

*Most of all, thanks to the 78 participants who made the Conference possible, who collectively developed the Position Statements, and who continue to work towards peace and reconciliation in an often conflictive world.*

## The Group of 78

The Group of 78 is an association of Canadians committed to leadership in the promotion of global stewardship: a Canadian foreign policy based on the pursuit of peace, justice and global survival.

The Group began in 1980 when several concerned and distinguished Canadians crafted a statement on how Canada could contribute to the building of a peaceful, secure world. In November 1981 that statement, *Canadian Foreign Policy in the 80s*, was sent to Prime Minister Trudeau. It was signed by 78 Canadians – a group of 78. The statement set out three inter-related objectives.

In summary:

- removal of the threat of nuclear war
- mobilization of resources to achieve a more equitable international order
- strengthening and reform of the United Nations and other global institutions

That began a dialogue between the Group of 78 and the Canadian government. Members of the Group made their views known about new issues in international relations and their implications for these central and universal objectives. While these objectives remain valid, the world to which they apply has changed. As a result, after celebrating its twenty-fifth anniversary in 2005, the Group decided to re-examine its core statement of principles, its objectives and its operations. Two major conferences in 2007 led to the adoption of a new statement of principles of Canadian foreign policy: *Global Stewardship: Awakening Canada's Commitment to the World*. A call was issued to Canadians and their government:

*We call on Canadians to commit to the world with moral integrity, energy, enthusiasm and investment unparalleled in our history. We call on Canadians to demand that these principles guide our policies, at home and abroad: Justice, Peace, Survival.*

Further, it identified concrete core objectives for Canadian foreign policy:

- Renew multilateralism
- Eliminate weapons of mass destruction
- Make a reality of human security
- Prevent armed conflict
- Protect the environment
- Promote and protect human rights
- Create a fair, democratically accountable international trading system
- Ensure effective development assistance
- Support and strengthen responsive and accountable governments.

## **Activities**

The Group holds an annual foreign policy conference each September to deliberate on key issues and to formulate recommendations to government. In 2009, the Group addressed the Middle East in the framework of international law. In 2010, the theme was security and human rights in Canadian foreign policy.

The Group also holds monthly luncheon talks, open to the public, on a wide range of topics. Recent speakers have addressed the Responsibility to Protect, aid effectiveness and delivery, the International Criminal Court, Palestinian refugees, and International Disarmament treaties. These sessions provide background and insight for participants and underscore the Group's public engagement and advocacy work.

Periodically the Group convenes other special events, often in cooperation with other civil society organizations.

Thematic panels, or working groups, within the organization track key themes of Canada's role in the world community towards greater understanding of the issues, recommending positions and actions by the government and civil society, and suggesting other program initiatives for the Group.

Through its Board of Directors, the Group produces positions on topical issues and recommends policy and actions for the Government of Canada to consider in its conduct of foreign policy.

The Group invites all like-minded Canadians to join it in pursuing these objectives.

## **Membership**

The Group of 78 is open to individuals who identify with and are committed to the principles of the Group.

## **Contact Details**

To join the Group of 78, or to learn more about its ongoing activities and aims, please contact:

Mary Edwards, Executive Secretary

Group of 78

206 - 145 Spruce St.

Ottawa, ON K1R 6P1

Tel.: (613) 230-0860

Fax: (613) 563-0017

Email: [group78@web.ca](mailto:group78@web.ca)

Web: [www.group78.org](http://www.group78.org)

## Conference Conclusions and Recommendations

As Canada's military engagement in Afghanistan draws to a close, it is vitally important for both the Canadian government and the Canadian people to reflect on the lessons to be drawn from this costly and painful experience. And that was the context within which the G78's Annual Conference set out to simulate a discussion of those lessons based on substantive presentations by a range of eminent and experienced speakers. Based on those discussions, the G78 suggests that the following lessons, in the form of conclusions and recommendations, should be given serious consideration by our government and policy makers.

### **(1) Basis for and terms of Foreign Military Intervention**

Under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations, the use of force may be authorized to maintain or to restore international peace and security when all other measures, peaceful and coercive, have failed. It also recognizes the inherent right of self-defence of states under threat of imminent attack.

Peacekeeping, both unarmed and armed, was developed as a consensual form of military assistance, to help countries resolve conflicts between them and, increasingly, in the case of internal armed conflict.

Afghanistan represents a toxic and self-defeating blurring of robust, armed peacekeeping on the one hand and all-out combat and counterinsurgency operations on the other. The coercive use of force, in the absence of a credible political framework to build peace, is far more likely to fuel conflict and the extremism underpinning it, than to defeat it.

### **Accordingly, we recommend:**

Despite the proliferation of ideological extremisms around the world, indeed precisely because of this, Canada's foreign policy must remain firmly grounded in our steadfast support of the UN Charter and of international law in general, of diplomatic peacemaking and of negotiated compromises embedded within comprehensive, ethically defensible and sustainable peace settlements.

Canada's political and military decision makers must keep foremost in their minds the acute limitations of, and risks inherent in, foreign military intervention. Military intervention, outside a clearly defined peacekeeping context, must be invoked only as a last resort, when Canada's national security is directly threatened.

Canadian military participation in “robust” peacekeeping, variously called peace support and/or security assistance operations – that is, military operations of choice – must be guided by the following:

Canada should establish a clear policy guiding decisions on whether to participate with military forces in international security assistance operations (variously called peacekeeping, peace support, stabilization and security assistance operations). This policy should include:

1. an international legal framework for intervention based on a UN mandate;
2. a UN-led and broadly agreed political framework for the intervention, ideally in the form of a comprehensive peace agreement or, at a minimum, an agreed negotiating framework to this end;
3. clear Canadian objectives, benchmarks and timelines for Canadian participation; and
4. timely public and parliamentary debate and full transparency in regards to the policy and its application in a specific case, in all phases of the intervention – that is, before it is begun, during the engagement and after its termination.

Canadian participation must also be based to the maximum extent possible on a comprehensive understanding of the situation, including not only the geo-political and security dimensions, but also the socio-economic and cultural aspects and the root as well as proximate causes of the conflict. Deep respect for local culture, customs and codes of conduct must also guide Canadian participation, within the overarching framework of respect for international law.

## **(2) Comprehensive Peace Process**

The international Community, including Canada, has struggled since 2002 to help build security, stability, good governance, economic and social development in Afghanistan. However, the failure to end the military conflict in that country has undermined – and continues to stymie – all of these efforts. As has been so often repeated, without security in Afghanistan, there can be no development and without development, there can be no lasting security. What has not been sufficiently articulated, however, is that there can be neither security nor development without an end to the civil conflict, ongoing in Afghanistan in one form or another for the last 30 years.

Current ad hoc and incoherent efforts to achieve a negotiated peace settlement have failed to bear fruit and frequently have heightened division and suspicions on all sides. Expert, independent, third party UN-led facilitation is urgently needed to build trust among the parties in a comprehensive peace process that seeks to address all relevant actors, both internal and external including regional actors; as well as all relevant issues.

## **Recommendations**

Accordingly, we call on the Canadian government to advocate at the UN, within NATO, in the capitals of non-NATO participants in ISAF and generally within the international community, to encourage the immediate establishment of a UN-facilitated comprehensive peace process.

Afghanistan Civil Society, including women's groups, has a vital consultative role to play in designing the negotiating framework and the range of issues it will address as well as building support for this process among Afghans in general. We call on the government of Canada to assist Afghan Civil Society in contributing to such a comprehensive peace process.

### **(3) Transparency and Accountability: A Public Enquiry on Canada's mission in Afghanistan**

Canada has paid an enormous price in lives lost and war wounded; in public expenditures and in opportunity costs. Serious allegations linger regarding the transfer of Afghan detainees in contravention of international law. There are grave doubts about the operational security of soldiers participating in the ongoing training mission and very uncertain prospects for Afghanistan's future post 2014. It is imperative that Canada learn the lessons of its engagement in Afghanistan, to pursue any instances of misconduct or criminality that may be found and to restore confidence in Canada's ability to perform effectively and at the highest standard.

#### **Recommendation**

We call upon the Government of Canada to convene a public enquiry into all aspects – military, diplomatic and developmental – of the Canadian mission in Afghanistan. Such a review also provides an opportunity for non-governmental actors, such as the media and civil society organizations, to assess their roles as well.

### **(4) Humanitarian and Development Assistance**

Humanitarian action to meet basic human needs should be guided by the humanitarian principles of humanity, impartiality, neutrality, and independence.

Key operational principles for longer term development in post conflict situations include the paramount need to establish security so that development might proceed; local ownership of the reconstruction process, a commitment to local capacity building to ensure sustainability; and adequate and sustained funding for the long term effort that post conflict development/peacebuilding requires.

Contrary to these well-established principles for the provision of humanitarian assistance and for post-conflict peacebuilding, in Afghanistan military-led humanitarian and development activities have distorted aid priorities, sacrificed long term sustainability to ineffective short term “quick fixes”, and have often put both aid workers and ordinary Afghans at risk of becoming targets of opposition groups.

### **Recommendations**

To address the problems of militarized aid and focus on solutions that work for Afghans, we recommend that international donors and NGOs work with the Government of Afghanistan to:

- ensure that aid is equitably delivered throughout the country based on development and humanitarian needs and in line with national development plans; this in turn means separating these programs from any military funding or direct military participation;
  - work to improve the capacity, responsiveness and transparency of the Afghan government, particularly at the local level;
  - ensure that “quick impact projects” proceed on the basis of sound development principles so that they support, rather than undermine, capacity building and longer term development;
  - use conflict sensitive methodologies for project development and implementation;
- and
- take all possible steps to avoid a local “brain drain” that pulls talented, committed people and experienced local staff out of the national or local government into international donor or non-governmental organizations.

## Panel 1: The Road to Kandahar and Why It Was Taken

Peggy Mason - moderator  
Hon. John McCallum - panellist  
Ernie Regehr - panellist  
Ghulam Farouq Samin - discussant

**Hon. John McCallum**, Former Minister of National Defence  
Summary of Presentation:

John McCallum reflected on Canada's foreign policy from 2002-2003, at which time he was serving as defence minister. He spoke about four missions, including: Kandahar 1, Iraq, Kabul and Kandahar 2.

Kandahar 1 took place in late 2001, shortly after 9/11. Canada's involvement in the mission reflected the NATO doctrine that "an attack on one is an attack on all." McCallum visited Kandahar just as the mission was coming to an end. He saw Canadian soldiers in action and described them as "very professional and brave under difficult conditions."

Mr. McCallum believes that we made the right decision by not going to Iraq. When Jean Chrétien refused to join the coalition of the willing even with a minimal military commitment, he did so because it was the right thing to do. In particular, the government was concerned that the mission did not have a UN mandate, and it had a hard time believing US evidence regarding weapons of mass destruction.

As far as Kabul was concerned, Canada made the right decision to take on a major role in the International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) mission. The mission was partly to protect national security, and partly to help the people of Afghanistan. That was a positive move. Some believe the reason why the Prime Minister and the whole cabinet agreed to move so quickly was the need to make the Americans happy and compensate for not going to Iraq. However, Mr. McCallum advocated that Canada move forward on this mission because it was the right thing to do, and not to appease the Americans.

Mr. McCallum spoke less positively of Kandahar 2. Paul Martin was looking for new foreign initiatives at the time and Afghanistan was the obvious choice. However, where within Afghanistan Canada should focus was unclear. Options were limited, but Kandahar was not the only option. Chief of Staff Rick Hillier recommended Kandahar over other regions like Herat. He apparently wanted to go to a dangerous place to convince the world that Canada was as tough as the Americans. In summary, Mr.

McCallum said he was disappointed with the results of NATO's Afghanistan intervention, as compared with his expectations and hopes at the time. While the first mission of eliminating Al Qaeda from Afghanistan was achieved and some improvements have occurred in the lives of many people, especially women, the Taliban is quite strong again and the Afghan government is corrupt.

**Ernie Regehr**, Research Fellow, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Waterloo

Summary of Presentation:

**The interveners in ISAF, including Canada, ignored the fact that the ongoing civil war needed a political solution.** ISAF's basic (and fatefully mistaken) operating assumption contradicted decades of lessons learned about peace support operations -- namely, that if strategic consent and a basic political consensus is eroding, intensified military effort is not be able to recover it. It requires a political process, and in Afghanistan that required engagement with the Taliban and the Pashtun community more broadly. Without that, we have learned from bitter experience, will be impossible to build a stable order there.

Western countries ignored decades of lessons learned by the United Nations about successful peace support operations (PSOs), as per the UN guidelines on multilateral peace operations. These guidelines emphasize that peace operations need to take place after a cease-fire and in a context of strategic consent, or in the context of the active and persistent pursuit of political accord. Robust peacekeeping can involve some military combat against spoilers, but in the context of the consent of the major actors. However, military combat against spoilers cannot be successful without complementary political, social, and economic activity. Parallel activity is needed especially on four fronts: building political consensus and the legitimacy of the government of the day (through elections and effective service provision); military restraint to maintain the legitimacy of the intervener (respecting civilians and avoiding civilian casualties); winning regional support among neighbouring countries; and reconstruction and economic recovery.

**Immediately after the US invasion and the Bonn Agreement, the interveners had the strategic consent of the major parties (the Taliban were excluded and assumed, mistakenly it later became clear, no longer to be a force to be contended with). This was the lowest point of combat, with the lowest number of combat deaths, in the last 30 years** in Afghanistan. The Bonn Agreement was flawed by excluding the Taliban, but many thought at the time that the Taliban were no longer a significant force. However, the fact that a member of the peace operation was also fighting an unrestrained combat war, the US Operation Enduring Freedom, outside of the peace support coalition was problematic.

As ISAF expanded outside Kabul, it overlapped more with Operation Enduring Freedom, and the civilian deaths in combat operations were a key factor in the loss of credibility by the interveners. After 2005, a steep increase in combat operations led to a further erosion of strategic consent, while the insurgency recovered and gathered momentum. The loss of strategic consent moved ISAF from being a PSO to fighting on one side of a civil war. This raises the question of how an intervener recovers strategic consent after their reputation has been tarnished.

In order to ensure strategic consent and make a positive contribution in Afghanistan and other future PSOs, Canada should:

1. Restore political processes as a condition of its participation in PSOs. There is no military solution to the political divisions in Afghanistan.
2. Ensure direct Canadian involvement in reconciliation is a priority in any PSO operation.
3. Shift funding within the 5D (Development, disarmament, diplomacy, democracy, defence) security envelope toward greater support for the first 4Ds.

The exit of the international forces brings with it a high risk of another spike in combat activities and deaths, and an exclusive focus on training Afghan security forces means training them for perpetual war. Canada should stay engaged in Afghanistan to support a diplomatic surge linked to reconciliation and the pursuit of a new strategic consensus.

**Ghulam Farouq Samim**, Physician and Communications expert  
Summary of Presentation:

Dr. Samim focused his presentation on insights into Afghanistan from a local perspective. He believes the international armed intervention in Afghanistan was a good thing and cited numerous improvements in the country since the fall of the Taliban. The number of health centers and the number of students with access to education has increased with the help of the international community. Infant mortality has decreased, while women's rights have improved. Under the Taliban, women had no rights. Today, there is a minister for women, female journalists, and businesses run by women. In addition, Afghans are now enjoying increased media freedom and increased GDP levels. There is still a lot of room for improvement, but the achievements the country has made could not have been realized without the foreign intervention.

While he was optimistic about the hope for Afghanistan and the achievements to date, he noted several failures from which we can extract lessons:

Not knowing the sociology of the country, including Afghan patterns of irregular warfare, culture, tribal structures and institutions, local priorities, acceptable ways of doing things, and local opinion leaders

Inadequate communication. The Taliban had sophisticated communication technologies using both modern and traditional forms of communication (word of mouth, etc.). They were very good at understanding local narratives and grievances and Canadians were missing this information

Failure to address the regional factor behind the conflict, including the Taliban sanctuary in Pakistan, Pakistan's policy towards Afghanistan, and Pakistan's legitimate concerns

Lack of coordination between the forces of different countries, which had neither 'unity of command' nor 'unity of purpose.' The four provinces of southwestern Afghanistan, one part of the Pashtun belt, were covered by four different countries.

The reliance on military power was a major failure

Choosing Kandahar as the focus area for Canada was a mistake as Canada had very limited deployable forces

While there is no magic bullet or all-inclusive approach to ending the conflict, there are many ways the international community can help. Canada should support from behind and focus on areas in which it has particular expertise and value added. These include education, health, governance, ANSF training, agriculture and hydro- and wind-power. Canada should ensure to communicate well, to Canadians and to Afghans, what it is doing in Afghanistan.

Military security has to be maintained by the Afghan armed forces, which are the most legitimate armed force to take on this role. International forces should not operate in the towns and villages.

### **Points Raised in General Discussion**

Understanding Afghanistan within a six months deployment is impossible for the average soldier from Kingston. Yet, a better understanding could have helped the interveners; for example, they might have noticed local police and justice structures and the corruption factor, and they might have worked with egalitarian local leadership structures rather than displace them.

When emphasizing establishing structures for the rule of law and justice, as well as democratic governance structures, an analysis of what type of justice and governance structures are most appropriate is important. The interveners should not just impose Western structures and models of democracy that may be at odds with local culture and structures.

Selecting Kandahar was a mistake for the Canadians; they should have focused on Kabul or Herat. However, the development need was greatest in Kandahar, although the security needed for any development intervention was not understood at the time the decision was made.

## Panel 2: Stuck in the Sand? Where is Afghanistan Now?

Gerald Ohlsen - moderator

Michael Byers - panellist

Nipa Banerjee - panellist

Sadiqa Basiri Saleem - panellist

**Michael Byers**, Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, UBC  
Summary of Presentation:

Despite government announcements of a troop withdrawal, Canada very much retains a military presence in Afghanistan, including the training mission component and the Special Forces continued operations. Training can be dangerous, as witnessed in the string of green-on-blue incidents, and the Special Forces continue to sustain casualties that are never announced publically (unlike in the United States). The Harper government has recently increased funding for the JTF 2 Special Forces and may have several hundred in Afghanistan, who may stay well beyond 2014.

There is a need for greater accountability and transparency about the Special Forces, and about the military in general. Part of the blame lies with the media, which has not been sufficiently rigorous in its work and has relied too exclusively on reporters embedded with the armed forces. The Defence Department employs 700 public relations staff, but the media should go beyond relying on public relations lines and embedded reporting. Civil society also has an important role to play, and there is a need for strong institutions to be nurtured and maintained.

Attention should in particular be turned to the breakdown in the responsibility relationship between the army and the elected government and its proper policy process and decision-making hierarchy. It is not acceptable for a charismatic military officer to strong-arm the government into an ill-conceived military operation or to sign an international agreement like the 2005 prisoner transfer agreement.

The prisoner transfer agreement was not reviewed by then Defence Minister Bill Graham, who had a legal background and would have noticed its inadequacies. The agreement ignored available British, Dutch and Danish detainee arrangements with more robust protections for the prisoners and continuous access provisions for the detaining forces. Best practices were ignored and the alleged human rights violations and infringements of national and international law should be investigated. Whistle-blowers, like Richard Colvin, were not given the kind of protection they should have had.

There is a need for a public inquiry in order to establish what really happened. If it is found that war crimes and crimes against humanity were committed within the ranks of

the Canadian army, there must be prosecution. This will be a traumatic experience for Canada, but is a necessary process in order to put ourselves back into a position of moral leadership internationally.

Other panelists have mentioned how the Harper government has squandered 'soft' capital internationally. However, equally important are the effect the Afghanistan operation and the prisoner transfer episode have had on Canadian soldiers. Beyond the issue of post-traumatic stress disorder, policies have been exposing them to the moral and legal risks of being involved in torture. This undermines the moral integrity and professionalism of the Canadian forces and has a corrosive effect on morale.

**Nipa Banerjee**, Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa

Summary of Presentation:

Nipa Banerjee analyzed the major positive and negative impacts of a large foreign presence in Afghanistan and the sustainability of the positive changes after the exit of the foreign troops and reduction in development aid.

The immediate result of the war following 9/11 was the removal of the brutal regime of the Taliban, resulting in the country thriving under a semblance of security and barriers for women being removed with the end of a religious extremist rule. The victory was followed by the adoption of a constitution and establishment of a transitional government, with some excellent ministers in the cabinet to lead a moderate reform agenda. The double digit growth, not unexpected in a new nation starting from a zero base, nonetheless uplifted the moral of the nation. The Afghan currency was stabilized. Progress was made in the delivery of certain services, such as education, primary health care and micro-credit, and in participatory rural development. A modest start was made in reforming the public finance management system. The 2004 election was a resounding success. Freedom of the media also developed in leaps and bounds in these years.

Some international donors and agencies did well in providing financial support to the national programs developed and implemented by Afghans, but the majority of international donors created parallel mechanisms to deliver the same services as the yet under-developed Afghan institutions struggled to provide. Such programs undermined the Afghan government efforts and the cause of establishing the legitimacy and authority of the government, elements essential for a new nation emerging from decades of conflict.

Over the decade (2001-12), a disproportionate amount of aid (roughly 80%) have been programmed and implemented by the donors and their own contracted agencies, not giving the opportunity to Afghan institutions to develop capacities of planning,

implementation, monitoring and accountability. Despite donor-supported technical assistance, the Afghan institutions remain weak due to the placement of less than satisfactory quality of experts and the supply-driven rather than demand-driven nature of the technical assistance.

**A disproportionate amount of aid has been directed to the provinces (through the Provincial Reconstruction Teams –PRTs) where international troops have been fighting the insurgency, as a part of the strategy of winning the hearts and minds of the people for the foreign troops, instead of promoting people’s support for the Afghan government (at the center or in the provinces).** The very poor remote areas and the Northern provinces have not benefitted equally from such skewed aid allocation. Aid investments through the PRTs have been driven by short term political and military objectives. PRTs’ focus on quick-impact projects have run contrary to long-term development strategies. Little attention was paid to consultations at the provincial level or with the tribal heads. Overall, millions of dollars of the development investment of the PRTs had little impact on Afghan state legitimacy or institution building because of lack of participation from the local administration or communities.

Excessive aid flows without appropriate planning or adequate accountability structures, fuelled corruption both in internationally-led programs and in the Afghan government, which delegitimized the government. Excessive funding also generated competition and conflict over aid resources, often along factional, tribal and ethnic lines, compromising efforts for national unity and solidarity.

Aid largely bypassed the poor. High unemployment and under-employment served as incentives for young men to join the Taliban. Abuse of women and their lock out from the justice system continued unabated. While the international community take credit for putting children to school, especially young girls, they neglect to quote the dropout rates or mention the number of school-going girls burnt with acid or poisoned.

Drug production continues to be a curse - UNODC reports that revenue from opium constitutes 25% of the licit GDP. New roads and schools built with aid dollars are in poor condition due to poor quality material used and lack of maintenance. Democratic development has retracted, with the 2009 election fractured with fraud, and in the absence of well capacitated institutions such as, the civilian police and the justice system, protecting the democratic rights of the people.

Inadequate leadership capability throughout the country is a serious limitation. Most of the ministers who contributed to the earlier successes of the new Afghan state are no longer in the cabinet.

In the midst of insecurity and governance chaos, an economic slowdown is predicted by the International Financial Institutions. With the drawdown of the military forces and inevitable increase in insecurity and already announced reduction in development

assistance, real GDP growth is predicted to be reduced to 5-6%. Too quick a pace in transition of security responsibility and premature and aggressive draw down of troops will be risky from military, political and development points of view. The regional conflict may mutate into a proxy-led civil war, with disastrous consequences, making a return of Al Qaeda possible. To avoid the expected negative impacts of transition in all areas, Afghanistan must continue to rely upon external funding and technical support, with Afghanistan taking a lead. Political or military solutions and development progress cannot be left in the hands of the western nations. That task belongs to the Afghans. The west should continue to provide financial support- development aid and adequate military support- so that the Afghan State does not collapse and is able to prevent the Taliban from mobilizing.

**Sadiqa Basiri Saleem**, Afghan educator and women's rights activist  
Summary of Presentation:

**Afghan women have been through difficult circumstances under the Taliban, but they do not see themselves as victims.** Indeed, new hope has been instilled under the new government and women now see themselves as 'change-markers'. Tangible progress at the policy level is evident in Afghanistan. Several legal projects have been enacted that provide women with equal rights and some degree of protection.

Canada has been successful in advocating for women's rights, and in its commitment to building schools and supporting projects that target women. However, not all women have benefited equally from these advances. They have been more felt in urban settings, with few of the projects and little of the funding reaching into the rural and remote areas. More funding should be ear-marked for women. Funding of young women's education is essential to prepare the next generation of women leaders. More women are needed in the legal system, including the Supreme Court, so that cases of gender-based violence will stop being resolved in the aggressor's favour.

Women remain concerned that in discussions about reconciliation with the Taliban, hard-fought-for gains and rights will be stripped away from them in order to reach a compromise. In particular, there are concerns over the removal of Article 22, which guarantees equal treatment regardless of gender. Women do not have a problem with the Taliban as long as they recognise women's and human rights. Peace talks should be pursued responsibly and not to facilitate a quick exit of Western military forces. These peace talks should include women to give them a chance to protect their rights and to build confidence in the process among civil society.

## **Points Raised in General Discussion**

Afghan women were included in the Chicago and Tokyo conferences because women's groups in Western countries were pushing the Afghan government to include women. Without such pressure, women are not accepted as full citizens and participants in the peace process. They were initially excluded from the Peace Jirga and had to lobby hard for inclusion. Afghan women have been using United Security Council Resolution 1325 to make the case for their role in resolving the Afghan conflict. President Karzai likely does respect the Constitution and believe in the role of women, but he probably also believes that he will not be able to appease the fundamentalists if he gives women a strong role. The role of women in the peace process should be enhanced until there are at least 20-30% women as participants. The more women there are, the less they can be stopped from speaking up.

The PRTs have blurred the line between aid and the military, endangering both aid workers and aid recipients. Local leaders often do not attend PRT meetings because of the threats and dangers that follow.

The International community pays 95% of Afghanistan's bills but cannot get President Karzai to appoint competent people to lead key posts. There appear to be cases of conscious sabotage in the form of appointing incompetent people to the head of well-designed institutions to prevent them from working. At a minimum, the international community has caused a brain drain, whereby talented and educated Afghans work for international organizations at international salaries rather than working for the Afghan government and civil service.

The Canadian government should stand up for human rights, particularly in Afghanistan by opposing torture and promoting women's rights. It should never lose sight of international humanitarian law again. Without full respect for and adherence to IHL, the Canadian military will never be able to win hearts and minds overseas and Canada will not have a professional military that can fulfil its mission as Canadians expect.

## Panel 3: Afghanistan, Central Asia and a Troubled World: Future Engagement

Manfred Bienefeld - moderator

Peggy Mason- panelist

Hussain Ramoz- panelist

Daryl Copeland - discussant

**Daryl Copeland**, Author and consultant

Summary of Presentation:

The fundamental question is how to create human security. Development - long term, equitable, sustainable - is the new security, and diplomacy must replace defence at the centre of international policy. The continued militarization of foreign policy is holding Canada back, and Canada is mismanaging the Afghanistan issues. Daryl Copeland distilled three lessons:

1. Look before you leap - Governments need to undertake research and analysis before they decide to change course and before they commit resources. In the case of the decision to leave behind the UN mandate and get into aggressive counter-insurgency under OEF in Kandahar, this policy research was not done.
2. Have clear priorities – Without clear priorities, strategies, objectives and benchmarks, goals cannot be reached. If nation building was a goal, the mission should have been demilitarized as soon as the Taliban was ejected, and much more development assistance would have been needed.
3. Learn from failure - There are no military solutions to Afghanistan's underdevelopment. This was clear ten years ago, and yet some of mistakes of Vietnam seem to have been repeated. The increase of green-on-blue attacks suggests a radically deteriorating situation on the ground.

Counter-insurgency can be ended through extreme brutality, massive occupation with a high number of forces, or a political deal. The latter solution would have worked better earlier on, before the high number of civilian casualties and scandals around Quran burnings and disrespect towards the dead. **Canada forgot the Cold War lesson that militaries work best when they are not used, that talking is better than fighting, and that war should be a policy instrument rather than policy being a weapon of war.** As a result, Afghanistan became like a tumour in DFAIT that took resources away from the real threats and challenges of the day, most of which – like climate change, resource scarcity, and pandemics – have a significant science and technology component.

Canada should review the operational security of the training mission and cancel it if needed. Then it should hold a full public inquiry into Canada's decisions and operations in Afghanistan, in the interest of public accountability for how decisions were made. Thirdly, it should initiate a wider discussion about Canadian foreign policy in a new world and about what kind of military, diplomatic service, and aid agency Canada should have and needs to have.

**The international community should demilitarize and multilateralize the intervention in Afghanistan by immediately transferring the lead to the UN and exploring how to involve the Organization of the Islamic Conference, the Shanghai Cooperation Organisation, and the Organisation for Security Co-operation in Europe (OSCE).** Then it should hold a peace conference with the civil society and governments of the regional powers, including Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, and India.

**Hussain Ramoz**, Former Executive Director, Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission

Summary of Presentation:

### **Afghanistan's Waves of Reform and Democracy: Destiny of a Process to be Tested in the Transformation Decade?**

Historically, reforms in Afghanistan were introduced in waves, starting with the 1919-1927 and the 1964-1973 reform waves, which brought social progress and democratization. The third wave was the intervention of the international community in 2001. A new administration was established and despite the many failures and mistakes, one cannot ignore the great progress made in human rights, political pluralism, the introduction of a moderate Islam, a free media, and legislative reforms.

The nation building process is encouraging representatives of various layers of society, including people with different religious, ethnic, gender, and linguistic identities, to discuss and dialogue with each other. Institutions of rule of law and democracy are being established and the collapsed army and police are being rebuilt. Regional and international dialogue on Afghanistan has intensified in a variety of forums.

Now with the exit strategy, there is a fear that the progress made will again be reversed, as it happened at the end of the first two waves. It is time for civil society of Afghanistan to rise to the occasion. Some new ideas coming from Afghanistan are promising, but others are alarming and may cause destabilization. The message from the international community is confusing. There needs to be a clear follow-up mechanism on the renewed partnership set forth in Bonn 2 between the international community and Afghans and a firm international commitment to support for governance, security, the peace process, economic and social development, and regional cooperation.

Conflict factors rising from Afghanistan traditional society in transition toward democratic practices would need appropriate management; these factors include:

- the rising young people,
- clash of modernity and traditionalism,
- rural vs. urban divide,
- feminism vs. religion,
- secularism vs. sharia law,
- social networks

Going forward, Afghanistan should connect with its rich history, including historical commitments to reform and democracy. Peace is an achievable goal in Afghanistan, but it is a long and complex process that requires intervention, time, resources, and management.

Some necessary elements of a peace process are:

- Durand Line
- Nation-building and social justice
- The need to position Afghanistan toward reconciliation with other states and peoples in the region.
- The need to reach an irreversible state of stability
- The need to reconnect with Afghanistan past civilization
- Building a stable Afghan army, rather than focusing on numbers

The New Afghan National Development Strategy in 2013 should be based on the principles of Bonn 2. The 'Red Lines' of Quality Governance, Credible Elections, and Ongoing Peace Talks should not be compromised. Development should not be neglected. The focus should be on essential needs: power, water, schools, health, roads, and employment. Long-term priorities include roads, which have an important role in connecting people, and the parliamentary system and internal democracy, with political parties that support democracy and sustain political order. Short-term priorities include a responsible military exit; the 2014 elections; continued regional and local peace talks; a review of civil society's role in projects that ensure peace and social progress; and a series of regional forums among the civil societies of Afghanistan, Pakistan, Iran, Turkey, and India.

**Peggy Mason**, Peace and Security consultant, former Ambassador for Disarmament  
Summary of Presentation:

### **The UN – the Indispensable Peace Facilitator for Afghanistan**

The only way forward for Afghanistan is a negotiated settlement.

The best opportunity for an inclusive negotiation was wasted in 2003. What about now in 2012? There is a plethora of talks about talks going on, mainly in secret, with a bewildering array of back channels and actors. I would argue they are inadequate, ineffective and incoherent at best and utterly counterproductive at worst.

Let me now outline some of the key principles for a durable negotiated settlement for Afghanistan.

The first lesson is the need for a broad, inclusive peace process leading to as comprehensive a peace agreement as possible, meaningfully addressing all relevant issues underlying the conflict.

The second lesson is that the agreement must encompass not only all relevant issues but also all relevant parties. This will include all the various factions engaged in the conflict (government and insurgents alike, all sides of the civil war). There may be some “irreconcilables” but, if there is to be any chance of achieving a comprehensive and sustainable agreement, they must be kept to a minimum. The more factions outside the negotiation, the less chance of the peace holding. This, of course, is the story of Afghanistan post 2003.

But it will not be enough for the peace talks to involve political and military leaders. The negotiations must be informed by an inclusive consultative process down to the grass roots level if it is to replace elitist, exclusionary forms of governance with pluralistic, inclusive political institutions and mechanisms.

And of course the next lesson is that relevant parties that need to be part of the overall peace process architecture/ negotiating framework go well beyond the internal factions, to encompass regional actors (Pakistan, Iran, India and bordering Central Asian states) and other external players with vested interests - USA, Russia, China.

All of these external actors are involved in the conflict for a variety of reasons relating to their own perceived interests and it is quite simply impossible to effectively address these concerns without a negotiating framework expressly designed to do so. (The antithesis of this approach is secret talks with select actors that so concern other key actors that they resort to assassinating participants to stop a process that does not include them.)

A fourth lesson relates to the need to negotiate and include in the peace agreement the type and scope of international assistance in its implementation phase. There can be no coherence in the international effort without it.

**Now to the lesson that I wish to highlight here today and that is the centrality of impartial and expert third party assistance for a comprehensive peace process and, in turn, the indispensability of the UN in fulfilling this role.**

Belligerents, parties to the conflict, cannot devise an inclusive peace process on their own, however important and critical it may be to ensure that the negotiating process is Afghan-led to the maximum extent possible. Even if they had the requisite expertise, there is manifestly insufficient credibility and trust and even motivation among the parties to take on this task. One of the early tasks of an expert facilitator will be to build confidence that a broad peace process is both possible and worthwhile.

We are talking about a multi-tiered, complex negotiating process – the internal Afghan negotiation with government, opposition, insurgents, but also a broad public consultative dimension, an extraordinarily complex regional dimension and key external actors, particularly but not only the USA, with vested interests;

Only the UN has the expertise, the legitimacy and the credibility to take on this role of third party, expert, impartial facilitator.

Key coalition partners, notably the USA, have now embraced the need for some sort of negotiations AND equally important, credible international voices are finally calling for a broad, inclusive peace process with the UN as the indispensable third party facilitator. These include in particular Brahimi and Pickering in the *2011 Report of the Century Foundation International Task Force on Afghanistan in its Regional and Multilateral Dimensions*; and the ICG report, of 26 March 2012 entitled: *Talking About Talks: Toward a Political Settlement in Afghanistan*.

Where are we on a comprehensive UN-facilitated comprehensive peace process?

So far as one can discern from the outside, there has been no progress in actually appointing a UN facilitator/mediation team to begin to devise a comprehensive peace process.

The international Community, has followed a US-led strategy since 2001 that has, in the damning words of the painstakingly documented ICG report, and many others too, not only failed to end the war but has instead reinforced long standing factional and ethnic rivalries, empowered the rise of predatory government and thus contributed substantially to the resurgence of the armed opposition to the Karzai government.

Now the international community appears to be acquiescing in a US-led negotiating

strategy that, insofar as one can discern anything about it at all, given its opaqueness, seems designed, like President Karzai's myriad ad hoc efforts, to co-opt certain insurgents into some sort of power-sharing arrangement – and which seems destined to have as little success as Karzai's efforts at building a durable political framework but a high likelihood of undermining further the prospects for a *meaningful* negotiation process.

How do we move forward?

What nation will argue for a comprehensive UN-facilitated negotiation process for Afghanistan? This used to be a pre-eminently Canadian role but we were, until recently, a belligerent to the conflict (and, until relatively recently, an extremely outspoken opponent of talks with the Taliban).

The USA of course is a vital participant in the peace process but cannot effectively lead it. Precisely because Canada is a former belligerent, our promotion of a comprehensive peace process could be very powerful, and would be even more effective if we actively solicited the support of fellow NATO members.

There is also a big role for civil society in countries who contributed troops to ISAF to take up the call.

### **Points Raised in General Discussion**

The call for UN mediation left unclear what part of the UN should take the lead in this. Some Afghans see the UN as a belligerent, which is why UN facilities and staff have been attacked in ways that have never been seen in other war zones. Even the UN is unable to meet with people because of security restrictions imposed after these attacks. Yet, belligerents have to meet somehow, requiring an impartial and trusted third party to help them do so. The UN should put together an expert negotiating team to explore possible issues with the parties and start drafting a negotiating agenda.

The US recently signed an agreement with Kabul for a continued presence in Afghanistan. While the NATO military combat forces may leave Afghanistan in 2014, military trainers will likely stay on, and Special Forces soldiers will likely stay. As many as 20,000 US soldiers might remain after the 'withdrawal' because Central Asia is an important location for its oil and gas reserves and a central location for land trade routes (including potential pipelines). The Special Forces are the dark side of the military and responsible for most of the assassinations, night raids, bombings, drone attacks and civilian casualties caused by the pro-government forces.

## **Keynote Address: *Lessons Learned from Afghanistan and Other Interventions***

### **Ferry de Kerckhove**

Former Canadian High Commissioner to Pakistan and former Ambassador to Egypt and Indonesia

#### **Putting the concept of intervention in a broader context.**

From the first Gulf War to the Kosovo operation, the West has felt compelled to use force to intervene in humanitarian crises around the world, building on the Mitterrand concept of “le droit d’ingérance humanitaire” to eventually attempt to establish a quasi-code of intervention based on the concept of the “responsibility to protect”.

Well, at the height of the Darfour crisis, when I was responsible for the UN at DFAIT, I went to New York a few days prior to UNGA 2004 and met for an early breakfast my US counterpart, Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations Kristen Silverberg, a rising star of the Bush Administration who is the age of my daughter. She quipped “I like your R2P stuff, but how do we apply it to Darfur?” to which I replied “As a former commander of a platoon of tanks, I wish I could suggest 40 M1Abrams tanks, but it is not that easy”. Victoria Holt and Tobias Berkman ably put it in the title of their brilliant book on R2P, “The Impossible Mandate”. Hence the need to put the concept of intervention in a broader context.

#### **Intervention or war - where the difference?**

I am sure I can bore you to death by recalling the origins of foreign intervention all the way to the Neanderthals meeting their demise at the hands of the Cro-Magnons but if there is anything we have learned from Afghanistan is that in terms of means, there is little difference between an armed intervention in another country for the perceived higher good – does Iraq ring a bell, or Kosovo for that matter? – and a military intervention to conquer a country or subdue a population. This is why all scholars of R2P have put so much emphasis on the multiple stages of R2P prior to armed intervention. But for their part, political leaders have had a tendency to bypass those stages and to focus on the “to go or not to go, that is the question”, e.g. Libya vs. Syria ! And while we may have made progress from the times of the Congress of Vienna to the present United Nations via the League of Nations, foreign interventions remain very much tied to the respective powers of the potential targets and of the potential interveners, as well as to the safeguards the latter have provided themselves with, such as the right of veto at the UNSC. Senator Romeo Dallaire has known a piece of that one as much as the Syrian National Council does today. “Coalition of the willing” is a neat subterfuge to mask a refusal by the UNSC to endorse a peace-keeping or some other Chapter VII intervention. When successfully brokered, it circumvents a UNSC veto, with all the associated risks, but with morality and legitimacy hopefully trumping illegality.

### **The right to intervene**

Before going on to lessons learned, maybe we should first ask why we (i.e. humans, writ large) intervene in one another's affairs mostly through the use of force. Of all the authors who have extolled one way or another the moral illegitimacy of aggression while justifying intervention, John Stuart Mill's stands out: *the only purpose for which power can be rightfully exercised over any member of a civilized community, against his will, is to prevent harm to others*".

But this is far from sufficient as we sadly found out with Georges Bush's invasion of Iraq. There is no God-given certainty about the judgment on the use of force being better than any other recourse or no recourse at all, particularly when the so-called God-inspired higher good is based on fallacies and lies. In fact, all the arguments made by the Bush administration to justify a preemptive intervention against Iraq were false, from the so called magnitude of the threat and the alleged intention of Iraq to make use of the alleged WMD, to the alleged exhaustion of all alternatives and the failed consonance of the use of preemptive force with the UN Charter.

### **The R2P legacy or death**

The implications of the Iraq War for R2P were pretty negative as Iraq was thrown at us, at the UN, as a clear abuse of a norm yet to be enshrined despite all our attempts to dispel the notion that Iraq was an R2P case. Clearly it was not! But it also had an impact on the Libyan operation in that while all of us, nice hypocrites, in our hearts, were adamant that the success of Operation Unified Protector would be judged on Moammar Khadafy no longer being in power, we swore that regime change was not part of the deal! Of course, the real difference was the UNSC sanctioning the intervention - maybe for the last time!.

But not only did the invasion of Iraq provide opponents of R2P further ammunition to oppose it as an attack on state sovereignty – an old worn out argument – but with the companion ongoing war in Afghanistan – also initially a coalition of the willing operation - it has also stifled any enthusiasm for other interventions which might be really needed in future. Potential interventions are equally hampered by rising anti-US and more generally anti-West sentiments and the greater chance of Chinese and Russian vetoes to any further UN condoned intervention, such as in Syria – Libya being a one-time aberration!

This is why the proper articulation of the R2P doctrine, mandate or norm is so critical. In 2005, I was asked to represent Canada on the Friends of UN Reform Group of 15 countries from all continents. We spent a huge amount of time lobbying member countries for a robust inclusion of R2P in the 2005 UN World Summit Outcome Resolution – a crisp, focused, neat, rigorous, and lean, 38 pages, 178 paragraphs document – a sleeper, Un somnifère garanti! But its sections 138 and 139 enshrined R2P and on 28 April 2006, the UN Security Council unanimously adopted Resolution 1674 on

the Protection of Civilians in Armed Conflict, reaffirming the provisions of these paragraphs giving it some *customary prescriptive value*. It also underlined the UNSC's readiness to address gross violations of human rights, as "genocide and mass crimes against humanity may constitute threats to international peace and security". On paper, we have made progress at the multilateral level. Indeed, on September 14, 2009, the UN General Assembly adopted its first resolution on R2P. Yet, neither has R2P established new international legal obligations – à la genocide - nor has there been much progress in attempts to implement it despite sophisticated watering down by Ban-Ki-Moon's "three pillars" approach to R2P – for those who may have forgotten, pillar one emphasizes the protection responsibilities of the state, pillar two defines international assistance and capacity building requirements, while pillar three refers to timely and decisive response, with a strong emphasis on pacific measures.

Interestingly, while President Obama and Prime Minister David Cameron both spoke early on of the *responsibility to act* in the Libyan case, it took the November 2011 Halifax Security Forum to hear Defense Minister MacKay emphasize the R2P character of the intervention.

So we have to content ourselves with what Griffith University's Hugh Breakey said in a detailed review of the literature on R2P: "Perhaps most significantly, it is arguable that R2P has gained sufficient ground to frame the discourse and set the terms around which discussions of sovereignty and international action must now take place".

### **Failed multilateralism and Islam**

I have spent a lot of time so far on R2P because the unending debate about its applicability reminds us that the multilateral institutions we created to help build some form of collective wisdom around decisions to intervene or not to intervene are pretty faulty and deeply thorn by competing national ideologies at a time when the nature and challenges of the requirements for international action are changing rapidly. We have indoctrinated ourselves in believing that existing mechanisms and models are applicable to new forms of conflicts despite our inability or our refusal to appreciate the significance of new realities, notably the civilizational and societal exacerbation of fundamentalism. We are now facing religious extremisms which know no frontier. I for one have a lot of sympathy for my friend Bob Fowler's slow "conversion" during his ordeal to the notion of a "clash of civilizations" as a result of people's different religious identities. The question is the extent of the clash and how many are caught in the "black hole" of extremism.

I think we are committing a serious error in refusing to admit that there is a Huntington effect at play in the world today, be it so far only at the margins.

**However, our interventions as much as our inability to intervene through alternative modalities of influence, have a significant impact on the expansion or the contraction of these margins.**

When the battleground is civilizational and not merely ethnic, territorial, or socio-economic, our traditional, Westphalian, Pavlovian conditional, reflexes are inoperative. Conventional weapons are of limited use against fanatics. And the zealots who display their anti-Americanism in Benghazi, Cairo or Sana'a are not targeting specifically military forces, economic establishments, institutions or building or even a social system. They wage an all-out war – a Jihad – against "l'autre". Remember Jean-Paul Sartre's "L'Enfer c'est les autres" – "Hell is other people". No Exit !\_This is what we are dealing with. Satan is an American. As Raheel Raza of Muslims Facing Tomorrow puts it so well: "They (the Americans) are after all responsible for every evil that befalls the Muslim world including natural disasters, the killing of Shias and other minorities by Islamist mobs, the Arab Spring, oppression of women, honour killings and now this film!"

Bob Fowler talks about a "gulf between who and what they are – between their beliefs, messages, and purposes, and mine". 24 hours a day these Jihadists base their life on archaic interpretations of the Holy Koran, often "spruced" with adequately self-serving Hadiths, many of which were twisted, when not actually written de novo, to serve political interests of the times. Ignorance and rejection of modernity fueled by a passion for a rigid enforcement of Sharia make these fundamentalists turn readily against their own Muslim brethren for failing to live by THE BOOK and for falling prey to the pluralistic voices of the West. It is no wonder that a group of fanatics in the Sinai have pronounced President Morsi as a non-believer! To paraphrase Sam Harris in "The End of Faith", in the face of the lack of a secular culture or of secularism permeating only a few strata of Muslim populations, for these fundamentalists the progress of science has failed to winnow down belief-based interpretations of daily realities.

So it is no wonder that what we see as legitimate and essential interventions to foster or establish the rule of law, democracy, respect for human rights, stable institutions, and empowered civil societies, eventually turn into religious or quasi-religious conflicts with little accomplishments on our Western inspired objectives.

### **Cases studies**

I have said enough about Iraq which is somewhat of an hybrid case of intervention. It's *ab initio* illegitimacy – illegality said Kofi Annan – produced insurgencies such as that of Shiite leader Moqtada al-Sadr's deeply religious inspired calls for the establishment of Islamic Law. But was followed after Saddam Hussein's demise by a regime change whose long term stability and democratic fabric remains at best uncertain. What is certain is that religion will play an increasing role in defining the ultimate institutional and social set-up of the country. We will have to learn to deal with these changing societies.

### **A word on Afghanistan from that perspective**

My personal experience with Afghanistan was two-phased – first travelling by car as a tourist in November 1975 with my then 6.5 months pregnant wife from Tehran to Herat,

Kandahar, Ghazni, Kabul, Bamyan, Bandi Amir, Balk, Tashkourgan, Mazar-e-Sharif and through the Khyber into Pakistan, a heavenly trip with not a moment of fright, the kind of defining trip you never forget – and then the second phase, in 1999-2001, once I got clearance from Lloyd Axworthy to go into a war-thorn, wrought with destruction, mostly Taliban-controlled country, where we were still doing good work at the local level through our Canada Fund for local initiatives. I had several encounters with the Taliban leadership, including when I asked then Foreign Minister Mutawakil that the Taliban stop protecting their Al-Qaeda guests, to no avail. Throughout these encounters I remained appalled by the gulf not only between their mindset and ours but between theirs and the common Afghan folks, such as the Elders from the Jagouri district who pleaded with me to go and talk to the young Taliban leader so that our education project in the village could be sustained. I must admit that when the US forces in the weeks following 9-11 chased the Taliban from Kabul, I hoped that these men - outrageously equipped and armed by the Pakistan government, under the watchful eye of Naseerullah Babar, the Minister of Interior of Benazir Bhutto, (I hoped that these men) would not return. But then there was the escape of Bin Laden through the Tora Bora mountains into Pakistan and the subsequent birth of the insurgency.

George Petrolekas, my friend and colleague at the Conference of Defense Associations Institute, suggests looking at the war in Afghanistan in four phases. The first one, in 2001-2 had clear objectives and was an unmitigated success. The second, from 2003 to 2006 was a failure of missed opportunities in that we did not deliver what we had committed to do – remember references to a Marshall Plan? The US war in Iraq deprived Afghanistan of the full engagement required; the mission became balkanized and the lack of strategic continuity and coherence allowed the insurgency to fill the vacuum. The third, from 2006 to 2011- was the triumph of insurgency as we failed to implement a full-fledged counter insurgency strategy, our prime focus on winning the hearts and minds of people being its softest edge. The fourth is the present exit strategy, putting a brave face on it all through the commitment to train Afghan police.

This analysis is very congruent with the superb paper written by David Bercuson and Jack Granastein in their 2011 Research Paper for CDFAI on lessons learned from Afghanistan. Among his key points:

- A) “whole of government” missions are to be achieved through the early injection of well trained, well equipped, prepared, experienced civilian and military personnel in adequate numbers with clear goals. Sounds logical ?
- B) Political and military objectives must be clearly defined by all the active partners to a mission.
- C) There must be clear, consistent and persistent lines of command and communication.
- D) Particularly cogent is his remarks that NATO being “divided both politically and militarily,... any national caveats which limit the alliance’s ability to succeed politically and militarily in any conflict must be clearly enunciated by all partners at the outset and taken into consideration in Canadian mission planning. Ask General Charles Bouchard if he agrees with that one ! David Bercuson’s conclusion is clear: “Canadian decision

makers should think long and hard before entering into any coalition to which national caveats have been attached”.

While all these conclusions are intrinsically valid, the broader question remains: can or should the West intervene in conflicts or insurgencies that are increasingly religious inspired? We should never forget that the entire Muslim world, Sunni's and Shia's, unifies when there is a sense that an issue appears to be opposing Moslems to non-Moslem, as evidenced in the recent crisis when deeply held religious beliefs were deemed to be under attack.

In today's world, war is not always the continuation of politics through other means. As conventional interstate wars have increasingly ceded their place on the international stage to internal crises, civil strife, ethnic and religious conflicts, it is obvious that deterrence no longer plays the role it did in the balance of power days between the US and the Soviet Union. In fact today's failure of deterrence makes nuclear weapons more dangerous and fosters the proliferation temptation. The Israeli undeclared nuclear capacity is doing little to limit Iran's efforts in giving itself at least their own nuclear capacity despite the baffling war mongering of the Israeli administration. But it is clearly not the sole motivation. I will not insult the intelligence of this gathering by even asking if we all agree that a potential Israeli “intervention” through an attack on Iran's nuclear facilities would be catastrophic, to the point of potentially igniting if not a global war, certainly pretty dangerous regional conflagrations.

With regard to Israel, there is an ongoing, interesting debate between those who are convinced that the conclusion of a final agreement between Israeli and Palestinians through the creation of a Palestinian state living in peace alongside Israel would bring a significant cooling off in the region and that terrorism would abate rapidly in the world. Others argue that in the present circumstances, with the turmoil of the Arab Spring and the reemergence of a dominant Islamism, such an agreement not only would do little to bring peace in the region but could add to its instability as it would alter the existing set of allegiances and power ratios. It is certain, however, that Israel's continued settlement expansion and the fundamental injustice meted to the Palestinians to whom the international community promised a state in 1948, add fodder to the Islamists' stridency and undermine deeply the potential influence of the moderate forces who are accused of betraying the only cause that unites Arabs. A lot of blood has been shed in the Middle East on the altar of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and it matters little who wins the debate. The key is for all to work towards an agreement whose terms are known to all and whose implementation only lacks political will, particularly on the part of the occupying power. For too long the dialogue, if any, has been held by or through outside nations or interlocutors. No durable peace can ever materialize in such a mode.

More broadly, I would venture to argue that more than ever before, solutions to societal, humanitarian, political, sectarian, religious, ethnic and socio-economic problems in any region will have to come from the region itself. And they will come from

spasms to spasms. And, as Afghanistan slowly returns to tribalism, Taliban controlling vast swaths of land, and Kabul retaining only appearances of governance, the solutions will seldom please us!

My conclusion is not optimistic. In the face of religious extremism, were you to give me a choice between the epic Indian poem of Mahabharata and the blind allegiance and fanatical obedience to the ancient prescriptions of the Deuteronomy or some equally egregious interpretations of the other revealed religions, I would argue that as a guide for conduct, deference to the former would probably have reduced the number of atrocities the latter's modern renditions have produced. While it is true that our security depends on our capacity to defend ourselves against extremists, armed interventions are not the best means to do so.

Thank you.

## **Luncheon Address:** ***Iran - Current Crises and Regional Context***

### **Philip MacKinnon**

Former Canadian Ambassador to Iran and Egypt

For the observer looking at modern Iran, there is a temptation to focus on one aspect of the country and to define the total reality more or less in terms of that one aspect. This tendency is the source of a great deal of the controversy that one sees today among external observers.

Iran is this educated, cultured, fascinating nation – the fruit of a very long history (including a great empire) – composed of an increasingly educated people proud of that history, proud of their traditions (including their religious traditions), and in particular of, if I may use the word, a womanhood more educated and far more assertive than the female population of other Moslem countries of the region. It is a nation groping towards greater freedom and economic prosperity through an eventual republic ruled by people be it though a secular vision of the people as final arbitrary power or, still for many, by people themselves expressing God’s genius and exercising that political sovereignty in His name. Incidentally, there has been much talk of American exceptionalism in recent years and many observers have added France and China to the list of those societies that see themselves as unique, as uniquely blessed by God and as having a unique role to play in history. I would add Iran to that list.

Moreover, Iran represents a genuine attempt to bring the heavenly city to earth – to create a state –not with the guidance of the people but with the guidance of God as that guidance is understood by a relatively small group of Shia theologians who interpret, apply and enforce holy law to modern life.

Iran is also a state that can be described, as a prison state, a garrison state, a Mafia state and a terrorist state – a state that has, since 1979 penned its people into a much restricted compound, tortured and murdered tens of thousands of its citizens, oppressed and imprisoned tens of thousands more, sponsored terrorism throughout the region (and beyond), raised corruption and cronyism to dizzying heights, pursued for essentially ideological reasons a further eight years a horrible war which although started by Iraq could have been ended much earlier, delivered on very few if any of its original promises (beyond a certain safety net for the poorest sector of its population) and built a rentier state which continues to run the economy into the ground.

In looking at the regional context, it has to be noted that as Ayatollah Khomeini developed his vision he took as a target not just Iran, but the whole Moslem world. He himself said later that “we don’t recognize Iran as ours, as all Moslem countries are a

part of us.” The constitution of the IRI recognized him as the “Imam of the Moslem Umma” and part of the constitutional responsibility of the IRGC is to export the revolution.

As a result an integral aspect of Iran’s foreign policy and thus by definition its regional policy was and is its export to the world and particularly to the Moslem world. During the lifetime of the IRI this has waxed and waned to the degree that it has clashed with Iran’s more prosaic and more pragmatic national interests. Moreover it has throughout the years made it very difficult for Iran’s interlocutors to determine what are Iran’s policies and to what degree that they can be trusted and relied upon. The regime could spend years castigating the governments of its neighbours as “evil” and do its best to get rid of them through terror and intimidation and then turn around and call for cooperation with them on regional, economic and security issues (as President Rafsanjani did after the first Gulf War). When I was in Iran, President Khatami did much to improve relations with Iran’s neighbours, including Saudi Arabia, and I would submit that this was one of the most successful of his policies. He had more latitude from the Supreme Leader and his acolytes in this area than in many other areas, perhaps as a result of a pragmatic recognition that even the execution of Khomeini’s vision required, if nothing else, an ordering of priorities. As relations with Russia and China have shown, the Iranian regime can be very pragmatic in sacrificing the interests of Moslems in those countries if it is seen to be in its interest.

On the other hand, I would submit that pragmatism is in short order today in Tehran in the determination and execution of its policies in Syria. I assume, perhaps wrongly, that the major reason why the IRI continues to support President Assad in such an unconditional fashion is that the most important political investment that it has made abroad is in Lebanon with, as its goal, the pursuit of its policies of destroying Israel. That investment is endangered if the Syrian regime goes down.

I have chosen to focus on only two regional issues: Afghanistan and Israel. However, there is no lack of other regional issues that are important and deserve attention: Iraq, the Persian Gulf and Syria all spring to mind and all have as a principal focus the role of Iran.

### Afghanistan

Certainly after 9/11 Iran cooperated with the US in Afghanistan, facilitating over flights, agreeing to perform search and rescue missions for downed American air crew who bailed out over Iran and other measures to indirectly aid the US military effort to overthrow the Taliban. Iran also played a part in supplying arms to the Northern Alliance and, at the Bonn conference, in helping the US to establish the Karzai Government, including pressuring Rabbani to step aside. They also reportedly offered to help train the Afghan Security forces and indicated that they were ready to cooperate fully in the task of rebuilding Afghanistan.

Interestingly, both the US and Iran allowed other issues to get in the way of developing the cooperation that had proved useful in Afghanistan. The Iranians initially sheltered Gulbuddin Hekmatyar, one of the major Afghan Mujahedeen leaders who opposed the settlement in Afghanistan, but they later threw him out. A number (and the estimates here vary wildly) of al-Qaida fighters were given shelter in Iran. More to the point, the US problems with the Iranian nuclear program and its stance on Middle Eastern issues, particularly Israel, probably doomed any development of the cooperation that had been evident in the months after 9/11. The Axis of Evil designation not only returned the US-Iranian relationship to the status quo ante but signaled a significant deterioration in the relationship. I was present in Tehran when President Bush made that speech and I can attest as to the very negative effect of that designation, particularly among the reformist faction and those who supported it (many of the conservatives reveled in it, seeing it as proof of the bankruptcy of Khatami's policies). Whether it was made because of the capture in the Red Sea of the boat, the Karine A, loaded with Iranian arms destined to Palestinian militants in the Gaza Strip or because US officials did not want to so stigmatize Iraq alone, and as an afterthought threw in North Korea and Iran, the fact remains that the designation "Axis of Evil" had no discernible benefit to American interests and in fact hurt them. During days following the speech there was much talk in Iran of the belief that the IRGC had initiated the shipment of arms to put an end to any further cooperation. Moreover one should not forget that for many years the Iranian regime had designated the US as the source of all evil, so to be so designated themselves should not have been an unwelcome surprise.

After Karzai and the Americans concluded a strategic partnership agreement in 2005, the Iranians asked the Afghan Government to conclude one. Reportedly the US Government did not allow Karzai to conclude such an agreement. It seems that, from 2007 onwards, Iran took a different approach, supplying arms to the Taliban and to members of the Northern Alliance, and it has since continued this approach, apparently with the twin ideas of making life difficult for the Americans and keeping the American forces in Afghanistan off balance to the extent that there would be no question of using those forces to effect "regime change" in Iran. Indeed the very fact that the US was becoming increasingly bogged down in both Iraq and Afghanistan meant that a US invasion of Iran was less realistic. There was thus room for Iranian authorities to return to their traditional hostility to and confrontation with the US – space that was greatly expanded in late 2007 when a US National Intelligence estimate concluded that Iran had put a stop to its nuclear weapons program some years before. It should be noted, however, that the growing Iranian involvement in making things difficult for the Americans and for ISAF seems to have been carefully calibrated. The military assistance seems to have been limited to training, money, explosive material, small arms, rockets and mortars. More recently, a shipment of rockets seized by ISAF in Feb 2011 allegedly were Iranian in origin and last month the Afghan NDS indicated that insurgents involved in suicide attacks in Nimroz Province were Iranian citizens.

Since 2007, Iran has spent a great deal of money in Afghanistan – by some accounts over \$100 million a year on media, civil society and religious schools, clearly attempting to counter American influence. They have been clear about their opposition to the Strategic Agreement signed earlier this year with the US and have threatened to force the return of some one million Afghan refugees in Iran. By some estimates, over half of the TV stations and other media outlets in Afghanistan are funded by Iranian sources and there has been a concerted campaign against the strategic agreement.

Yet as Iran has stepped up its anti-coalition activities in Afghanistan, it must, I assume, be mindful that its interest is in a stable Afghanistan after the departure of the US, NATO, and other foreign troops in 2014. And there is plenty of evidence to suggest that this is so. It would be natural to detect some ambivalence in how the Iranians comport themselves in Afghanistan and it is perhaps this that explains the tenor of recent comments of the senior allied commander in Iran, General John Allen, in which he noted that Iran continued to “fuel the flames of violence” in Afghanistan. “Our sense is that Iran could do more if they chose to,” General Allen said. “But they have not, and we watch the activity and the relationships very closely.” It also explains what seems to be the relatively qualitatively low level of the military assistance it gives to the insurgents.

In fact, as the foreign troops leave Afghanistan, there is a convergence of interest between Iran and the NATO countries, in particular the US, upon which one could foresee the possibility of considerable cooperation (the stability of the Afghan regime itself, narcotics, refugees, cross border trade and others). As was the case in 2001, the US has other strategic concerns that make cooperation with the IRI difficult and the Iranians themselves are pulled hither and yon by the tension between the still living ideological vision of Khomeini and the practical interests of the state and people of Iran. Indeed, it goes deeper than this. Iranian hostility to the US is a bit like US hostility to Castro’s Cuba – it has a very important domestic component. During my years in Iran, I came to believe that, as other aspects of the revolution fell by the wayside, hostility to and hatred of the US (and, of course, Israel) was the glue that held the ideological basis of the regime together. Scott Peterson of the Christian Science Monitor in his most interesting book “Let the Swords encircle me” reported a conversation with Amir Mohebian, a very influential conservative newspaper editor, in which the latter noted that, while some people felt that it was time to solve the problem with the US in a balanced way, others “think the hostility against the US after thirty years is a main element of our identity, and if we solve it we will dissolve ourselves”. While all this sounds a bit melodramatic, the degree to which this is true has a lot to do with finding a solution to how Iran conducts itself in Afghanistan. The same applies to the Israeli/nuclear issue.

The dilemma the Iranians are facing was also evident in the remarks that Foreign Minister Salehi made to the media at the Istanbul Conference last November. He deplored NATO and US troops in Afghanistan, suggested that that presence was linked to terrorism and instability and underlined Iran’s commitment to strong regional

security cooperation as an alternative to the western strategy. One is tempted to think that in the lead-up to 2014 and beyond, there is room for working together with the West (at least in a de-facto fashion) for the transition of security responsibilities to the Afghan authorities and for an inter-Afghan political settlement. It would be much easier to believe in this possibility and to take the Iranians at their word if they were not themselves linked to the terrorism and instability that they ascribe to the foreign military presence.

## Israel

As I have indicated earlier, from its very early days the Iranian regime has projected the destruction of Israel. In that regard, Amadinejad's remarks questioning the right of Israel to exist were not new as he himself in fact noted. What was really new was President Khatami's earlier indication that Iran could accept an Arab settlement with Israel if it was acceptable to the Palestinians. It was a major change at least in the tenor of Iranian discourse on Israel as was the comment in his inaugural speech in 1997 that Iran was prepared to accept an agreement predicated on UN Resolutions. How much this seeming change of official policy could be relied upon as a real change in policy was another matter (even though, as Hooman Majd reported in his book "The Ayatollahs' Democracy," the Supreme Leader, Mr. Khomeini, has seemingly publically echoed the same point that Mr. Khatami made earlier).

Iranian policy regarding Israel has now become so tied up in the nuclear issue that the latter is, in effect a regional issue (despite talk of delivery systems that might reach Europe and even farther). Moreover, others here have a far better knowledge of the relationship than I have and of how the thinking is developing in Israel.

The nuclear issue is also a regional issue in another way which is seldom referred to. As someone who has lived several years in Egypt and several months in Saudi Arabia, my guess is that if the Iranians develop nuclear weapons there will be a very strong push in these two countries to follow the same path and it would not easily be headed off or stymied by the US and the West.

When the extent of Iran's interest in developing an indigenous capacity across the nuclear fuel cycle was revealed in 2002, it was noteworthy that pride in what Iran was doing was one of the very few developments that resonated across the entire political spectrum. At that time, I found that people, even those who opposed the regime on most if not all other issues, were proud that Iran had a nuclear program. During the so-called "Green Revolution" in 2009, Mr. Mousavi indicated that, if he formed a government, it would continue the uranium enrichment program and would continue with the existing nuclear program. When Ahmadinejad in late 2009 appeared to agree to a western proposal to send its stock of LEU abroad for fabrication and have it returned in the form of reactor fuel rods, he was denounced by Conservatives and reformers. Many people may not have made the distinction between fuel cycle

development for peaceful purposes and the creation of a nuclear weapons capability, but at a time of considerable political tension, they could unite in support of the indigenous development of this important modern technology and their right to develop it. (Many of the themes, indeed even the actual words, recalled the pre-Three Mile Island, pre-Chernobyl days in countries like Canada, the US and Western European nations, when development of nuclear power was thought by almost all to be an essential criteria of a modern state and the key to its continuing economic development. Many Iranians also ask why Iran should receive qualitatively different treatment than India, Israel and Pakistan.

It is not surprising therefore that for many in Iran, a country intensely conscious of its history, parallels have been made between the current situation and the one that existed in 1951, when Iran's national oil production was nationalized by the Mossadegh Government only to have that Government overthrown in a coup d'état in which American intelligence services played an important part. During the war with Saddam Hussein, the latter's original aggression, his targeting of civilians and his use of chemical weapons were all more or less ignored by the outside world. This could only reinforce the importance of self-sufficiency for Iranians, including an independent nuclear fuel cycle.

It is also not surprising that, given the nature of Iranian politics, the issue was immediately used as a political weapon for domestic political purposes in both a positive and negative sense. In particular President Ahmadinejad has embraced the development of nuclear energy as a natural right to consolidate his own position and build support among his power base. The President and the people around the Supreme Leader have also used the issue as a factional weapon to castigate their opponents and to condemn those who would seek any compromise. Indeed, Ahmadinejad has on a number of occasions characterized domestic critics of his nuclear policy as "traitors" or as "not part of the Iranian nation."

This is not to say that there are no nuances in Iran's policy. Those around the Supreme Leader and the President see the nuclear issue as an equalizer in Iran's relationship with the US – a weapon to safeguard the revolution in the face of the supposed American wish to dismantle it. There is an echo of this in Rafsanjani's much noted remarks at Friday prayers in late 2001, when he noted: "If a day comes when the world of Islam is duly equipped with the arms Israel has in its possession, the strategy of colonialism would face a stalemate because the exchange of atomic bombs would leave nothing of Israel, while only damaging the Moslem world." While these remarks, as a number of people at the time noted, sounds like a doctrine of MAD for the Middle East, the fact that for the Iranian Regime, Israel's existence is an integral aspect of Western colonialism led to much alarm, particularly in Israel and all the more so as the remarks came from Rafsanjani.

The more pragmatic elements of the ruling elite see the issue as a bargaining chip with the US – something that can be used to both safeguard the revolution through accommodation with the modern world and thus help Iran, through economic development, escape many of the problems that have developed since 1979 and which carry their own danger to the revolution.

We are all very aware here of the gorilla in the room and that relates to Israel's reaction and a possible attack by Israel (or even by the US) on Iranian nuclear and command and control facilities.

When in 1981 the Israelis destroyed the Iraqi nuclear reactor, they made it very clear at the time that the prospect of Iraq gaining nuclear weapons was an existential issue for Israel. There is no reason to believe that an Iranian nuclear weapon capacity is any less existential in nature and Mr. Netanyahu has so described it on numerous occasions. In this regard, President Ahmadinejad with his pronouncements on the holocaust and on Israel's right to exist plays into the hands of those who believe that a military attack (possibly accompanying regime change) are necessary to deal with the Iranian nuclear weapons program. Indeed, an Iranian conspiracy theory (and there are a great many of them in Iran) is that Ahmadinejad is an Israeli agent!! On the other side of the ledger, it should be remembered that President Ahmadinejad does not control Iranian foreign policy. Moreover, a nuclear attack on Israel would probably kill as many if not more Moslem Arabs than Jewish Israelis, not to speak of leading to overwhelming retaliation from Israel and probably the US. Too much emphasis should not be given to the "Mahdaviat thinking" of President Ahmadinejad and some of his followers and their so-called desire to hasten the Day of Judgment and the return of the Mahdi. Such thinking is not confined to this generation of Iranian thinkers and is not that unique (Two of the Shah's titles were "Pivot of the Universe" and "Shadow of God"). The Iranian regime has on several occasions proved that it can be quite pragmatic when its fundamental interests and its existence are threatened.

Given the current situation, sanctions seem to be the only realistic channel to follow. While some people may see sanctions as a necessary prelude to be gotten out of the way before more radical steps are taken and may see sanctions as ineluctably leading to war, many see sanctions as the only realistic alternative to an attack on Iranian facilities. Moreover, they believe that those sanctions are starting to have an effect on Iran and that they could therefore soon have an effect on Iranian comportment. The belief in the efficacy of sanctions or at least the eventual efficacy of sanctions drives the continuing process of ratcheting up those sanctions. But so too does the realization that, if sanctions fail and Iran continues to develop a nuclear weapons capacity, then the voices of those who favour a military solution will become louder and more influential. One hopeful note: there seems in recent days to be increasing attention paid to two issues. First, would a so-called surgical strike on Iranian facilities significantly delay an Iranian effort to develop nuclear weapons? (From my limited perspective, the answer to this question would be no). Second, what would be

the implications of an attack on Iran for wider Western/American interests? (The answer is that the implications would be major and wholly negative in nature).

If there is uncertainty as to what the Iranians would do and what the Israelis would do, there is also a problem for those driving the sanctions process. It is not clear what they want. Do they want zero enrichment of uranium or would they be prepared to allow appropriate enrichment under international supervision? Moreover, a related question is whether sanctions are the only arrow in the quiver or whether they will be accompanied by a readiness to pursue the path of negotiation.

Despite the foregoing, the reasons for the international community (led by the US) and Iran to cobble together an agreement that would involve some enrichment in Iran coupled with comprehensive safeguards (including the additional protocol) are compelling. Moreover, the regime in Tehran flinched once before – in 1988 when a realization that a continuation of the war with Iraq was endangering the very existence of the regime or, more positively, it has acted responsibly when its interest so dictate, as it demonstrated during the two Gulf Wars since 1990.

I do believe that to convince the Iranians to eschew the path towards establishing a nuclear capability, the US would have to convince them that the idea of forcible regime change is definitely off the table. Given the situation it would be very, very difficult for such a commitment to be made prior to a negotiation or even prior to an actual agreement. It could only be part of a package that would also include recognition of Israel's legitimate right to exist (even if it was accompanied by caveats along the lines of those articulated by former President Khatami and reportedly by the Supreme Leader himself), a commitment to withdraw Iran's military aid to various elements in the region including Hamas, recognition of Iran's right to an enrichment capacity for its reactors (as noted above), and a (short) timetable for the end of sanctions. Ironically, this is not so very different from the package proposed by the Iranians in the May of 2003. That package included the following elements: Iran would agree not to pursue nuclear weapons and open up its nuclear program to true transparency; Iran would cut support for Hamas and Islamic Jihad and pressure them to stop violence against Israeli civilians; Iran would disarm Hezbollah and push it to evolve into a purely political organization; and Iran would not object to a two state solution. In return, the US would end sanctions; it would recognize Iran's legitimate security concerns; it would permit the use of peaceful nuclear technology under comprehensive safeguards; and it would take decisive action against MEQ in Iraq.

It is true that this proposal was made at a time when the Iranian leadership was frightened silly at how quickly the US was able to dispatch an Iraqi Regime which Iran had taken a decade to fight to a standstill. But it is also true that, with the same considerations in mind, the US was not prepared to seriously consider the proposition. Thus the genuineness of the Iranian proposal was not truly tested. One is reminded, unfortunately, of the striking comment made by Barbara Slavin in her book "Bitter

Friends, Bosom Enemies: Iran, the US, and the Twisted Path to Confrontation” to the effect that Iran was the Bermuda Triangle of American diplomacy for swallowing up good faith efforts to end the hostility.

We can only hope that the dangers of the situation today might be sufficiently evident for all involved to bring them to the table.

## Speakers

### **Ferry de Kerckhove**

*Former High Commissioner of Canada to Pakistan and Ambassador to Indonesia and Egypt*



Ferry de Kerckhove was born in Belgium in 1947. He has a B.Soc. Sc. Honours in Economics, an M.A. in Political Science from the University of Ottawa and pursued Ph.D. Studies at Laval University in Québec City. Ferry de Kerckhove has published several papers on international relations as well as on the relationship between the Muslim world and the West in specialized journals.

After working as an intern at the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), Ferry de Kerckhove became a Researcher at the Québec Centre for International Relations and then later headed up the International Security Section at the Canadian Institute for International Affairs (Québec section).

In September 1973, Ferry de Kerckhove entered the Canadian Foreign Service. After a stint in European Affairs, he was posted as Third Secretary to the Canadian Embassy in Tehran. When Ferry de Kerckhove returned to Canada in 1976, he became Assistant Secretary, Inter-Departmental Committee on External Relations then moved to East European Affairs (Yugoslavia, Hungary, Romania, Bulgaria and Albania). From 1978 to 1981, he was responsible for Canada-France relations. From 1981 to 1985, he was Economic Counsellor at the Canadian Delegation to NATO.

Back in Canada, Ferry de Kerckhove became Deputy Director of the Political and Strategic Analysis Division, then Director of the Economic and Trade Analysis Division in the Policy Planning Bureau. In 1989, he became Director, Economic Relations with Developing Countries Division. In September 1992, he was posted to Moscow as Minister and Deputy Head of Mission.

Ferry de Kerckhove returned to Ottawa in September 1995 to become Associate Chief Air Negotiator. In January 1996, he became Deputy Head of the Policy Branch and Director-General, Federal-Provincial Relations in Foreign Affairs and International Trade. He remained in this position until being named Canada's High Commissioner to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in August 1998. He spent three years in Islamabad. On September 13, 2001, Ferry de Kerckhove presented his credentials as Ambassador to the Republic of Indonesia. He was also accredited to Timor Leste.

Ferry de Kerckhove returned to Ottawa in September 2003 and joined the Faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Ottawa as a Canadian Center for Management Development Diplomat in Residence.

On August 9<sup>th</sup>, 2004, he returned to the Department of Foreign Affairs and became Director General, International Organizations. In July 2006, he added to his responsibilities the function of Personal representative of the Prime Minister for Francophonie.

From September 10<sup>th</sup> 2008 to September 10 2011, Ferry de Kerckhove was in Cairo as ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt.

He retired from the Foreign Service on September 23d, 2011. He is a Senior Fellow at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, Faculty of Social Sciences, University of Ottawa, a member of the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, and a member of the Board of the Conference of Defence Associations Institute. He is President of *Ferry de Kerckhove International Consultants Inc.*

## **Hon. John McCallum, MP**

*Former Minister of National Defence*



John McCallum was first elected to the House of Commons in November 2000. He was re-elected in 2004, 2006 and 2008. Mr. McCallum currently serves as the Critic for Treasury Board, Public Works, Government Operations and Housing.

Mr. McCallum has previously served as Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Finance, as Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee on Citizenship and Immigration, and as a member of the Standing Committee on Finance. He then served as Secretary of State (International Financial Institutions) from January to May 2002. From May 2002 to December 2003, he served as Minister of National Defence, and in 2003, as Minister of Veterans Affairs. In July 2004, he was appointed Minister of National Revenue and Chair of the Expenditure Review Committee by Prime Minister Paul Martin. Before entering politics, Mr. McCallum was senior vice-president and chief economist of the Royal Bank of Canada.

Mr. McCallum worked as a professor of economics at McGill University (1987-94), at the Université du Québec à Montréal (1982-87), at Simon Fraser University (1978-82), and at the University of Manitoba (1976-78).

He is the author or co-author of eight books or monographs and has written on fiscal and monetary issues, comparative macroeconomic performance of OECD countries, Canada-U.S. economic integration, and other economic issues.

A native of Montreal, Mr. McCallum obtained a bachelor of arts from Cambridge University, a Diplôme d'études supérieures from the Université de Paris and a doctorate in economics from McGill University.

Mr. McCallum and his wife, Nancy Lim, have three children.

## Ernie Regehr

Research Fellow, Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, University of Waterloo



Ernie Regehr, O.C., is a Fellow of The Simons Foundation of Vancouver and Research Fellow at the Institute of Peace and Conflict Studies, Conrad Grebel University College, the University of Waterloo. He is co-founder of Project Ploughshares and his publications on peace and security issues include books, monographs, journal articles, policy papers, parliamentary briefs, and op-eds. Ernie has served as an NGO representative and expert advisor on numerous Government of Canada delegations to multilateral disarmament forums, including the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty and UN Conferences on Small Arms. In 1990-1991 he was Canada's representative on the United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Arms Transfer Transparency that led to the creation in 1992 of the UN Conventional Arms Register, and in 2001 he was an advisor to the Government of Kenya in the development of a regional arms control agreement on small arms known as the Nairobi Declaration. Visits to conflict zones, especially in East Africa, have included participation in Track II diplomacy efforts related to the conflict in southern Sudan, and he is on the Board of the Africa Peace Forum of Nairobi, Kenya. He is a former Commissioner of the World Council of Churches Commission on International Affairs, where he was active in developing the WCC's position on Responsibility to Protect. From 2008 to 2010 he was involved in three visits to Kabul (two with the Canadian "Pathways to Peace" project) to explore reconciliation opportunities and requirements.

## Ghulam Farouq Samim



Dr. Farouq Samim was born in the eastern Afghan province of Laghman in 1977, moved to Kabul after the Russian invasion in 1979, and remained in Afghanistan until 2009 when moved to Ottawa with his wife and four children.

### Education

He graduated as MD from Kabul Medical University in 2002 and received his MA in Communication from Communication Dept., University of Ottawa in October 2011 (Title of MA thesis: Communication for Conflict Resolution: The Pashtun Tribal Rhetoric for Peace Building in Afghanistan).

### Employment

Dr. Samim has worked as a translator, local reporter, TV producer and human rights investigator for various media, including leading newspaper and magazines in the United States (Chicago Tribune, New York Times, Los Angeles Times, Time Magazine, The Christian Science Monitor, Starts and Stripes, United Kingdom (Sunday Times,

Sunday Telegraph, The Guardian), Germany (Stern), France (Figaro) and Canada (Globe and Mail).

### **TV & Radio**

Dr. Samim has worked with other media including Al Jazeera English, BBC World Service, National Geographic, RTL (Germany), Irish National TV, NPR Radio, and BBC Radio.

### **Human Rights Organizations**

He has also been engaged with Human Rights First, Human Rights Watch, and The Crimes of War.

### **Publications**

His publications include as the Principle Author of “Laghman Provincial Handbook: A Guide to the People and the Province” for the use of NATO forces based in the Province. (<http://www.amazon.ca/Laghman-Provincial-Handbook-People-Province/dp/1936336081>)

### **Farouq Samim has been featured in:**

- 1- “The Taliban Shuffle: Strange days in Afghanistan and Pakistan”, a book by American Journalist Kimberly Barker, who worked with Farouq for 5 Years for Chicago Tribune Newspaper.
- 2- “From Kabul to uOttawa: student seeks resolution to Afghan conflict through communication”, an article at the University of Ottawa.
- 3- “One Graduate Student’s Mission in the Afghan Front”, an article in the Chronicles of Higher Education.
- 4- “Foreign doctors learning new careers in Canada”, CBC Radio.
- 5- “The Taliban Shuffle” chronicles ups and downs of reporter's experience in Afghanistan and Pakistan”, Local NPR Chicago.

### **His previous presentations include:**

- 1- Journalism & Human Rights in Transitioning Societies: A sophisticated Taliban media campaign is winning the hearts and minds of Afghans, Journalism School of University of Western Ontario, November 2011
- 2- Afghan Media as a Communication tool for ISAF Force in Afghanistan: A pre-deployment cultural orientation, Petawawa Canadian Force Base, May 2010.
- 3- Lessons Learned during Conducting a Primary Communication Research in Afghanistan, Guest lecturer for Class of Communication, University of Ottawa, fall 2011.

## **Michael Byers**

*Canada Research Chair in Global Politics and International Law, University of British Columbia*



Michael Byers works on the interaction of international law and international politics, with a focus on human rights, the laws of war, Canadian foreign and defence policy, and most recently climate change and Arctic sovereignty. Professor Byers has been a Fellow of Jesus College, Oxford University, and a Professor of Law at Duke University. He has also taught as a visiting professor at the universities of Cape Town, Tel Aviv, and Novosibirsk. He is the author of *War Law, Intent for a Nation*, and *Who Owns the Arctic?* He is also a regular contributor to the *Globe and Mail*, *Toronto Star*, and *National Post*.

## **Nipa Banerjee**

*Professor, Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa*



Nipa Banerjee earned Doctorate and Master's degrees, specializing in development studies, from Toronto, Carleton and McMaster Universities. She served as a practitioner and policy analyst in international development and foreign aid for over 30 years. She worked with CUSO and IDRC and 33 years in CIDA. She represented CIDA in Bangladesh, Indonesia, India, Thailand, Cambodia, Laos and in Afghanistan (2003-2006) heading Canada's aid program in the four latter countries. She joined the University of Ottawa in July of 2007, teaching international development. Her primary objective as a teacher is to transfer development knowledge, expertise and skills to young Canadians and prepare them as analytic and critical thinkers and future practitioners in international development. She strives to promote debates and dialogue on development and aid, aiming to influence public opinion and public policies. She has to her credit several published policy briefs and a Chapter on Canada's Role in Afghanistan in a recently published book. Her research interests include reconstruction, development and aid effectiveness, coordination, management and related policies in fragile states, in general and a special focus on Afghanistan, where she travels frequently. Her other activities comprise capacity building in partner developing countries in planning and managing for results and monitoring & evaluation. She also conducts evaluation of effectiveness of aid in partner countries.

## Sadiqua Basri Saleem



As a refugee in Pakistan, Sadiqa Basri Saleem FP'09 was close to earning a medical degree when the Taliban closed her Afghan-run university. After the fall of the Taliban in 2002, she returned to Afghanistan's Wardak province, where 150,000 girls had no hope for an education. She and three other women pooled their money to found a school for girls in her home village of Godah. With help from family, friends, and donors, that effort—known as the Oruj Learning Center—expanded to four literacy centers serving 200 women and six schools educating more than 2,700 girls.

In 2005, Saleem began studying international relations as a Frances Perkins Scholar at Mount Holyoke College through the Initiative to Educate Afghan Women. Shortly before graduating, she was among six women—including Secretary of State Hillary Clinton—honored by the Vital Voices Global Partnership. That same spring, she was awarded the prestigious Samuel Huntington Public Service Award.

Since graduating, Saleem has established the first Afghan community college for women, as well as the Family Welfare Center for the Elimination of Violence against Women, a domestic violence prevention project serving 14,000 Afghan women while also training government staff and encouraging spiritual leaders to discuss women's issues constructively. Since 2006, she has been serving as a professional development centers manager for the Academy for Educational Development's Higher Education Project in Afghanistan. In 2010, Saleem received the "People's Voice" Award from the Diller-von Furstenberg Family Foundation and was the Chicago Council on Global Affairs' Patricia Blunt Koldyke Fellow. She is currently enrolled in the MA program of the Communication Faculty at the University of Ottawa.

## Philip Mackinnon

*Former Canadian Ambassador to Iran and Egypt*



Born: February 5 1944 in Montreal.  
Educated: Queen's University, University of Toronto and Oxford University (History and Philosophy).  
Joined the Department of External Affairs in June 1974.  
Posted in Tunis, Tunisia (1975-1977), Seoul, South Korea (1980-1983), Geneva, Switzerland (1986-1990), and Vienna, Austria (1994-1998).  
Served in USA Transboundary Division (1974-1975), Industry, Investment and Competition Division (1977-1980), and Nuclear Division (1983-1986).  
Director of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe (1990-1991).  
Director of UN and Commonwealth Division (1991-1994).  
Director of Western European Division (1998-2001).

Appointed Ambassador to the Islamic Republic of Iran in 2001 and served in Iran from 2001 to 2004.

Appointed Ambassador to the Arab Republic of Egypt in 2004 and served in Egypt from 2004 to 2008.

## **Peggy Mason**

Peace and Security consultant, former Ambassador for Disarmament



Peggy Mason's career highlights diplomatic and specialist expertise in the field of international peace and security, with a particular emphasis on the United Nations, where she served as Canada's Ambassador for Disarmament from 1989 through 1994. Since 1996 Mason has been involved in many aspects of UN peacekeeping training, including the development of groundbreaking principles on the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former fighters. As a regular trainer and exercise developer, she also brings the UN political/diplomatic perspective to a range of NATO and EU training exercises to help prepare military commanders for complex, multidisciplinary peace and crisis stabilization operations. Since 2002 Mason has been a Senior Fellow at The Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA) at Carleton University, where she also chairs the Advisory Board of the Canadian Centre for Treaty Compliance (CCTC). Since 2004 she has been Chair of the Board of Directors of Peacebuild, a network of Canadian NGOs engaged in all aspects of peace-building. A graduate and gold medalist of the University of Ottawa Faculty of Common Law, Peggy Mason was inducted into its Honour Society in September 2003. Peggy Mason is a past Chair of the Group of 78 and is currently a member of the Executive Committee and Conference Planning Committee.

## **Hussain Ramoz**

*Former Executive Director, Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission*



**Dr. Hussain A. Ramoz** is a democracy and human rights activist. From 2005 to 2009, he was the Executive Director of Afghanistan Independent Human Rights Commission. The organization focused on promoting and protecting people's basic rights, strengthening rule of law, and good governance. From 2002 to 2005, in his roles as the Senior Program Manager and Deputy Country Director in National Democratic Institute for International Affairs, he assisted more than 50 democratic political parties and civil society organizations to organize mobilized campaigns for building a democratic constitution, to gain seats in the parliamentary elections, and to establish mechanisms for ensuring elections transparency.

Since 2004, Hussain has voluntarily co-founded and worked as Member of Board of Director in a number of not-for-profit organizations, notably Free and Fair Elections Foundation of Afghanistan, Afghan Civil Society Forum, and Afghanistan Human Development Report 2007. In these roles, Hussain has advocated for transparent elections, rule of law, and good governance. He continues with his civic activism in Canada as he is currently a volunteer member of Canadian Center for International Justice.

## Daryl Copeland

*Author and consultant*



Daryl Copeland is an analyst, author, educator and consultant specializing in diplomacy, international policy, global issues and public management. His first book, ***Guerrilla Diplomacy: Rethinking International Relations***, was released in 2009 by Lynne Rienner Publishers and is cited as an essential reference by the editors of *Oxford Bibliographies Online*. Mr. Copeland is a frequent public speaker; he comments regularly for the national media, and has written over 100 articles for the scholarly and popular press. His work has appeared in many anthologies, as well as in the *International Journal*, *World Politics Review*, *Foreign Policy in Focus*, *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*, *The Globe and Mail*, *Toronto Star*, *Embassy*, *The Mark*, *iPolitics* and elsewhere. He was awarded the 2010 Molot Prize for best article published in *Canadian Foreign Policy* ("Virtuality, Diplomacy and the Foreign Ministry", 15:2).

From 1981 to 2011 Mr. Copeland served as a Canadian diplomat with postings in Thailand, Ethiopia, New Zealand and Malaysia. During the 1980s and 1990s, he was elected a record five times to the Executive Committee of the Professional Association of Foreign Service Officers. From 1996-99 he was National Program Director of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs in Toronto and Editor of *Behind the Headlines*, Canada's international affairs magazine. In 2000, he received the Canadian Foreign Service Officer Award for his "tireless dedication and unyielding commitment to advancing the interests of the diplomatic profession."

Mr. Copeland is now Visiting Professor at the London Academy of Diplomacy (UK) and Otago University (NZ) and is a Research Associate at the University of Ottawa's Centre for International Policy Studies. He serves as a peer reviewer for University of Toronto Press, *Canadian Foreign Policy*, the *International Journal* and *The Hague Journal of Diplomacy*, and is a member of the Editorial Board of the journal *Place Branding and Public Diplomacy*. From 2009-11 he was Adjunct Professor and Senior Fellow at the University of Toronto's Munk School of Global Affairs, where he designed and delivered an advanced seminar on *Science, Technology, Diplomacy and International Policy*. In 2009 he was a Research Fellow at the University of Southern California's Center on Public Diplomacy.

Mr. Copeland grew up in downtown Toronto, and received his formal education at the University of Western Ontario (Gold Medal, Political Science; Chancellor's Prize, Social Sciences) and the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (Canada Council Special MA Scholarship). He has spent years backpacking on six continents, and enjoys travel, photography, arts and the outdoors.

**Program**  
**Group of 78 Annual Policy Conference**

***Armed Intervention: Lessons from Afghanistan***

September 28 – 30, 2012

Brittany Salon, Cartier Place Suite Hotel, 180 Cooper St., Ottawa

***Friday September 28***

***5:45 – 6:30 p.m. Cash bar and registration***

**Welcome and introduction of keynote speaker: Richard Harmston, G78 Chair**

**6:30 p.m. Dinner**

**7:00 p.m. Keynote Address: *The Afghan & Other Interventions – Lessons for History***

An overview and identification of the issues

***Ferry de Kerckhove***

Former Canadian High Commissioner to Pakistan and former Ambassador to  
Egypt and Indonesia

***Saturday September 29***

**8:00 a.m. Registration and Continental Breakfast**

**9:00 a.m. Session I: *The Road to Kandahar and Why It Was Taken***

Alternative approaches that were available to the international  
community and to Canada

Moderator: Peggy Mason

Panelists: Hon. John McCallum

Ernie Regehr

Discussant: Ghulam Farouq Samim

**10:45 a.m. Break**

**11:00 a.m. Session II: *Stuck in the Sand? Where is Afghanistan Now?***

Assessing the intervention, the successes and failures, and possible  
alternatives.

Moderator: Gerald Ohlsen

Panelists: Michael Byers

Nipa Banerjee

Sadiqa Basiri Saleem

**12:30 p.m. Lunch**

**1:00 p.m. *Introduction of Luncheon speaker: George Jacoby***

**Luncheon Address: *Iran: Current Crises and Regional Context***

***Philip MacKinnon***

Former Canadian Ambassador to Iran and Egypt

**2:30 p.m. Break**

**3:00 p.m. Session III: *Afghanistan, Central Asia and a Troubled World:***

***Future Engagement***

What responsibilities do Canada and the West have in light of a costly twelve year commitment to Afghanistan? Can we commit to a comprehensive peace process? What are the implications for both immediate action and broader policy?

Moderator: Manfred Bienefeld

Panelists: Peggy Mason

Hussain Ramoz

Daryl Copeland

**4:45 p.m. Concluding Comments**

***Sunday, September 30***

**8:00 a.m. Continental Breakfast**

**9:00 a.m. Session IV: *Wrapping Up: Conference Conclusions & Recommendations for the Government of Canada and the ISAF Partners.***

Moderator: Richard Harmston

**10:30 a.m. Break**

**10:45 a.m. *Group of 78 AGM***

**12:30 p.m. Conclusion**

## Conference Participants

|                       |                       |                   |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Nadia Abu-Zahra       | Belle Jarniewski Milo | John Schioler     |
| Maureen Ahern-Blais   | Prajeena Karmacharya  | Michael Shenstone |
| Savanah Ashton        | Susan Korah           | Susan Shenstone   |
| Ranjan Baduri         | Fouad Kronfol         | Hally Siddons     |
| Nipa Banerjee         | Sylvie Lemieux        | Paul Skahan       |
| Ranjan Banerjee       | Samphe Lhalungpa      | Justine Smith     |
| Sadiqa Basiri Saleem  | David Lord            | Steven Staples    |
| Manfred Bienefeld     | Flora MacDonald       | Andy Tamas        |
| Mary Lou Bienefeld    | Philip MacKinnon      | Calvin Walton     |
| Jean-Jacques Blais    | Paul Maillet          | Stewart Webb      |
| Jonathan Blais        | Ani Mamikon           | Lisa Weighton     |
| Gordon Breedyk        | Peggy Mason           | Jennifer Wiebe    |
| Joan Broughton        | Carolyn McAskie       | Ann Young         |
| Micka Buckley-Pearson | Hon. John McCallum    |                   |
| Michael Byers         | Tudy McLaine          |                   |
| Micheline Caron       | Leslie McWhinnie      |                   |
| James Christie        | Peter Meincke         |                   |
| Pinar Cil             | Boris Minaev          |                   |
| Daryl Copeland        | Peter Moore           |                   |
| Lawrence Cumming      | Yves Morneau          |                   |
| Barbara Darling       | Millie Morton         |                   |
| Ferry De Kerckhove    | Margaret              |                   |
| Valerie Deschamps     | Moyston-Cumming       |                   |
| Mark Edwards          | Jan Nitoslawski       |                   |
| Mary Edwards          | Erica Noordermeer     |                   |
| Nour Fadol            | Gerald Ohlsen         |                   |
| John Foster           | Landon Pearson        |                   |
| John W. Foster        | Lauren Poolie         |                   |
| Ardath Francis        | Brad Pye              |                   |
| Ross Francis          | Hussain Ramoz         |                   |
| Barbara Fulford       | Ernie Regehr          |                   |
| Justine Gilbert       | Nancy Regehr          |                   |
| Sandra Green-Anderson | Silke Reichrath       |                   |
| Gretel Harmston       | Gordon Ritchie        |                   |
| Richard Harmston      | Margaret Ritchie      |                   |
| Moira Hart-Poliquin   | Alain Roy             |                   |
| Hilary Homes          | Ghulam Farouq Samim   |                   |
| Caroline Hyslop       | Clyde Sanger          |                   |
| Margaret Hyslop       | Penny Sanger          |                   |
| George Jacoby         | Ashpreet Sangha       |                   |

