I VERY MUCH APPRECIATE THE OPPORTUNITY TO SPEAK TO THE CENTRE FOR CONFLICT RESOLUTION, AND HOPE THESE REMARKS MIGHT GENERATE A DISCUSSION WHICH CAN INFLUENCE INTERNATIONAL POLICY IN BOTH OUR COUNTRIES.

THIRTY YEARS AGO, I FIRST CAME TO AFRICA, AS PRIME MINISTER, FOR THE LUSAKA MEETING OF COMMONWEALTH HEADS OF GOVERNMENT. I WAS LATER PRIVILEGED TO SERVE NEARLY SEVEN YEARS AS CANADA’S FOREIGN MINISTER. THOSE WERE TIMES OF GREAT CHANGE IN THE WORLD – THE END OF THE COLD WAR AND APARTHEID, THE RIO CONFERENCE ON THE ENVIRONMENT, FREE TRADE AND THE RISE OF FORCES WE NOW CALL GLOBALIZATION. CANADA THEN PURSUED AN ACTIVIST AND BROAD INTERNATIONAL POLICY.

MY REMARKS TODAY ARE ENTIRELY MY OWN – I HAVE BEEN OUT OF GOVERNMENT FOR 16 YEARS, AND OUT OF PARLIAMENT SINCE 2004. I AM NOT NOW A MEMBER OF, LET ALONE A SPOKESPERSON FOR, ANY CANADIAN POLITICAL PARTY.

THE TRANSFORMATION OF SOUTH AFRICA WAS THE WORK OF SOUTH AFRICANS, BUT I WAS PRIVILEGED, AS BOTH CANADA’S FOREIGN MINISTER, AND THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMONWEALTH COMMITTEE ON SOUTHERN AFRICA, TO PLAY A SUPPORTING ROLE.

AMONG OTHER THINGS, I LEARNED THE IMPORTANCE, ON CRUCIAL ISSUES, OF THE DETERMINED ENGAGEMENT OF COUNTRIES WHO ARE NOT DIRECT PARTIES TO A CONFLICT, AND OF COUNTRIES WHOSE CAPACITY RELIES MORE ON INFLUENCE THAN ON POWER.
Canada’s Identity

First, what we do in the world reflects who we are at home...

Second, we are the other North America...

IN SOME SENSES, OUR SMALL INTENSE ROLE IN YOUR STRUGGLE WAS AS IMPORTANT TO CANADA’S SENSE OF ACCOMPLISHMENT AS IT WAS TO SOUTH AFRICA. WE DEMONSTRATED THAT CANADA, WHILE NOT A MAJOR POWER, COULD HAVE AN IMPACT ON EVENTS, THROUGH A COMBINATION OF GOVERNMENT POLICY AND THE ACTIVE ENGAGEMENT OF CITIZENS AND N.G.O.S. IT CONFIRMED THE LATE BARBARA WARD’S DESCRIPTION OF CANADA AS “THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL COUNTRY.”

THIS TALK WILL NOT BE ABOUT “LESSONS FOR SOUTH AFRICA”. I HOPE INSTEAD TO SPEAK OF PARALLELS BETWEEN THE INTERNAL NATURE, AND THE INTERNATIONAL CAPACITIES, OF SOUTH AFRICA AND CANADA.

I UNDERSTAND THAT, IN SOUTH AFRICA, AS IN CANADA, AS ALMOST EVERYWHERE IN THESE TIMES, GOVERNMENTS WILL FOCUS ON DOMESTIC POLICY. IN DEMOCRACIES, GOVERNMENTS ALMOST ALWAYS DO. I ARGUE THAT SUCCESSFUL DOMESTIC POLICY REQUIRES ADDRESSING CRITICAL QUESTIONS WHICH ARISE BEYOND OUR BORDERS, BUT HAVE REAL EFFECTS ON LIVES AND FUTURES AT HOME.

LET ME STATE SIX BASIC FACTS ABOUT CANADA AND OUR FOREIGN POLICY.

FIRST, WHAT WE DO IN THE WORLD REFLECTS WHO WE ARE AT HOME – A POPULATION DRAWN FROM THE GLOBE AND CONNECTED TO IT, GENUINELY COMMITTED TO HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIAL JUSTICE, BLESSED WITH PHYSICAL AND HUMAN RESOURCES, MULTILATERAL, ENTREPRENEURIAL, MODERN -- AND DISPOSED TO RESOLVING DIFFERENCES BECAUSE WE HAVE SO MANY OF OUR OWN.

SECOND, WE ARE THE OTHER NORTH AMERICA – AND WE HAVE BEEN FOR A LONG TIME. WE ARE VERY CLOSE TO OUR SUPERPOWER NEIGHBOUR, IN GEOGRAPHY, IN BASIC VALUES, IN OPTIMISM. BUT, AT OUR BEGINNINGS, THE UNITED STATES SAW ITSELF AS A NEW SOCIETY, AND DELIBERATELY LEFT THE OLD WORLD BEHIND. CANADA, BY SHARP CONTRAST, SOUGHT TO TRANSPLANT THE VIRTUES OF THE OLD WORLD IN THE NEW. THOSE TWO HISTORIES ARE DIFFERENT IN THEIR ROOT – ET, DEPUIS TOUJOURS, CES DIFFERENCES IMPORTANTES NOUS DISTINGUENT, L’UN DE L’AUTRE.
THIRD, CANADA HAS BEEN MOST EFFECTIVE INTERNATIONALLY WHEN WE PURSUED TWO
SOMETIMES-CONTRADICTION GOALS SIMULTANEOUSLY. WE WORKED HARD ON OUR
FRIENDSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES. AND WE WORKED HARD ON AN INDEPENDENT
AND INNOVATIVE ROLE IN THE WIDER WORLD. THOSE ARE THE TWO SIDES OF THE
CANADIAN COIN.

OUR ACCESS TO WASHINGTON HAS ADDED REAL CLOUT TO THE STANDING WHICH WE
EARNED BY OUR ACTIONS IN OTHER COUNTRIES, BECAUSE WE WERE THOUGHT TO BE
ABLE TO INFLUENCE OUR POWERFUL NEIGHBOUR. AND OUR REPUTATION IN THE
DEVELOPING WORLD, AND IN THE MULTILATERAL COMMUNITY, HAS TRADITIONALLY BEEN
AN ASSET TO OUR NEIGHBOUR. OFTEN, WHERE THE U.S. MIGHT GENERATE ENVY OR
FEAR, CANADA HAS BUILT PARTNERSHIPS AND TRUST.
Fourth, we are active multilateralists...nations our size and smaller need rules and need cooperation.

Fifth, at our best, we have been a bridge between North and South.

FOURTH, WE ARE ACTIVE MULTILATERALISTS, IN PRINCIPLE, BUT ALSO FOR THE PRACTICAL REASON THAT NATIONS OUR SIZE AND SMALLER NEED RULES AND NEED CO-OPERATION. MEGAPOWERS MIGHT NOT; WE DO.

FIFTH, AT OUR BEST, WE HAVE BEEN A BRIDGE BETWEEN NORTH AND SOUTH.

MOREOVER, BECAUSE WE ACT AS A COMMUNITY, CHARACTERIZED BY STRONG SOCIAL BONDS AND INSTITUTIONS – HEALTH CARE, A CHARTER OF RIGHTS, PARA-STATAALS AT CRITICAL TIMES IN OUR DEVELOPMENT, AND NETWORKS OF CO-OPERATIVES, AND CREDIT UNIONS, AND CAISSES POPULAIRES.

SIXTH, HISTORICALLY, CANADA HAS BEEN CONSTRUCTIVE AND ACTIVE IN AFRICA.

AN INTERESTING QUESTION IS: WHICH OF THOSE ATTRIBUTES ALSO APPLY TO SOUTH AFRICA? YOU HAVE YOUR OWN DYNAMIC WITH THE USA, AND YOUR SPECIFIC AND DISTINCTIVE ORIGIN, HISTORY AND IDENTITY.

BUT YOUR INTERNATIONAL REPUTATION, YOUR SINGULAR SUCCESS – AND YOUR FUTURE – RELATE TO HOW YOU EMBRACE, RESPECT AND RECONCILE DIVERSITY. YOU ARE – BY YOUR NATURE -- A BRIDGE BETWEEN THE DEVELOPED AND DEVELOPING WORLDS, AND YOU ARE, BY TALENT, DISPOSITION AND NECESSITY, MULTILATERALIST. SINCE THE A.N.C. TOOK OFFICE, YOUR MULTILATERAL INITIATIVES HAVE BEEN IMAGINATIVE AND BOLD, PARTICULARLY IN THIS CONTINENT. AND YOU ARE, INDISPUTABLY, IN AFRICA.
The End of the Cold War Changed The Dynamics of Foreign Policy

I argue our two different and comparable nations, sharing deep traditions and recent history, should work much more closely together. That may not be practical, in the immediate term for either of our governments. But governments are usually slow to respond to new circumstances. Why need we wait for governments to become engaged?

A characteristic of our common attributes is that they reflect “soft” power, not “hard”. We both have “hard” power too, and we need both capacities. The question is: as the world changes, which national attributes will help most to determine events?

For some time, Canadian governments have considered economic policy, and security policy, to be the best way to advance Canadian interests. No doubt they are important, but the relevance of Canada’s other international attributes is increasing, and we should not turn away from them.

The end of the Cold War changed the fundamental dynamics of foreign policy in Western countries. The priority did not become a peace dividend, or international development. Instead, it became trade and economic growth. Governments chose to believe that trade would combat poverty, that market models would release energies which were inherently democratic, and that military force would contain local challenges and disorders.

The twin failures of the military intervention in Iraq, and the collapse of the financial system, demonstrate the limitations of that faith.

At the same time, there is a shifting of power — economic, cultural, political, and even military. In his book, “The Post-American World”, Fareed Zakaria argues that this is not about anyone’s decline — but rather the rise and assertion of new forces.
NOTABLY, THIS IS NOW A WORLD WHERE THE MOST SERIOUS CONFLICT FLOWS NOT FROM IDEOLOGY, BUT FROM CULTURE AND IDENTITY AND FAITH. SO, TWO SETS OF QUESTIONS ARISE OF PARTICULAR INTEREST TO OUR TWO COUNTRIES.

FIRST – HOW REAL ARE THESE CONFLICTS? SPECIFICALLY HOW DEEP ARE THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SOCIETIES FORMED PRIMARILY IN A MARKET CONTEXT AND SOCIETIES WHICH THINK OF THEMSELVES AS THE “SOUTH”? IS THERE A SPECIAL ROLE FOR COUNTRIES, LIKE OURS, WHICH COMBINE GREAT CULTURAL DIVERSITY WITH SERIOUS COMMITMENTS TO SOCIAL AND INDIVIDUAL EQUALITY? IS SOUTH AFRICA ENOUGH ON THE EDGE OF THE “SOUTH”, IS CANADA ENOUGH ON THE EDGE OF THE “NORTH”, TO BE INFLUENTIAL TOGETHER IN BRIDGING THESE DIFFERENCES AND MANAGING THESE CONFLICTS?

GOLDMAN SACHS HAS PUBLISHED A CAREFUL PROJECTION OF THE CHANGES IN WORLD ECONOMIC STANDING, BY 2050.

NOTICE THAT O.E.C.D. COUNTRIES DOMINATE THE TEN LARGEST ECONOMIES.
These are only projections, but look where Canada would be, in 2050. We would be 17th, still a respectable economy – a little smaller than Spain, a little larger than Brazil.

South Africa would rank 22nd in the world then, a little behind Iran and Saudi Arabia, a little ahead of Thailand and Vietnam.

So – in this world of shifting power – how long would Canada have a place at the table of a G-8 Summit? Would we both make the cut of a G-20? In other words, would we keep our seat in the inner circle of countries which define international trade and military and diplomatic and development policy?

In Canada’s case, not if we focus narrowly on trade and economic policy, or define our international profile by military presence. But the odds are that we could increase our influence as a country were we to renew our trusted, activist diplomatic and development credentials.

For all our growth and innovation, Canada can have relatively more influence in politics and diplomacy than we do in trade and economics.

Economic power reflects size; diplomacy depends more on imagination, and agility, and reputation. Canada’s political strengths have more currency again, if we choose to use them.
SOUTH AFRICA, IN THIS CHANGING WORLD RANK BEHIND OTHER LEADING NATIONS DESCRIBED NOW AS EMERGING OR DEVELOPING – BEHIND INDIA, BRAZIL, INDONESIA, MEXICO – BEHIND NIGERIA.

THERE WAS A TIME WHEN THE SIGNIFICANT ECONOMIC BASE AND STRONG INSTITUTIONS OF CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA DIFFERENTIATED US FROM COMPARABLE ECONOMIES. IN CANADA’S CASE, IN THE 1970s, THAT WAS ENOUGH TO HAVE US ENTER THE THEN G-7. IT MADE SOUTH AFRICA THE FOCAL POINT OF BUSINESS, TECHNOLOGY AND RELATED STRENGTHS IN THIS CONTINENT. TODAY WE BOTH SIT IN THE G-20. BUT THE ECONOMIES OF OTHER COUNTRIES ARE CATCHING UP. SO, IF WE WANT TO SIT AT THE “BIG TABLES” IN THE FUTURE, WE HAVE TO THINK ABOUT THE “ADDED VALUE” WE BRING.

SOUTH AFRICA IS DISTINGUISHED BY A DOUBLE CREDENTIAL – PART MORAL, PART INSTITUTIONAL. THE MORAL CREDENTIAL IS PERSONIFIED BY NELSON MANDELA, WHO WOULD BE THE FIRST TO ACKNOWLEDGE THAT IT WAS EARNED BY THE PEOPLE OF SOUTH AFRICA – ALL THE PEOPLE.

IN AN AGE WHERE CONFLICT AND SELF-INTEREST DESTROY SOCIETIES, SOUTH AFRICA IS THE STIRRING MODERN EXAMPLE OF A DIVERSE SOCIETY WHOSE FIERCELY-CONTESTING MEMBERS UNDERSTOOD THAT EACH WAS ON THE EDGE OF THE PRECIPICE, AND THE ONLY WAY TO DRAW BACK WAS TOGETHER. AND YOU DID, YOU ALL DID, TOGETHER.

YOUR INSTITUTIONAL CREDENTIAL IS IN BOTH GOVERNANCE AND ECONOMICS. SOUTH AFRICA HAS THE STRONGEST AND MOST DIVERSE ECONOMY, THE MOST SOLID INSTITUTIONS OF GOVERNANCE, AND THE MOST MODERN INFRASTRUCTURE, IN AFRICA. THAT STRENGTH HAS BEEN EXTENDED IN THE POST-APARTEID ERA.

NO ONE ELSE IN AFRICA YET HAS YOUR CAPACITY. FEW NATIONS ANYWHERE IN THE WORLD CAN CLAIM YOUR MORAL LEGACY. BOTH ARE A FUNDAMENTAL PART OF SOUTH AFRICA’S NATURE AND YOUR REPUTATION. THESE ARE VALUABLE ASSETS IN THIS MODERN WORLD.
THE PROFOUND CHANGES IN THE “POST-AMERICAN” WORLD ARE NOT FORECASTS OR THEORIES. THEY REFLECT REAL ACTIONS BY REAL COUNTRIES. I HAVE A LITTLE LIST:

• CHINA IS DELIBERATELY BUILDING ITS RESOURCE NETWORK, WITH SIGNIFICANT GLOBAL INVESTMENTS, MOST PROMINENTLY IN AFRICA, BUT ALSO IN LATIN AMERICA, ASIA, AND CANADA’S OIL SANDS.

• INDIA AND BRAZIL ARE VIGOROUSLY EXPANDING THEIR ECONOMIC INFLUENCE AND PRESENCE, INCLUDING EMPHATICALLY IN PORTUGUESE-SPEAKING AFRICA.

• AS DIPLOMACY AND DEVELOPMENT BECOME IMPORTANT AGAIN, KEY COUNTRIES ARE DELIBERATELY BUILDING UP THEIR DIPLOMATIC CAPACITY – THE U.S.A., BRAZIL, NORWAY, SINGAPORE, QUATAR AND, AS USUAL, BRITAIN AND FRANCE.

• INDIVIDUAL SMALLER COUNTRIES ARE BUILDING THEIR CAPACITY FOR STABILITY AND GROWTH – IN AFRICA, RWANDA, GHANA, ANGOLA, MOZAMBIQUE, OTHERS.

PRESIDENT OBAMA IS NEW NOT ONLY BY REASON OF HIS RACE AND COLOUR, BUT IN THE EXPERIENCES WHICH FORMED HIM. HE IS THE FIRST AMERICAN PRESIDENT TO UNDERSTAND BY INTUITION HOW THE DEVELOPING WORLD SEES INTERNATIONAL FORCES AND EVENTS.


THERE IS ANOTHER CRITICAL DIMENSION TO THIS CHANGE. THE SHIFT IN POWER IS NOT SIMPLY AMONG NATIONS – IT IS FROM NATIONS TO OTHER FORCES. SOME OF THE MOST DECISIVE SOURCES OF CHANGE IN THE MODERN WORLD ARE NOT NATIONS AT ALL, BUT MOVEMENTS WHICH ARISE AND OPERATE BEYOND THE CONTROL OF NATION-STATES. THE CRITICAL THREATS TO INTERNATIONAL ORDER NOW ARE ROOTED IN CULTURE AND RELIGION AND REPORT TO NO CAPITAL.
AT THE SAME TIME, SOME OF MOST PROFOUND IMPROVEMENTS IN THE WORLD ARE STIMULATED BY INITIATIVES FROM OUTSIDE FORMAL GOVERNMENT – THE ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT, THE GRAMIN BANK, N-G-OS WORKING IN COMBAT ZONES OR TO RELIEVE POVERTY, THINK TANKS, THE GATES AND COMPARABLE FOUNDATIONS, THE NEW COMMITMENT TO CORPORATE RESPONSIBILITY. TAKEN TOGETHER, THIS IS A POWERFUL NEW SOURCE OF INNOVATION AND EXPERIENCE – IMAGINATIVE, RESPECTED, NOT BOUND BY PROTOCOL OR NATIONAL INTEREST.

YET HERE’S THE RUB: FOR ALL THESE PRIVATE OR NON-GOVERNMENT INITIATIVES, THIS IS STILL AN INSTITUTIONAL WORLD. SOVEREIGN STATES STILL MAKE THE CRITICAL DECISIONS – TO CUT OR INCREASE BUDGETS, RESPECT OR BREAK TREATIES, SEND OR WITHDRAW TROOPS, PAY OR WITHHOLD THEIR MEMBERSHIP CONTRIBUTIONS, CONFRONT OR IGNORE CRISES.
SO THE CHALLENGE AND OPPORTUNITY NOW IS TO MARRY MANDATE WITH IMAGINATION -- COMBINE THE CREATIVITY OF THESE INDEPENDENT FORCES WITH THE CAPACITY-TO-ACT OF INSTITUTIONS. THAT IS FAMILIAR TERRITORY TO CANADA BECAUSE PARTNERSHIPS LIKE THAT ARE WHAT HAPPENED IN THE COMMONWEALTH CAMPAIGN AGAINST APARTHEID, THE NEGOTIATION OF THE LAND MINES TREATY AND THE INTERNATIONAL CRIMINAL COURT, AND IN A WIDE RANGE OF LESS-PUBLICIZED INITIATIVES. IT IS OF EQUAL INTEREST TO SOUTH AFRICA.

THE BBC REGULARLY PUBLISHES AN INTERNATIONAL SURVEY, BY THE POLLING FIRM GLOBESCAN, WHICH LISTS SEVERAL COUNTRIES AND ASKS A BROADLY-BASED SAMPLE OF 28,000 RESPONDENTS, AROUND THE WORLD, IF EACH OF THOSE COUNTRIES HAD A “MOSTLY POSITIVE OR MOSTLY NEGATIVE IMPACT IN THE WORLD.” THEIR MOST RECENT POLL WAS IN JANUARY, 2009.
THE BEST RATINGS IN THE POLL WENT TO GERMANY – 15% NEGATIVE, 61% POSITIVE, WITH CANADA NEXT AT 13% NEGATIVE AND 59% POSITIVE. SOUTH AFRICA HAD NOT PREVIOUSLY BEEN INCLUDED IN THE POLL, BUT WAS ADDED THIS TIME, AND THE FIGURES SHOW A NEAR TIE – 32% NEGATIVE, 33% POSITIVE.
THE MOST WIDESPREAD POSITIVE VIEWS OF SOUTH AFRICA ARE AMONG ITS AFRICAN NEIGHBOURS, INCLUDING MAJORITY IN NIGERIA (62%) AND GHANA (60%). NEARLY HALF THE RESPONDENTS IN CHINA (49%) AND MEXICO (46%) ALSO HAVE POSITIVE VIEWS OF SOUTH AFRICA.

I RETURN TO THE NOTION OF SOUTH AFRICA AND CANADA NOT WAITING FOR OUR GOVERNMENTS.

• WHY SHOULD WE NOT START NOW TO BUILD UP THE LEVEL AND FOCUS OF CO-OPERATION AMONG THE THINK TANKS, UNIVERSITIES AND PROFESSIONAL AND POLICY ORGANIZATIONS OF OUR TWO COUNTRIES?

• MIGHT CIVIL SOCIETY IN OUR TWO COUNTRIES REVIVE THE CLOSE RELATIONSHIPS THEY ENJOYED DURING THE ‘STRUGGLE’ AGAINST Apartheid?

• MIGHT THE BUSINESS COMMUNITY, AS IT BECOMES MORE COMMITTED TO SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, BE PREPARED TO BE HELPFUL, AS IT HAS BEEN IN BRINGING NEW VITALITY AND RELEVANCE TO THE CANADIAN INTERNATIONAL COUNCIL?

WHAT MIGHT THE FOCUS BE? DELEGATES TO MAUREEN’S F.I.G.O. CONFERENCE WOULD ARGUE FOR MATERNAL AND NEW-BORN CHILD HEALT. NOT TO LIMIT DISCUSSION, LET ME SUGGEST TWO OTHER THEMES.

FIRST LOOK FOR WAYS IN WHICH CANADA-SOUTH AFRICA CO-OPERATION COULD BE OF DIRECT BENEFIT TO THIRD COUNTRIES IN AFRICA – IN GOVERNANCE, OR BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT, OR ADJUSTMENT TO TECHNOLOGY, OR ENVIRONMENTAL MITIGATION. OFTEN WE CAN BUILD ON AND ENLARGE INITIATIVES ALREADY IN PLACE.

The G-20: Not Just A Summit

It will become an institution, much larger than the leaders who gather there...

THE SECOND MAJOR FOCUS, WHICH CRIES OUT FOR ATTENTION, IS THE G-20.

WHAT STARTS AS A SUMMIT WILL BECOME AN INSTITUTION, MUCH LARGER THAN THE LEADERS WHO GATHER THERE. OF COURSE MEMBER GOVERNMENTS WILL TRY TO CONFINE IT, AND THEY WILL FAIL. AS WITH G-8 AND OTHER SUMMITS, THIS NEW INSTITUTION WILL GENERATE A POWERFUL, DURABLE INFORMAL SYSTEM OF ITS OWN, WHICH WILL BECOME BOTH CREATIVE AND INFLUENTIAL.

I PARTICIPATED ACTIVELY IN SUMMITS FOR A DECADE AND KNOW THE VALUE OF HAVING LEADERS MEET AND SPEAK DIRECTLY, PRIVATELY AND WITHOUT A SCRIPT. I HAVE SEEN MINDS OPEN AND POLICIES CHANGE AND UNDERSTANDING GROW. BUT BEYOND THAT, NETWORKS AND FRIENDSHIPS AND DISCUSSIONS BEGIN – BOTH IN THE SUMMIT, AND IN ITS SURROUND – WHICH CAN LEAD TO LARGE AGREEMENTS.

WE KNOW THE WORLD IS CHANGING. WE KNOW THE INSTINCT, WITHIN MOST NATIONS, IS TO SEE THINGS NARROWLY OR DEFENSIVELY. WE KNOW THE NEED, FOR DECISION-MAKERS FROM PROFOUNDLY DIFFERENT PERSPECTIVES, TO FIND A PLACE AND AN INCENTIVE TO TRY WHAT MR. GORBACHEV CALLED “NEW THINKING”.

SO, IF INSTITUTIONS TAKE ON A LIFE OF THEIR OWN, WHO SHAPES THOSE INSTITUTIONS – WHO ADDS THAT LIFE? NOT NECESSARILY THE NATIONS WITH THE BIGGEST BUDGETS OR THE BIGGEST MILITARIES, OR THE BIGGEST INTERESTS TO PROTECT.

SOUTH AFRICA HAS ITS OWN STRONG RECORD OF INSPIRING OR SHAPING INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS.

WHY NOT DO THAT AGAIN? IF CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA DON’T, WHO WILL?

THE BASIC CHALLENGE NOW IS TO HAVE OUR MAJOR INTERNATIONAL INSTITUTIONS REFLECT THE WORLD, AND NOT JUST THE WEST. THAT WILL REQUIRE PERSISTENCE, PARTNERSHIP, AND SOME OF THAT EXPERIENCE IN BRIDGING DIFFERENCES TO WHICH BOTH CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA LAY CLAIM. WE COULD BE A QUITE EFFECTIVE TEAM.

THE RISK INSTEAD IS THAT CANADA AND SOUTH AFRICA WILL BOTH FOCUS INWARD, ON PRESSING DOMESTIC AND IMMEDIATE CONCERNS, AND NOT INVEST ENOUGH IMAGINATION IN HOW WE MIGHT HAVE A POSITIVE INFLUENCE AT THIS TIME OF GREAT GLOBAL CHANGE.