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I. Abstract

The Middle East Peace Process has yet to result in a final resolution and settlement between the Palestinian and Israeli peoples. In November 2015, the newly elected Liberal government, under the leadership of Prime Minister Justin Trudeau, announced that Canada would resume its role as an ‘honest broker’ in the Middle East Peace Process. Employing a liberal internationalist lens, this paper will explore whether Canada’s contemporary foreign policy over the past two decades towards the Peace Process has been even-handed in nature, while discussing the foreign policy implications of holding the status of ‘honest broker’ and mediator. Further, in examining statements by the Government of Canada on the Israel-Palestine conflict, voting patterns at the United Nations, and Canada’s official policy on the Middle East Peace Process primarily over the past two decades, this paper will demonstrate that Canada’s policies pertaining to the conflict have not remained constant, but have shifted due to a multitude of factors (such as political party preferences, electoral support from religious groups and the personal values of political leaders).
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III. Introduction

What does it mean to be an ‘honest broker’? This term means pursuing an even-handed policy towards two sides in order to assist in resolving a dispute.¹ Historically, Canada has been viewed as a ‘helpful fixer’ on the international stage.² Following this definition, this paper aims to explore the following research question: contemporarily speaking, has Canada been an ‘honest broker’ in the Israel-Palestine conflict? This paper will specifically outline Canada’s activities and foreign policies towards the Middle East Peace Process, focusing in particular on the 2006-2015 period under the mandate of former Prime Minister Stephen Harper’s Conservative government. It will also explore questions as to whether Canada may have an opportunity to restore and enhance its credibility as a valued middle-power actor and mediator in the Israel-Palestine conflict and will outline policy options for the current Trudeau Government for re-engaging in both the conflict and in the region moving forward.

In addition, this paper seeks to employ a liberal internationalist lens in examining Canada’s role as a honest broker in the Israel-Palestine conflict; according to Kim Richard Nossal, there are five distinguishing features in the liberal internationalist approach to international affairs: a premium on the idea of ‘taking responsibility for playing a constructive role in the management of conflicts’; an emphasis on multilateral approaches to cooperation; support for, and involvement with, international institutions; a willingness ‘to use national resources for the system as a whole’; and an emphasis on international law.³

How does mediation play a role in international conflict resolution? According to Article 33 of the United Nations Charter, “parties to any dispute, the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, shall, first of all, seek a resolution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their choice.” In the context of the Israel-Palestine conflict, mediation between the Palestinians and Israelis is vital in managing and promoting a potential peace agreement and final status resolution.

Mediators must be both impartial and neutral in assisting conflicting parties in reaching a voluntary and ‘mutually acceptable settlement’. Bercovitch defines mediation as “a process of conflict management, related to but distinct from the parties’ own negotiations, where those in conflict seek the assistance of, or accept an offer from, an outsider (whether an individual, an organization, a group, or a state) to change their perceptions or behaviour, and to do so without resorting to physical force or invoking the authority of law”.

i. The Current State of the Middle East Peace Process

According to Global Affairs Canada, the Government of Canada remains “committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian state living side by side in peace and security with Israel”.

---

6Ibid, 344.
On December 6, 2017, United States President Donald Trump officially recognized Jerusalem as the capital of the state of Israel.\textsuperscript{8} That same day, the Honourable Chrystia Freeland, Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, issued a statement expressing that “Canada is a steadfast ally and friend of Israel and friend to the Palestinian people. Canada’s longstanding position is that the status of Jerusalem can be resolved only as part of a general settlement of the Palestinian-Israeli dispute. We are strongly committed to the goal of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East, including the creation of a Palestinian state living side-by-side in peace and security with Israel. We call for calm and continue to support the building of conditions necessary for the parties to find a solution”.\textsuperscript{9}

In response to President’s Trump declaration regarding the status of Jerusalem, on December 18, 2017, both Turkey and Yemen’s ambassadors to the United Nations wrote a letter to the President of the General Assembly to “request the urgent resumption of the tenth emergency special session of the General Assembly in accordance with the ‘uniting for peace’ procedure’, as per General Assembly resolution 377(V) of 1950 ”.\textsuperscript{10} The ambassadors’ actions occurred following a meeting of the United Nations Security Council, in which the United States vetoed a draft resolution on Jerusalem that would have stressed the need to view the status of Jerusalem as a final status issue and would disregard recent actions taken by the Trump administration to declare the holy city as the capital of Israel. In this particular meeting of the

\textsuperscript{8}The White House, “Statement by President Trump on Jerusalem,” https://www.whitehouse.gov/ briefings-statements/statement-president-trump-jerusalem/

Under the resolution 377A(V), “uniting for peace”, an emergency special session can be convened in 24 hours if “the Security Council, because of lack of unanimity of the permanent members, fails to exercise its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security in any case where there appears to be a threat to peace, breach of peace, or act of aggression, the General Assembly shall consider the matter immediately with a view to making appropriate recommendations to Members for collective measures… to maintain or restore international peace and security”.\footnote{Ibid.} It should further be noted that all ‘uniting for peace’ resolutions are non-binding in nature.

Later, in December 2017, a resolution was put forward to the United Nations General Assembly at the tenth emergency special session, under ‘illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian territory’ on the status of Jerusalem. The resolution outlined, among other things, the need for the protection and preservation of the spiritual, religious and cultural dimensions of the holy city of Jerusalem and that issues pertaining to the status of the city itself were to be viewed as a final status issue to be resolved through negotiations in line with relevant United Nations resolutions.\footnote{General Assembly of the United Nations, “Tenth Emergency Special Session: Vote Name: Item 5 Draft Resolution A/ES-10/L.22 Status of Jerusalem,” December 21, 2017, http://ask.un.org/loader.php?fid=9364&type=1&key=3b29d988a41310fed942b3fbb691795a} When it came time to vote on the
resolution, Canada was one of 35 countries (out of the total 193 United Nations member countries) to abstain on the resolution. In an Access to Information request obtained throughout the course of the research performed for this paper, an ‘Explanation of Vote’ written for Canada’s Ambassador to the United Nations, reiterated that “Canada considers the status of Jerusalem as a final-status issue. Canada’s long-standing position is that the status of Jerusalem can be resolved only as part of a general settlement of the Israeli-Palestinian dispute. Canada continues to support building the conditions necessary for the parties to find a peaceful solution”.\(^\text{14}\) It is also worth noting, prior to President Trump’s announcement concerning U.S. policy on Jerusalem, the United Nations General Assembly had voted on Resolution 72/15 (November 30, 2017)\(^\text{15}\) regarding the city of Jerusalem -- Canada was one of 6 countries to vote no on this resolution.\(^\text{16}\)

In January 2018, on the margins of the World Economic Forum annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland, both President Trump and Prime Minister Trudeau had one-on-one meetings with Israeli Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu. During his televised meeting with the Israeli Prime Minister, President Trump threatened to cut off aid to UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) if the Palestinians did not agree to restart peace talks with Israel; President Trump further said that Jerusalem was ‘off the table’, after his declaration concerning the city’s status as the capital of Israel.\(^\text{17}\) At the same time, on an official


\(^{15}\)For text of Resolution 72/15, please see ‘Annex’ section, page 49.


state trip to Israel, United States Vice-President Mike Pence announced that the United States embassy in Jerusalem would open its doors by the end of 2019.\textsuperscript{18}

In response to these statements by the American administration, Palestinian President Mahmoud Abbas’ official spokesperson said that the United States had abandoned its role as a ‘honest broker’ and that the United States could therefore no longer act as a mediator in peace negotiations.\textsuperscript{19} In retaliation, on January 25, 2018, in her remarks at the United Nations Security Council’s Open Debate on the Middle East, U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, stated that “the United States remains deeply committed to helping the Israelis and the Palestinians reach a historic peace agreement that brings a better future to both peoples...we have done nothing to prejudge the final borders of Jerusalem. We have done nothing to alter the status of the holy sites. We remain committed to the possibility and potential of two states”.\textsuperscript{20} In her remarks, Ambassador Haley also attacked the leadership abilities and courage of Palestinian President Abbas, saying that the United States “will not chase after a Palestinian leadership that lacks what is needed to achieve peace”.\textsuperscript{21}

At the same meeting of the World Economic Forum in Davos, Switzerland, Prime Minister Trudeau and Israeli Prime Minister Netanyahu held a bilateral meeting. According to the Israeli Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Trudeau and Netanyahu specifically addressed updating the Canad-
Israel Free Trade Agreement, the nuclear agreement with Iran and Canada’s support for a two-state solution. The Israeli Prime Minister reiterated in this meeting that “he will not compromise on Israel’s security needs in any future agreement”.22

Following these bilateral meetings, on January 30, 2018, in his State of the Union address to the United States Congress, President Donald Trump mentioned his actions the month prior to recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel. According to Trump, “shortly afterwards, dozens of countries voted in the United Nations General Assembly against America’s sovereign right to make this recognition. American taxpayers generously send those same countries billions of dollars in aid every year”.23 In response, the President called on Congress to ‘pass legislation to help ensure American foreign-assistance dollars always serve American interests, and only go to America’s friends’.

Given these facts, particularly in relation to the United States’ recognition of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel at the end of 2017, advancements towards a final resolution and peace talks in the Israel-Palestine conflict remain stalled. On the Palestinian side, internal strife between the two main parties, Hamas and Fatah, has led to a lack of unity between the Gaza strip (under Hamas control) and the Fatah-led Palestinian Authority in the West Bank. Attempts at forming a unity government over the years have not been successful, with the most recent talks taking place in October 2017. On a recent trip to the Gaza strip, Palestinian Authority Prime Minister Rami

23The White House, “President Donald J. Trump’s State of the Union Address,” https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefings-statements/president-donald-j-trumps-state-union-address/
Hamdallah survived what was widely suspected to be an assassination attempt by Hamas officials, further adding to the doubt surrounding the prospect of a reconciliation between Hamas and Fatah.

Additionally, a crucial roadblock is that Hamas does not recognize Israel, and has continually stated that it will not renounce the use of violence as part of its strategies. During talks in late 2017 between Hamas and Fatah on the topic of reconciliation, the United States special envoy to the Middle East, Jason Greenblatt, issued a statement on the potential unity government deal between both parties, saying that “any Palestinian government must unambiguously and explicitly commit to nonviolence, recognize the State of Israel, accept previous agreements and obligations between the parties – including to disarm terrorists – and commit to peaceful negotiations. If Hamas is to play any role in a Palestinian government, it must accept these basic requirements”.

On the Israeli side, Prime Minister Benjamin Netanyahu has stated that the Israeli government will not hold political talks with a Palestinian government that is supported by Hamas, a terror organization calling for the destruction of Israel”. Canada has also listed Hamas as a terrorist organization, per United Nations Resolutions 1373 and Canadian legislation, and therefore does not have contact with the group. The above-mentioned status quo regarding the Middle East Peace Process is important for Canada, as it leaves space for a third party to intervene due to the perceived lack of neutrality on the part of the United States by the Palestinians, most

25Office of the Prime Minister of Israel, “Statement by the Prime Minister of Israel,” https://www.facebook.com/pg/IsraeliPM/posts/
notably after President Trump’s declaration regarding the status of Jerusalem. As Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas has rejected America’s role as a mediator in the Israel-Palestine conflict, a respected mediator and ‘honest broker’ is required in order to offer assistance in bringing both the Israelis and Palestinians together to re-commence peace negotiations.

**ii. Methodology**

This paper seeks to answer whether Canada has been an ‘honest broker’ in the Israel-Palestine conflict (using a liberal internationalist perspective) through the analysis of primary documents (such as United Nations Resolutions, Access to Information requests for documents from Global Affairs Canada, speeches, research interviews and statements by the Canadian Government on issues related to the Israel-Palestine conflict) and secondary sources (such as news articles, books and peer-reviewed journal articles on Canada’s role in the Israel-Palestine conflict).

Interviews for this paper were conducted in Ottawa, Tel Aviv and Jerusalem with individuals working in academia, the Canadian federal government and with representatives from the Palestinian Authority over a four month period. Interviewees were asked a series of open-ended questions pertaining to their views as Canada’s role as a mediator and honest broker in the Israel-Palestine conflict; interviews lasted an average of 60 minutes. Lastly, this paper employs a snowball sampling technique, in which interviewees were selected based off of the recommendations of other acquaintances and interview participants.


28A full list of research interviews completed for this major research paper is located on page 59.
iii. **Brief Literature Review**

Few sources have explored Canada’s role in the Middle East Peace Process to date as an ‘honest broker’. The most well-known book to discuss this topic is *Canada and the Middle East: in Theory and Practice* (first published in 2007), which seeks to address how Canada should be and has been engaged in the Middle East; the authors note that Canada’s security, economic well-being, and domestic harmony are closely tied to the Middle East.²⁹ Musu evaluates Canada’s role in the Middle East and North Africa region as a ‘middle power’. According to Musu, the Government of Canada’s involvement in the peace process decreased following the start of the Second Antifada in 2000; Musu further explores the Harper Conservatives’ policies towards the conflict, outlining that the government’s “support for the legitimacy of the state of Israel and for its security needs turned into support of most policies of the Israeli government”.³⁰

On the topic of Canada’s role as a mediator in the international community, Peter Jones (Associate Professor at the Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Ottawa) conducted a study with officials from the then-named Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade who had been involved in international conflict mediation. Interviewees believed Canada was “well-placed to act as a conflict mediator… (and) mentioned Canada’s perceived international status as a country without a colonial past or similar baggage”.³¹ Jones further explored the statement expressed by several interviewees of Canada’s ‘brand’ as an

---


³¹Jones, 232.
impartial country interested in peace,\textsuperscript{32} a sentiment that is important for the purposes of this paper. In another article published by Jones on \textit{Canada and Mediation: Issues and Considerations}, the Trudeau’s government desire to make mediation a specific focus of its foreign policy is discussed, with evidence taken from the Minister of Foreign Affairs’ mandate letter, namely through the call to “increase Canada’s support for United Nations peace operations and its mediation, conflict-prevention, and post-conflict reconstruction efforts”.\textsuperscript{33}

\textit{iv. Canadian Values and Interests in Foreign-Policy Making}

The Government of Canada’s positions are based on the principles of freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. In June of 2017, Canada’s Minister of Foreign Affairs, the Honourable Chrystia Freeland, gave an address in the House of Commons on Canada’s foreign policy priorities. There was no mention in her speech of the Middle East or the Israel-Palestine conflict.\textsuperscript{34} Instead, the Minister of Foreign Affairs referred to Israel as a country that faces a “clear and immediate existential challenge”\textsuperscript{35}, which justifies its military spending. She also said that “as a middle power living next to the world’s only superpower, Canada has a huge interest in an international order based on rules”.\textsuperscript{36} Minister Freeland summarized her points by reiterating that Canada would be “tireless in pursuing our national interest, tireless in upholding progressive

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{32}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{33}Justin Trudeau, Prime Minister of Canada, “Minister of Foreign Affairs Mandate Letter,” https://pm.gc.ca/eng/minister-foreign-affairs-mandate-letter
\textsuperscript{35}Chrystia Freeland, “Address by Minister Freeland on Canada’s Foreign Policy Priorities,” House of Commons of Canada. Ottawa, ON. June 6, 2017.
\textsuperscript{36}Ibid.
\end{flushright}
Canadian values, (and) tireless in working to create a rules-based international order for the 21st century”.  

Marie-Joëlle Zahar addresses Canada’s role as a norm promoter in the Middle East through its foreign policies in *Talking One Talk, Walking Another: Norm Entrepreneurship and Canada’s Foreign Policy in the Middle East*; she underlines the three conditions for success as: “the ability to assess fragility, the understanding of those policy measures available that are likely to make a difference and the willingness to apply those measures”. On the subject of Canada’s role in promoting human security to the region and as a respected norm promoter, Zahar argues that Canada has a ‘responsibility to prevent’ further atrocities from occurring in the Middle East. What one can therefore conclude is that Canada’s role as a ‘norm entrepreneur’ in the Middle East has more to do with the question of the government’s political will in putting the ‘responsibility to prevent’ into action and in taking on a greater degree of responsibility in the region. A discussion surrounding Canada’s values and interests in developing its foreign policy must also address the role of its relationship with the United States. As Zahar argues on this issue, “Canada’s desire to please the United States by demonstrating that it is a serious partner in security and defence has been identified as “the major driver in its shift from the role of peacekeeper during the Cold War to peace supporter in the twenty-first century”.

How did Canadian values and principles manifest itself in Canada’s foreign policy during the Harper years? As outlined by Thomas Juneau in *A Realist Foreign Policy for Canada in the...* 

---

37Ibid.  
39Ibid, 50.
Middle East, conservative policies are guided by principles such as supporting democracies and opposing tyranny—yet, during the Harper Conservative years, the Conservatives did not promote these values consistently, and instead, “often came to emphasize a moralizing rhetoric at the expense of concrete action”. In this article, Juneau further explored Canada’s main interests in the Middle East: alliance management; security (shielding the status quo from deterioration); a stable international and regional order based on the rule of law; and diplomacy and the pursuit of international trade.

Finally, how can Canadian principles be applied to the resolution of the conflict in the Middle East? Nathan C. Funk (University of Waterloo) outlines seven prescriptions for a constructive Canadian role: to strengthen diplomatic preparedness, reaffirm multilateralism and internationally legitimate standards, to insist on negotiated solutions, to support (democratic) change from within, to leverage the soft power of multiculturalism, to facilitate transnational alliances and lastly, to form peace and development partnerships among governments, universities and civil society actors.

Hence, in examining a very small selection of international relations literature, Canada is continuously labelled as a respected ‘middle power’ and ‘honest broker’ with potential international influence particularly around values of human rights and peacebuilding. If one is to conduct an investigation into the main determinants of Canadian policy in the Israel-Palestine conflict, both the international state of affairs and the domestic political environment must be taken

41 Ibid, 404.
into consideration. In addition, Canada’s role as a peacebuilder, advocate for human rights and its interests in the Middle East as a whole must also be examined in addressing its policies in the Israel-Palestine conflict.

Is it in the Government of Canada’s interests to act as an ‘honest broker’ in the Middle East Peace Process? Bercovitch claims that “mediation is a rational, political process, representing a strategic engagement between parties and a mediator…(mediators) engage in mediation and expend resources because they expect to resolve a conflict and gain something from it”.\textsuperscript{43} For Canada, acting as an ‘honest broker’ in the Israel-Palestine conflict is a method to increase its degree of influence and to be recognized by the United States as a valuable player for its actions. Additionally, as a middle power, mediation in conflicts such as the Israel-Palestine conflict is one of Canada’s available foreign policy instruments that would increase its standing in the eyes of its more powerful allies.

IV. \textbf{A Short History of Canada and the Middle East Peace Process}

Since the end of WWII, Canada has been able to maintain its influence in specific sectors of global affairs despite its limited military force and economic power. In 1952, former Canadian External Affairs Minister Lester B. Pearson, who supported the state of Israel and was the father of peacekeeping (Pearson won the Nobel Peace Prize for his role in the 1956 Suez Canal crisis), explained in a memo to Cabinet that “with the whole Arab world in a state of internal unrest and in the grip of mourning anti-Western hysteria, Israel is beginning to emerge as the only stable element in the whole Middle East area”\textsuperscript{44} Historical developments, such as the Suez Canal crisis in 1956 and other events in the Middle East, have led to the formation of Canada’s national

\textsuperscript{43}Bercovitch, 347.
identity. Canada has recognized Israel’s right to defend itself under international law, and supported Israel’s right to exist under United Nations General Assembly Resolution 181 in 1948. Canada also voted in favour of United Nations General Assembly Resolution 194 in 1948, thus supporting the right of Palestinian refugees from the 1948 war to return to their homes or to receive compensation;\(^{45}\) contemporarily speaking, Canada’s support of Resolution 194 has been interpreted to only be applicable in the context of a final comprehensive peace agreement.\(^{46}\)

Gradually, Canada began to support the creation of a sovereign, independent Palestinian state that could co-exist and live in peace with Israel.\(^{47}\) Policy-makers in Canada backed United Nations Security Council (UNSC) resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1973), which are both regarded as ‘land for peace’ resolutions.\(^{48}\) On the topic of Israeli settlements in the occupied territories, Canada was supportive of UNSC resolutions 446 (1979) and 465 (1980), thus throwing its support behind the idea that Israeli settlements in the occupied territories should be viewed as a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention Relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War (1949) and an obstacle to peace.\(^{49}\)

V. Canada and the Palestinian Refugee Question

As mentioned previously, the Government of Canada supported Resolution 194 (1948), which outlines the ‘right of return’ of Palestinian refugees in Article 11, which “resolves that the


\(^{46}\)Heinbecker, 265.

\(^{47}\)Heinbecker, 265.


\(^{49}\)Bell et al, 21.
refugees wishing to return to their homes and live at peace with their neighbours should be permitted to do so…and that compensation should be paid for the property of those choosing not to return and for loss of or damage to property which, under principles of international law or in equity, should be made good by the Governments or authorities responsible”.

i. **UNRWA**

In 1948, 750,000 people became known as the ‘Palestine refugee problem’ after the events of the Jewish-Arab conflict. In 1949, the United Nations created a new subsidiary organ, the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East (UNRWAPRNE), which was later shortened to UNRWA, an active agency to this day (in Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, the Gaza Strip, and the West Bank) that provides humanitarian assistance to Palestinian refugees. UNRWA’s initial mandate [General Assembly Resolution 302 (IV)] was to provide “direct relief and work programmes” to Palestinian refugees in order to “…further conditions of peace and stability”. UNRWA is thus a prime example of the duty that the international community has in formulating a just and universally applicable solution for over five million Palestinian refugees.

Various actors still have not been able to solve the Palestine ‘refugee problem’ to this day; the mandate of UNRWA (the United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East) is to provide humanitarian assistance to such displaced persons. UNRWA, like other agencies and actors who work with the Palestinian people, has a vital role in developing a just and equitable solution.

---

51 Benjamin A. Schiff, *Refugees unto the Third Generation: UN Aid to Palestinians* (Syracuse, New York: Syracuse University Press, 1995), 3.
52 Ibid, 4.
resolution to the Palestinian refugee issue; the agency’s mandate extends far beyond humanitarian assistance, in reflecting the needs, political situation and values of the Palestinian territory.

According to UNRWA, a *Palestine* refugee is defined as “persons whose normal place of residence was Palestine during the period 1 June 1946 to 15 May 1948, and who lost both home and means of livelihood as a result of the 1948 conflict.”54 Refugees eligible for UNRWA assistance and services includes descendants of Palestinian male refugees who were displaced as a result of the 1948 conflict; presently, UNRWA statistics state that five million refugees (mainly living in the West Bank, Jordan, Syria, Lebanon and Gaza) fulfil UNRWA’s eligibility criteria for assistance.55

Conversely, the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR), formed in 1951, is mandated to provide assistance to refugees, asylum-seekers, stateless individuals, returnees and internally displaced persons.56 Article 1D of the 1951 Convention relating to the Status of Refugees acts as a central guideline for the classification of *Palestine* refugees, which states that the Convention “shall not apply to persons who are at present receiving from organs or agencies of the United Nations other than the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees protection or assistance”.57 Hence, the 1951 Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees and the 1967 Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees exclude Palestine refugees from falling under the UNHCR’s mandate, should they be receiving assistance from UNRWA. In the case of the

54United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestine Refugees in the Near East, “Who We Are,” https://www.unrwa.org/who-we-are
57Ibid.
Palestinian territory, the UNHCR operates outside of UNRWA’s main areas of operation, providing assistance and protection to Palestine refugees where required.

Following a March 2016 meeting with then-United Nations Secretary General Banki Moon, an Access to Information request of Global Affairs Canada revealed that the Secretary General’s office mistakenly announced that the Government of Canada would resume funding to UNRWA. In response, the statement was corrected; Global Affairs Canada further wrote that “Canada is aware that UNRWA has faced criticism on controversial issues, such as alleged neutrality violations, ‘incitement’ in social media, anti-Israeli textbooks, and weapons hidden in vacant UNRWA schools….the Government of Canada will not tolerate any misuse or diversion of assistance to support terrorism”.

In November 2016, the Government of Canada completed the first basic steps to enhancing its financial relations in Palestine by committing a total of $25 million to UNRWA for education, humanitarian assistance, and to help the organization address the needs created by the crisis in Syria. The former Conservative government of Stephen Harper had withdrawn funding from UNRWA in 2010, over the organization’s alleged ties with Hamas. In a statement, the Minister of International Development and La Francophonie acknowledged controversies surrounding UNRWA and that “rather than simply turning our back and walking away from our responsibilities- and to ensure that aid reaches the people who need it most- our government has taken the time to engage with UNRWA and negotiated a more robust oversight and reporting

__________________________

The proposed enhanced accountability mechanisms included regular site visits, a screening process of UNRWA lead staff with financial authorities, anti-terrorism provisions/references in funding agreements and social media training (on neutrality) for UNRWA staff.\footnote{Ibid, 53.}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
Year & Total Funding (USD) \textsuperscript{1} by the Government of Canada & Rank \\
\hline
2008 & $28,054,907 & 7 \\
2009 & $18,976,895 & 11 \\
2010 & $14,858,780 & 13 \\
2011 & $15,088,854 & 14 \\
2012 & $14,605,648 & 13 \\
2013-2015 & $0 & -- \\
2016 & $18,477,458 & 11 \\
2017 & $19,748,031 & 11 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Total Contributions to UNRWA (USD)}
\end{table}

\footnote{Global Affairs Canada, \textit{Access to Information Request: A-2016-01781\_QC/A201601781\_2017-03-02\_10-22-44} (Ottawa: Global Affairs Canada, 2017): 10.}
i. The Refugee Working Group

In the decade leading up to 9/11, Canada acted as an arbitrator in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict through its respected position as chair or ‘gavel holder’ of the Refugee Working Group.\(^6\) The creation of the Refugee Working Group had been launched as a result of the Madrid Peace Process in 1991; a conference in Moscow had followed in 1992 to commence the multilateral process, in which a total of five working groups were established (consisting of refugees, arms control and regional security, economic development, water, and environmental issues).\(^6\) The Refugee Working Group had been mandated “to treat the refugee problem as a regional phenomenon; develop common points of reference for studying the issue; and recommend practical steps for mobilizing international resources towards improving the immediate circumstances of the most destitute of refugees”.\(^6\) Refugees were defined in this context as individuals who had been displaced as a result of the six-day 1967 war, with most of the focus given to Palestinian refugees; the Refugee Working Group was tasked with determining the circumstances for the return of persons displaced by the war.

As chair of the Refugee Working Group from 1992-2000, Canada was directly involved in this multilateral aspect of the peace process; Canada had been chosen as the chair of the Refugee Working Group due to what was perceived as its neutrality towards the conflict, more specifically in its stance regarding the final resolution of refugee issues. Canada had also been a major donor to UNRWA, believed in the Palestinians’ right to self-determination, and was respected as a


\(^6\)Ibid, 208.
credible actor by the international community, as it possessed experience in every peacekeeping force in the Middle East.

In this context, Canada’s ‘multi-partial’ role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was viewed positively by the international community, and Canada’s position as chair allowed the government the opportunity to play the role of mediator and to potentially make a crucial contribution to long-lasting peace in the region. In trying to alleviate the humanitarian suffering of Palestinian refugees, Canada recognized that a resolution of refugee issues was an important precondition to a comprehensive peace agreement between the Israelis and Palestinians. In addition, it is worth noting that Canada had been elected to a non-permanent member seat in the United Nations Security Council in 1998—implying that Canada’s credibility as an actor in the Middle East Peace Process as an ‘honest broker’ had been recognized; Canada’s success at the United Nations could therefore be partially attributed to its ability to create conditions for multilateral negotiations between parties.

During its time as ‘gavel holder’ of the Refugee Working Group, Canada did its best to promote dialogue, and led an international mission in April of 1994 to Palestinian refugee camps in both Jordan and Lebanon; this mission then produced a report that aimed to determine and address the immediate needs of Palestinian refugees living outside of the West Bank and Gaza. Between 1994-2000, Canada also helped to repatriate approximately 70 Palestinian refugee families from refugee camps in Egypt to the Gaza strip.65

There were a lot of obstacles for Canada in its role as gavel holder of the Refugee Working Group, one of them being the difficulty that existed in having any influence beyond the role as chair in the working group structure. Canada also did not have a seat on the 4-member Committee containing the core parties of Jordan, Palestine (the Palestinian Authority), the Israelis and the Egyptians. All in all, the Refugee Working Group did help in mobilizing resources for refugee communities, along with providing a forum for parties to meet and discuss refugee issues; that being said, all multilateral track activities were suspended at the start of the second Palestinian intifada in September 2000.

VI. The Harper Years (2006-2015)

In 2002, before becoming Prime Minister, Stephen Harper said that his government would “adopt a value-oriented foreign policy with a stronger sense of Canada as a member of an alliance, a member of a family of western democratic nations that share certain political values—and our determination is to work with those countries to achieve those things. We have a view of Israel… as an ally and part of our western democratic family.” 66 For former Prime Minister Stephen Harper, Israel was the only developed democracy in the Middle East.67 Musu outlines that prior to the Conservative government of 2006, Canada was perceived as an ‘honest broker’ in the Middle East, thereby rendering it capable of enhancing its relations with Arab states, while maintaining a ‘strong relationship’ with Israel; after the Conservative victory, the “focus changed from the Palestinian-Israeli issue to the tightening and strengthening of relations with Israel”.68
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The then-new Conservative government in 2006 was compelled to take action-oriented policies that some viewed as confrontational in nature. The Harper government seized the opportunities presented in the post-9/11 international security context and the war in Afghanistan to be bolder in highlighting their power, expressing their principles and in reaffirming their commitment to not compromise their values or make concessions. The Conservative government did not have a ‘conservative foreign policy’ in the traditional sense, as they did not adhere to the level of moderation in world affairs practiced by their Conservative party predecessors. For the Conservatives, this was an ‘aggressive assertion of Canadian strength’ that promoted and emphasized Canada’s distinctiveness in foreign policy, which acted as a source of national pride.

Interestingly, Canada’s policies towards the Middle East Peace Process have not remained constant or homogenous—in fact, they have changed depending on political leadership, as the situation on the ground has remained fluid and continuously evolves. According to Adam Chapnick, “Canadian policy towards Israel between 2006 and 2015 was driven primarily by the personal views of Canada’s prime minister”. The Harper government promoted an unprecedented stance that was primarily pro-Israel, in its statements, engagements and rhetoric; yet, official statements by the Canadian government at the time continued to denounce the growth and illegality of Israeli settlements in Palestinian territory. Support for Israel was framed in the language of Conservative values, or principles: ‘Canada stands for what is right and good in the world’. The Conservative government’s policies in this regard, both in theory and in practice, led
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to divisions and confusion surrounding Canada’s stance concerning the recognition of a Palestinian state, particularly at the United Nations and within the G8.

The results of various public opinion surveys have consistently shown that “churchgoers and Christians show the most support for the religious rights of Jews in Canada and also the strongest support for Israel.”\textsuperscript{73} Between 2006 and 2015, Canada’s foreign policies under the Harper government could be characterized as primarily reactive in nature; yet, the Government of Canada was largely proactive in its continued support for Israel, based on what was described as common values of freedom and democracy, along with a commitment on the part of both countries to fighting global terrorism.\textsuperscript{74} Arguably, the particular stance towards Israel that was expressed by representatives from the Government of Canada was also driven by the personal views of the Prime Minister and members of his Cabinet, who communicated a more aggressive pro-Israeli rhetoric than that of any past Liberal government. Additionally, the presence of Christian Zionism in Evangelicals and Pentecostals in the Conservative party was a crucial factor in the party’s pro-Israel stance. A divide was also evident between Canada’s pro-Israel government and the emerging grassroots support for Palestinians which was occurring at the same time domestically (for example, in Canadian social organizations promoting the boycott, divestment and sanctions movement).

During the first year of the Conservative government’s mandate, the Government of Canada’s support for Israel’s right to defend itself became particularly evident during the crisis in Lebanon in 2006 between Israel and Hezbollah; the war had begun with a cross-border raid that
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had resulted in the abduction of two Israeli Defence Forces soldiers. In response, the Israeli military carried out various retaliatory actions against targets in Lebanon; in Canada, former Prime Minister Stephen Harper told reporters at the time that this was a ‘measured response’ on the part of the Israelis and maintained that Israel had the right to self-defence. Further, the Harper government, most notably in the statements of Cabinet ministers, launched a campaign to label Hezbollah as a ‘terrorist organization’ that they would subsequently not enter into negotiations with; for example, in August 2006, then-Conservative Parliamentary Secretary to the Prime Minister Jason Kenney was publicly quoted as comparing Hezbollah to the pre-WWII German Nazi Party. Even three months after the end of the 33-day war, Prime Minister Harper still chose to veto a Francophonie statement (supported by 55 of the organization’s members) that ‘deplored’ the ramifications of the conflict for the citizens of Lebanon.

Notably, the Government of Canada’s behaviour towards the Palestinians during the Harper era did not match its stated values, nor did it align with Canada’s past foreign policy objectives in the region. This particular fact was evident after the Palestinian elections in 2006 and the victory of Hamas, upon which Canada became the first country to formally announce that it would no longer be providing aid to the Palestinian Authority. The Conservative government refused to recognize Hamas as the legitimate governing party after labelling them a ‘terrorist organization’; the aid cut-off in 2006 to the Palestinian Authority was also said to be due to Hamas’
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refusal to recognize Israel—a condition that Canada had conversely not imposed equally upon both parties.

In 2007, Ottawa would restart diplomatic relations and financial support to the Palestinian Authority once Hamas officials were no longer part of the government. At this time, the now-defunct Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) pledged $8 million dollars ‘in direct support to the new government’; a portion of these funds were directed towards the goal of creating a Palestinian police force. In response to CIDA’s pledge, a Palestinian-based non-governmental organization observer noted that Canadian aid to Palestine “ultimately works to support Israeli military security at the price of Palestinian human security”.\textsuperscript{79}

Throughout Prime Minister Harper’s mandate, the Government of Canada continued to support Israel’s right to live in peace with its neighbours, recognized Israel’s right to assure its own security, and continued to affirm that “Israeli settlements in the occupied territories are a violation of the Fourth Geneva Convention [and]… a serious obstacle to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace”.\textsuperscript{80} This position was in line with that of the international community, yet the Canadian government under Prime Minister Harper rarely criticized Israel for its occupation and settlements in the West Bank, which violated customary international law and the Geneva Conventions that were ratified by Canada.\textsuperscript{81} In practice, Canada was among only six countries in November 2014 to vote against a United Nations General Assembly Resolution that stressed the need for Israel to withdraw from occupied Palestinian territory, outlined a demand for halting Israeli settlement activity and demanded that Israel comply with its obligations under
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international law. Around this same time, Israel would be the only country in the Middle East to appear in the Harper government’s ‘Speech from the Throne’; the Conservative government, under the heading of ‘promoting Canadian values’ reiterated that it “defends Israel’s right to exist as a Jewish state, the lone outpost of freedom and democracy in a dangerous region. And our Government stands opposed to those regimes that threaten their neighbours, slaughter their citizens, and imperil freedom. These regimes must ultimately be judged not by their words, but by their actions”.

i. Canada’s Bilateral Engagement with Israel

During the late years of the Harper mandate, bilateral engagement between Canada and Israel increased to an unprecedented extent. In May of 2011, Prime Minister Harper stood alone among his G8 allies in refusing to support an American proposal to restart Israeli-Palestinian peace negotiations on the basis of Israel’s pre-1967 borders—an approach that would have been in line with official Canadian policy.

In a July 2011 interview with Maclean’s magazine on the Conservative party’s approach to foreign policy, former Prime Minister Harper explained that Canadian foreign policy was in line with a set of values, freedom, democracy, human rights and the rule of law. In addition, Harper
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outlined his views that “those societies that promote those values tend to share our interests, and those that do not tend to, on occasion, if not frequently, become threats to us”.

In this same interview, former Prime Minister Harper also spoke of the Middle East Peace Process:

“we all recognize there has to be a two-state solution, but we have in Israel essentially a Western democratic country that is an ally of ours, who’s the only state in the United Nations whose very existence is significantly questioned internationally and opposed by many, including by the other side of that particular conflict—and when I look around the world at those who most oppose the existence of Israel and seek its extinction, they are the very people who, in a security sense, are immediate threats to our own country.”

The above-mentioned quote demonstrates the ways in which the Harper government focused on terrorism and ‘Islamist threats’ to peace and security—which had a profound impact on Canada’s domestic and foreign policy. At home, the Harper government would seize the opportunity to attract the support of individuals belonging to the ‘religious right’, along with obtaining the liberal Jewish vote in important constituencies. As reiterated by Yves Engler in Harper’s Love Affair with Israel, many Canadians supporters of the Palestinian cause believed that former Prime Minister Harper’s unrelenting support for Israel was driven by ethnic politics and the right-wing, evangelical base in Canada—whom he believed were the true support base for the state of Israel.

Lastly, Prime Minister Harper’s personal objective of combatting anti-Semitism (which some likened to opposition to any criticism of Israel) both in Canada and around the world created
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a personal, religion-based mission that further distanced the Canadian government from being considered a credible actor and playing an ‘honest broker’ role in the Middle East. In 2010, in a speech to the Inter-Parliamentary Coalition for Combatting Anti-Semitism Conference, then-Prime Minister Harper showcased his view that Israel was frequently the subject of criticism, saying:

“…when Israel, the only country in the world whose very existence is under attack, is consistently and conspicuously singled out for condemnation… we are morally obligated to take a stand… whether it is at the United Nations or any other international forum, the easiest thing to do is simply to just get along and go along with this anti-Israeli rhetoric, to pretend it is just about being even-handed and to excuse oneself with the label of honest broker… but as long as I am Prime Minister, whether it is at the United Nations, the Francophonie, or anywhere else, Canada will take that stand whatever the cost”.

VII. Canada and the Middle East Peace Process Today

To date, Canada has not adopted a framework for the Middle East as a whole; it has continually expressed an interest in the security and prosperity of Israel, which it considers the only Western democratic power in the region that has like-minded values to Canada. For the rest of the region, Canada’s interests are best expressed as a desire for stability due to its increasing economic interests.

Canada’s position as a ‘champion of multilateralism and an ‘honest broker’ in the Middle East has been severely diminished, partially as a result of the Harper government’s opposition and severing of diplomatic ties with Iran, influenced by the government’s unwavering pro-Israel stance. During the Conservative mandate, attitudes and policies toward Israel were considered

within and determined by the ever-present threat of Iran’s nuclear capabilities. In 2009, the government of Canada began a campaign that condemned Iran’s human rights record; during the same time period, the Harper government chose to abstain on votes at meetings of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) that called on Israel to put its nuclear weapons program under the leadership and control of the organization. The Harper government also condemned an ‘unbalanced’ IAEA resolution that called for the inspection of Israel’s nuclear facilities, along with its joining of the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty.

In July 2015, the United Nations Security Council, along with Germany and the European Union, established an agreement with Iran on its nuclear program (the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action). Canada was one of the last countries to express its support during the lead up to the agreement; furthermore, both the Government of Canada website and Prime Minister Harper expressed that “the Iranian regime was the greatest threat to international peace and security in the world today”. Presently, the rhetoric of the Trudeau government has been less aggressive but marks a continuity, rather than a change, in Canada’s foreign policy on its relations with Iran; for example, in early 2017, a spokesperson for Foreign Affairs Minister Freeland reaffirmed that the Government of Canada continues to denounce Iran’s support for terrorist organizations, its threats toward Israel, and its ballistic missile program. This statement, on behalf of the Minister of
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Foreign Affairs reinforces the fact that Canada, like other nations, continues to prioritize the safety and security of Israel over Palestinians’ desires for independence and self-determination.

i. **Recent Statements by the Canadian Minister of Foreign Affairs**

Since coming to power in late 2015, the Trudeau government has remained relatively quiet on the Israel-Palestine file, an evident change from the Harper government’s approach. In February 2017, the Minister of Foreign Affairs issued a statement on the passing of the ‘settlement regulation law’ in the Israeli Parliament (the Knesset). The statement read, in part, that “Canada is deeply concerned by the announced expansion of settlements and the retroactive legalization of settlers’ outposts, which are illegal under international law… Canada calls on all parties to refrain from unilateral actions that prejudge the outcome of direct negotiations and jeopardize the prospects for a two-state solution.”

What are the political risks associated with Canada strengthening its ties to the Middle East Peace Process today? It remains to be seen as to whether the Trudeau government possesses the political will to become more engaged in the Middle East Peace Process and to expand Canada’s role within the region itself. Should the Trudeau government continue Canada’s long-held position in favour of a two-state solution, it would adequately have to translate its support for a two-state solution to the conflict into real policies. Regardless of the policy it adopts towards the Israeli-
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Palestinian conflict, the Government of Canada must be willing and able to provide resources to the region in order for it to be seen as having a constructive role.

**Statements Related to the Israel-Palestine Conflict by the Canadian Government**

*January 1, 2008 to January 1, 2017*
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**VIII. Canada, the Middle East and the United Nations**

While the Israelis have continued to dominate militarily over the years of the conflict, the Palestinians have been able to gain ground diplomatically, particularly in international institutions, as the default forum for the Arabs (under Palestinian leadership) continues to be the United Nations General Assembly. Unfortunately for the reputation and credibility of Canada, the Harper government would this learn this truth first-hand in its efforts to acquire a United Nations Security Council nonpermanent member seat. In October 2010, Canada withdrew its United Nations Security Council campaign bid after failing to win the necessary endorsement from members of
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the General Assembly. The Canadian delegation had specifically failed to gain the support of member countries from Arab and African regions, who continue to regard Israel as non-compliant on various United Nations resolutions, such as the return or compensation of refugees, the control of East Jerusalem, the occupation of the West Bank, and the growth of illegal settlements. Therefore, through its United Nations voting patterns and support of Israel, Canada had not appeared respectful in the eyes of the international community of various United Nations declarations condemning Israel and had subsequently paid the price of altering its formerly more-balanced foreign policy towards the Israelis and Palestinians.

In July 2014, Canada formally opposed the then-United Nations High Commissioner for criticizing Israel’s heavy response to rocket attacks from Gaza and for suggesting that there was a ‘a strong possibility that Israel was committing war crimes in Gaza’. More recently, in 2015, Canada opposed Palestinian accession to 15 United Nations conventions and protocols, in addition to a United Nations General Assembly resolution to allow the Palestinian flag to be raised at the United Nation’s headquarters in New York city.


In a briefing note prepared for the Assistant Deputy Minister of Global Issues and Development at Global Affairs Canada written in fall 2017, a strategy was proposed to advance Canada’s bid for a non-permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council for the 2021-22 term. It reads that “progress can be made through continued campaigning by the Prime Minister, 
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Minister Freeland and other Cabinet Ministers, Parliamentary Secretaries, and Canada’s Ambassadors abroad”; it further outlines that ‘high-level interactions that strengthen Canada’s bilateral relationships with target countries will be critical—(such as) key opportunities to advance Canada’s United Nations Security Council bid by amplifying Canada’s brand and by providing opportunities for bilateral interactions’. The memo details how, throughout the spring of 2018, Canada’s Permanent Representative to the United Nations in New York will host several study visits to Canada by small groups of permanent representatives to the United Nations.

In October 2016, at the request of Prime Minister Trudeau, the Governor General of Canada conducted a state visit to Jordan, the West Bank and Israel. The Governor General’s visit was meant to be opportunity to reiterate Canada's long-standing support for a peaceful path towards a two-state solution based on dialogue and mutual respect; the trip was also meant to help change perceptions of Canada’s role to the Arab world. During this trip, the Governor General met with Palestinian Authority President Mahmoud Abbas; during this meeting, President Abbas expressed the Palestinian Authority’s readiness in assisting the Government of Canada in garnering the support of approximately 57 United Nations General Assembly Arab states to back Canada’s United Nations Security Council 2021 non-permanent member seat bid. In return, President Abbas communicated his desire for the Canadian government to formally recognize the state of Palestine and his aspiration for peace with Israel. At the time that the research interview was conducted with the representative of the Palestinian General Delegation in Canada in April
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2017, no official response from the Canadian government pertaining to President Abbas’ offer had been communicated to the Palestinian Authority.

All of the above-noted information is important for Canada’s campaign, as the Trudeau government will require the support of United Nations Arab member states, should it wish to be successful in its bid for a United Nations Security Council non-permanent member seat for the 2021-2022 term. Notably, should Canada actively seek the support of Arab states in the United Nations General Assembly for its campaign, voting patterns at the United Nations by the Canadian government on issues related to the Israel-Palestine conflict would most definitely have to shift, in order to reflect a more even-handed approach towards both parties.

**ii. Voting Patterns at the United Nations over the Years**

According to Leech-Ngo and Swan, “Canadian voting has experienced a profound shift over the last 16 years from voting almost exclusively in favour of all 16 resolutions under Jean Chretien (in office 1993-2003), to slightly less enthusiastic support under Paul Martin (2003-2006), to exclusively against all 16 resolutions under Stephen Harper (2006-2015)”.

While the Trudeau government has touted that the government’s policies have shifted to promoting a more ‘balanced’ approach, it can be observed that little change has occurred between the voting patterns of the Harper government and the Trudeau government concerning the Israel-Palestine conflict at the United Nations.

Former Prime Minister Harper arguably exerted his greatest influence over Canada’s Israel policy at the United Nations; as outlined previously, the Conservative government, particularly in
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its voting patterns at the United Nations, expressed unconditional support for Israel. During Palestine’s bid for non-member observer state status at the United Nations in 2012, Canada was among only 9 nations to oppose the bid, and called on both sides to negotiate directly for a two-state solution.\(^{103}\)

**Canada’s Voting at the United Nations (Arab-State Sponsored Resolutions)**\(^{104}\)

![Graph showing Canada's voting pattern at the United Nations](image)

The Government of Canada claims that it recognizes “the Palestinian right to self-determination and supports the creation of a sovereign, independent, viable, democratic and territorially contiguous Palestinian state, as part of a comprehensive, just and lasting peace settlement”.\(^{105}\) Post 9/11, the Israeli government framed Palestinian violence in terms of the ‘fight against terror’, leading Canada to “abstain or vote against United Nations General Assembly
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resolutions on the Israeli-Palestinian question. Initiated under the Martin government in 2003 and continued by Harper, this notable change was accompanied by a change in language. The Canadian government went from talking about Palestinian rights to speaking of ‘Palestinian aspirations’, and it decided to stop supporting resolutions regarding Palestinian self-determination. Ottawa explained this change by highlighting the asymmetry of United Nations resolutions that typically criticize the State of Israel while failing to condemn Palestinian terrorist actions against Israeli civilians.”

Global Affairs Canada’s website also addresses Canadian Policy on Key Issues in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict. Under the heading of ‘Occupied Territories and Settlements’, it states that “Canada believes that both Israel and the Palestinian Authority must fully respect international human rights and humanitarian law which is key to ensuring the protection of civilians, and can contribute to the creation of a climate conducive to achieving a just, lasting and comprehensive peace settlement”. Yet, Canada’s actions in its voting patterns at the United Nations do not match such statements and policies.

Since the Trudeau Liberal government came into power on October 19, 2015, they have continued the voting pattern of the previous Harper Conservative government, by withholding support from various United Nations General Assembly Resolutions addressing the rights of Palestinians. To this day, the Canadian government’s actions and voting patterns at the United Nations on the Israel-Palestine conflict continue to fail to match the rhetoric and values that it espouses-- such as supporting a fair and equitable peaceful resolution to the conflict, the promotion
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of international law, and to uphold human rights.\textsuperscript{108} Should Canada continue to vote against or abstain on issues supporting the rights of Palestinians at the United Nations General Assembly, its reputation as an even-handed player and ‘honest broker’ that is committed to human rights will be put at an even greater risk.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{chart.png}
\caption{The Trudeau Government's Support of United Nations General Assembly Arab-State Sponsored Resolutions}
\end{figure}
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IX. **Conclusion**

There must be more effective and strategic means in place to address and eventually resolve the Israel-Palestine conflict; presently, deliberations on the so-called core issues (Jerusalem, settlements and refugees) have not made significant progress and the gaps between the Israelis and the Palestinians are still quite evident. Since the October 2015 Canadian federal election that saw the defeat of the Harper Conservative government and the introduction of the Trudeau Liberals, the tone of the Government of Canada has been marked by considerable change. In seeking to prove to the world that ‘Canada’s back’ on the world stage, the Trudeau government set out to make its mark in both reshaping and re-engaging Canada’s policies on a vast array of both domestic and international issues. Yet, as reiterated previously, the position of the Trudeau Liberals on the Israel-Palestine conflict has remained remarkably unaltered from its Conservative predecessor in substance.

Regarding its current foreign policy options, the Trudeau government has two distinct choices: to maintain the pro-Israel stance of the Harper Conservatives and align itself unilaterally with Israel based on its status as a ‘western’ democratic power, or to act as an ‘honest broker’ between the Israelis and the Palestinians. Regardless, Canada risks further diminishing its credibility as an important contributor to the resolution of world crises and as an ‘honest broker’ should it not aim to re-engage itself as a middle power actor in the Middle East Peace Process. The current Trudeau government must also address if it wishes to rekindle Canada’s past role on the issue of refugees (specifically in the context of the Refugee Working Group) or to engage in other aspects of the Arab-Israeli conflict as an ‘honest broker’.
Canada could take on a more prominent role in the Middle East by first re-committing and establishing itself in Israel and Palestine as a mediator willing to back up its policies through financial means; a willingness on the part of the Government of Canada to provide resources to the region would allow it to be perceived as having a constructive and valued role. Canada could further focus its efforts in the region on projects that specifically promote democracy, while striving to play a more proactive and pronounced role in the conflict by working with other countries to improve economic development in the Palestinian territories. On a broader scale, irrespective of the long-term foreign policy that Canada adopts towards the Middle East Peace Process, it must be driven by a clear purpose, priorities and values; it must also call for a greater degree of multilateral cooperation in regards to policy implementation towards the region. As there is a clear linkage between democracy-building and the Israel-Palestine conflict, Canada’s aid strategies, in particular, could be reoriented to allow for more effective state-building institutions to emerge in Palestine (under the leadership of the Palestinian Authority).

Canada continues to present itself on the international stage as an advocate and defender of human rights, yet, its stance (official Government of Canada responses, its language and diplomatic actions) surrounding the Israel-Palestine conflict do not reflect these values. Moving forward, the Government of Canada should strive to derive and root its positions on the Middle East Peace Process in international law; hence, Canada must be clear on its stance against human rights violations, in order to be perceived as ‘principled’ both in its rhetoric and in practice. Furthermore, Canada should also look at developing a coordinated policy approach, based on multilateral cooperation with other actors, that would restore the need for a rules-based international system. Lastly, Canada could open a dialogue with Israel to discuss settlements
removal and a freeze on growth, which would be part of an end objective of creating a viable Palestinian state.

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau still has the opportunity to promote a more even-handed policy for Canada on the Middle East Peace Process, rather than continuing the one-sided policy of the Harper government. Canada’s image as an ‘honest broker’ is increasingly at risk, as long as the Canadian government continues to place the security of Israel above all other considerations in its foreign policy towards the Middle East Peace Process. Further, the Trudeau government risks embarrassment by losing its bid for Canada to win a non-permanent seat between 2021-2022 on the United Nations Security Council should it not win the support of Arab states at the United Nations General Assembly.

At present, the likelihood of the creation of viable and independent Palestinian state appears bleak as a result of recent actions by both the Israelis and the Americans. The corresponding rhetoric and policies espoused by both Canada and the United States of advocating a ‘two-state solution’ must therefore be updated to reflect this changed reality. In this regards, in enhancing its role in the Middle East Peace Process, Canada could promote its democratic values, the human rights of immigrants and refugees, as well as the need for a diplomatic and multi-faceted approach to issues; this would allow it to further gain the respect of other actors in the region as a constructive ‘honest broker’ and valued middle power.

Today, the Arab world still views Canada as a ‘champion of multilateralism’ and an ‘honest broker’, as Canada is seen as a nation that values peace, with the ability to put a ‘human face’ to its policies and relationships.\textsuperscript{110} Canada’s ‘multi-partial’ role in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict
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therefore allows it to play the role of mediator and ‘honest broker’, and to potentially make a crucial contribution to long-lasting peace in the region. Canada’s foreign policy objectives pertaining to the Israeli and Palestinian peoples are to ‘improve stability and security in the Middle East’; hence, an enhanced role for Canada as an ‘honest broker’ in the Israel-Palestine conflict would be in tune with the government’s humanitarian agenda and its values and principles.

Israel will celebrate the 70th anniversary of its independence in May 2018, with likely little hope or advancements towards a final resolution with the Palestinians. Recent actions taken by the Trump administration on the status of Jerusalem have re-ignited the Israeli-Palestine conflict by re-emphasizing the importance of strategic thinking and a cohesive vision in formulating foreign policy that seeks to appropriately communicate and reflect long-term national interests; the Trudeau government still lacks a clear sense of mission regarding the Middle East Peace Process and its foreign policy agenda in the Middle East region.

Canada is still frequently regarded as a ‘helpful fixer’ in the international community; yet, the Government of Canada’s policies on the Israel-Palestine conflict do not showcase Canada’s leadership in regards to its ability to act as an ‘honest broker’ and mediator between both parties. As a foreign policy is ‘how a nation best expresses itself’, Canada risks giving up an opportunity and becoming irrelevant should it not speak up and clearly articulate its positions on the international stage, now more than ever.

Tenth emergency special session

Agenda item 5

Illegal Israeli actions in Occupied East Jerusalem and the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory

Turkey and Yemen: draft resolution

Status of Jerusalem

The General Assembly,

Reaffirming its relevant resolutions, including resolution 72/15 of 30 November 2017 on Jerusalem,


Guided by the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, and reaffirming, inter alia, the inadmissibility of the acquisition of territory by force,

Bearing in mind the specific status of the Holy City of Jerusalem and, in particular, the need for the protection and preservation of the unique spiritual, religious and cultural dimensions of the city, as foreseen in relevant United Nations resolutions,
Stressing that Jerusalem is a final status issue to be resolved through negotiations in line with relevant United Nations resolutions,

Expressing, in this regard, its deep regret at recent decisions concerning the status of Jerusalem,

1. Affirms that any decisions and actions which purport to have altered the character, status or demographic composition of the Holy City of Jerusalem have no legal effect, are null and void and must be rescinded in compliance with relevant resolutions of the Security Council, and in this regard calls upon all States to refrain from the establishment of diplomatic missions in the Holy City of Jerusalem, pursuant to Security Council resolution 478 (1980);

2. Demands that all States comply with Security Council resolutions regarding the Holy City of Jerusalem, and not recognize any actions or measures contrary to those resolutions;

3. Reiterates its call for the reversal of the negative trends on the ground that are imperilling the two-State solution and for the intensification and acceleration of international and regional efforts and support aimed at achieving, without delay, a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East on the basis of the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Madrid terms of reference, including the principle of land for peace, the Arab Peace Initiative\textsuperscript{112} and the Quartet road map,\textsuperscript{113} and an end to the Israeli occupation that began in 1967;

4. Decides to adjourn the tenth emergency special session temporarily and to authorize the President of the General Assembly at its most recent session to resume its meeting upon request from Member States.

\textsuperscript{112} A/56/1026-S/2002/932, annex II, resolution 14/221.
\textsuperscript{113} S/2003/529, annex.
Seventy-second session

Agenda item 37


[without reference to a Main Committee (A/72/L.11 and A/72/L.11/Add.1)]

72/15. Jerusalem

The General Assembly,

Recalling its resolution 181 (II) of 29 November 1947, in particular its provisions regarding the City of Jerusalem,

Recalling also its resolution 36/120 E of 10 December 1981 and all its subsequent relevant resolutions, including resolution 56/31 of 3 December 2001, in which it, inter alia, determined that all legislative and administrative measures and actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, which have altered or purported to alter the character and status of the Holy City of Jerusalem, in particular the so-called “Basic Law” on Jerusalem and the proclamation of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel, were null and void and must be rescinded forthwith,

Recalling further the Security Council resolutions relevant to Jerusalem, including resolution 478 (1980) of 20 August 1980, in which the Council, inter alia, decided not to recognize the “Basic Law” on Jerusalem,
Recalling Security Council resolution 2334 (2016) of 23 December 2016, in which the Council affirmed that it would not recognize any changes to the 4 June 1967 lines, including with regard to Jerusalem, other than those agreed by the parties through negotiations,

Recalling also the advisory opinion rendered on 9 July 2004 by the International Court of Justice on the legal consequences of the construction of a wall in the Occupied Palestinian Territory, and recalling further its resolution ES-10/15 of 20 July 2004,

Expressing its grave concern about any action taken by any body, governmental or non-governmental, in violation of the above-mentioned resolutions,

Expressing its grave concern also, in particular, about the continuation by Israel, the occupying Power, of illegal settlement activities, including measures regarding the so-called E-1 plan, its construction of the wall in and around East Jerusalem, its restrictions on Palestinian access to and residence in East Jerusalem and the further isolation of the city from the rest of the Occupied Palestinian Territory, which are having a detrimental effect on the lives of Palestinians and could prejudge a final status agreement on Jerusalem,

Expressing its grave concern further about the continuing Israeli demolition of Palestinian homes and other civilian infrastructure in and around East Jerusalem, the revocation of residency rights, and the eviction and displacement of numerous Palestinian families from East Jerusalem neighbourhoods, including Bedouin families, as well as other acts of provocation and incitement, including by Israeli settlers, in the city, including desecration of mosques and churches,

Expressing its concern about the Israeli excavations undertaken in the Old City of Jerusalem, including in and around religious sites,

Expressing its grave concern, in particular, about tensions, provocations and incitement regarding the holy places of Jerusalem, including the Haram al-Sharif, and urging restraint and respect for the sanctity of the holy sites by all sides,

Reaffirming that the international community, through the United Nations, has a legitimate interest in the question of the City of Jerusalem and in the protection of the unique spiritual, religious and cultural dimensions of the city, as foreseen in relevant United Nations resolutions on this matter,

Having considered the report of the Secretary-General on the situation in the Middle East,
1. **Reiterates its determination** that any actions taken by Israel, the occupying Power, to impose its laws, jurisdiction and administration on the Holy City of Jerusalem are illegal and therefore null and void and have no validity whatsoever, and calls upon Israel to immediately cease all such illegal and unilateral measures;

2. **Stresses** that a comprehensive, just and lasting solution to the question of the City of Jerusalem should take into account the legitimate concerns of both the Palestinian and Israeli sides and should include internationally guaranteed provisions to ensure the freedom of religion and of conscience of its inhabitants, as well as permanent, free and unhindered access to the holy places by people of all religions and nationalities;

3. **Also stresses** the need for the parties to observe calm and restraint and to refrain from provocative actions, incitement and inflammatory rhetoric, especially in areas of religious and cultural sensitivity, and expresses its grave concern in particular about the recent series of negative incidents in East Jerusalem;

4. **Calls for** respect for the historic status quo at the holy places of Jerusalem, including the Haram al-Sharif, in word and practice, and urges all sides to work immediately and cooperatively to defuse tensions and halt all provocations, incitement and violence at the holy sites in the City;

5. **Requests** the Secretary-General to report to the General Assembly at its seventy-third session on the implementation of the present resolution.

*60th plenary meeting*
*30 November 2017*
Statement by President Trump on Jerusalem

December 6, 2017

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. When I came into office, I promised to look at the world’s challenges with open eyes and very fresh thinking. We cannot solve our problems by making the same failed assumptions and repeating the same failed strategies of the past. Old challenges demand new approaches.

My announcement today marks the beginning of a new approach to conflict between Israel and the Palestinians.

In 1995, Congress adopted the Jerusalem Embassy Act, urging the federal government to relocate the American embassy to Jerusalem and to recognize that that city — and so importantly — is Israel’s capital. This act passed Congress by an overwhelming bipartisan majority and was reaffirmed by a unanimous vote of the Senate only six months ago.

Yet, for over 20 years, every previous American president has exercised the law’s waiver, refusing to move the U.S. embassy to Jerusalem or to recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital city.

Presidents issued these waivers under the belief that delaying the recognition of Jerusalem would advance the cause of peace. Some say they lacked courage, but they made their best judgments based on facts as they understood them at the time. Nevertheless, the record is in. After more than two decades of waivers, we are no closer to a lasting peace agreement between Israel and the Palestinians. It would be folly to assume that repeating the exact same formula would now produce a different or better result.

Therefore, I have determined that it is time to officially recognize Jerusalem as the capital of Israel.

While previous presidents have made this a major campaign promise, they failed to deliver. Today, I am delivering.

I’ve judged this course of action to be in the best interests of the United States of America and the pursuit of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. This is a long-overdue step to advance the peace process and to work towards a lasting agreement.

Israel is a sovereign nation with the right like every other sovereign nation to determine its own capital. Acknowledging this as a fact is a necessary condition for achieving peace.
It was 70 years ago that the United States, under President Truman, recognized the State of Israel. Ever since then, Israel has made its capital in the city of Jerusalem — the capital the Jewish people established in ancient times. Today, Jerusalem is the seat of the modern Israeli government. It is the home of the Israeli parliament, the Knesset, as well as the Israeli Supreme Court. It is the location of the official residence of the Prime Minister and the President. It is the headquarters of many government ministries.

For decades, visiting American presidents, secretaries of state, and military leaders have met their Israeli counterparts in Jerusalem, as I did on my trip to Israel earlier this year.

Jerusalem is not just the heart of three great religions, but it is now also the heart of one of the most successful democracies in the world. Over the past seven decades, the Israeli people have built a country where Jews, Muslims, and Christians, and people of all faiths are free to live and worship according to their conscience and according to their beliefs.

Jerusalem is today, and must remain, a place where Jews pray at the Western Wall, where Christians walk the Stations of the Cross, and where Muslims worship at Al-Aqsa Mosque.

However, through all of these years, presidents representing the United States have declined to officially recognize Jerusalem as Israel’s capital. In fact, we have declined to acknowledge any Israeli capital at all.

But today, we finally acknowledge the obvious: that Jerusalem is Israel’s capital. This is nothing more, or less, than a recognition of reality. It is also the right thing to do. It’s something that has to be done.

That is why, consistent with the Jerusalem Embassy Act, I am also directing the State Department to begin preparation to move the American embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem. This will immediately begin the process of hiring architects, engineers, and planners, so that a new embassy, when completed, will be a magnificent tribute to peace.

In making these announcements, I also want to make one point very clear: This decision is not intended, in any way, to reflect a departure from our strong commitment to facilitate a lasting peace agreement. We want an agreement that is a great deal for the Israelis and a great deal for the Palestinians. We are not taking a position of any final status issues, including the specific boundaries of the Israeli sovereignty in Jerusalem, or the resolution of contested borders. Those questions are up to the parties involved.

The United States remains deeply committed to helping facilitate a peace agreement that is acceptable to both sides. I intend to do everything in my power to help forge such an
agreement. Without question, Jerusalem is one of the most sensitive issues in those talks. The United States would support a two-state solution if agreed to by both sides.

In the meantime, I call on all parties to maintain the status quo at Jerusalem’s holy sites, including the Temple Mount, also known as Haram al-Sharif.

Above all, our greatest hope is for peace, the universal yearning in every human soul. With today’s action, I reaffirm my administration’s longstanding commitment to a future of peace and security for the region.

There will, of course, be disagreement and dissent regarding this announcement. But we are confident that ultimately, as we work through these disagreements, we will arrive at a peace and a place far greater in understanding and cooperation.

This sacred city should call forth the best in humanity, lifting our sights to what it is possible; not pulling us back and down to the old fights that have become so totally predictable. Peace is never beyond the grasp of those willing to reach.

So today, we call for calm, for moderation, and for the voices of tolerance to prevail over the purveyors of hate. Our children should inherit our love, not our conflicts.

I repeat the message I delivered at the historic and extraordinary summit in Saudi Arabia earlier this year: The Middle East is a region rich with culture, spirit, and history. Its people are brilliant, proud, and diverse, vibrant and strong. But the incredible future awaiting this region is held at bay by bloodshed, ignorance, and terror.

Vice President Pence will travel to the region in the coming days to reaffirm our commitment to work with partners throughout the Middle East to defeat radicalism that threatens the hopes and dreams of future generations.

It is time for the many who desire peace to expel the extremists from their midst. It is time for all civilized nations, and people, to respond to disagreement with reasoned debate — not violence.

And it is time for young and moderate voices all across the Middle East to claim for themselves a bright and beautiful future.

So today, let us rededicate ourselves to a path of mutual understanding and respect. Let us rethink old assumptions and open our hearts and minds to possible and possibilities. And finally, I ask the leaders of the region — political and religious; Israeli and Palestinian; Jewish and Christian and Muslim — to join us in the noble quest for lasting peace.

(The proclamation is signed.)
Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Nikolay, for the briefing that you gave.

During the past year, as the representative of the United States, I have most often taken the position that this monthly session on the Middle East is miscast. As I’ve pointed out many times, this session spends far too much time on Israel and the Palestinians and far too little time on the terrorist regimes and groups that undermine peace and security in the region, chief among them Iran, ISIS, Hezbollah, and Hamas. That remains my view. And I expect that in future months I will continue to focus on those threats from the Middle East that draw too little attention at the UN.

However, today I will set aside my usual practice. Today, I too will focus on the issue of peace between Israel and the Palestinians. What has changed?

The events of the past month have shed light on a critical aspect of the Israeli-Palestinian problem, and it is important that we do not miss the opportunity here at the UN to bring attention to it. The aspect I will address is the single most critical element to achieving peace. No, it’s not the issues of security, borders, refugees, or settlements. All of those are important parts of a peace agreement. But the single most important element is not any of those. The indispensable element is leaders who have the will to do what’s needed to achieve peace.

Real peace requires leaders who are willing to step forward, acknowledge hard truths, and make compromises. It requires leaders who look to the future, rather than dwell on past resentments. Above all, such leaders require courage. Egyptian President Anwar Sadat was such a leader. Forty years ago, President Sadat did an exceptional thing. Egypt and Israel were still in a state of war. In fact, Sadat himself had led Egypt in war with Israel only a few years before. But Sadat made the courageous decision to pursue peace. And when he made that decision, he went to Jerusalem and delivered a speech before the Israeli Knesset. That he went to the Knesset was courageous in itself.

But what took real courage was what he said there. Sadat did not go to Jerusalem on bended knee. He spoke in no uncertain terms about the hard concessions he expected from the Israelis. And then he said the words that both he and the world knew marked a turning point. He said to the Israeli legislators, “You want to live with us in this part of the world. In all sincerity, I tell you, we welcome you among us, with full security and safety.”

“We used to reject you,” he said. “Yet today, I tell you, and declare it to the whole world, that we accept to live with you in permanent peace based on justice.”
These were the words that led to peace between Egypt and Israel. It was not an easy process. It took another 16 months of tough negotiations to reach a peace treaty, and both sides made difficult compromises. But Sadat’s words helped make Israel understand that it had a partner with whom it could make those painful compromises. Some have said these were the words that got Anwar Sadat killed. But no one can question that generations of Egyptians and Israeli citizens have enjoyed a peace that has stood the test of time.

Compare those words to what Palestinian President Abbas said to the PLO Central Council 11 days ago. In his speech, President Abbas declared the landmark Oslo Peace Accords dead. He rejected any American role in peace talks. He insulted the American President. He called for suspending recognition of Israel. He invoked an ugly and fictional past, reaching back to the 17th century to paint Israel as a colonialist project engineered by European powers.

Once more, let’s contrast Sadat’s words with Abbas’. President Sadat acknowledged that some Arab leaders did not agree with him. But he told them it was his responsibility to, “exhaust all and every means in a bid to save my Egyptian Arab People and the entire Arab Nation, the horrors of new, shocking, and destructive wars.”

President Abbas also acknowledged criticism from other Arab leaders – and he, too, had a message for them. His response was “Get lost.” Curiously, President Abbas’ speech has gotten little attention in the media. I encourage anyone who cares about the cause of a durable and just peace in the Middle East to read President Abbas’ speech for yourself.

A speech that indulges in outrageous and discredited conspiracy theories is not the speech of a person with the courage and the will to seek peace.

Despite all of this, the United States remains fully prepared and eager to pursue peace. We have done nothing to prejudge the final borders of Jerusalem. We have done nothing to alter the status of the holy sites. We remain committed to the possibility and potential of two states, if agreed to by the parties.

Just as it did with Egypt, peace requires compromise. It requires solutions that take into account the core interests of all sides. And that is what the United States is focused on for the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Hate-filled speeches and end-runs around negotiations take us nowhere. Ultimately, peace will not be achieved without leaders with courage.

King Hussein of Jordan was another such leader. In 1994, he ended 46 years of war and entered into a peace agreement with Israel that holds to this day. When King Hussein signed the peace treaty, he said this: “These are the moments in which we live, the past and the future. When we come to live next to each other, as never before, we will be doing so, Israelis and Jordanians,
together, without the need for any to observe our actions or supervise our endeavors. This is peace with dignity; this is peace with commitment.”

I ask here today, where is the Palestinian King Hussein? Where is the Palestinian Anwar Sadat? If President Abbas demonstrates he can be that type of leader, we would welcome it. His recent actions demonstrate the total opposite.

The United States remains deeply committed to helping the Israelis and the Palestinians reach a historic peace agreement that brings a better future to both peoples, just as we did successfully with the Egyptians and the Jordanians. But we will not chase after a Palestinian leadership that lacks what is needed to achieve peace. To get historic results, we need courageous leaders. History has provided such leaders in the past. For the sake of the Palestinian and Israeli people, we pray it does so again.
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