

Rapporteur's report

## A Symposium on "Canada-USA Relations after 9/11"

by Danielle Carbonneau

The symposium began bright and early on March 20<sup>th</sup> in the Heyns Room, at the Faculty Club on the UC Berkeley campus. For the participants and organizers who had the delight of dining at the Barnes' residence the previous night, the morning may have crept up a little too early, although all were anxious to hear the presenters and debate the topics set out for discussion that day. Nelson Graburn, Co-Chair of the Canadian Studies Program and professor in the Anthropology department at Berkeley, welcomed all participants with his opening remarks and introduced the first panel of the day, entitled "Borders and Boundaries: Porosity and Impermeability".

### Panel 1: Borders and Boundaries: Porosity and Impermeability

Heather Nicol, professor of Geography from the State University of West Georgia, chaired the first session of the symposium. Having done much work on the topic of borders and boundaries between Canada and the USA, Ms Nicol provided some background information to the subject before opening the floor to the three panelists. In essence, the border between Canada and the USA has been the longest undefended border between two states in history, and the mutual understanding and cooperation existing on both sides has allowed it to function properly without the need for harmonizing domestic policies (i.e. immigration or environmental policies). However, the terrorist attacks of 9/11 have changed everything, especially the manner in which the USA views its foreign relations with other states. This horrific event greatly augmented the importance of border security and propelled the dialogue for the "Smart Border Program" between Canada and the USA. Ms Nicol finished with a few questions for the panel to answer: "What have been the implications of 9/11 on border security between Canada and the USA? What specifically has changed?"

Glynn Custred, professor of Anthropology at California State University at Hayward, began with a quote inscribed on an arch near the U.S.-Canadian border in Washington: "Children of a Common Mother." The cultural and juridical backgrounds of Canada and the USA are similar because of our colonization by the British. He noted the dual function of borders, which serve both an instrumental and symbolic purpose. The instrumental function of borders is that they mark the jurisdictional and territorial limits of a country, within which a state possesses population, power and sovereignty. A border can also serve a symbolic function when it allows citizens to collectively imagine their state and its individual identity. The border thus becomes a representation of the legitimacy of

the state. The border deeply penetrates the Canadian identity and consciousness because such a large percentage of the nation's population resides close to it. Since 9/11, the USA is more concerned with border issues and its ability to protect itself from future terrorist attacks. Members of Congress feel that security at the border is dangerously inadequate for several reasons. Part of the problem lies in the differing immigration policies of Canada and the USA, where the former is often viewed as having softer asylum criteria. Mr. Custred pointed out that when Canada grants asylum, its refugees are permitted to obtain driver's licenses and can receive welfare checks. Many Americans would like to harmonize immigration policies with Canada, although the culture differences in both nations would make this problematic. He concluded by suggesting that the smart border arrangement would be the best solution for the present time.

The second speaker on this panel was Ted Thomas, professor of Sociology at Mills College in Oakland, California. Mr. Thomas brought a sociological and cultural perspective to the discussion by raising the issue of globalization and the decline of the nation-state. It has always been a challenge for Canada to preserve its culture against the onslaught of American commercial networks and products across the fluid border. Back in the 1980s, Seymour Martin Lipset explored Canadian and American values and identities in his book *The Continental Divide*. At present, these cultural cleavages are no longer as relevant, as the globalization of western culture has transformed us into "global citizens." Mr. Thomas noted that we must take into account three factors when looking at national borders: the erosion of territorial sovereignty, the resurgence of religious and ethnic movements in the world, and the dynamics of change that allow for the collapse of systems under the pressure of globalization. The technological revolution has also affected citizenship, and we cannot predict the final impact of this factor. Mr. Thomas closed his statements by asking to what extent state boundaries were still present and how much they should actually matter to us, "the netizens of the world," and how these issues were affected by the post 9/11 world.

Coline Campbell, a former Member of Parliament, contributed the viewpoint of a politician and public servant. She agreed with previous comments about the similar nature of Canada and the USA, as they both share democratic ideals and (for the most part) the same language, and both uphold the rule of law. As a Canadian, she was hurt to hear accusations that Canada was at fault for the entry of the terrorists into the USA. Why was Canada blamed when it closed its airspace hours after the attack and its citizens welcomed stranded travelers into their homes? Immediately after the attack, Canadian immigration policies were criticized and the terrorists were assumed to have traveled across the weak Canadian borderline, when it was later discovered that they had been established in the USA for some time. Ms Campbell also mentioned President Bush's deliberate omission of Canada in his words of appreciation to ally states after the attack. In her opinion, this may show that Canada is now less influential than it was in the past, but so is the USA since the end of the Cold War. There

are three routes that Canada and the USA might take to increase border security. First, the USA could return to a more isolationist position, although this would greatly hinder trade and economic development. Second, immigration policies could be harmonized between Canada and the USA, or throughout North America. Third, a moderate route could be chosen, through which the pre-existing system could be strengthened. The third option is the most viable and Canada has already taken strides to complete it. It has improved the background checks performed on aliens entering or exiting the state, along the border crossings and at airports, as well as perfecting intelligence gathering and security information systems. Ms Campbell finished with two fundamental questions that remain unanswered: "How far will the USA expect Canada to go with their enhanced security measures?," and "How much sovereignty will Canada yield to quell the fears of its neighbor from the South?"

After the panelists' comments, Ms Nicol raised a common theme in everyone's remarks, which was that they were still uncertain about the implications of 9/11. The discussion was opened to all participants, who eagerly took part. Consul Wendell Sanford reminded everyone that none of the nineteen attackers of 9/11 came from Canada. A comment from the audience raised the example of the EU and how they have been able to harmonize their immigration policies while maintaining their national cultures. Mr. Custred noted that Canada does not have the same attitude as European states, which were willing to yield a share of their sovereignty to achieve policy harmonization. They have pooled their sovereignty, and Ms Nicol termed it a devolution, where there has been a hardening of the outside but a softening of the inside.

David Haglund, professor of Political Studies at Queen's University, believes that the issue of security has been resolved, given that nothing will ever guarantee perfect security. There have been changes to Canadian refugee and immigration policies, with the practice of sending asylum-seekers back to the countries they've just arrived from (not necessarily the one they originally fled) and officials at airports checking passengers' documents immediately after they get off the plane. Michael Hawes, Executive Director of Canada-US Fulbright Program, noted that Canadians did not debate the placement of armed officials on flights because it was a solution for a real problem. Tom Barnes, Professor of History and Law and Co-chair of the Canadian Studies Program, added that the reason for this was that Canadians have never had a problem with law enforcement, and for a policed state, more technology was needed to improve security. Mr. Haglund commented that both American and Canadian immigration and border policies need revision, as boats at American ports are inspected even less than in Canada. Mr. Hawes retorted that the current systems are constructed on what was construed until recently as the low probability of a substantial threat, and that there is no need to inspect every boat or truck that crosses a border. This would interfere with the free flow of goods in trade.

A request from the audience asked the panelists to revisit the issue of the harmonization of policies within North America. Mr. Custred reaffirmed that harmonization of policies would cause both a political problem and a cultural problem, one that Canada and the USA may not be ready for yet. Ms Campbell pointed out that another difficulty in this task is that each province maintains jurisdiction over immigration, so that Quebec's criteria for admission tend to differ from that of the other provinces of Canada. These comments ended the first session of the morning, which was followed by a short break.

## Panel 2: Trade and Transit: Maintaining Flow and Growth.

Michael Hawes, Executive Director of the Canada-US Fulbright Program, chaired the second session of the morning, entitled "Trade and Transit: Maintaining Flow and Growth." Mr. Hawes began the discussion with some comments of his own on the nature of the Canada-USA relationship. Above all, the Canadian-American relationship is based on economics, with a \$400 billion trading relationship between the countries. Not only is the border between Canada and the USA the longest undefended border, but it also joins two countries with a firm economic interdependence, increasingly so with the single North American market created by NAFTA. Canada's high standard of living is extremely dependent on trade relations with the USA, with 80% of its exports and 40% of its GDP dependent on trade with the USA. The USA is somewhat less dependent on Canada, with only 20% of its exports heading to Canada and 14% of its GDP dependent of Canadian trade, although this is changing since the USA economy is longer based solely on their domestic market. Mr. Hawes explains this relationship more precisely, by categorizing it into 3 distinct periods since 1945. The period from 1945-1971 was characterized by *exceptionalism*, during which the Canadian government had no legal or formal connections to the US market. It was up to the Foreign Service of Canada to find ways into the American market by seeking exemptions or exceptions in trade regulations. From 1971-1988, the debate about negotiating free trade began, although President Nixon insisted that "every boat remains on its own bottom." The third period, from 1988 to the present day, was marked by the creation of the FTA, followed by the NAFTA in 1992 and perhaps one day a hemispheric trade agreement. Although North American markets have become more integrated, governmental policies have lagged behind. Canada has tried to create a political reality that mirrors the economic reality existing between it and the USA, an undertaking that has become more difficult since the attacks of 9/11.

John Vardalas, a visiting scholar at UC Berkeley at the Office for the History of Science and Technology, continued the discussion by looking at how corporate institutions have influenced international trade and the interplay that exists between trading partners during technological change. The birth of innovations always drive the economy forward, as was the case with the invention of the steam engine, the railway, electric power, chemical power, and now computer-electronic technology. However, the waves of economic

development have not been homogeneous throughout the world, and the country that perfects the latest technology first usually gains economic dominance. This creates a situation where the state that possesses economic dominance also tends to have military superiority, while the have-nots push to get technology in order to participate in the world economy. It is important to look at trade and transit in the context of the multinational corporation (MNC) because it is through this means that Canada has tried to build its economy. Technology is an important source of transborder flows, yet the capacity to move it between a MNC and the USA, or a MNC and Canada can lead to conflicts. These conflicts and the USA's concerns about security led to the creation of export controls. The USA tries to use these controls to restrict its allies from trading technology with its enemies, which it did during the Cold War. In the aftermath of 9/11, it remains to be seen whether the USA will again increase export controls, and by doing so, impede MNCs from trading with so-called terrorists. The issue of export controls is not mentioned in Canada's anti-terrorism plan, and Mr. Vardalas thinks that this situation is likely to cause friction between the USA and Canada on trade, especially since Canada is presently looking for new technological niches.

Russell Kalmacoff of Rockmount Financial Corporation in Calgary brought his expertise as a small Canadian businessman to two areas of importance to both Canada and the USA: energy and capital. In light of President Bush's new energy policy, which seeks to reduce reliance on energy from the Middle East, the enormous supply of crude oil in the Alberta oil sands takes on heightened importance. 25% of the world's oil supply is in friendly Canada, and Mr. Kalmacoff suggests that attempts to exploit this source can only intensify in the aftermath of 9/11.

Mr. Kalmacoff's other area of expertise is in financial and banking services, which he called "until recently the last bastion of economic nationalism." What impact will 9/11 have on recent attempts to integrate these services across the border? Such recent moves as new rules for mergers, relaxation of ownership restrictions, and cross-border licensing may, he suggests, be impacted by increased worries about security in the new climate.

Once the discussion was opened to the floor, David Haglund pressured Mr. Vardalas to answer his own question of whether export controls would be increased in the aftermath 9/11 and asked Mr. Kalmacoff to comment on the environmental impact of using Alberta's crude oil reserves. Mr. Vardalas responded that the Canada-USA relation would be contingent on whether Canada decides to trade with a country forbidden by the USA (which he thought highly unlikely). The attacks of 9/11 have complicated the process of building trade policies with foreign countries. In response to Mr. Haglund's second question, Mr. Kalmacoff and Mr. Vardalas explained the different methods of extracting oil from the Alberta oil sands, along with their costs and environmental impacts. These costs will have to be weighed against the vulnerability that dependence on some Middle Eastern sources entails.

Later, Rita Ross, vice-chair and academic coordinator of the Canadian Studies Program, asked Michael Hawes to comment on the impact 9/11 has had on the flow and growth of educational exchanges. In the immediate aftermath of the attacks, an attempt was made to reduce the regular number of student visas from 600 000 to approximately 100 000 for security reasons. Not only would this have diminished the growth of education in the USA, but it would also have effected the economy because international students normally generate up to 12 billion dollars annually to the US economy. At the Fulbright Program, they have noticed a decrease in the number of applications to universities abroad, particularly those in the Middle East and Africa. This demonstrates the reluctance of Americans to travel abroad for extended periods of time, which may increase the number of those applying to go to safe countries like Canada. Next, Nelson Graburn put a question to the panel about the technology available for a Smart Border Program. Is the technology needed for this type of Program easily available or does it need to be developed? Heather Nicol replied by saying that there is a lot of technology required to increase border security, especially because of NAFTA. The transport industry has been trying to use the railroads more than trucks, with which Mr. Vardalas agreed. Mr. Hawes disagreed with this because the actual numbers haven't changed, while Mr. Graburn concluded that the issue seems to be more about public policy change than technology adaptation. Mr. Vardalas asked a final question to his co-panelist Mr. Kalmacoff about the extent to which Canadian and American policies were harmonized on the flow of money (i.e., money laundering). Mr. Kalmacoff responded that the USA does provide lists to Canada for the purpose of tracking funds and that many assets were frozen in Canada after 9/11. Both US and Canadian banks have been cooperating in following suspected terrorist money trails and, if necessary, in freezing assets. This question ended the second session of the morning and was followed by a luncheon during which Wendell Sanford, from the Canadian Consulate in Los Angeles, gave a keynote speech.

**Keynote speaker at luncheon: The Honourable Wendell Sanford, Consul for Political, Economic and Public Affairs at the Canadian Consulate General, Los Angeles.**

Mr. Sanford spoke briefly and eloquently on the deep connections between Canada and the USA and how they have been strengthened in the aftermath of the attacks on New York and Washington D.C. The Canadian government and the Canadian people opened their airports, their homes, and their hearts to thousands of diverted travelers in the immediate aftermath, and Canada has staunchly supported the US both diplomatically and militarily ever since. Mr. Sanford mentioned the importance of events such as today's which explore issues of pressing concern on both sides of the border. He reiterated the Government of Canada's appreciation for the efforts of the Canadian Studies Program at Berkeley in focusing attention on the study of Canada and Canada-US relations.

### Panel 3: Defence Amidst Differences: Meeting the Common Threat

Thomas Barnes, Professor of History and Law and Co-Chair of the Canadian Studies Program, chaired the third panel of the symposium. Mr. Barnes introduced the topic by speaking of defence from a historical standpoint. Wars and colonization marked the manner in which new nations viewed defence, and the Canadian experience was definitely determined by a British influence and the absence of a civil war. After confederation gave birth to Canada in 1867, the country had to seriously think of defence in light of a possible invasion from the USA. Fears of an American invasion have diminished since then, as Canada and the USA have become close allies and come together to fight off threatening nations. However, defence doesn't figure highly in the issue of sovereignty for Canada and has never been as great a priority as it has for the USA. Even though Canada increased its defence expenditure to four billion dollars in the last budget, it still does not conceive itself as a powerful nation.

David Haglund, professor in the department of Political Studies at Queen's University, argued convincingly that 9/11 has had an impact on Canada-USA relations, but that it only accelerated a trend that had already begun. The size of a state's military earns it respect and helps to form its identity. When it comes to defence, there are many myths about Canadian capability. First, there is the myth of continentalism, which argues that Canada will eventually become the 51<sup>st</sup> state of America. Continentalists or integrationists believe that Canada's interests could be best served if the country was annexed to the USA. Mr. Haglund does not believe that this is the most favourable way to develop Canada and he favors a partnership like the NORAD model. He affirms that Canada will not disappear, although the theory of continentalism will continue to exist. Second, there is the myth of Canada as peacekeeper. Canada rose to international stature as a part of the British Empire, and over time, it has been associated with the UN and peacekeeping missions. The myth that Canada is only involved in peacekeeping missions feeds into a third myth, that Canada is a free rider. These are both false. Canada has a history of being an expeditionary military force, and it proved its capability as part of the shock group of allies at Vimy Ridge in 1917. In 1999, Canada was also a prominent player in the fighting in Serbia, completing as many missions as the UK and France. Canada does possess combat capability, although its military remains small because of the lack of threat of conflict with the USA. In 1938, President Roosevelt asserted in the "Kingston Dispensation" that the US would not stand idly by if Canada were threatened by an external force. In turn, Canada has promised that it would not do anything to threaten US security, which demonstrates the trust and mutual agreement to help one another that exist between Canada and the USA. The attacks of 9/11 forced the two countries to reaffirm their commitment to one another and to rally together as North Americans. The attacks were a strike that came close to home and risked jeopardizing the economies of both countries. Mr. Haglund believes that Canada

responded to the challenge of 9/11 as a good neighbor, and hopes for a reciprocal attitude on the USA's part.

The final speaker of the day was Arnold Beichman, from the Hoover Institution. Mr. Beichman mentioned some occurrences that have altered the Canadian political culture. The end of the Cold War has created a global plebiscite against communism and a great reaction against the left in general. This phenomenon may have contributed to the disappearance of the NDP party in Canada. Even though the rise of subnationalism has led to the growth of new states in the UN, the secessionist movement in Canada has lost its appeal, creating a more stable environment for governance and trade. Mr. Beichman predicts that the EU may become a serious military threat against the USA and Canada, unless a North Atlantic Free Trade agreement is worked out.

Although there was little time for discussion after this panel, a few ideas were thrown back and forth. An audience member asked specifically about terrorist cells that exist in Montreal, whether their presence could be linked to multiculturalism in Canada, and what the government planned to do about it. Mr. Haglund admitted that there probably are dormant cells in Quebec, but that it was most likely due to the country's biculturalism rather than its multiculturalism, through which a province like Quebec can establish its own criteria for immigrant admittance. Mr. Sanford added that since 9/11 there has been an intensive search for Al Qaeda cells and none have been found in Canada or even in North America. Each sovereign state is responsible for maintaining its own borders, added Mr. Barnes, although increased cooperation would be beneficial to all. The issue of Iraq was raised. All agreed that this issue will test the limits of cooperation in the battle against terrorism. The rejection of continentalism will be proven if the USA decides to invade Iraq when Canada is opposed. Canada may be swayed to fight along side the USA if the latter can provide evidence that Iraq is linked to Al Qaeda. Mr. Barnes warned not to discount the ability of the US administration to manipulate allies in the war against terrorism. The last words of the day went to Ms Campbell and audience member Peter Dale Scott, who both agreed that the problem with Iraq was an opportunity to engage in dialogue with the Middle East to resolve the conflict in a peaceful manner rather than in a violent one.

### **Keynote speech at dinner by Michael Hawes, Executive Director, Canada-US Fulbright Program**

As a hockey fan and player himself, Mr. Hawes began with a hockey story that demonstrated the close relationship that exists between Canada and the USA. This relationship can withstand a certain level of banter, demonstrated when the owner of the Maple Leafs team somewhat tactlessly rubbed the Canada Olympic hockey victory in the US ambassador's face. Since Canadians



and Canadianists alike all love a hockey story, this story was greeted with great appreciation.

Mr. Hawes then turned to more serious matters. As the newly-chosen Executive Director of Fulbright Canada, he travels back and forth frequently between Ottawa and Washington, and he shared his experiences and impressions of the immediate aftermath of the attacks. The events of 9/11 were horrific and Canadians felt the impact of it because Canada could have just as well been the target of the attack. In his opinion, Canada was a bit slow in its official reaction to the attack, but this may have been in part due to the cautiousness that is part of Prime Minister Chrétien's political style. However, the Canadian people made up for this, as they welcomed stranded travelers into their homes and gathered on Parliament Hill to mourn as a neighboring nation. " Nous sommes tous des Américains" stated empathetically the French newspaper *Le Monde*, showing that the viciousness of the attacks was felt around the world (even in a country that often harbors antagonistic feelings for the USA).

Were the attacks enough to profoundly change Canada-USA relations? In reflecting on the day's symposium sessions, Mr. Hawes suggested the following key questions:

1. Do the events of 9-11 amount to a "moment of creation" in the international order .... in other words, has there been a fundamental change in circumstances? Superficial changes like the Smart Border Program, tightened airport security, and increased border searches are certainly now more evident, but Mr. Hawes emphasized that many of our impressions about the aftermath of 9/11 need to be tested by careful empirical research. For instance, early forecasts of severely reduced border traffic do not seem to be supported by the actual figures. We need to study and quantify some of the variables before we can understand the full consequences of 9/11.
2. Do the US Government, the US media, and, perhaps most importantly, the US public **believe** that there has been such a change?
3. If, indeed, there is reason to believe that there is a genuine paradigmatic shift in world politics, and that there is a broad consensus within the United States that such is the case, the question (for us) then is how and to what extent does this affect the Canada - US relationship?

Mr. Hawes thanked Tom Barnes, Nelson Graburn, and Rita Ross of the Canadian Studies Program for organizing the symposium. On behalf of Fulbright he presented them each a gift, a book entitled *A Diary Between Friends*. The book is a moving visual tribute to the efforts of Canadians to shelter the travelers stranded in their communities and to assist in the rescue and recovery operations at the World Trade Center.