

MUNK CENTRE MONITOR

IEWS, NEWS, PEOPLE AND EVENTS FROM THE MUNK CENTRE

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

MUNK CENTRE
FOR INTERNATIONAL STUDIES



VIEW FROM THE DIRECTOR

Janice Gross Stein, Director of the Munk Centre for International Studies, is an acknowledged expert on conflict resolution and international relations, with an emphasis on the Middle East. A Fellow of the Trudeau Foundation, Professor Stein has served on many international advisory panels, including the Working Group on Middle East Negotiations at the United States Institute of Peace. She is currently a member of the Education Advisory Board to the Minister of Defence. Professor Stein is the co-author of We All Lost the Cold War (1994) and The Cult of Efficiency (2001).

FROM ACCIDENTAL PRESIDENT TO PRESIDENT OF CHOICE

The accidental president has now become the president of choice. George W. Bush won the election of 2004 with a clear majority of the popular vote and increased Republican strength in Congress. Around the world, leaders are trying to decipher the meaning of the victory and the implications of a second Bush term. Will the next four years deepen the divisions between the United States and many of its allies, or will the newly affirmed president consolidate his gains and move to repair some of the cracks with long-term friends? Pessimistic voices predict that the second-term president will be even less constrained than he was in his first term, and that the radical thrust of his foreign policy will intensify. He will bring the revolution that he began in his first term to completion. This pessimism may be somewhat overdrawn.

Ironically, many European allies may find life easier with President Bush than they would have with John Kerry. No matter which man won the presidency, he would have faced serious challenges both at home and abroad. At home, any president would confront a very large deficit that, sooner or later, would have to be brought under control, an economic recovery that is anemic in its capacity to create significant numbers of well-paying

continued on page 2

The Middle East: The Match that can Ignite the World

COVER STORY BY JANICE GROSS STEIN

The Middle East is a tinderbox, with flames licking at the edges. As news stories report the ongoing violence, broader threats to the region and world are building. The prospect of a nuclear-armed Iran, as well as widespread economic deprivation, militant Islam and the safety and security of the supply of oil are the tinder. Not only the current conflicts that capture the headlines, but also those that are emerging could ignite the flame. What can the outside world do? The international community requires fresh approaches and new strategies to prevent ignition.

Consider the current state of affairs. Violence between Israel and Palestine continues to escalate and to exact its grinding toll, with no end in sight. Israelis and Palestinians are locked in a war of attrition which neither can win, but both have lost hope in negotiation and in peaceful solutions. They are locked in a deadly spiral and they see no way out.

The brutal regime of Saddam Hussein has been unmade – its instruments of repression and violence have been destroyed – but it is far from clear that Iraq can now remake itself. A population that has been brutalized for decades is now seething with humiliation and anger at the foreign troops in its midst. Their anger is unleashed in a context where guns and ammunition are available on every street corner. It is no surprise that Iraq is boiling over with violence, and that an insurgency against the United States is gaining in strength. Iraqis live daily with insecurity, vengeance, and death.

The challenges ahead are formidable as Iraq struggles to create a future. In the next decade, can Iraqis build a functioning society, *continued on page 6*



The Munk Centre for International Studies at Trinity College, University of Toronto, houses Centres and Programs that specialize in international studies.

HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS ISSUE

Kristol's clear: A New World Era has begun, page 5. Six

Questions for Michael Ignatieff, page 7. Michael Donnelly

sees watershed changes in Japan, page 8. A Muslim

Democracy: Jacques Bertrand on Indonesia, page 9.

Jeffrey Kopstein on the EU's Turkish dilemma, page 10.

EVENTS TO WATCH FOR

DISTINGUISHED LECTURERS

NOVEMBER

Michael Ignatieff on
Intervention after Iraq: Some
Second Thoughts, Nov. 19

Return to Iran: captors and
captive meet to reflect on
the 1979 Hostage Crisis,
Nov. 18-19

DECEMBER

Common ground: Canada-
Russian session on federalism,
indigenous peoples and more,
Dec. 13-14

JANUARY

Roméo Dallaire, retired Lt-Gen.,
on The Responsibility to
Protect, Jan. 28

LIONEL GELBER PRIZE



THE LIONEL GELBER
PRIZE

JANUARY

The short list will be
announced for the 2004 Gelber
Prize, awarded to the year's
best work of non-fiction on
international issues. The
\$15,000 award is sponsored
by the Lionel Gelber
Foundation in partnership
with the Munk Centre for
International Studies and
Foreign Policy Magazine.

FIND US ON THE INTERNET

Check the Munk Centre's
full listing of events at
www.utoronto.ca/mcis/



CONTENTS

THE MUNK CENTRE MONITOR

VIEW FROM THE DIRECTOR

Continued from page 1

jobs, and a crisis in health care insurance. Internationally, the challenges are stark: an ongoing possibility of another major attack against the United States, the proliferation of nuclear weapons, escalating spending on the military and security and, of course, the stabilization of Iraq in the midst of a boiling insurgency.

John Kerry would likely have turned to France, Germany, Canada and many others as soon as he took the oath of office and asked them to step up, now that a new president was in place. He would almost certainly have asked them to send troops to Iraq, to broaden the international presence and ease the crisis of legitimacy. He would have pushed Kofi Annan very hard to re-engage UN personnel on the ground. It would have been very difficult for Paris, Berlin, Ottawa and New York to say "No" to a newly elected President Kerry. A "No" would no longer be a rejection of Bush's foreign policy, but an abandonment of the United States in time of need. The separation between President Bush and the United States would no longer be available as a convenient fiction. Everyone's feet would be held to the fire. In all likelihood, however, many would have ultimately said "No," even if they did so very politely.

The reelection of George W. Bush allows allies around the world to escape this choice. For the next four years, leaders can continue to reject the policies of the president even while they proclaim their friendship for the United States and the American people. The argument will, of course, ring somewhat hollow this time, since – this time – George W. Bush is no accident. He is the president of choice.

If the next four years provide very little opportunity to repair the rifts of the last four, how much more radical – internationally – will an isolated President Bush become? Not very much more, I suspect. Fiscal constraints limit even what the world's only superpower can do. Iraq will continue to be an ongoing and serious military and political distraction during the president's second term. If the president is far less constrained politically than he was, he will be far more constrained financially and militarily than he was during his first term. George W. Bush is not Gulliver unbound. To much of the world, the next four years may look much like the last four years.

Our new Munk Centre Monitor will draw on our scholars and visitors to grapple with these challenges over the next four years. It is our opportunity at the Munk Centre to share our research, scholarship and debate about the world with you and to connect with our many partners and friends around the world. We look forward to hearing from you about the Munk Centre Monitor, its research, its debates, and the opinions of our scholars about the big issues.

VIEW FROM THE DIRECTOR 1

COVER STORY

Middle East: The Match that can Ignite the World 1

BY JANICE GROSS STEIN

CENTRE EVENTS

From Sips to Gulps? 3

The Great Lakes Water Controversy

Sharing Values: 3

Panelists debate Canada's role in the world

Starving for Fun 4

The Right to Play brings dignity to needy kids

The Canada-Russia Series – for Judges 4

A New World Era 5

as seen by William Kristol

The Buck Stops Where? 5

Assessing a North-South Institute Report

CENTRE SECTION

Middle East Flashpoints: 6

Cover Story continued

Six Questions for Michael Ignatieff 7

CENTRE INSIGHTS

Insight Japan: Watershed Changes 8

BY MICHAEL DONNELLY

Insight Turkey: Let Turkey into the EU 9

BY JEFFREY KOPSTEIN

Insight Indonesia: A Muslim Democracy 10

BY JACQUES BERTRAND

PEOPLE AND IDEAS 11

CENTRE BOOKS 11

Books from Munk Centre scholars

BACK PAGE

More than the Music: 12

Insights into The Handmaid's Tale – a Munk Centre Humanities Initiative

NEED A SOURCE?

Munk Centre scholars can be contacted for further comment on issues raised in this edition at munk.centre@utoronto.ca.

Commentators in this issue: Jacques Bertrand, Insight Indonesia; Michael Donnelly, Insight Japan; Adèle Hurley, Great Lakes Water Controversy; Jeffrey Kopstein, Insight Turkey; Janice Gross Stein, Middle East politics, U.S. foreign policy.

MUNK CENTRE MONITOR

Director of Editorial Janice Stein
Editor James Fleming

Art Director Lawrence Finn
Assistant Editor Janet Hyer

Contributors: Jason De Zilva,
Alesia Kachur, Oksana Kachur,
Laurentiu Luca.

Editorial Board: Janice Gross Stein,
Michael Donnelly, Rick Halpern,
Jeffrey Kopstein, Louis Pauly,
Peter H. Solomon, Jr.

Published seasonally and distributed to international opinion leaders in government, business, universities and the media by the Munk Centre for International Studies.

Director: Janice Gross Stein,
Executive Director: Marketa Evans.
Munk Centre for International Studies, University of Toronto,
1 Devonshire Place,
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5S 3K7
Phone: 416-946-8900
email: munk.centre@utoronto.ca
website: www.utoronto.ca/mcis

EDITORIAL MISSION

A forum to extend and enhance the contribution of the Munk Centre for International Studies to public debate on important international issues, and contribute to public education.

STAY UP TO DATE

For weekly listings on Munk Centre events, subscribe at listserv@listserv.utoronto.ca: subscribe MCIS-L First Name Last Name. Or contact janet.hyer@utoronto.ca

CENTRE EVENTS

FROM SIPS TO GULPS?

Public debate on a draft agreement that will shape the future of the Great Lakes Basin got off to a brisk start at the Munk Centre in September. Adèle Hurley, Director of the Program on Water Issues, chaired the Toronto end of a three-way videoconference that linked the Munk Centre with the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor and the Canada Institute of the Woodrow Wilson Institute for Scholars in Washington, which hosted the conference.

At issue was a draft compact by eight state governors and two Canadian premiers (Ontario and Quebec) that sets a common standard for water diversions in the Great Lakes Basin, home to about 40 million people. The consensus was that the pact, called the Annex 2001 Implementing Agreement, is seriously flawed and is little more than a licence to take water. With thirsty towns and industries, especially in U.S. states, eyeing the Great Lakes

for more water, the Agreement is seen as opening the door to death by a thousand straws for the Great Lakes. Presentations based on a paper entitled Decision Time: Water Diversion Policy in the Great Lakes



After the session, Adèle Hurley (right) chats with audience member.

Basin (www.powi.ca) were made by two of the continent's foremost water experts. James Olson, an environmental lawyer from Michigan, pointed out that the doctrine of public trust

has been diluted over the years in decision-making standards for water withdrawals. "The public trust doctrine allows us the principle of stewardship. We have got to maintain and honour that principle. You cannot privatize common property," he said.

As for the Agreement itself, Olson believes: "The water marketing industry, in whatever form it takes with a world water crisis, has been handed over liquid gold." He pointed out that the threshold for application of the compact's consent mechanism is one million gallons per day (gpd) for diversions and five million gpd for consumptive uses. Water diverted and shipped out of the basin in containers less than 5.6 liters will no longer be defined as a "diversion" but "consumptive use," he said, and will not be subject to veto unless it is above five million gpd.

Calling the draft compact "a very high-risk strategy," Ralph Pentland, a consultant and former Director of Water Planning and Management in

the Canadian Department of the Environment, argued that the proposed regime could eventually open the region to larger diversions. "In the first instance it would facilitate several small diversions to nearby communities right away...That in and of itself would not be a major problem. The amount of water involved would be very small – I would venture to guess that in total the net loss may be equivalent to about one per cent of the Chicago Diversion. [Chicago is licensed to take two billion gallons per day.] But it will have established the respectability of new and formally sanctioned diversions – a bad precedent, he said, that could eventually lead to larger diversion over longer distances.

Pentland also said the Agreement's "resource improvement" standard, under which water diverters could trade damage to wetlands in one area with funding for improvements in another area, "...is tantamount to a 'Water for Sale' sign."

SHARING VALUES

WHAT CAN CANADA DO?



Janice Gross Stein and Peter Harder.

Share our values and expertise in good governance around the world – that's what, according to speakers at a Munk Centre session on Canada's contribution to international development.

"Governance issues are becoming a foundation for Canada's influence in world affairs," said Peter Harder, Deputy Minister, Department of Foreign Affairs. "Studies have shown that good governance is a foundation for public motivation and a foundation for economic development." Canada should lend a hand to countries trying to build institutions that will govern people equitably and fairly. "Countries will not develop until their citizens invest in their own country; to do that, they need

the rule of law and public order," he said. Canada can be of assistance by sharing expertise and values in democratic elections, legal systems, public administration and federalism.

Peter Harder was one of three high-profile speakers at the event, which was organized by two students, Kartick Kumar and Andrew Harder, and hosted by Richard Sandbrook, professor of political science at the Centre for International Studies.

The imperatives are growing much stronger for good governance, according to Harder. "The fight against terrorism has raised the importance of good governance. Terrorists are feeding off the frustration of people because their governments are not delivering the goods," he said. In order to push good governance forward, a multilateral effort is needed. "We have to keep asking for change and help to manage it, and be clear in our resolve to keep at it, despite the intrusiveness."

Richard Gwyn, Toronto Star columnist, offered an overview of the state of Canada-U.S. relations before assessing Canada's contribution to peace order and good governance. As for the former, he observed: "In Washington, we're not taken seriously anymore." He portrayed the two countries as neighbours that

don't really understand each other. For one thing, the U.S. is a strongly religious society, with about 30 per cent evangelical Christians, but Canada is a post-Christian, secular society, he said. "In the past, we knew the U.S. people better than they knew themselves. People turned to us to help understand them. But American democracy is turning away from us, to the South and South-West, to Hispanics that are unaware and unconcerned about us."

The U.S. and Canada are alike in one way. "We both adopt the 'missionary position.' We are both doing good for other peoples in different ways. The Americans are the shining city on the hill, with a missionary, but also an imperialist, motivation. We promote and preach values like gender equality, democratization, civil society and economic equality."

Gwyn agreed that Canada has much to offer, especially its successful multicultural experience. However, he was critical of our foreign aid spending. With the aid envelope at \$3 billion a year, our problem is "not a lack of money to spend, but how we spend the money." No coordination among too many competing departments and agencies means: "We spend more money to spend money than any other

country in the world."

Another speaker Bob Rae, the former Ontario Premier, agreed that Canada has values to share, but stressed that soft power often goes hand in hand with the hard power of police or military force, as shown by the presence of Elections Canada in Afghanistan. This would not have been possible without a military presence, he said.

And what of Canada's military spending? Gwyn suggested that, with public priorities elsewhere, Canada's \$13 billion a year budget for the military is not going to change significantly. Rae disagreed with this assumption. He stressed that Canada's military capability will be important. "Canada cannot afford not to be part of the international effort to deal with the consequences of failed and failing states." For Canada, this will mean focusing on more than health care spending. "Governments have to learn that the preoccupation with health care alone is a very high-risk strategy – it's not sustainable." Rae also noted that post-9/11, there aren't any "no-go" countries, with conflicts or abuses that we can ignore. "We ignore parts of the world at our peril because people have the means to export conflict to us."

CENTRE EVENTS

THE RIGHT TO PLAY

JOHANN OLAV KOSS

For Johann Olav Koss, Olympic speed skating champion, the idea that would turn him into a friend of the poorest children of the world began with a visit to Eritrea in the mid-90s. He recalls: "I saw a group of boys, 12 or 13 years old. One guy was the most popular. Why? Because he was the only one with a long-sleeved shirt that could be rolled into a soccer ball. He had to be there for them to play." Koss told them he would be back after the upcoming Lillehammer Olympics and bring them a proper ball. Koss did that and more. After winning three gold medals for Norway at the 1994 Olympics, he set in motion an organization that today is called Right to Play (RTP), which provides sports equipment, training for coaches, and more to needy kids in about 20 countries around the world.

Koss recounted his tale during a presentation in the Munk Centre's Distinguished Lecture Series this fall. He addressed the question that he sometimes gets about his work: why give kids sports equipment when they haven't even got enough to eat? The answer, he says, comes from the comments of refugee



Starving for fun: Johann Koss livens up children at a Rwanda refugee camp.

children, such as this one in the Oruchinga refugee camp in Uganda: "Before Right to Play came we felt that we were not human beings. When RTP came to Oruchinga we came out of fear." Right to Play provides kids with the opportunity for a little dignity and joy in miserable circumstances. But the organization does more than that, Koss explained. It spreads values like those shared by the people of Canada, where it is now based. For example, Right to Play's symbol is a

red ball, inscribed with the slogan, "Look after yourself. Look after one another." It espouses the "best values of sport" – respect, fair play and teamwork and seeks to instill optimism, inspiration, compassion, leadership and courage.

Right to Play's core programs are: Sport Works, which seeks to enhance the physical, social and emotional development of children through sport and play and to build individual capacity and community-based partnerships; and Sport Health, which uses the

"mobilizing power of sport to support national health priorities on immunization, HIV/AIDS and disease prevention." It partners with Zambian health authorities in a "take your shots" campaign against measles. In a Tanzanian



Koss (centre) with Marketa Evans, Executive Director of the Munk Centre, (left) and audience member.

refugee camp, where HIV/AIDS is rampant, it has trained about 300 women sports coaches, who are also coaching kids on the "Right to Protect Ourselves" from the disease.

Koss's cause has support at the international level. Kofi Annan, Secretary General of the United Nations, is a proponent of sport initiatives to improve the lives of individuals and communities. As a 2003 UN report concluded, sport "bridges cultural and ethnic divides....It teaches tolerance, cooperation and respect."

For more information about Right To Play, visit www.righttoplay.com

WHO OWNS WHAT, WHEN?

THE CANADA-RUSSIA SERIES – FOR JUDGES

Rarely have so many distinguished judges from two countries been gathered around the same table. At a Munk Centre event in October, top judges from Canada and Russia gathered together as part of the Canada-Russia Judicial Partnership Program. Organized by Peter Solomon, Director of the Centre for Russian and East European Studies, the session provided a cross-fertilization of legal ideas about property rights – an issue that goes to the heart of democracy.

Canadian presenters covered such topics as: the extent to which Canada's constitution regulates property relations; governmental



Russian judges Vladimir Solovieve (left) and Sergey Savkin.

restrictions on private property rights; relations with the mass media and public; intellectual property rights; corporate governance; and fair taxation and property rights.

Russian presenters addressed



Holding court: Distinguished judges from Russia and Canada gathered at the Munk Centre. Photo: Eric Morse

such topics as the use and abuse of property rights, including money laundering and illegal business activity; the legal practice of confiscation and expropriation; the effectiveness of injunctions and liens to prevent hiding assets; and chal-

lenges in enforcing property rights judgments against the government.

Weighty legal talent was on hand. Session chairs from Canada were Michel Bastarache, Supreme Court Justice; Donald Bowman, Associate Chief Justice of the Tax Court of Canada; Patrick Lesage, former Chief Justice of the Ontario Superior Court; and Suzanne Labbe, Deputy Commissioner for Federal Judicial Affairs. Russian session chairs were Sergey Savkin, Justice of the Supreme Arbitrage Court; Vladimir Solovieve, Justice of the Supreme Court; as well as Larisa Krasavichikova and Anatoly Kononov, both Justices of the Constitutional Court.

The stated purpose of the Partnership Program is to "facilitate ongoing judicial reform in Russia."

A NEW WORLD ERA

9/11 AND THE 2004 U.S. ELECTION

Sweeping perspective, controversial views and a heated debate: all were provided by William Kristol, a leading American political analyst and commentator, at a September lecture on 9/11 and the 2004 U.S. presidential election. In his view, the key to understanding the dynamics of the election is that "post 9/11 we have entered a new era in world history." Although many still assume we can go back to the normalcy of the 1990s, he said, in every new era, "the conventional wisdom of the preceding era is wrong." Moving from historic trends to strategic issues, Kristol also expressed support for the Bush administration's policy in Iraq, notwithstanding his misgivings about aspects of its execution.

Kristol, a one-time philosophy professor, advisor to George Bush senior, Fox TV commentator and current editor of the conservative publication *The Weekly Standard*, said we are witnessing "a new moment" in the world. He identified three recent eras: first, the Cold War Era, from the late '40s to the collapse of the Berlin Wall (1989) and the disintegration of the Soviet Union in 1991; second, the '90s, a decade of peace and prosperity; and third, the post 9/11 era. Elections have been fought and won on different sets of issues in each era, he said. During the Cold War, foreign policy performance was the deciding factor; during the '90s, domestic issues such as the economy and health care were key – a fact that George Bush Sr. was slow to realize. While Bush Sr. stuck with a Cold War era emphasis on foreign policy on the 1992 campaign trail, Clinton "focused on the economy like a laser beam" and won. Turning to the 2004 election, Kristol said that the "single most important thing about it" was its timing – the first election post-9/11. This made it a foreign policy election, according to Kristol. "All the old issues remain, such as stability in Russia, but they are looked at through a different prism, because in the new era they are viewed through a single big event." As well, new uncertainties have emerged in this era, partly reflecting different understandings in the U.S. and Europe about the meaning of 9/11. There are questions about the NATO alliance, and questions about U.S. relations with European countries. "They are all up in the air."

As for past U.S. policy on Iraq, Kristol said: "I think Bush was right. He had to grasp this nettle now." The alternative, he said, was to let Saddam win, outlast the sanctions, restart the WMD program, and kill more Iraqis. More generally, he asserted, "A vigorous, internationalist United States is important. We have to be willing at the end of the day to use force. That's the kind of world it is. There's no alternative."

Kristol acknowledged that there have been mistakes in Iraq. Not enough soldiers were sent to secure the country and U.S. policy makers underestimated the strength of resistance in the Sunni triangle. But he endorsed the objective of establishing a functioning democracy in the Middle East that would set an example in a region where autocracies prevail. Exporting democracy can work, he argued, noting the successful elections in Indonesia and Afghanistan.

Audience reactions to Kristol's views were highly polarized, but the issues he raised will remain on the international agenda well into the future.

THE BUCK STOPS WHERE?

Since 1990, there has been a tremendous explosion of private foreign investment flows from North to South, while foreign aid has been in decline. In 2003 alone, private foreign investment flowing into developing countries totaled U.S. \$163 billion. With the poorest countries now competing for foreign investment, the timely question is: Who Benefits? That question was addressed at a Munk Centre session held to introduce the 2004 Canadian Development Report by Canada's North-South Institute.

Entitled "Investment in Poor Countries: Who Benefits?" the Report takes a balanced approach, pointing out the many potential benefits of Foreign Direct Investment (as opposed to debt), while also noting its pitfalls. The benefits include access to technology, skills and markets, as well as jobs, local purchasing, tax revenues, and enhanced education and health care, in the case of corporate investors that seek to contribute to sustainable development.

"Foreign investment can be a catalyst for local violence."

But there are also pitfalls. Roy Culpeper, President and CEO of the Ottawa-based North-South Institute, pointed out that there can also be unintended costs associated with foreign investment, such as environmental degradation and corruption. And it can be a catalyst for local violence over control of resources (Congo) and a challenge for workers rights and workplace standards.

And what of the practices of the multinationals, which have been developing standards of corporate social responsibility? "There has been a shift to voluntary corporate codes of conduct," noted Culpeper, "but this is not the answer. We need international standards with accountability."

For a copy of the North-South Institute's Report, contact the publisher at Email: order.dept@renoufbooks.com



William Kristol

Kristol's visit to the U of T campus was co-sponsored by the Centre for International Studies, Program on Political Philosophy and International Affairs and St. Michael's College. He was in Toronto to open the Grano Series of lectures organized by Rudyard Griffiths and Patrick Luciani and sponsored by BMO Financial Group, the Donner Canadian Foundation and the Peter Munk Charitable Foundation.

THE MIDDLE EAST: The Match that can Ignite the World

continued from page 1

bridge the deep divides among its Sunni, Shiite, and Kurdish populations, and create institutions that will reduce the violence and the brutality that has been its history for the last 30 years? Can they build a politics which is authentically their own but is free of violence and repression? Can they preserve their rich heritage and at the same time create a safe space to do politics?

Or will Iraq slide deeper into violence, descend into anarchy and become a "failed state," an inviting home to those who seek to use terror to rid Iraq and the Middle East of the hated foreigner, the outsider, that has colonized the Middle East in the last 150 years? Will it become the new safe haven for networks of terror whose target is not Baghdad, but Washington, London, Paris, and Berlin? Will a failed Iraq provoke a region-wide conflict among Iran, Turkey, and Syria as they scramble for the spoils?

All these futures are real possibilities. Which future develops will matter not only to Iraqis, but to the Middle East and to all of us.

Across the border, Iran is proceeding with its nuclear program. It has acknowledged that it has begun the process of enriching uranium. Despite a year of multilateral engagement with European powers, Iran has not wavered in its determination to continue with its nuclear program. Iran's leaders insist that its program is for peaceful purposes, but for years it concealed its nuclear activities from international inspectors. It is possible that 10 years from now, or five, Iran may have nuclear weapons. A nuclear Iran would challenge Egypt, Syria, and even Iraq, to develop nuclear weapons of their own. Israel's finger would be constantly on its nuclear trigger. It is not difficult to imagine the terrible consequences that could flow from a nuclear arms race in this part of the world.

In Sudan, a human catastrophe of major proportions has exploded in Darfur. Over 50,000 people have been killed in the last 18 months, and

1.5 million refugees have streamed across Sudan's borders into Chad. Representatives of the United Nations have brought the crisis in Sudan to the Security Council, but after months of debate, the Council has yet to take meaningful action. A tiny force of observers from the African Union patrols an enormous

area, with little effect. African states stand ready to send additional forces, but they need logistical and communications support and transportation. The United Nations has not been able to persuade any of its members to step forward. Unless a global response can be coordinated in the next two months, hundreds of thousands – far more than have died in Iraq – will die of disease and starvation.

These pockets of flames are embedded in tinder throughout the rest of the region. The combined gross domestic product of the 22 Arab countries – including the oil rich – is less than that of Spain. From 1960 to 1990, labour productivity dropped in the Arab world, while it soared everywhere else in the world. The Arab Human Development Report, written by Arab social sci-

entists, tells us that every second citizen in the Arab world is ready to emigrate. It finds no significant improvement in political openness, respect for human rights, or freedom of the press. The Middle East has slid backward while almost every other region in the world has moved forward.

It is no surprise that, in almost every Arab country, militant Islam is growing in strength as the only viable alternative to governments that have failed to deliver the most basic services, economic opportunities, and political responsiveness to grievance. To make matters even worse, most Arab countries have very young populations. In Egypt, over 50 per cent of the population is below 25 years old. As governments fail to deliver on their most basic promises, angry, frustrated and often hopeless young people are ready recruits for militant Islam. I see them all over the Middle East. The gravest threat to global security is not weapons of mass destruction, or even rogue states, but unemployed, disenfranchised, angry young males. The Middle East will continue to export violence if it cannot meet the

basic needs of its young people.

All this in a context where oil has never been more important – and more expensive – in the global economy. Energy hungry China and India have only begun to push up world demand for oil. The strategic importance of oil can only grow over the next quarter century. Oil will contin-



Will they trade the ball for guns? The gravest threat to global security is unemployed, disenfranchised, angry young males.
© Benjamin Lowy/CORBIS/MAGMA

ue to be the vortex that sucks great powers into the region, distorts its politics, and strengthens the autocracies that are in place. With only mild exaggeration, we can say that oil has been the curse of the modern Middle East. It draws outsiders in and allows insiders to avoid the difficult economic, political and social choices that they would otherwise face. It is hard to conceive of a more explosive mixture of ingredients.

What can we do to change the trajectory of the Middle East? How can the outside world be most helpful? Another way of asking the same question: how can outsiders help to ensure that militant Islam does not become the dominant form of political expression in the Arab world in the next decade? If it does, the whole world will pay the price.

It is important to be modest about

THE MIDDLE EAST: The Match that can Ignite the World

what outsiders can do, for outsiders have done far more harm than good in the modern history of the Middle East. In this spirit of restraint, let me make some unconventional suggestions:

First, we must work to create more flexible and more nimble international institutions that can help to provide order and security. The UN Security Council has failed, and failed badly, in Darfur. It is hard to conceive of this kind of failure only 10 years after Rwanda, but the UN has not protected civilians in Darfur. It is vitally important to make our institutions both more inclusive and better able to respond and protect. Reform of the Security Council and a change in the veto could help, but neither has been the obstacle in Darfur. Those who affirm the international community's "responsibility to protect," as Canada does, may have to go around the Security Council. Prime Minister Paul Martin has proposed creating the equivalent of the G-20 to deal with political and security issues. A new G-20 may not necessarily solve all the problems, but it is an initiative that moves us in the right direction. If we are to meet the challenges of the next decade, we desperately need to experiment and innovate to build more responsive and flexible institutions.

Second, the Arab world suffers acutely from a deficit in governance. Arab writers make this point again and again. Here, countries like Canada could do a great deal. We could work with journalists, political parties, electoral commissions, public administration, and jurists when we are asked to do so. I have been asked repeatedly by colleagues in the Arab world for help from Canada on governance issues. Often, unfortunately, the request goes unmet. Our government is not positioned to respond. We are not organized so that our people can be sent when they are invited to come. Often, a request is lost in institutional bickering or buried in reels of red tape, so that by the time we do respond, the invitation has been withdrawn. We cannot afford to continue to waste our best assets. Canada has much to

offer – its values, principles and legal norms that underpin good governance, its federal experience, and its multicultural practice – when interested states come calling.

Finally, an important debate is now taking place in Europe on beginning a process to admit Turkey into the European Union. Turkey is a large Muslim nation, with functioning political institutions and an improving record on governance. Yet, some of the discussion we hear from Europe is, quite frankly, shocking. Frits Bolkestein, a Dutch member of the executive committee of the European Union warned that Europe risked becoming Islamized if Turkey joined. If that should happen, he concluded, the battle of Vienna in 1683 when Austrian, German, and Polish troops pushed back the Ottoman Turks would "have been in vain."

Imagine how this conversation sounds to Arab ears that are also listening to Europe and North America as they preach good governance. Imagine how this conversation sounds to the millions of Muslims who are law-abiding citizens within the European Union. It is difficult to avoid a charge of hypocrisy. If Europe cannot accommodate Islamic governments within its political and economic institutions, the militant Islamists have won before the stakes have been engaged. A European Islam offers an unparalleled opportunity for pushing the conversation within the Arab world. But will Europe meet the challenge, or turn its face away?

Making space for political Islam is the challenge of the next decade. We do not have much time. The Arab world gave Islam to the world. If its gift is not accepted, if it is rejected and thrown back in its face, the angry young men, already facing little opportunity and with little hope, will find solace in the militancy that threatens them as much as it threatens us.

– Based on a speech delivered by Janice Gross Stein, Director of the Munk Centre for International Studies, to the Empire Club of Canada, October 7, 2004.

SIX QUESTIONS FOR MICHAEL IGNATIEFF



Michael Ignatieff: points of principle

Few issues have been more controversial in recent years than the so-called "right of humanitarian intervention." Whether it concerns Kosovo, Rwanda, Iraq, or Darfur, there has been controversy over who should act, when and how. Should states act alone, with or without international backing? On what grounds? Or should action be the sole right of the United Nations? In advance of his public lecture on the subject at the Munk Centre on November 19, we asked Michael Ignatieff, one of the world's leading thinkers on human rights, to answer six questions of principle that are central to the debate. A U of T alumnus, Michael Ignatieff is Carr Professor of Human Rights Policy at the Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, and the author of *The Lesser Evil: Political Ethics in an Age of Terror*.

1. Do states have a responsibility to intervene when the UN can't or won't? For example, when violations of rights are egregious and the Security Council is deadlocked?

MI: Yes. Otherwise we fetishize procedural legitimacy (UN approval for all intervention operations) at the expense of substantive legitimacy (the necessity to stop gross and persistent human rights violations).

2. What criteria should be used to justify intervention by a state or the international community – ethnic cleansing, mass killing, gross viola-

tion of human rights? In other words, when does the international community's "responsibility to protect" trump the sovereignty of the state where abuses occur?

MI: The bar for legitimate intervention should be set high: at actual or apprehended ethnic cleansing or genocidal massacre.

3. Is a state justified in intervening on preventative or other grounds, as the U.S. did in Iraq?

MI: There are justifications for preventative intervention to forestall imminent attack or aggression; and as above, if there are well-grounded apprehensions of imminent ethnic cleansing or genocide, a state would be justified in taking preventive action. By 2003, Iraq had proven its capacity for violations on every one of these fronts; whether it would continue to do so is now a matter of intense debate. The U.S. government clearly thought it would and took preventative action.

4. Do you have much hope for the UN to act even in egregious cases?

MI: The UN is a club of states with a strong bias towards the defence of sovereignty, which means there is a general reluctance to intervene, or even agree on the principles to justify intervention. Hence, states who can intervene should do so – in cases of ethnic cleansing or genocidal massacre – even if the UN won't authorize it.

5. Is a multilateral (UN) approach to intervention preferable in principle? Is it practical?

MI: Of course, any state should seek UN approval, if only to leverage legitimacy and resources. But, they should also proceed – even unilaterally – if actual or apprehended genocidal massacre or ethnic cleansing is going on.

6. Does the U.S. experience in Iraq make it less likely to consider similar intervention in trouble spots like Iran?

MI: The U.S. experience in Iraq will preclude military intervention in Iran, unless the Iranians were to launch against the Israelis. The same holds true in North Korea.

WATERSHED CHANGES IN JAPAN

MICHAEL W. DONNELLY

Japan's prolonged struggle to escape from stubborn economic stagnation that followed the bursting of the speculative bubble in 1991 has become one of the legendary international stories of our times. Familiar themes have emerged among foreign critics on what's wrong with Japan and how to fix it. Yet, this conventional wisdom falls short in explaining what's actually happening in Japan and why. Far from being a "lost decade," as the critics would have it, the 90s began a defining period in the nation's history. A deeper understanding of the forces at play is required.

The most widely accepted truism among foreign critics is that the nation's inability to recover is rooted in iron triangles, the myriad formal and informal ties that fuse together the ruling Liberal Democratic Party (LDP), government bureaucracy, and vested political interests like the nation's notorious postal system, with its reputation as a national electoral machine for the LDP. Only when production and distribution of goods and services are entrusted primarily to the market mechanism, only when the government moves dramatically in a revolutionary way to allow capitalism to flourish will Japan regain its maximum productive capacity to compete in the global economy.

Economic reform during the past decade has been widely judged as pitifully inadequate, far from what the theoretical ideals of Anglo-American capitalism require. Opportunities for needed changes are portrayed as squandered or stymied. Painful choices, we are told, are avoided for reasons of political expediency. The picture that emerges from following press reports and a vast range of academic studies of what is called "the lost decade" is almost frightening. A recent study of initiatives by Prime Minister Junichiro Koizumi, who has vowed to destroy his own LDP by carrying out structural reforms, judges them to be a case of "failed revolution." The

country has all but dropped off the world's radar screen as a big power.

Have all the scholars and critics been wrong? The LDP is still in power. Interest groups remain powerful. Most economic reform initiatives have brought only partial results. Nonetheless, the country is on the way to economic recovery. Overall growth rates have been positive for over two years and are projected to exceed those of the United States in 2004. The recovery is led by business investment and consumer spending rather than government-stimulus programs. Corporate profits are improving; capital spending and industrial output are significantly up. Consumer spending, which represents more than half of the GDP, has shown the highest growth rates in 21 years.

To be sure, there are still many worrisome aspects in Japan's turnaround. Gross public debt is unsustainable, deflationary pressures persist, and non-performing loans still haunt the financial system. An economic slowdown in China will have a negative impact. The country is also extremely vulnerable to international oil markets. Many features of what was once considered a typical salaried worker's life, including long working hours, are no longer acceptable to younger people. In the longer term, a fundamental issue is the country's ability to raise its productivity growth.

Orthodox economic theory provides one way to frame and judge the complexities of reform politics in Japan. Yet, I believe that a key to unlocking the puzzle of why reform measures have taken the form that they have is to understand how politics is shaped by the search for security. Historians have observed that insecurity and vulnerability have long been the origins of decisions in Japan. The ideal of avoiding the unpredictable has been deeply woven into the fabric of daily life for decades, shaping key government policies and even the nation's links with the world. It is insecurity and political power, and not simply economic efficiency, that still matters most in Japan.

In many respects, this has been a

watershed period for the country since 1991. Remarkably, the country has undergone greater changes in political governing than at any time since the Allied Occupation period of 1945-52. Far from being a "lost decade," this has been a defining period in the nation's history, especially when politics, uncertainty and the nature of governing are considered.

Political governing is a dynamic process in which power is acquired and exercised for the management of a country's economic and social resources. Governing is the exercise of power; it is also necessarily a clash of ideals and an exercise in political values. Key areas of governing include: (1) electoral processes by which politicians are selected, monitored and replaced; (2) how prime ministers are selected, cabinets appointed and policy initiatives undertaken and approved; (3) how government is organized, its tasks defined, its power distributed, checked and made transparent; (4) relationships connecting business and other organized interests with government and politicians; and (5) civil society and politics, including public attitudes towards politics, the way men and women think of their roles in public life, and the degree of volunteerism and local initiatives.

Across all of these dimensions of political governing there have been deep and fundamental changes. Elections are more competitive, the powers of the prime minister enhanced, government has been dramatically restructured, vested interests are not as entrenched as they once were and civil society is burgeoning in Japan. Power sharing relationships in Japan are in flux. People on all sides of the economic reform debate have been largely in agreement on the desirability of change. After all, who likes bad times? But the essence of politics has been the management of uncertainty rather than the search for an idealized form of market-based capitalism. How far Japan will be able to sustain its economic recovery, shaped as it is by the politics of uncertainty, remains unclear.



Michael W. Donnelly
Dr. David Chu Professor
in Asia-Pacific Studies and
Director of the Asian Institute
at the Munk Centre for
International Studies

*"Far from being a 'lost decade,'
as the critics would have it,
this has been a defining period in
the nation's history."*

MOVING THE WEST TO EAST: Let Turkey into the EU

JEFFREY KOPSTEIN

Is Turkey part of the West? Are Muslims welcome in the European Union? Or is it a "Christians only" club? These are the questions that the European heads of state will answer when the European Council meets on December 17 to decide on whether to open negotiations with Turkey on joining the EU. Although the challenges of admitting Turkey are formidable, a definite "no" would be disastrous for Europe and the Middle East. It would confirm the worst suspicions about the West in the minds of Muslims throughout the world.

Fortunately, Europe's politicians understand this. The logic behind admitting Turkey to the EU is not economic but political. The EU could easily live without a country of 70 million people whose incomes are far below those of most West Europeans (though not so far below those of the newer East European member states, not to mention the other candidate states in waiting such as Bulgaria, Romania, and Albania). But the exclusion of Turkey just because its citizens are Muslim would be profoundly destabilizing in a region that borders Europe itself.

Turkey first applied for membership in the EU in 1987. Its application was refused several times, and for good reasons. Turkey's military meddled in civilian politics and its human rights record, especially in its treatment of its Kurdish minority, did not pass the democratic minimum. Note that these reasons for refusal had nothing to do with Islam.

Since the mid-1990s, however, Turkey's record on both democracy and human rights has been at least as good as that of other EU candidates. And although the election of a moderate Islamist party in 2002 seemed to bring Turkey's official secularism into question, Prime Minister Erdogan has sensibly argued his party's Islamic orientation is no different from the "Christian" orientations of ruling Christian Democratic parties throughout Europe. The European Commission's report on Turkey in early October urged the European Council to give the green light for negotiations on membership at its December meeting. Europe stands poised to make the smart move and extend the "West" into the Muslim world.

In a rare consensus, Europe's leaders have signaled their intention to welcome Turkey. France's president, Jacques Chirac, has come out in favour of Turkey's membership. German Chancellor Gerhard Schroeder put the matter most clearly when he stated that the decisive arguments for admitting Turkey to the EU were strategic and security related. If the prospect of EU membership could deepen and consolidate Turkey's reforms, Mr. Schroeder argued, "we could stabilize the land and create a link between the European Enlightenment and non-fundamentalist Islam." Such farsighted thinking suggests Europe's leaders understand that the key to democratic stability and moderate Islam in Turkey is the continued possibility of EU membership within some reasonable period of time.

The bad news is that Europe's politicians have not been able to resist playing the anti-Turkish card at home. The French have been perhaps the most irresponsible in this regard, though they are not alone. Prime Minister Jean-Pierre Raffarin asked if Europe really wanted "the river of Islam to enter the riverbed of secularism." And in the run up to, and immediately after, the Commission's favorable report in October, French politicians across the spectrum, including Mr. Chirac, called for a national referendum on Turkey's admission. The head of Germany's Christian Democrats, Angela Merkel, called for a petition opposing EU membership for Turkey. Of course, part of this populist posturing by mainstream politicians is probably intended merely to prevent politicians from the extreme right, such as Jean Marie Le Pen, from grabbing the issue for their own nefarious ends. Public opinion polls suggest that there is not much support for Turkey's membership, just as there was not much enthusiasm for admitting the post-communist countries in May 2004. This kind of politics, however, can get out of hand and at some point the posturing politicians will have to become leaders and get out ahead of public opinion.

When this will happen is anyone's guess. Some European politicians who want to keep Turkey out of the EU have proposed extending it a "privileged partnership," something better than outsider status but short of full membership. They argue that the

EU must develop a policy to deal with non-members on its periphery: enlargement, they maintain, is a lousy substitute for a foreign policy.

This is true. Someday the EU will need to exclude a country that wants in. But Turkey is a bad place to start. The evolution of democratic political Islam in Turkey is something that could only have happened under the watchful eye of Brussels. EU conditionality and the prospect of admission has profoundly influenced Turkish politics in every respect, from economic policy to the reform of its criminal code. In the latter case, under strong pressure from Brussels, Mr. Erdogan recently quietly killed a plan by conservative politicians in his ruling party to criminalize adultery.

The experience of the recently admitted post-communist member states is instructive. The protracted period between the onset of formal negotiations and admission produced unprecedented positive change throughout the region, not only in economic terms but also in human rights and minorities policy. In fact, most observers maintain that the prospect of EU membership rather than actual membership itself is what matters. Once a country is admitted, Brussels loses most of its leverage.

What is the lesson for Turkey from Eastern Europe? Brussels should use the leverage of a protracted period of negotiation (2015 is the date for admission that is being tossed around) to consolidate the important changes that have already taken place in Turkey and to push the Turks for further changes where possible. The trick will be to draw out the period of candidacy without stepping back from the promise of full membership.

When the European Council meets in December, the best we can hope for is a firm date for negotiations and an offer of full membership by 2015 but only if Turkey stays on track. What will probably come out of that meeting, however, is a typical EU diplomatic formulation that leaves everything open to later interpretation. Ambiguity can be useful, but if it undercuts Turkish moderates and reformers at home, it will be counterproductive. European leaders need to tell their people that Turkey is part of the West. They will have 10 years to come to grips with this fact. The sooner they start, the better.



Jeffrey Kopstein
Director of the Institute of European Studies at the Munk Centre for International Studies

A French politician asked if Europe really wanted "the river of Islam to enter the riverbed of secularism."

INDONESIA'S 2004 ELECTIONS AND DEMOCRATIC CHALLENGES

JACQUES BERTRAND

On October 20, 2004, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (commonly called "SBY") was inaugurated as Indonesia's sixth president. This event marked an important watershed in Indonesia's democratization. It ended several months of electoral campaigning that confirmed the health of the democratic process in the world's most populous Muslim country. Yet, the new president and government still face enormous challenges that will determine how well and how healthy Indonesia's democracy will remain.

Only seven years ago, the country was led by one of the world's most senior authoritarian leaders, Suharto. He had maintained a firm grip for 33 years over a highly sophisticated authoritarian regime. When it collapsed under the weight of regime fatigue, an aging leader, and economic turmoil triggered by the 1997 Asian financial crisis, many observers were pessimistic about the country's future. Ethnic, religious, and social conflict erupted and chaos appeared to be the most probable future. The pessimists were wrong. Since then, economic growth has resumed (although at a slower rate) and political stability has been restored in most areas of the country.

The achievements so far in Indonesia's democratization are remarkable. First, free and fair elections were conducted for the legislative assembly in June 1999 and April 2004. In both cases, a large number of political parties ran for seats, the campaigns and voting were peaceful, and the elections were clean. Second, the first direct presidential elections were conducted via two electoral rounds, on July 5 and September 20, 2004. Again, the campaigns and voting process were peaceful and clean, and the change of government occurred smoothly on October 20, with opposition candidate SBY taking over the presidency from the incumbent, Megawati Sukarnoputri. Third, the military refrained from intervention in the election, even though it was completely excluded from the legislature for the first time as a result of constitutional amendments passed after the 1999 election.

Finally, recent legislation is dramatically increasing the number of elected officials from Indonesia's regions, and there are plans in the works for direct elections of governors and district heads. Procedurally, therefore, Indonesia's democracy is healthy and impressive.

Another major achievement has been to show to the world the compatibility between Islam and democracy. More than 87 per cent of the country's 210 million people are Muslims; Indonesia is the world's largest Muslim country. Indonesia has received bad press as a result of bombings by a terrorist organization, Jemaah Islamiyah, but all major Muslim organizations as well as Islamic political parties have condemned the JI's attacks and the group commands little support in the country. Furthermore, the 2004 elections showed that Indonesians are not inclined to support Islamic politics. Political parties running under the banner of Islam received a total of 31.1 per cent of the votes, a significant increase from 26.6 per cent in 1999, but a fraction of the support won by the large, secular parties. Furthermore, the votes are divided among several political parties, only a few of which have any mention of Islamic law as part of their program. Others clearly distance themselves from Islamic law, and none openly advocate an Islamic state. Instead, Indonesia has emerged as a new, well-functioning democracy, with a peaceful rotation of power, in a relatively short period of time. It has also developed a vibrant free press and dynamic civil society. All of these democratic credentials have been more difficult to achieve in many non-Muslim countries.

Nevertheless, the new government faces some important challenges. For one thing, SBY rose in popularity to become president despite a very weak party base. His Democratic Party obtained only 8 per cent of the votes in the legislative assembly elections in April. While this was no small achievement for a new party, SBY may face some important governance problems as he seeks allies in the legislature among the larger parties, most of which supported Megawati's bid for the re-election.

A second challenge is corruption. Indonesia remains one of the most cor-

rupt countries in the world. There has been very little improvement in fighting corruption since Suharto's downfall. Corruption is endemic, widespread and decentralized. A program to decentralize power and fiscal resources to the more than 200 districts of Indonesia has given rise to new sources of corruption that will be difficult to eradicate. SBY ran on a promise to fight corruption and he has made it his top priority for the first 100 days of his government, but the obstacles are almost insurmountable.

The future role of the military is another uncertainty. Although it has significantly diminished its political role, it is not yet completely under civilian control. As a former general, SBY may well be able to reassert civilian dominance over the military where his predecessors failed, but there are important pockets of resistance.

SBY's greatest challenge, will be national unity. Two regional trouble spots continue to tarnish Indonesia's image as a new democracy. The military campaign against a guerilla movement in Aceh has led to many civilian casualties. Media and non-governmental organizations' access has been restricted. Reports that have filtered through have shown a continued pattern of abuses by the Indonesian military. Megawati essentially abandoned negotiation and deferred to the armed forces to use a "military solution" to the conflict. Her government also clamped down on a civilian movement in Papua, where secessionist demands were voiced alongside demands to revisit Papua's historical integration and status within the Republic of Indonesia.

SBY will need to reign in the military to avoid continued abuses and protect civilians, but the search for political solutions will be extremely difficult. The quality of Indonesia's future democracy may well be measured by the way the SBY government deals with these conflicts.

There are many reasons to be optimistic about the future of democracy in Indonesia. Challenges to the new government are also considerable. While the transition to a well-functioning procedural democracy was fairly rapid, progress in the quality of democracy may happen at a much slower pace.



Jacques Bertrand
Associate Professor of
Political Science,
at the Asian Institute,
Munk Centre for
International Studies

"Indonesia has emerged as a new, well-functioning democracy, with a peaceful rotation of power, in a relatively short period of time."

RICH LIKE ME?

SASHA TORRES



In TV land, everyone is portrayed as an aspiring consumer, minorities included. Forget issues such as poverty or discrimination. Racial minorities are shown as "sharing confidence in the power of goods and services to transform lives," according to Sasha Torres a leading expert on the subject from the University of Western Ontario. Her guest lecture was part of the F. Ross Johnson/Connaught Distinguished Speaker Series organized by the Centre for the Study of the United States. In comments entitled "TV's New Commodification of Race," Torres traced TV's treatment of race from '60s shows like *Harvest of Shame*, in which destitute black workers were shown waiting for jobs as sharecroppers in Florida, through '70s hits like the *Bill Cosby Show* and *All in the Family*, to the present.

Today is different. "In the changing television landscape, race is less likely than ever to use old stereotypical forms," she said. "It's more likely to wrench a person of colour out of their political, economic situation and turn them into a racialized symbol of consumerism." Torres cited the example of a recent episode of a "makeover" show, in which the TV team gives a black woman in Watts, Los Angeles a brand new home containing everything in the consumer dream. The team has also given her a surveillance camera on her roof and steel security shutters for her windows. She has been lifted out of her context and joined the middle class – turned into a symbol of the power of consumer goods.

FREE, YES. BUT FAIR?

MARIA POPOVA

Ukraine's image as one of the more Westernized, reform-minded successor states to the Soviet era has some tarnish. The question hanging over elections there, including the recent presidential vote, has been the same for a decade: Free yes, but fair? That's the question addressed by Maria Popova, a Harvard University scholar, in a lecture at the Munk Centre sponsored by the Wolodymyr George Danyliw Foundation. Popova presented the findings of her study of the 2002 elections, in which she analyzed the role of Ukrainian courts in resolving electoral disputes.



Who's counting? Collecting ballots during the Ukrainian election.

By looking at the cases of 134 candidates who filed lawsuits over the campaign disputes, she determined that the courts were biased in favour of pro-presidential candidates. "If they went to court, they won more often than other candidates," she observed. "Legal expertise didn't have an effect. Regional competitiveness didn't matter." She concluded that the "courts were not arbiters, they were instruments."

Her findings bore out anecdotal tales of impropriety during Ukrainian elections, including stories of candidates who handed out free coal along with a campaign brochure, and administrative pressure on companies to buy election materials or expect closer attention when it comes to fire and tax inspections.

WHO'S GOT THE POWER? THE WTO

GILBERT WINHAM

"We're now dealing with an international rule-making body," Gilbert Winham told his audience at a recent Munk Centre event. "There is a changing locus of decision-making to the international level." Professor Winham was referring to the World Trade Organization (WTO), where trade negotiations that began with GATT have become institutionalized.

The WTO was created in 1995 by the Uruguay Round of the GATT negotiations. Its formation marked the increasing institutionalization of world trade negotiations, and it is emerging as a powerful decision-making body on trade policy, trade disputes (Canada-U.S. tiffs over lumber and wheat, for example), product safety, the environment, and more.

What interests Winham, a Dalhousie University political economist and distinguished visiting professor at the University of Toronto, is the nature of decision-making in the WTO. In his paper, he compared how decisions are made in the WTO and the U.S. Congress. He found striking similarities between the trade-offs and deal-making that go on in each institution. Nevertheless, the WTO, like Congress, has a hierarchy, and economically powerful nations dominate decision-making, much to the irritation of developing countries.

Major multinational corporations have recognized the power of the WTO and often work through national governments to lobby for their corporate interests. Louis Pauly, Director of the Centre for International Studies, wondered whether we were seeing "something akin to world legislative machinery in embryo." Another eminent Munk Centre scholar on the WTO, Dr. Sylvia Ostry, observed that the domestic analogy theme "is worth pursuing in much greater depth."

CENTRE BOOKS

Recent books by scholars at the Munk Centre and its affiliated institutes, centres and programs.

- Jacques Bertrand, *Nationalism and Ethnic Conflict in Indonesia*, Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- Peter Brock, ed., *These Strange Criminals: An Anthology of Prison Memoirs by Conscientious Objectors from the Great War to the Cold War*, University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Eric Cazdyn, *The Flash of Capital: Film and Geopolitics in Japan*, Duke University Press, 2002.
- Amrita Daniere and L. Takahashi, eds., *Rethinking Environmental Management in the Pacific Rim: Exploring Local Participation in Bangkok, Thailand*, Ashgate, 2002.
- Meric S. Gertler, *Manufacturing Culture: The Institutional Geography of Industrial Practice*, Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Peter Hajnal and John Kirton, eds., *Sustainability, Civil Society, and International Governance: Local, North American and Global Perspectives*, Ashgate, 2004.
- Adam Harmes, *The Return of the State: Protestors, Power-Brokers and the New Global Compromise*, Douglas & McIntyre, 2004.
- Gustavo Indart, ed., *Economic Reforms, Growth and Inequality in Latin America: Essays in Honor of Albert Berry*, Ashgate, 2004.
- Chelva Kanaganayakam, *Counterrealism and Indo-Anglian Fiction*, Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 2002.
- Paul Kingston and Ian S. Spears, eds., *States Within States: Incipient Political Entities in the Post-Cold War Era*, Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
- J.J. Kirton and Virginia W. Maclaren, eds., *Linking Trade, Environment and Social Cohesion: North American Experiences, Global Challenge*, Ashgate, 2002.
- Sylvia Ostry, *At the Global Crossroads: The Sylvia Ostry Foundation Lectures*, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.
- Katharine Rankin, *Cultural Politics of Markets: Economic Liberalization and Social Change in Nepal*, University of Toronto Press, 2004.
- Jeffrey G. Reitz and Raymond Breton, eds., *Globalization and Society: Processes of Differentiation Examined*, Praeger, 2003.
- Jacob Ryten, ed., *The Sterling Public Servant: A Global Tribute to Sylvia Ostry, with Foreword by David Dodge*, McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004.
- Andre Schmid, *Korea Between Empires, 1895-1919*, Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Winner of the John Whitney Hall Award of the Association of Asian Studies.
- Andre Sorenson, *The Making of Urban Japan: Cities and Planning from Edo to the Twenty-First Century*, Routledge Press, 2002.
- David Wolfe and Matthew Lucas, eds., *Clusters in a Cold Climate: Innovation Dynamics in a Diverse Economy*, McGill-Queens University Press, 2004.
- Joseph Wong, *Healthy Democracies: Welfare Politics in Taiwan and South Korea*, Cornell University Press, 2004.

MORE THAN MUSIC



A scene from the Canadian Opera Company's production of *The Handmaid's Tale*. Photo: Michael Cooper

The operatic version of The Handmaid's Tale, Margaret Atwood's chilling novel, was the subject of an in-depth symposium in October organized by the Munk Centre for International Studies and the Canadian Opera Company (COC).

It was the latest in a series of seminars called The Opera Exchange, which brings together scholars from a variety of disciplines to provide fascinating insights into opera before large public audiences.

The Handmaid's Tale provided plenty of fodder for experts in such areas as feminism, the politics of reproduction, Atwood's life and work, and political science.

Caryl Clark, from the Faculty of Music, describes how

The Opera Exchange grew out of the Humanities Initiative at the Munk Centre.

THE HUMANITIES INITIATIVE: ORIGINS OF A CROWD PLEASER

CARYL CLARK

Like many good ideas, the Humanities Initiative at the Munk Centre originated over lunch. In March 2001, Director Janice Stein asked Linda Hutcheon and me to help bring new scholarship in the humanities to the Munk Centre. At the time, Linda and I were co-teaching a new graduate course on opera that brought together students from English, Comparative Literature, Drama, German, Italian and Music. We thought it would be promising to build upon this experience by exploring ways in which works of art might open up collaborative learning opportunities. To that end, we selected three operas presented at various venues in Toronto and held an interdisciplinary symposium around each at the Vivian and David Campbell Conference Facility at the Munk Centre. Each event brought together scholars and

artists interested in the themes presented in a particular opera being performed locally. And we opened the doors to members of the general public, creating a collaborative audience of students, faculty and citizens who were all eager to learn and share knowledge.

Why opera? Because it is a naturally interdisciplinary art form, whose interpretive potential often extends beyond the artistic and cultural to embrace historical and political perspectives. Since interdisciplinarity lies at the heart of the Munk Centre's academic mission, this seemed like a natural fit to us.

And our hunch proved correct! To date we have held 10 very successful symposia – *The Handmaid's Tale* being the most recent. We continue to host leading scholars, from around the world and from many different disciplines, and top-notch artists (like Atom Egoyan, Michael Schade and Richard Bradshaw) interested in teaching, research and public outreach. In the fall of 2003, this led to a formal partnership between the Munk Centre and the Canadian

Opera Company. Having renamed our series The Opera Exchange, we continue to hold seminars in the Centre, where students can interact with distinguished visitors in the Isabel Bader Theatre at Victoria University in order to accommodate our growing audience (450+ at last spring's Wagner symposium).

Papers from two events held in the fall of 2002 – "Apprenticing with a Sorceress: Handel's *Alcina*" and "Oedipus Rex: Plagues and Politics" – now appear in a special issue of *The University of Toronto Quarterly* (vol.72/4; Fall 2003) entitled "Opera and Interdisciplinarity." And several articles from the 2003-04 season of The Opera Exchange will appear in UTQ in the spring of 2005, with topics ranging from the effect of post-unification Italy on Verdi to the cultural significance of Wagner in today's society.

Future symposia include: "Siegfried: The Forging of a Hero, Jan. 29, 2005;" and "Tancredi: Sicilians, Saracens, Singers," April 2, 2005. For tickets, call the COC at 416-363-8231 or visit www.coc.ca.