

Response

Mr Speaker,

I would like to thank the honorable member for his contribution to the argument and regardless of it's credibility a lot of effort was clearly put into the post. I will happily address the issues that the member has raised.

>Canadian intervention abroad has never been unilateral and has always been in assistance to its allies, which Canada have a vested interest in maintaining close relationships with.

Canada's trade will not be effected by withdrawing from the middle east. I would not agree with my friend that the relationship between Canada and her allies would be put in harm's way at all as a result of our withdrawal. People aren't suddenly going to stop trading with us, countries will not be shutting their embassies and I just don't see the credibility in the argument that we should continue to intervene in the civil wars abroad for the sake of a 'vested interest' with a handful of countries for reasons that will be addressed as I look further into the arguments being presented.

>In regards to "imperialist" American and British actions, I can only assume that my esteemed colleague is referring to the Middle East conflicts over the past decade or so.

This is correct but also the United States role in toppling democratically elected governments across the globe too.

>The actions taken in this region have been nothing but imperialist, rather a securing of interests abroad.

I'm going to give my friend the benefit of the doubt and assume that he meant to state the actions were ****not**** imperialist as I think that was what was intended. I believe that if one actually looks at what Imperialism is, one could easily see that these acts of war were Imperialist.

I would ask my friend, does he agree that the United States of America and the United Kingdom (to a much lesser extent than the US) have extended their country's influence and power in the region/country through the use of their

military with regards to the war in Iraq? In my opinion, they have and I believe they have been imperialistic in their actions.

>You see, terrorist organizations in the Middle East not only pose a threat to crucial oil supplies in the area, but they are also inherently in opposition to the ideals that the Western world stands for.

These terrorist organizations are gaining lots of support from the native and recruits from the people as they have support from many of the people. Our best course of action is to look at why these people are becoming radicalized and I think the answer to that is that the people resent foreign powers coming to their country and occupying it, they resent foreign powers bombing their people whilst claiming to be the saviors of them and they blame us, the West, and they begin their journey to radicalization and end up joining ISIL.

We need to attack ISIL's ability to recruit to deliver any serious blow, we need to stop the resentment among the natives, we need to stop giving ISIL justification by bombing citizens, regardless of whether it is indirectly or not. If we cease bombing and pull out of the middle east, the people aren't being bombed, they aren't being resentful of the Westerners killing civilians but grow resentful of ISL instead, the folks who are enforcing an ideology and way of life on them and are causing continuous war in the region. This is the way to combat ISIL effectively.

>Values such as freedom, democracy, and proper rule of law are the subject of attack by Islamic extremists belonging to Daesh. To simply extract ourselves from the conflict which we have immersed ourselves in through intervention would be devastating to the region and to the Western world, as the organizations that are the subject of NATO airstrikes would be allowed to flourish in the Middle East.

I completely disagree with what the member is saying here. I do not believe for one moment that Canada ceasing airstrikes would be detrimental to the stability of the middle east, I think our air strikes are actually sustaining ISIL's propaganda machine as stated above. I would like to make this very serious point, a point I consider so important it will be bolded, ****This motion is on behalf of Canada, we are stopping Canadian airstrikes and our airstrikes alone. The foreign policy of other countries involved in the middle east is their business, not ours.**** I think my friend really couldn't make the distinction between stopping Canada's airstrikes and all Western involvement in the middle east. I hope that clears it up.

>How can one label the fighting of a terrorist organization as an imperialist act?

I think it's fair to say you are deliberately misinterpreting me there. I believe you are far too intelligent to have genuinely misinterpreted it but let me clear it up. The

US and UK invading Iraq to extend its power, as you said, further their interests with the use of their military ****WAS**** Imperialism. These civil wars are a ***result*** of imperialism.

>This displays a startling disregard for not just the security of the Western world, but for the security of Canada herself.

Naturally, I disagree with this conclusion. I believe Canada and the Western World are safer when following non-interventionist foreign policies. We should only be involved in wars when our allies are attacked or there is a violation of an agreement by a country and a threatened invasion of another following said agreement. There are a few more reasons I would state but none include wanting oil or to establish influence in regions.

>This statement is truly absurd, and I would urge all members of Parliament to take notice of the substance within it.

Feel free, I meant every word.

>My colleague brings up a real problem: the natives of countries in the Middle East are not exactly enthused about the presence of foreign military forces within their borders.

I would add they also don't like being bombed to bits by said foreign military forces.

>I would like to think that members of NATO and Canada herself have a moral obligation to rid the world of an organization that openly commits acts of terror against the Western world, murders citizens within their own countries, and rapes women and children in the name of their movement.

I admit, I'm sad you didn't elaborate on the real problem you mentioned but I digress. I'm not in anyway supporting the actions of ISIL but I don't think bombing the hell out of the country indiscriminately killing civilians is really the kind of thing that you can expect the citizens of those countries to thank you for. I would propose supporting Kurdish and rebel forces with financial aid on behalf of NATO and allow them to purchase the weaponry they need to combat the evil terrorists threatening our way of life. I think that is a plan I could get behind in such a drastic situation, instead of putting Canadian lives at risk.

>These soldiers which you almost describe as being led to the slaughter are fighting for their country, fighting to rid the world of the horrors that exist currently within the Middle East. I cannot imagine a more justifiable cause.

I do not doubt the bravery and courage of the soldiers bravely fighting the terrorists. I doubt the bravery and courage of the men pulling the strings behind it all. I think the soldiers from the West are currently dying needlessly in the conflict to be honest and it's a very sad situation. No more Canadians need to die in this conflict is what I'll stress, we can win it without military action by arming the Kurds and supporting them financially. I would urge all members not to confuse their love and respect for our soldiers and members of the airforce with failed interventionist foreign policies.

>People like the Kurds have no means to arm themselves except arms which we provide them with and financial support.

Since it is such a drastic situation with a terrorist group attacking major cities of the west I think financial support for the Kurds for them to purchase arms with may be warranted.

>A total pulling out as you would suggest would leave this group, which happens to be Pro-Western, to be decimated by organizations such as Daesh.

This isn't true at all, the brave Kurdish forces have been giving ISIL hell with outdated weaponry and minimal funding. They truly are giving them hell with minimal resources and Turkey breathing down their backs. They are a brave spirited people who deserve a nation state of their own to call home, in my opinion.

>We intervened many years ago, and we have to live with this decision and shape our foreign policy accordingly.

I disagree, the US misled the coalition going into Iraq. The US alone should face the consequences of them misleading other countries.

>Our acts in the Middle East may have fueled a manipulated perception of hate that is used as a tool by Daesh, but it is the purpose of the cause that we must stay true to: keeping Daesh from preventing any more violent acts, both in the region and abroad.

We aren't able to keep ISIL from preventing further acts of violence with airstrikes in fact continued airstrikes didn't stop Paris, Orlando, Nice. They didn't stop any of them. Our current policy isn't working and is probably doing more harm than good especially for the poor innocent folks that are being indiscriminately harmed by western bombings.

>Civil wars happen to be the most dangerous threat the Middle East faces today, and will continue to be the most dangerous threat for decades to come.

These Civil wars were caused by American interventionism for the most part. America caused the radicalization we see today and these civil wars in the Middle East are Middle Eastern problems, not American problems and not Western problems.

>The result of civil wars can be a reform of the previous government, or it can be the establishment of a tyrannical one. It is important that we stay close to our allies in the region for the purpose of securing their safety, aiding them in the fight against Daesh, and keeping a hold on the vast amount of natural resources on which most of the world relies on, oil.

Firstly, I don't believe in sending Canadians to die for Oil. I'm a Libertarian so you know I value liberty, individual freedoms and right to self determination above all but there will be democratic institutions in place when the people will for there to be democratic institutions. We cannot shove democracy down these people's throats when they show no want for it.

>No nation should have a policy of "interventionism", or "non-interventionism." Every situation should be gauged and weighed differently before acting, and every situation is unique in its foreign policy requirements.

Even with a pragmatic view of interventionism, the middle east was an interventionist disaster. I really outlined the ways which I personally believe would warrant involving Canada getting into wars and I don't think these civil wars warrant intervention, especially when there are fighters on the ground already combating ISIL like the Kurds, pro-democracy rebels, Iraqi forces and Syrian government.

>Immediate pulling out is detrimental to interests in the near-term, and long-term.

This point has been repeated multiple times through your argument and I completely disagree. I do not believe for one second that Canadian airstrikes are of such significant importance to the fight against ISIL.

> It would undermine any stability we have attempted to establish and would instead create a huge power vacuum.

I don't think it's fair to say we are establishing stability. Stability is what we destroyed when Iraq was invaded. We completely destabilized this region with the US misleading us.

Mr Speaker,

I think I fairly responded to my friend's argument and thank him for his contribution. I would plead with every man and women in this house to consider the innocent Civilians who are suffering as a consequence of our interventionism, consider that we can help so much more through financial aid to Kurds than our Airstrikes ever could accomplish and consider the Canadians no longer in harm's way as a result of this motion passing.

Thank you.