

Europe

Lecture 19

POL 312Y Canadian Foreign Policy

Professor John Kirton

University of Toronto

John Kirton, February 25, 2010

Introduction: Canada's European Policy Assessed

Significance

Canada is inherently a European country, in so many ways.

Geographically, Canada borders on three European countries — France through St. Pierre and Miquelon, Denmark through Greenland to the east of Hans Island, and Russia over the North Pole. Canada's geographic ties are thus equally with western Europe, eastern Europe through Russia, and the United States. France is almost as close as the United States.

Ecologically, Canada is bound to Europe by the North Atlantic Gulf Stream, the fish in the North Atlantic, the fur trade, persistent organic pollutants in the Arctic, and climate change everywhere.¹ Its ecological ties embrace living things, water, air and even land in the form of the ice that connects the two.

Demographically, most of Canada's people came from Europe, first from today's Russia in the Northwest, then Scandinavia in the east, and then the French in the east and into the interior and the British and Irish everywhere (Bothwell 2006). Canada has largely been populated by their descendants and later arrivals from all over Europe to this day.

Culturally, Europe's languages, legal systems, religions and social values are in many ways Canada's most used and cherished ones (Helliwell 2002).

Economically, Europe was the primary source of the markets, capital, management and technology that propelled Canada's rise as an industrial country.

Militarily, Canada was fought over, conquered and colonized by Europeans. Reciprocally Europe is largely where Canada fought its two major, long, most deadly wars and two of its more recent ones.² It is where Canada maintained its only overseas peacetime military alliance with stationed land, sea and air forces for over 40 years. Here, among the major powers, Canada has always fought alongside Britain and France, and both with and against Russia, Germany and Italy.³

¹ It was the Gulfstream that led the Vikings to establish the first permanent, if not continuous, European settlement in Canada, at L'Anse Aux Meadows, Newfoundland.

² General war has a decisive impact in altering relative capabilities (and the processes of interdependence that flow from them), determining victors, vanquished, and allies, and establishing international institutions which the victors dominate. The minor wars are the Balkans from 1992–95 (including Medak Pocket in September 1993) and Kosovo in 1999.

³ It has also defended, liberated and fought alongside middle power Netherlands, bilingual Belgium and Poland.

Institutionally, Canada is connected to Europe through a dense, cumulative, multifunctional web of plurilateral intergovernmental institutions: first by the Commonwealth and Francophonie, then by the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), the International Energy Agency (IEA), the Group of Seven (G7) — now Eight (G8), the North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO), and finally since 1991, by the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Arctic Council and the Group of Twenty (G20).

Politically, Canada remains the British North American polity that it began as in 1753 and the francophone country where it started more than 400 years ago with its first permanent settlement at Quebec City in 1608. Europe has served as the first target of Canada's recurrent efforts to broaden, diversify, and balance its relationship with the United States. Indeed, Canadian governments that wish to distance and differentiate Canada from the U.S. traditionally look first to Europe. Mackenzie King did it in 1935 and 1938 when he forged the reciprocal trade agreements with Britain and the U.S. in the North Atlantic triangle (Brebner 1945). Lester Pearson and Louis St. Laurent did it in the late 1940s when they joined with Britain and France to create the plurilateral NATO, with a strong Article 2 and 5, and the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), as an addition or alternative to continental security and trade arrangements with the U.S. alone. John Diefenbaker did it in 1957 when he proposed to divert 15 percent of Canadian trade from the U.S. to Britain. Pierre Trudeau did it in his 1968 and 1970 foreign policy doctrines, and subsequent contractual link with Europe to diversify Canadian relationships from the U.S. (Department of External Affairs 1970). Brian Mulroney listed Britain and France, along with the U.S. and Israel, as Canada's "four friends" in the world. Jean Chrétien focused his bilateral visits on Britain and France, maintained Canadian troops in combat roles in Bosnia, helped liberate Kosovo in 1999, and promoted a trans-Atlantic free trade area (TAFTA) in 1994. Paul Martin, once he was safely elected as prime minister, quickly toured Europe. Stephen Harper in his first campaign platform put Britain as one of Canada's four priority partners, sent his foreign minister, Peter MacKay, to Europe on his first visit abroad, concluded Canada's first European bilateral free trade agreement beyond Britain with the European Free Trade Area (EFTA) in 2008, and then opened negotiations for a full free trade plus agreement with the European Union (EU) itself.

Canada is thus inherently as much of a European country as a North American one. Indeed, Canada has had **special relationships**, similar to those with the US, with Britain for much longer, with the Netherlands since 1945, increasingly with France after 1981, and now even with Germany too (Massie 2009: 235-236, Dolata-Kreutskamp 2008).

The Debate

With Europe looming so large in Canadian life, it is not surprising that Canadian foreign policy toward Europe is marked by much the same debate that flourishes over Canadian foreign policy as a whole.

The first, currently dominant school of **marginalists**, follow a peripheral dependence (PD) logic (Nossal 1992; Hettmann 1996, Long 2003, Bernard-Meunier 2006). Its adherents argue that Canada figures only marginally, occasionally and decreasingly in Europe, pursuing a reactive policy, heavily constrained by a strengthening EU and by Canada's close proximity to the United States. In regard to Germany, Europe's most powerful polity, the marginalists argue that "each seems to realize that the other is simply a good friend pursuing its own special interests. There is some disillusionment about the other's foreign policy initiatives and general directions, whether it

is Canadians looking at Germany's Afghanistan policy or Germans looking at Canada's Arctic policy" (Dolata-Kreutzkamp 2008: 528).

A second, school of **multilateralists**, relies on a liberal internationalist (LI) logic. It counters that Canada can and should "work with a small group of Europeans who have their own reasons for being particularly unsettled by the current state of the Atlantic community, to restore transatlantic links and ensure a revived and continuing American commitment to the alliance" (Pentland 2003–04, 147). It points to Canada's successful human security crusades with the Scandinavians, Dutch and Belgians during the Axworthy years. In regard to Canada-German relations, it concludes, with the familiar emphasis on continuity, that "the relationship is a very durable one" (Dolata-Kreutzkamp and Kitchen 2008: 528).

A third school of **expansionists**, consistent with complex neo-realist (CNR) logic, sees instead an "important expansion of Canada's embedded Eurocentricity" especially during the Chrétien years (Kirton 2000a, 8, Bartleman 2005, 59–83). This school looks beyond the traditional focus on north western Europe and how the end of the Cold War impaired transatlantic cohesion within the old NATO. Instead, it embraces the newly expanded Europe, with Russia now a partner, pulling together to conquer the new security threats of genocide in Kosovo, environmental assaults on the Atlantic, Arctic and global climate, the proliferation of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Afghanistan and Pakistan and Iran, and a global financial and economic crises since 2008. In regards to Canada-German relations, it emphasizes the "third dimension," where each look to the other to locate best domestic practices and "deal with each other in regionally or internationally mediated ways via institutions such as the EU, NAFTA, NATO, UN, G8 or transatlantic forums" (Dolata-Kreutzkamp and Kitchen 2008: 529).

The Thesis of Canada's Embedded, Expanding Eurocentricity

This third school, enhanced to highlight Canada's **embedded, expanding Eurocentricity**, most accurately accounts for Canadian foreign policy toward Europe since 1945. For Canada has been not only inherently but also increasingly a European country, due primarily to the growing new vulnerabilities faced by a rising, expanding, integrating Europe unable to cope on its own.

This increase has not been continuous, but driven by changing power, polarity and war in the world. In the broadest terms, Europe first created and defended Canada from 1608 to 1913, then Canada defended Europe from 1914 to 1963. Next, France from Europe sought to destroy Canada from 1963 to 1981, but now Canada is again defending a newly vulnerable Europe in the post cold war world. The rise of America's imperial foreign policy role in Vietnam, as charted by the meta-model of hegemonic transition, did much to drive de Gaulle's attack.

Since 1945 the key question for Canada has not been "whether Europe" but "how much" Europe it should have in its foreign policy mix, "which" Europe it should focus on, and "how" to shape its relationship with Europe. The traditional answers have been, in turn, to focus on Europe first (before, after or along with the U.S.), to focus on the North Atlantic parent countries of Britain and later France, and to focus on the Atlantic institutions of NATO, the OECD, and the European-dominated Permanent Five (P5) members of the United Nations Security Council (UNSC).

Right after World War II, this traditional Euro-Atlantic centricity represented a **rational response** to the real centres of power, polarity, partnership, and international institutional predominance in the world. Despite the commanding lead of a hegemonic U.S., in 1950 **Britain** was the world's second-ranked power, with 15 percent of U.S. gross national product (GNP). **France** came third

with 9 percent, **Germany** fourth with 7.4 percent, and the **USSR** fifth with 6 percent.⁴ Canada had just fought two long, major, costly **wars** in Europe in the previous 30 years, as an ally of Britain and France throughout. Canada had just moved into a new cold war with the neighbouring USSR. Britain, France, and the western European middle powers of the Netherlands, Belgium and the Scandinavians were the leading **democracies**, a rather rare political species in an ideologically divided world. And Canada had just succeeded, through persistent middle power diplomacy, in assisting in the birth of a UN whose Security Council joined the U.S. to Britain, France, and the Soviet Union, and of a **NATO** managed by the U.S. along with Britain, France, and Germany in the exclusive Berlin Dinner Four.⁵

On the home front, Canada was overwhelmingly a European society and state. Most Canadians had immigrated, many quite recently, from Britain, France, Ireland, and now Germany and Italy as well. They brought their languages, legal systems, and dense social, cultural, and personal ties with families and friends back home. The memories of fighting alongside Britain, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium in the world wars were fresh in the minds of the millions of Canadian veterans, some of whom filled the hall for St. Laurent's historic Gray Lecture address. Canada had only recently, and still not completely, acquired formal independence from Britain. Within the state most of the Canadian foreign policy elite, led by Lester Pearson himself, had received their higher education and world view in Britain, or on the battlefields in and over northwestern Europe and the Atlantic seas.⁶

More than half a century later, in the post–Cold War era, this traditional focus on the old Europe made far less sense. By 1992, Britain had plummeted to become the world's sixth-ranked power. France had slipped to fourth. The USSR had downsized into a remnant Russia that at best stood eighth. Within Europe, capability had shifted to the southeast powers starting with a third-ranked reunified rising Germany, and fifth-ranked Italy. Arising also was a newly liberated belt of now accessible, market-oriented, democratic middle powers in central and eastern Europe. In the 1990–91 Gulf **war** and the subsequent ones in the former Yugoslavia, Britain, France, and the Netherlands were joined by Italy, Spain, and even Germany in fighting at Canada's side. Within western Europe the centrepiece of **regional order** had become the new EU, a veritable political “Pacman Europe” gobbling up into an even more supranational superpower the old northwestern democratic middle powers of Ireland, the Netherlands, Belgium and some Scandinavians—which had long served as Canada's closest soul mates. The EU was joined by new, expanded, **plurilateral regional institutions** in which Canada was a full founding member—the OSCE, the EBRD, NATO's North Atlantic Cooperation Council, and the Arctic Council. Together they created a common European homeland extending from Vancouver to Vladivostok. And the UNSC P5 was superseded and set aside by the **G8**, with Russia as a full member after 1998, in the war to liberate Kosovo from genocide in 1999.

At home, Canada's new waves of immigrants came more from southeastern, central and eastern Europe and Russia and from other parts of the world. And not since 1984 had an elected Canadian prime minister studied or served in military uniform, over, on, or around European soil.⁷

⁴ Counts of relative capabilities focusing on defence spending, globally deployed military forces, and possession of nuclear weapons tell a similar tale.

⁵ This itself was an expansion of the earlier North Atlantic triangle and World War II alliance.

⁶ The only Canadian prime minister with another citizenship was John Turner, who had a British one.

⁷ At the ministerial level, the two exceptions are: Bill Graham, Canada's foreign minister under Jean Chrétien and Paul Martin, who had, like Pierre Trudeau, studied in France, and unlike Trudeau, been a member of France's naval cadets; and Pierre Pettigrew, who served as minister of international trade and of foreign affairs under the same prime ministers, and studied in England. In the early Harper

The Old Biases of Embedded Eurocentricity

Yet despite the changing world, Canadian foreign policy still showed an irrational toward the old Europe, an attachment to the British and French parent countries, and a benign, bridge-building approach to Russia. Canada accepted without protest the centrality of a UNSC dominated by Britain, France, and Russia, and a nuclear war committed NATO dominated by the Berlin Dinner Four, bodies both formed 60 years before. This continuing bias toward an “old Europe” increasingly separated Canadian foreign policy from the new sources of power and potential partners in the world and from the people and political leaders within Canada itself.

Several forces caused this bias. The most general one flows from the principal power paradox. That is, Canada had enough relative invulnerability and capability to remain internationally maladjusted for a long time without paying an unsustainable price. Thus it could continue to focus on declining powers such as France, whose traditional foreign policy values (such as nuclear weapons, overseas intelligence services, and even what some saw as state terrorism) were antithetical to Canada’s. But Canada’s greatest vulnerability and resulting national unity imperative rationally demanded that France come first. For on the list of national interests, survival came first, legitimacy in the middle and relative capability last.

Three specific factors also played a part. The first, at the **international** level, was Canada’s uncritical internationalist attachment to inherited institutions embedding a 1945 Eurocentric order, notably the UNSC P5 and NATO, and a historical tendency to defer to European-dominated clubs, such as the newer Bosnia Contact Group.⁸ Second, at the **societal** level, stood a demographically and politically dominant anglophone and francophone population in central and eastern Canada, a media corps and thus public opinion still heavily focused on Britain and France, and shared national values that made Canada more a British North European country than a pan-European one. Third, at the **state** level lay an organizational inertia in the foreign policy establishment, grounded in the large complements of Canada’s three missions in Brussels, three missions in Paris (to France, the OECD and UNESCO), two missions in Geneva, and the natural personal interest of prime ministers who since 1968, with only four brief exceptions, came from Quebec.⁹

The New Breadth of Expanded Eurocentricity

Yet amidst this continuing bias, there was also substantial change, coming at an accelerating pace in the post–Cold War years. It added to Canada’s long embedded Eurocentricity an expanding engagement in four major ways.

The first was **expanded involvement**, in military, political, diplomatic, and economic forms. After 1993, Canada was again going to war in, with and against Europe. By 2008 it was again concluding free trade deals with countries there.

government, Defence Minister Gordon O’Connor had served as a general with the Canadian forces stationed in continental Europe.

⁸ Europe remains the region where there is the most diffuse array of major powers, and the most who were victors, Canadian allies, and international institutional leaders from the last general war.

⁹ Mila Mulrone was the first prime ministerial spouse to come from Europe, from the former Yugoslavia, in southeastern Europe in her case.

The second was a **shift to the southeast**, which added the states of central and eastern Europe, the former Soviet Union, the Balkans, and the southern tier to Canada's previous partnerships with the Atlantic powers of the northwest.

The third was a **multidimensional engagement**. This was led by more active military and economic initiatives from a Canada again engaged in combat on and with the continent, seeking and securing free trade with countries there and partnering in successful ecological and other campaigns to shape world order.

The fourth was a new generation of **regional institution building**, to form a more inclusive, trans-Atlantic post-Cold War order from Vancouver to Vladivostok. This new approach to regional and global order included the Russians and eastern Europeans, embraced a trans-Atlantic and trans-Arctic Europe, was plurilateral in character, grounded in cooperative security, and gave Canada a more equal place than the P5 or NATO with its Berlin Dinner dominance ever did.

This new expansive Eurocentricity was driven by four **external** determinants. The first was intensifying interdependence and emerging **inter-vulnerability**, particularly in the fields of investment, migration, ecology in the North Atlantic and over the North Pole, terrorism, genocide and financial crisis. The second was the changing global distribution of **capability**, notably the rise of once defeated but a now unified Germany and Italy, and, a reviving Russia, Ukraine and Poland. The third was the change in **polarity**, notably the end of the Cold War and the old need for Atlantic solidarity, the new freedom to forge links with post-communist countries, and the new need to construct international institutions that more equally embraced both western and eastern Europe in a deepening democratic club. The fourth was the central **international institutional** connections created by a host of new plurilateral institutions, above all the G7/8.

Yet Canada's expanding Eurocentricity was grounded in four highly salient **societal** forces that together placed Europe, along with the U.S., at its foreign policy core. The first was an acute - **national unity** imperative that forced Canada to cultivate excellent relations with France and with its neighbour Germany as a constraint on France. The second was Canada's more **diverse demography**, easily open to the new Europe of the democratizing east and south. The third was a **media image** that accorded a substantial, attractive, if mythologically bound, place to a newly expanded Europe. The fourth was an entrenched **public opinion** that increasingly recognized and respected the many values that Canada and pan-Europeans shared.

A Geopolitical Gravity Model

To explain and evaluate in the broadest terms the expanding importance of the new Europe in Canada's foreign policy, it is useful to construct and apply a **geopolitical gravity model** of Canada's involvement, influence, and impact in different geographic regions of the world. As the geopolitical equivalent of the gravity model economists use to explain a country's international trade flows, this model centres on the weight, distance, and openness of geographically grounded countries abroad, relative to Canada at the centre. In political terms, these variables translate into the number and relative capability of principal and middle powers in the region as a gravitational pull attracting Canadian behaviour, the distance of the region from Canada (with distance degrading the attractational capability pull), and the democratic nature of the principal and lesser powers in the region, which create inter-political and inter-societal connections and allow Canada's soft and hard power to penetrate with added weight.¹⁰ The geopolitical version of the

¹⁰ Distance can be measured variously from the geographic centre of the countries, from their national capitals, from their closest land or maritime extensions (and respective border crossings or ports), from

gravity model adds one uniquely political variable—the history of fighting and winning wars together in the past. For this brings the material legacy of war graves, war brides, war monuments and allies and the socially constructed memories and myths that endure (Kirton 1993). The model parsimoniously highlights the range of external systemic and relational variables that matter, explains Canada’s behaviour in a region, and provides a baseline for predicting and measuring how rational Canada’s response to systemic changes has been.

As Appendix A shows, Europe looms large as a source of global power. In weight, it has generally growing relative capability as a region with a GDP and population surpassing that of North America itself. It has the largest number of principal powers of any region—five now that Russia has politically joined, and several rising middle powers. In distance, it has three countries neighbouring Canada with a long common icebound and maritime boundary to the north and east, and proximate capitals (starting with Reykjavik and Dublin) by air. In openness it has virtually complete democratization. There are a large number of allies with which Canada has fought and won wars in the past. Most notably, Canada has fought all its major victoriously concluded wars there—in the northwest from 1914 to 1918, and 1939 to 1945, in the southeast in the Balkans from 1992 to 1995, in the Atlantic in 1995, and in Kosovo in 1999. Indeed, when Canada goes to war, it does so with and for Britain and France, even more than the US. There is thus much in an expanding Europe to pull Canada in. Beyond, and in some ways even before, the United States and North America, Europe ranks for Canada as region number one.

Canada’s Changing Approach, 1945–93

The St. Laurent Years

As Canada’s post-1945 foreign policy began, Europe’s centrality was clear. Despite the sudden appearance of a hegemonic American superpower, the St. Laurent government lived largely in an Atlanticist northwest Eurocentric world. St. Laurent’s Gray lecture put Britain in first place and France in third as Canada’s priority partners. Thanks to the Commonwealth Heads of Government Meetings (CHOGMs) every other year—Canada’s only summit-level institution during that era—Britain ranked high in Canada’s summit diplomacy as well. As Europe recovered from the war, trans-Atlantic trade revived. Canada provided post-war economic and military assistance to Britain and continental Atlantic Europe. From 1951 onward Canada stationed large amounts of much-needed front-line air and ground forces on continental European soil on the front lines of the east-west divide (Bercusson 1992).¹¹ Although plunged into an all-Canadian version of the Cold War by the 1945 Gouzenko affair, Canada still pursued building bridges building across the Iron Curtain. In 1954 Pearson became the first NATO foreign minister to visit the Soviet Union.

In the late 1940s, Canada crafted a distinctive vision of regional order. It centred on a multilateral, politically, and socially driven North Atlantic democratic community, in a way that Karl Deutsch (1957) rather than Henry Kissinger (1964) would applaud. Canada also conceived of an Arctic council, which would bring the Nordics and Soviet Union together over the North Pole. Such designs fell prey to the Cold War that created NATO as a permanently U.S.-

the length of their common land or maritime borders, and from the number of countries in the region bordering others. While trade economists might favour economic equivalents—such as shipping or freight rates, political scientists using a geopolitical model should focus on the speed, security, and effectiveness of deploying troops and other military assets—a task in which, even in an age of globalization, the importance of geography looms large.

¹¹ Canada’s participation in the Berlin airlift of 1948?

commanded military alliance, and ultimately the North American Aerospace Defense (NORAD). Another victim of that coming cold war was St. Laurent's vision in the late 1940s of a regional institution embracing all Arctic powers, including Canada's recent Soviet ally, up north. Yet Canada did secure its cherished multilateral NATO, there to rush to a vulnerable America's defence when the world changed on September 11, 2007.

The Diefenbaker Years

John Diefenbaker came into office in 1957 promising European-centred diversification. He began in the northwest with Britain, with a commitment to divert 15 percent of Canadian trade from the U.S. to Britain. He suggested a Canada-UK free trade agreement. Yet when Britain proved eager, Diefenbaker backed off. While his summitry still showed the importance of Britain, there was less substance underneath. In regard to the USSR, Diefenbaker began as a firm anticommunist, but ended trying to give disarmament a real chance. In that he largely failed, amidst the nuclear weapons controversy and proliferation of 1963. Diefenbaker wished to reform NATO in keeping with Canada's 1947 conception. But Canada got nuclear weapons from its presumed NATO obligations instead. Equally unrealized was Diefenbaker's initial Arctic vision of "roads to - resources" to develop the Canadian North. However in 1960 Canada was admitted as a founding member to the Atlantic-centred OECD.

The Pearson Years

If St. Laurent and Diefenbaker both tried and failed to diversify toward Europe, Pearson was the one prime minister who did not even try. The gravitational and global crowd out of America's imperial ascendance was just too strong. While the CHOGM kept Pearson connected to Britain at the summit level, the changing Commonwealth community directed him to the newly independent leaders in the Caribbean closer to home. To Britain's south, he was bewildered by the demands from a more powerful and assertive France, such as requests to buy Canadian uranium and have Canada buy French civilian airplanes rather than American ones. Pearson's one innovation was greater engagement, led by wheat sales with the USSR. When Charles de Gaulle ordered NATO out of France, Pearson's preferred institutional connector with the continent was downgraded to a significant degree. At the end of his tenure Pearson's original conception of an Atlantic community began to take life in NATO's Harmel Report.

The Trudeau Years

With Trudeau came a major change, both in initiative and results. From the very start, Trudeau doctrinally put diversification with Europe in first place and went well beyond Britain and France in its pursuit. His summit diplomacy showed he meant it. Through a new partnership with the rising continental power of Germany, cemented in the Canadian purchase of German Leopard tanks and Trudeau's personal friendship with German Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, Trudeau delivered on diversification. He did so despite such obstacles as Britain's 1973 entry into the European Community and Canada's sanctioning of several European countries over their weak nuclear safeguards. By 1976, Trudeau had his desired contractual link with Europe, from which a host of new economic partnerships flowed.

Militarily, Trudeau first reduced the number and nuclear roles of Canadian forces stationed in the European theatre of NATO in 1969, as De Gaulle's France had done a few years before. Yet in 1978, under the growing impact of the new Cold War, he readily agreed to a NATO-wide commitment to increase Canada's defence spending by 3 percent in real terms per year. At the same time, from his early visits to the USSR, through his involvement in the new CSCE in the mid-1970s, to his concluding peace initiative in 1983-84, he sought to penetrate the Iron Curtain

at a level and with an intensity and consistency never seen before. In his diplomacy over the Arctic, centred on the 1970 *Arctic Waters Pollution Prevention Act*, Canada's historical partnerships within Europe were reversed, with similarly ice-covered Russia as the primary ally and maritime power Britain standing at first on the other side (Kirton and Munton 1992). During this time a new set of plurilateral institutions emerged with the embracive CSCE in 1973, the IEA in 1974 and Canada's associate membership in the European Space Agency.

The Mulroney Years

Mulroney's foreign policy vision put Britain and France, along with the U.S. and Israel, in the front ranks as Canada's best friends. It centred on cultivating a supportive personal relationship with French president François Mitterrand. Mulroney's summit diplomacy showed he succeeded. Militarily, Mulroney first moved Canadian forces out of their very safe location in Lahr, Germany, in 1992. He soon shifted them to the southeast, inserting them alongside the French, into the very dangerous Sarajevo that same spring (Donneur and Roussel 1996). In June 1992, following the European Council Summit, Canada pressed successfully at the Munich G7 Summit to endow these forces with a combat role—by endorsing the use of “all necessary means” to deliver humanitarian relief. In September 1993, with former defence minister Kim Campbell now prime minister, these Canadian forces went to war, initiating and winning the Battle of Medak Pocket in Croatia (Windsor 2005, 2000; Off 2004).

In the economic field, immediately after the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (CUFTA) was concluded, Mulroney pursued diversification with Europe. The effort soon produced the Transatlantic Declaration by the European Community and Canada, issued on November 22, 1990. Signed in Rome by Mulroney and Italian prime minister Giulio Andreotti, it formalized high-level political ties between the Canadian prime minister and foreign minister and their European Union counterparts. When, in 1992, a transforming Russia requested financial assistance from the G7 to support its democratic reforms, Mulroney's response, like Helmut Kohl's in Germany, was “we say yes.”

The Chrétien-Martin Years, 1993–2005

When the Chrétien government took office in 1993, early scholarly assessments suggested that Europe was being downgraded in Canadian foreign policy and that Canada was becoming marginalized in European affairs (Nossal 1992; Hettmann 1996). Indeed, the February 1995 Statement appeared to deprive Europe of the centrality it had long enjoyed (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] 1995). The new Team Canada missions took five years before they reached Europe. In 1994, there were free trade agreements with the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and promises of ones with the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum and in the Americas, but not in Europe. Militarily, the Chrétien government signalled a clear desire to take out of the Balkans the Canadian forces Mulroney had just put in.

Yet these appearances were misleading. For from the very start, with increasing force, Chrétien's focus on Europe acquired a full-strength, comprehensive character that Canada's relationships with other overseas regions largely lacked (Kirton 2000a; Bartleman 2005, 59–83).

The Doctrine of February 7, 1995

To be sure, Chrétien's 1995 foreign policy statement left Europe and the transatlantic partnership off the list of rising centres of power in the post-Cold War world. But it also noted the rise of the European Union as a political, economic, and security actor, central and eastern Europe as a new

centre of gravity, the “potential of Russia as a major partner,” the conflict in the former Yugoslavia and the ethnic and religious challenges it brought. It concluded Canada “cannot rely on rigid adherence to only traditional relationships with old partners ... **Variable alliances** will increasingly become a pattern in international relations” (DFAIT 1995). The doctrine also declared Canada to be a key trade partner of the EU, the U.S., and Japan in the Trade Ministers Quadrilateral, the fixed trade ministers forum of the G7.

Resource Distributions

Embedded, expanding Eurocentricity was evident in Chrétien’s **summit diplomacy**. During his first year, Chrétien gave the U.S. six visits, but France and Britain five each (Kirton 1996). During his first full mandate, from October 25, 1993, to April 7, 1997, France came first with 20 visits, followed by the U.S. with 17, Britain 15, Russia 11, Italy 11, and Germany 11. In bilateral visits France also came first with six, followed by Britain, Russia, and Germany with three apiece. Only then came the U.S., tied with Italy at two each. The Quebec referendum and national unity imperative put **France first**. In 2003, during his last year in office, Chrétien planned no visit to the U.S., but took several European tours—in March to the Netherlands, Britain, and Italy, to the EU Summit in Greece in May, and to EU and G8 summits in Russia and France in June.

Canada’s **diplomatic deployments** from 1980 to 1995, also put Europe first. It had double the totals of North America or South America and still 50 percent more than Asia by 1995. Indeed during the early Chrétien years, there was an increased post–Cold War concentration on Europe, as the portion of Canadian posts in the region rose from 26 percent in 1993 to 27 percent in 1995.

Military Engagement: The War in Bosnia and Kosovo

In the military sphere, Canada became more expansively engaged as well. Chrétien granted six-month extensions to Canadian military participation in the United Nations Protection Force (UNPROFOR) in the Balkans. He did so even as Canadian forces were taken hostage, and Canada remained excluded from the Bosnian Contact Group that gave overall political direction to the allied effort (Schwegmann 2001; Bartleman 2005, 114–34). Canada’s military involvement continued with the transition to the combat roles of first NATO’s Implementation Force (IFOR) and then its Stabilization Force in Bosnia and Herzegovina (SFOR), the latter designed to implement the Dayton Accords. In 1998, Canada joined with its European allies in a threat to pull out if the U.S. were to withdraw its forces as it seemed likely to do. The American—and thus the allied—forces, remained.

They went into action again over Kosovo in 1999 (Dashwood 2000, Heinbecker and MacRae 2001). In 1998, Canada had agreed to dispatch six CF-18 attack aircrafts to Aviano, Italy, for use against the Serbs committing atrocities in Kosovo. In February 1999, Canada announced it was prepared to use its CF-18s in air strikes if the peace talks failed and to send up to 800 ground troops to Kosovo as part of a 30,000-person NATO force to enforce a peace settlement. Such forces would be in addition to the 1,300 person battalion that Canada then maintained in Bosnia.¹² On March 24, 1999 it flew in the first wave of the air campaign against Serbia. It supported the G7’s subsequent threat to send the ground forces in.

¹² Canada’s 500–800-person contribution compared with the other pledges: Britain 8,000, France 7,000, U.S. 4,000, and Germany 3,000. Foreign minister Lloyd Axworthy stressed Canadian forces would go in as a peacekeeping force to administer a peace accord (as under the Dayton agreement in Bosnia). The New Democratic Party (NDP) supported the government action. At the time, Canada had 30 unarmed soldiers in Kosovo doing verification for the OSCE.

Three elements of this evolution are striking. The first is Canada's early, enduring, and expanding military engagement as a leading contributor, and its willingness to accept combat roles in situations of active conflict. The second is its strong alliance with France and Britain. The third is its successful pursuit of the diplomacy of combat, designed to get a reluctant, inward-looking, instinctively isolationist U.S. into military engagement in Europe.¹³ This was a replay of Canadian foreign policy against a reluctant America from 1914 to 1917 and again from 1939 to 1941. It was the diplomacy of combat, not the diplomacy of constraint. Canada was more successful in getting the US to fight for freedom in Europe from the start this time.

Three causes lay behind Canada's forceful, expansive southwestern European military engagement. The first was the enduring spectres of Sarajevo spiral of 1914 and 1939, which showed Canadians the imperative of injecting North American and European forces into Europe at an early stage to prevent the spread of a conflict that could expand to engulf all. The second, flowing from Canada's World War II experience and domestic composition as a multiethnic society, was its distinctive national value of multiculturalism, its strong concern with the rights of minorities, and a desire to prevent a genocide that might arise if incipient conflicts and repressive regimes were left unaddressed. The third, reflected in Canada's initial entry alongside France's Mitterrand, was the national unity imperative, and consequent need to show France and francophone Canadians the exceptional solidarity between the two countries and the capacity of a united Canada to come to France's aid.

The Canada-Spain Turbot War

Chrétien's Canada also went to war against, as well as alongside, Europe. The case where Canada's national interests as well as distinctive national values came together most strongly to produce a relatively pure pattern of CNR behaviour was the Turbot War against Spain in the spring of 1995 (Barry 1998; Keiver 1996; Schaefer 1995; Springer 1997; Tobin 2002; Bartleman 2005). Driven by the national interest of national unity and the distinctive national value of environmentalism, Canada unilaterally initiated the use of military force against a European middle power and NATO ally, to secure a revised global regime—the United Nations Agreement on Straddling and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks—a regime that successfully entrenched Canadian values into the international order in a highly multilateral legalized form.

Since the earliest negotiations for a United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), Canada had unsuccessfully sought provisions to manage adjacent fish stocks lying just outside national boundaries. As fishing stocks dwindled in the late 1980s and early 1990s, Canada secured ever stronger commitments from the G7 for improved enforcement against overfishing. At Canada's behest, the 1992 UN Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) recommended that the UN General Assembly (UNGA) convene a conference to deal with straddling stocks. By 1994 UNGA agreed that the result would be a binding treaty, as favoured by Canada, rather than the general guidelines favoured by the EU.

In May 1994, Canada unilaterally authorized Canadian enforcement of North Atlantic Fisheries Organization (NAFO) measures against non-NAFO members. Non-NAFO vessels thus stopped fishing straddling stocks in waters adjacent to Canada. The EU expressed concern. Canada then moved against U.S. boats on the West and East coasts in June and July. The U.S., without a deep interest in the East, tried in good LI fashion, to mediate there.

¹³ This is the opposite of the diplomacy of constraint or combining with middle powers to keep an eager U.S. out of military action. In a return to the dominant Canadian foreign policy imperative of 1914–17 and 1939–44, it was replaced by combining with other major powers to induce a reluctant, isolationist U.S. to come in.

In 1994, Ottawa also substantially reduced the turbot quota available to Canadian fishers. This provoked a confrontation between Quebec fishers in the Gaspésie and enforcement officers, at a time when a referendum on Quebec separation was drawing nigh. On February 1, 1995, NAFO agreed to Canada's request to reduce the total turbot quota in the high seas off Canada's East Coast from 60,000 to 27,000 metric tons. It gave Canada 16,500 metric tons (up from 6,000 the previous year), Spain and Portugal only 3,400, and other NAFO members 7,000.

The EU, which had traditionally harvested 70 percent of the turbot in the area, used NAFO rules to object and set its own quota of 19,000 metric tons. In response, Brian Tobin, Canada's Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, amended Canadian law to permit unilateral Canadian enforcement action against Spanish and Portuguese vessels. After Canada's offer of a moratorium was rejected, Canada sent patrol boats to the disputed zone. On March 19, 1995, they fired at the Spanish trawler *Estai*, then seized it and publicly displayed its illegal undersized nets, false hold, immature small turbot catch, and falsified logs. Canada took this unilateral enforcement action without prior consultation with the U.S., and amidst concerns from Canadian Navy lawyers about the unfortunate precedent for the expansion of coastal state jurisdiction.

Spain retaliated. It imposed visa requirements on Canadian visitors, sent vessels to protect the Spanish fishing fleet, and took the case to the International Court of Justice (ICJ). The EU condemned Canada's action, deferred indefinitely a cooperation agreement with Canada, and considered trade retaliation. But within the EU, Britain quietly supported Canada's case.

Although Canada soon released the *Estai*, it threatened to board other boats and cut their nets. An Easter compromise between Canada and the EU saw the EU's NAFO quota increase, the Canadian quota reduced, and Canadian charges against the *Estai* and its captain dropped. In return Canada secured more effective enforcement outside Canada's 320-kilometre zone, through an agreement on stringent conservation measures, observers on board Canadian and EU vessels, inspections at dockside and satellite surveillance installed on 35 percent of the boats. Canada withdrew its regulations prohibiting Spanish and Portuguese fishing on the banks, while the EU accepted the *Canadian Coastal Fisheries Protection Act*. In mid-May, the EU itself inspected a Spanish boat accused of using an illegal net. Chrétien and EU president Jacques Santor met in Paris to declare an end to the affair.

More importantly, Canada's actions gave impetus to the UN Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. It had begun a new session in New York on March 27 sharply divided between coastal states such as Canada and distant fishing states such as the EU. Canada led the drafting of a strong enforcement agreement. On August 4, 1995, under the Law of the Sea Convention, the UN approved a new protocol on straddling and migratory fish stocks. It protected stocks in jeopardy, prohibited unauthorized fishing for these stocks, included new measures for monitoring, and outlawed fishing by boats flying flags of convenience.

The Trans-Atlantic Free Trade Initiative and Beyond

During this time, Canada also sought with some success to secure a closer economic relationship with the EU (Long 1998). In September 1994, international trade minister Roy MacLaren ambitiously proposed a trans-Atlantic free trade area (TAFTA) in speeches in Britain and Canada. In autumn 1994, Chrétien in his speech to the French parliament called for a NAFTA-EU free trade agreement. In October 1995, MacLaren and German foreign minister Klaus Kinkel formed a working group to explore the concept. Endorsements came from senior figures in France and Britain.

However, the U.S. remained opposed, declaring its LI preference for multilateralism. The EU, in retaliation for Canada's conduct in the Turbot War, delayed progress for a year. And while EU trade commissioner Sir Leon Brittan showed some interest, he wanted a U.S.-EU agreement first.

Yet in December 1996 a joint Canada-EU Action Plan and joint Political Declaration on Canada-EU relations was signed. At the December 1997 Canada-EU Summit, an agreement on customs cooperation was added. Soon, influential voices called for bolder moves, such as NAFTA expanding to include Britain (Black 1997–98, Rugman 2002). But there was little take-up on the European side.

Russia and the East

Simultaneously Canada was forging new political and economic partnerships further east, especially with a reforming Russia (Laux 1994; Lamb 1994; Sarty 1993; Buduru and Popa 2005; Bartleman 2005). Canada's main vehicle was the G7. Here Canada supported the Europeans in favouring greater Russian participation and financial support, against a very reluctant Japan and varying United States. Canada also took a lead role in the G7's dealings with Ukraine hosting a G7 ministerial conference to raise money for it in Winnipeg in 1994. These efforts culminated at the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit. Here, on behalf of the G7, Canada negotiated the Global Partnership against Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction with Russia, and mobilized a US\$20 billion funding package in support. Canada contributed \$1 billion to the fund. Canada's distinctive national values of anti-nuclearism and environmentalism, its hosting of the G8 concert where it had an equal principal power place, and the sense of vulnerability exposed by the shock of September 11 came together to produce a major new 21st century disarmament regime.

Canada's Approach to Regional Order

Canada's expanding ties with Europe under Chrétien were further evident in the new regional order Canada helped shape.

From 1945 to 1969 Canada was institutionally connected to Europe by the Commonwealth, NATO and the OECD. The next two decades added the CSCE in 1993, the IEA in 1974, the G7 in 1976 and the Francophonie in 1970 and 1986. The post-Cold War years added the ERBD, NATO and the Arctic Council. Globally, Canada partnered with several European states, notably Austria, Norway, and Germany, to create new international regimes to ban antipersonnel landmines, prosecute war criminals through the new International Criminal Court (ICC), control persistent organic pollutants (POPs), and create an international cultural diversity network (English 1997; Long and Hindle 1998). It also joined its European G8 partners, over American opposition, to bring the Kyoto protocol into effect. Regionally, Canada helped create new institutions that were more politically inclusive and geographically expansive and that gave Canada a full place in the inner management core.

North Atlantic Treaty Organization Enlargement and Military Doctrine

The first arose over NATO's future once the Cold War was won. Canadian fully supported the creation of the North Atlantic Cooperation Council and other mechanisms to engage Russia and post-communist European states in a confidence-building dialogue (Buteaux 1997). Yet Canada departed from the U.S. and many Europeans on the critical issues of NATO enlargement and NATO's nuclear defence doctrine (Bergbusch 1997; Pellerin 1998; Legault and Sens 1995). In July 1997, at NATO's Madrid Summit, Canada called for the rapid and full inclusion into NATO of not only the Czech Republic, Hungary, and Poland, but Slovenia, Romania and Slovakia as

well. On February 2, 1998, Canada became the first NATO country to ratify the agreement to embrace the first three.

In the lead-up to NATO's April 1999 50th anniversary summit in Washington, an antinuclear Canada under foreign minister Lloyd Axworthy, working with his counterpart in the new red-green German government, called for a debate over the possible need for a revision of NATO's nuclear first-use strategy (Axworthy 2003, 360–65). Washington refused. France and Britain proved reluctant. Washington won, in a NATO that was still in some ways a U.S.-controlled club.

Canada's and NATO's vision continued to expand. Canada played a lead role in invoking NATO's Article 5 on collective defence to have the alliance help defend America in response to the September 11 attacks. On September 11, when the planes struck the twin towers in New York and the Pentagon in Washington in the morning, it was 3:00 in the afternoon at NATO headquarters in Brussels. Canada's Permanent Representative, David Wright, was the longest serving Ambassador and the dean of the diplomatic corps. The American Permanent Representative, Nicholas Burns, had arrived only ten days before. Canada thus encouraged NATO and its members to go to war, not just in nearby Kosovo, but in far-off Afghanistan as well—the first time NATO forces would be deployed outside of Europe.

The OSCE: Enlargement to the East

A second institutional success came in the CSCE, a body which Canada had helped found in 1973 (Lyon and Nimo 1992). Canada now fully supported its transformation into a real international organization, the OSCE. The OSCE extended Canada's European family far eastward, creating a common European as well as Atlantic and Arctic homeland from Vancouver to Vladivostok. Yet when Chrétien attended his first OSCE summit in 1994, he found it to be a sterile, speechifying forum reminiscent of the UN. With the OSCE soon proving to be a disappointment in the Balkans, Canada quickly looked to other, newer, more flexible forums.

The New Plurilateral EBRD

Outside the political-security domain, Canada helped pioneer, and become a founding member of, the EBRD. This was a new, European-controlled institution, to which Canada devoted a larger than proportional share of the financing and staff.¹⁴

The Arctic Council Enlargement to the North

A further inclusive, plurilateral institution where Canada took the lead came in the environmental and social fields with the long sought creation of the Arctic Council in Ottawa on September 19, 1996. Here Canada joined with the U.S. and several European countries, including Russia, to form a body devoted primarily to promoting sustainable development in this ecologically vulnerable area of Canada's north (Axworthy 2003, 329–36; Koring 1998). St. Laurent's late 1940s dream and Canada's distinctive national values of environmentalism and international institutionalism came to life at long last in the far North. Sustainable development in the Arctic and the Arctic Council became important priorities in the Martin government's foreign policy doctrine (Pettigrew 2005). The Arctic also threatened to bring Canada into military conflict with Europe again, as Canada and Denmark each used their military forces to bolster their claim to

¹⁴ In 1993, the contributions to the EBRD among the G7 countries were as follows: U.S. US\$10.4 million, Japan US\$8.8 million, Germany US\$8.8 million, France US\$8.8 million, Britain US\$8.8 million, and Italy US\$8.8 million. Canada accounted for 3.5 percent of the total contributions. For fiscal year 1994–95, Canada contributed 61.2 million European currency units (ECU). The EBRD employed 22 Canadian nationals, representing 4.9 percent of its staff.

Hans Island, which each claimed as their own. However a compromise settlement was equally reached.

The Bosnian and Kosovo Contact Groups

One place Canada and others looked was to the ad hoc contact groups managing the growing conflicts in Bosnia and later Kosovo. From the start Canada, with troops on the ground, sought admission to these inner clubs. It never got in. Canada then worked successfully to give the G7, where it had an equal place, the central political role (Schwegmann 2001). It succeeded by 1999, when the G7 foreign ministers and leaders assumed the leadership in directing the war to liberate Kosovo, democratize Serbia, and put Milosevic in jail awaiting his war crimes trial (Axworthy 2003; Heinbecker and McRae 2001; Hubert and Bosner 2001; Dashwood 2000; Nossal and Rousel 2000).

The Harper Years, 2006-

During the Harper years, this expanding Euro-centricity expanded, above all in Canada's deepening involvement along with its European allies in the war in Afghanistan.

Doctrine

In its doctrine, Harper's 2006 campaign platform placed Britain in the first rank, along with Asia's Japan, India and Australia, as Canada's priority partners in the world. Harper speech in London in 2006 proclaimed Canada as an emerging energy superpower. Blair, making a speech in London about Canada alone, later acknowledged as much and even more. This refutes the declinist argument that Canada was irrelevant to Europe and had no capabilities that counted and influence as a result.

Distributions

In its resource distributions, the old and now the new Europe also did well. To be sure, Harper after his first year in office closed the Canadian consulates in St. Petersburg and Milan. But he also opened a new embassy in Romania.

In his summit diplomacy, Europe rank highly, right after the North American community. By the end of November 2006, just after the NATO summit in Latvia, the US and Mexico came first with four visits each, while Britain, France, and Japan tied for second. He also continued Canada institutionalized annual summit with the EU, something Canada had with Europe but had not had with the US since the Shamrock Summit had ended in 1993.

Decisions

In the Harper government's major decisions, the importance of the expanded Europe stood out, above all in the defining cases of France's full support for a united Canada at home, control of the Arctic so close at hand, the war in distant Afghanistan, and trade liberation with the European Free Trade Association and, prospectively, the EU itself.

France and Quebec

The greatest achievement of Canada's foreign policy toward Europe during the Harper years came in the definitive public end of any support from the president of France for Quebec's separation from Canada.

In 1963, Charles de Gaulle had told his information minister Alain Peyrefitte: “French Canada must become independent and, consequently, must shake off, violently or otherwise, the state of dependence in which it finds itself.”

Since the presidency of Francois Mitterrand, France had opposed Quebec separatism and had an excellent relationship with Ottawa. However France’s official public line was “*ni ingérence ni indifférence*” or neither interference nor indifference.¹⁵ And as a result, problems from France for a united Canada remained.

Moreover, before the 1995 Quebec referendum on unilateral separation, President Jacques Chirac had said on Larry King Live that he would recognize a majority “yes” vote. He also planned with Premier Jacques Parizeau to issue a declaration the next morning if the yes vote had won. His prepared press release said: “The sovereignty of Quebec is a fact, it lacks only a legal form.”

In 1997 Premier Lucien Bouchard came from a meeting with Chirac saying: “The President told me in as many words that ‘Whatever path Quebec chooses, France will accompany it. Quebec can count on the friendship and solidarity of Quebec.’”

Difficulties arose on the Canadian side as well. In December 2006 when Stephane Dion became the Liberal Party leader calls arose for him to renounce the French citizenship that he had inherited from his father. No such calls had arisen when John Turner, a British citizen born in Britain had become Liberal party leader several years before. Dion refused, referring to the millions of Canadians who had dual citizenship, in a country where 5.4 million people began life as citizens of another country. Of those just over 4 million had become Canadian citizens, and 3.5 million exclusively so.

On January 22, 2007, Ségolène Royal, the Socialist candidate for president in the French election, mouthed support for Quebec separation, following a 15 minute meeting in Paris with Parti Québécois leaders Andre Boisclair. She said: “It goes with our common values, which are Quebec’s sovereignty and freedom. I think that Quebec’s influence and its place in the hearts of the French people support that.” Harper immediately took her to task in a statement that read: “Experience teaches that it is highly inappropriate for a foreign leader to interfere in the democratic affairs of another country.” He added: “We expect in turn that the next president will display an understanding of our shared history, and the respect for Canada and Canadians that such an important partnership requires.” Royal backed off the following day, saying she was not breaking with French policy of “neither interference nor indifference.” In France, Royal’s remarks became a campaign issue, being treated as yet another of her diplomatic gaffes.

Three months later, in April 2007, at Vimy Ridge, Queen Elizabeth and French prime minister Dominique de Vilpin, with Harper standing by, explicitly linked the sacrifices of 1917 with those in Afghanistan in 2007, where six more Canadian soldiers had been killed the day before. De Vilpin said “thank you” in English, then commended Canada for fighting for France in two world wars, assisting in NATO and UN missions in Africa, the Balkans, Asia and Afghanistan.

¹⁵ France’s constitution states in Article 1: “France is a Republic that is indivisible...” Article 3 states: “National sovereignty belongs to the people, which exercises it through its representatives and by way of a referendum. No section of the people nor any individual can assume its exercise.” Article 89 states: “No procedure of amending [the constitution] can be undertaken or pursued where the integrity of the territory is affected.”

In May 2008, rather than follow the tradition of spending Victory Day in Paris, Sarkozy flew to Beny-sur-Mer in Normandy to honour Canada's war dead at the Canadian cemetery there. Standing beside Governor General Michaëlle Jean he said: "You know that we are very close to Quebec, but we also love Canada very much. You have to know that France loves Canada very much. We love Quebec but we love Canada. And of those who died here, we didn't ask what region they came from. We didn't even ask what language they spoke. Those who are buried here, even if they didn't speak our language, saved us." *Le Devoir* noted that never before had a French president "made such a glowing declaration of love for Canada."

In October 2008, at the Francophone Summit in Quebec, Sarkozy said: "Do you believe the world as it faces an unprecedented crisis needs more divisions?"

On February 2, 2009, Sarkozy, while awarding the Légion d'Honneur to visiting Quebec premier Jean Charest, spoke out against separation even more strongly. He said: "Believe me, my friends, does the world, moving throughout this [economic] crisis without precedent, need division, need hatred? Is it in proving that we love others that we need to detest our neighbours? What a strange idea." Identifying Canada as France's friend he said: "It's true that the non-interference, non-indifference formula was the rule for years, but honestly, it's not my thing."

This statement reflected and reinforced the close Canadian-France relationship over the war in Afghanistan, the quest for a Canada-EU free trade agreement, and France's help in finding two Canadian diplomats kidnapped, probably by Al Qaeda terrorists, in Niger.

Drawing Canada and France together at the systemic level were the war they were fighting together, along with Britain and the Netherlands in Afghanistan, then the financial and economic crisis they were fighting together around the world. At the societal level, links were enhanced by the close personal relationship between Sarkozy and Pierre Desmarais, CEO of Quebec-based Power Corporation. Other business links included Quebec-based Bombardier, which won a contract to build cars for the Paris subway over nationalist complaints from its French competitor.

Arctic Sovereignty

In regard to Arctic sovereignty, Harper moved from conflict to co-operation with Denmark over Hans Island. Before Harper, Denmark had signalled its willingness to co-operate as Denmark's defence minister gave his Canadian counterpart, Bill Graham a Danish flag, saying the next time you go there leave it there, so I don't have to go and do this myself. Competition continued with Russia over ownership of the ocean floor, but this was done over the UNCLOS framework, even as Russia's bombers started to test NORAD reactions by flying close to Canada as in the cold war days.

However in early May 2009 Canada blocked the EU's attempt to become a permanent observer in the Arctic Council, in return for the expected EU seal ban.

Afghanistan

On the ongoing war in Afghanistan, the importance of Europe was clear at the NATO summit in late November 2006. Here Canada, supported by the Americans, pressed its allies in the wake of the bloody battle of Panjawai in the summer, to reinforce their combat presence in Afghanistan by relaxing the caveats on the issue of their troops and by ending more combat capable forces to the region. The first to respond were the Poles, who committed 1,000 of their best forces. The second were the British, who in late February 2007, promised another 1,400 troops for their region in Helmand, bringing their troop total in Afghanistan to 7,500. The biggest boost came from the

Americans, who promised more troops and aid. The Germans and other allies promised, somewhat opaquely, to reduce the restrictions or the caveats on their forces, so that they could better come to the aid of Canadians and other forces there. Thus Poland and now France were joining Britain (and America) in coming through for Canada with more troops in Kandahar.

Trade: From EFTA to CETA

A further Harper initiative to expand Canada's partnership with the old Northwest, even Arctic Europe, came with its renewal of negotiations for a free trade agreements between Canada and the EFTA countries of Norway, Iceland, Switzerland and Lichenstein. These were successfully concluded in early 2008. The deal took effect on Canada Day 2009.

Forging freer trade with the bigger European powers proved more difficult, but the effort was made. TAFA reviewed by Merkel and Charest.

On October 17, 2008, Canada and the EU began scoping what areas should be included in a bilateral FTA. The study identified benefits in labour mobility, including temporary entry for business people, environment, regulatory co-operation and science and technology.

On March 5, 2009, after months of scoping exercises, Trade minister Stockwell Day announced in Parliament that Canada and the EU agreed to negotiate an ambitious, comprehensive free trade agreement covering 14 areas, including goods, investment, services, intellectual property, competition policy, trade facilitation, customs regulation, technical barriers to trade and sustainable development. Day said he hoped formal negotiations would begin in a few months. A Canada-EU joint economic study released earlier had estimated that such an economic agreement could increase bilateral trade by more than 20%. Canada's merchandise trade exports to the EU, its second largest trading partner, had risen by 3.5% to \$36.1 billion in 2008, despite the global financial turmoil taking hold that year.

On October 19, 2009, formal negotiations began in Ottawa, as 200 officials gathered for the first of five planned rounds to negotiate the "Comprehensive Economic and Trade Agreement (CETA)." It would take free trade and investment into the integration of manufacturing standards, government contracting, food standards and possibly labour mobility. They aimed to have the CETA deal done within two years, with a major push at the Huntsville G8 summit in June 2010. On the European side, obstacles awaited on climate change, seal hunting, visa restrictions, food standards and geographical indicators. On the Canadian side they came from supply management, Buy Ontario policies on green products.

Russia

Canada's relationship with its Arctic neighbour and rising Russia also intensified under Harper. The two leaders worked together well at the St. Petersburg G8 summit on its defining priority of energy security. The Russians showed interest in developing an Arctic bridge for transportation from Murmansk to Churchill, Manitoba. And while a high profile case of a Russian caught spying in Canada reminded the media of the old cold war images, Canada began making progress in Russia on some of the old irritants, notably the Aerostar hotel.

The two governments facilitated Canadian investments in Russia in gold, automotive manufacturing, and prospectively for a plan to bring Gazprom's LNG into North America through PetroCanada's port in Quebec. But it was cancelled by Gazprom in February 2008.

Kosovo's Independence, February 17, 2008

A final case aroused once again the always present spectre of military conflict in Europe. On February 17, 2008, the Serbian province of Kosovo unilaterally declared independence. It was immediately recognized as a sovereign state by Britain, France, Germany, many other European states and the United States. Canada did not do so, at least for the first nine days. What explains the Canadian refusal and reluctance, in a world where, as John Holmes reminds us, deciding to do nothing is often the most important and wisest course. Several factors were cited by commentators engaged in the public debate as reasons why Canada should, would and did take a particular course. The “**recognize now**” school led by Robert Austin, argued that the pent up frustration of Kosovars made violence likely if their independence was not now affirmed. Those in the “**wait a while**” to see which way the wind is blowing school argued it would be prudent to wait, to see what was happening on the ground and what the rest of the international community does. Those in the “**not now or never**” school on the other side cited several external determinants, and several salient ones from the Canadian society and state as well.

NATO, struggling to fulfill its heavy commitments already in Afghanistan. No troops to spare if the EU could not handle it. And even if they could, would German public opinion, refusing to see its troops in deadly combat in Afghanistan, stay the course if they saw them killed in Kosovo?

Russian retaliation or refusal to stop the further acts of succession that could erupt in the frozen conflicts that around former Soviet space.

The Causes of Canada's Expanded Eurocentricity

What caused Canada's successful expanding engagement with the new enlarged Europe during the post-Cold War years?

The System

At the systemic level, the great general gravitational pull of the four forces featured in the geopolitical gravity model were the underlying cause. Beyond it were the profound changes in the international system at both the global and regional European levels after the Cold War's end. These generated a relatively stable European oasis amidst rapid relative capability shifts in the world, new and rising vulnerabilities from transnational threats, a much more diffuse set of potential partners, tightening trans-Atlantic ties, and a stronger G7/8 as the great global connector that tied Canada and Europe together in the world as a whole.

Rising U.S. capabilities during the second half of the 1990s led Canada to diversify its intensifying relations with the U.S. Meanwhile a stagnant Japan, and an Asia and Americas devastated by the 1997-99 financial crisis, made a stable and secure Europe an attractive economic and political space. The EU expanded in members to 27, the Euro rose and European relative capability rose.

The end of the European Cold War opened up an array of new market-oriented democratic middle powers in Europe in the previously communist South and the East.

It also generated a new need for greater engagement to defend against the emerging, transnational security threats, to develop an insurance policy against possible Russian recidivism and state collapse in the former communist bloc, and to take advantage of the opportunities of Euroland in the emerging economically bipolar world. The growing interdependence extending into mutual vulnerability between Canada and Europe was evident in finance, trade and foreign direct investment (Hodges, Kirton, and Daniels 1999; Kirton 1999, 2005; Rugman 2002). It arose in the

emerging intervulnerabilities of the ecological realm, as highlighted by the Turbot War, the Global Partnership, the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, and many trade-environmental disputes over leg-hold trapping, forestry practices, and product standards with the EU (Kirton and Trebilcock 2005; Rugman, Kirton, and Soloway 1999). It inspired the difficult diplomacy that led Canada after 2001, along with Russia and Japan, to ratify and thus bring into formal legal force the Kyoto protocol for controlling climate change, even as the U.S. under George W. Bush remained outside.

Canada's connection through war with Europe was furthered by the broadening and deepening of global plurilateral institutions, starting with the G7 and now G8, in the post-Cold War era of proliferating globalization (Kirton 1994, 1997d; Kirton and Kokotsis 1997-98; Hodges, Kirton, and Daniels 1999).

Canadian Society

Canada's embedded, expanding Eurocentricity was also driven by a highly salient Canadian society and state. Canada's overwhelming concern with national unity drove its foreign policy toward Europe with particular force before, during, and after the October 1995 separatist referendum campaign. It was reinforced by the distinctive national values of antinuclearism, environmentalism, and multiculturalism, and the rights of minorities, with its aversion to preventing multiethnic federations from falling into the destructiveness of ethnically based nationalist claims.

Canada's demography also remained overwhelmingly European (Helliwell 2002).¹⁶ It was led by the British and Irish, followed by the French with 24 percent of the population, the 1 million Canadians of Ukrainian origin, and the post-war waves of immigrants from Germany, Italy, Greece, and Portugal, refugees from central and eastern Europe in 1953, 1956, and 1967. It was reinforced by more recent arrivals from Russia and south and eastern Europe, including 800,000 Canadians of Polish origin in 2008. In all, about 2 million Canadians could trace their roots to central and eastern Europe or the former Soviet Union as the 21st century began (Norton 2001).¹⁷

Meanwhile, the media, with bureaus in London and Paris, accorded high attention to Europe and portrayed it in a way that evoked the myths of Canada's distant, emotionally European war-drenched, proud past (Kirton 1993). A supportive public opinion saw Canadians rank Europe, led by Britain and Germany, in second or third place as a priority region. The UN, Commonwealth, and la Francophonie in Quebec ranked high on the list of preferred international institutions as well. Most basically, the underlying sense of community remained very real. It was based on a common commitment to social democracy (or Red Toryism), a belief in a social market model distinct from the free market fundamentalism that flourished in the U.S., and shared convictions about the value of publicly funded health care, a secure social safety net, strong environmental protection, strict gun control, and publicly funded cultural production (Kinsman 1998; Black 1997-98). Amidst this broad scope of salient societal drivers, business interests had only a modest place.

¹⁶ During the 1960's, Europe provided 90% of Canada's immigrants. By the mid 1990s it still accounted for 19%.

¹⁷ As the percentage of foreign-born Canadians as a portion of the overall population was higher than in the U.S., and as net immigration became a larger contributor than natural births to overall population increase in Canada, the ties that these newer Canadians maintained abroad had an important structuring effect on Canada's foreign relations, even without the existence of strong, focused, well-resourced ethnic group lobbies at work.

The State

Within the state, Canada's enduring attachment to Europe was also deeply entrenched. It was grounded in the personal experiences and resulting belief systems of prime ministers. Lester Pearson, prime minister from 1963 to 1968, like so many of his former colleagues in the Department of External Affairs (DEA) and the civil service and Cabinet, had spent a considerable part of his life in Europe and, above all, in Britain, as an airman in World War I, as a student at Oxford, and as a diplomat in Geneva in the 1930s and in London during World War II. Pierre Trudeau, prime minister from 1968 to 1984 (with a brief interruption in 1979–80), studied in both Britain and France, at the London School of Economics and Political Science and at the Sorbonne. Joe Clark, prime minister from 1979 to 1980 and foreign minister for most of the government of Brian Mulroney between 1984 and 1993, spent a year as a youth in southern Spain. Kim Campbell, prime minister briefly in 1993, spent a year in London pursuing a doctoral degree with research on Russia.

Within the Chrétien government, neither the prime minister nor his first two foreign ministers had this direct personal connection with Europe. But the appointment of Bill Graham as foreign minister in January 2002 gave Canada its first foreign minister educated in France.

Paul Martin's foreign minister, Pierre Pettigrew, had studied at Oxford and spent three years in Brussels in the NATO assembly. Under Stephen Harper, foreign minister Peter MacKay's upbringing and constituency in Nova Scotia made it easy for him to take his first ministerial visit across the Atlantic to Europe, to the favoured northwest parts of old if not quite the original Scotland itself. At the official level, those in the most senior civil service offices in the foreign affairs establishment also tended disproportionately to have had careers in Europe, including representing Canada to NATO and the EU.

Conclusion

Canada has long been deeply embedded in Europe, as a primary regional focus for its foreign policy, just as the geopolitical gravity model predicts. But the post-Cold War years have brought an expanded Eurocentricity, with a shift to the southeast, involvement in a broader array of functional areas, including wars in the Balkans, and the shaping of a new array of regional organizations to lock in this new order. Canada's expanded Eurocentricity has been pulled into existence and effectiveness by the major changes in the international system that the end of the Cold War brought. But Canada has also been pushed more broadly into a continuing, Canadian-like Europe by the Canadian people and government at home.

References

- Axworthy, Lloyd (2003). *Navigating a New World: Canada's Global Future* (Toronto: Knopf Canada).
- Barry, Donald (1998). "The Canadian-European Union Turbot War: Internal Politics and Transatlantic Bargaining." *International Journal* 53 (Spring): 253–84.
- Bartleman, James (2005). *Rollercoaster: My Hectic Years as Jean Chrétien's Diplomatic Advisor, 1994–1998* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).
- Bercusson, David (1992). "Canada, NATO, and Rearmament, 1950–1954: Why Canada Made a Difference (But Not for Very Long)." In John English and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Making a Difference? Canada's Foreign Policy in a Changing World Order* (Toronto: Lester Publishing).

- Bergbusch, Eric (1997). "NATO Enlargement: Should Canada Leave NATO?" *International Journal* 52 (Summer): 147–68.
- Bernard-Meunier, Marie (2006), "Did You Say Europe? How Canada Ignores Europe and Why that is Wrong," in Andrew Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds, *Canada Among Nations 2006: Minorities and Priorities*, pp. 109-124.
- Black, Conrad (1997–98). "Taking Canada Seriously." *International Journal* 53 (Winter): 1–17.
- Bothwell, Robert (2006), *The Penguin History of Canada* (Toronto: Penguin Group).
- Brebner, John Bartlett (1945), *North Atlantic Triangle: The Interplay of Canada, the United States and Great Britain* (Toronto: Ryerson).
- Buduru, Bogdan, and Dragos Popa (2005). "Canada-Russia Relations: A Strategic Partnership?" In Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2005: Split Images* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), 185-202.
- Buteaux, Paul (1997). "The Common Foreign and Security Policy of the European Union: Implications for Canada." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 5 (Fall): 129–41.
- Dashwood, Hevina (2000). "Canada's Participation in the NATO-led Intervention in Kosovo." In Maureen Appel Molot and Fen Osler Hampson, eds., *Canada Among Nations 2000: Vanishing Borders* (Toronto: Oxford University Press).
- Deutsch, Karl (1957). *Political Community in the North Atlantic Area* (Princeton: Princeton University Press).
- Dolata-Kreutzkamp, Petra (2008), "Canada-Germany-EU: Energy security and climate change," *International Journal* 63 (Summer): 665-681.
- Dolata-Kreutzkamp, Petra and Veronica Kitchen (2008), "Canada, Germany, Canada-Germany: Relations in the third dimension," *International Journal* 63 (Summer): 527-531.
- English, John (1997). "Banning Anti-Personnel Mines." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 5 (Fall): 169–73.
- Helliwell, John (2002). *Globalization and Well-Being* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press).
- Heinbecker, Paul, and Rob McRae (2001). "Case Study: The Kosovo Air Campaign." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press).
- Hettmann, Jens (1996). "La politique extérieure canadienne vue de l'Europe: fin de siècle pour les rapports canado-européens?" *Études Internationales* 27 (June): 303–24.
- Hodges, Michael, John Kirton, and Joseph Daniels, eds. (1999). *The G8's Role in the New Millennium* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Hubert, Don, and Michael Bosner (2003). "Humanitarian Military Intervention." In Rob McRae and Don Hubert, eds., *Human Security and the New Diplomacy* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press).
- Jockel, Joseph and Joel Sokolsky (2009), "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa In, Expenses Down, Criticism Out ... and the Country Secure," *International Journal* 64 (Spring): 315-336.
- Keiver, Michael (1996). "The Turbot War: Gun Boat Diplomacy of Refinement of the Law of the Sea." *Cahiers de Droit* 37 (June).
- Kinsman, Jeremy (1998). "Transatlanticism: Is Europe 'Old Hat'?" *Behind the Headlines* 55 (3): 6–13.
- Kirton, John (2007), *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Changing World* (Toronto: Thompson Nelson), chapter 19.
- Kirton, John (2005). "America at the G8: From Vulnerability to Victory at the Sea Island." In Michele Fratianni, John Kirton, Alan Rugman, and Paolo Savona, eds., *New Perspectives on Global Governance: Why America Needs the G8* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

- Kirton, John (2000). "Canada and the New Europe: The Compounding Cultural Connection." In Fritz Peter Kirsch and Waldemar Zacharasiewicz, eds., *Canada/Europe: Opportunities and Problems of Interculturality* (Hagen: ISL-Verlag).
- Kirton, John (1999). "Canada and the Global Financial Crisis: G7 and APEC Diplomacy." *Canadian Studies Journal* 3.
- Kirton, John (1996). "Une ouverture sur le monde: la nouvelle politique étrangère canadienne du gouvernement Chrétien." *Études Internationales* 27 (June): 257–80.
- Kirton, John (1994). "Exercising Concerted Leadership: Canada's Approach to Summit Reform." *International Spectator* 29 (April-June): 161–76.
- Kirton, John (1993). "National Mythology and Media Coverage: Mobilizing Consent for Canada's War in the Gulf." *Political Communication* 10 (December): 425–41.
- Kirton, John, and Ella Kokotsis (1997–98). "Revitalizing the G7: Prospects for the 1998 Birmingham Summit of the Eight." *International Journal* 53 (Winter): 38–56.
- Kirton, John, and Don Munton (1992). "The Manhattan Voyages, 1969–70." In Don Munton and John Kirton, eds., *Canadian Foreign Policy: Selected Cases* (Scarborough: Prentice Hall).
- Kissinger, Henry (1964). *A World Restored: Metternich, Castlereagh, and the Problems of Peace, 1812–22*, Universal library ed. (New York: Gosset Dunlap).
- Koring, Paul (1998). "Foreign Policy and the Circumpolar Dimension." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 6 (Fall): 51–60.
- Lamb, John (1994). "Canadian Relations with the New Russia: Security Concerns and Policy Responses." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 2 (Spring): 79–108.
- Laux, Jeanne (1994). "From South to East: Financing the Transition in Central and Eastern Europe." In Maureen Appel Molot and Harald von Riekhoff, eds., *Canada Among Nations 1994: A Part of the Peace* (Ottawa: Carleton University Press).
- Legault, Albert, and Allen Sens (1995). "Canada and NATO Enlargement." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 4 (2): 88–93.
- Long, David (2003). "Transatlantic Relations and Canadian Foreign Policy." *International Journal* 58 (Autumn): 591–614.
- Long, David, and Laird Hindle (1998). "Europe and the Ottawa Process: An Overview." *Canadian Foreign Policy* 5 (Spring): 69–84.
- MacDonald, Douglas and Heather Smith (1999-2000), "Promises Made, Promises Broken: Questioning Canada's Commitments to Climate Change," Bratt and Kukucha, 357-367.
- Massie, Justin (2009), "A Special Relationship? The Importance of France in Canadian Foreign Policy," in Robert Bothwell and Jean Daudelin, eds. *Canada Among Nations 2008: 100 years of Canadian Foreign Policy*, (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press), pp. 235-270.
- Norton, Roy (2001). "Ethnic Groups and Conservative Foreign Policy." In Nelson Michaud and Kim Nossal, eds., *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984–93* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press).
- Nossal, Kim Richard (1992). "A European Nation? The Life and Times of Atlanticism in Canada." In John English and Norman Hillmer, eds., *Making a Difference: Canada's Foreign Policy in a Changing World Order* (Toronto: Lester Publishing).
- Nossal, Kim Richard, and Stéphane Roussel (2000). "Canada and the Kosovo War: The Happy Follower." In Pierre Martin and Mark Brawley, eds., *Alliance Politics, Kosovo, and NATO's War: Allied Force or Forced Allies?* (New York: Palgrave).
- Pellerin, Alain (1998). "NATO Enlargement: The Way Ahead." In Fen Osler Hampson and Maureen Appel Molot, eds., *Canada Among Nations 1998: Leadership and Dialogue* (Toronto: Oxford University Press).
- Pentland, Charles (2003–04). "Odd Man In: Canada and the Transatlantic Crisis." *International Journal* 59 (Winter): 145–66.

- Pettigrew, Pierre (2005). "Canada's International Personality." *International Journal* 60 (Summer): 623–34.
- Potter, Evan (1999), *Transatlantic Partners: Canadian Approaches to the European Union*, (McGill-Queen's University Press: Montreal).
- Rugman, Alan (2002), *The End of Globalization* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Rugman, Alan, John Kirton and Julie Soloway (1999), *Environmental Regulations and Corporate Strategy: A NAFTA Perspective* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Sarty, Leigh (1993). "A Rivalry Transformed: Canadian-Soviet Relations to the 1990s." In J.L. Granatstein, ed., *Canadian Foreign Policy: Historical Readings*, rev. ed. (Toronto: Copp Clark).
- Schaefer, Andrew (1996). "1995 Canada-Spain Fishing Dispute (The Turbot War)." *Georgetown International Environmental Law Review* 8 (Summer): 437–49.
- Schwanen, Daniel (2006), "Canada and the Kyoto Protocol: When Reality Sets In," Cooper and Rowlands, 292-318.
- Schwegmann, Christoph (2001). "Modern Concert Diplomacy: The Contact Group and the G7/8 in Crisis Management." In John Kirton, Joseph Daniels, and Andreas Freytag, eds., *Guiding Global Order: G8 Governance in the Twenty-First Century* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Springer, Allen (1997). "The Canadian Turbot War with Spain, Unilateral State Action in Defense of Environmental Interests." *Journal of Environment and Development* 6 (March): 26–60.
- Tobin, Brian (2002). *All in Good Time* (Toronto: Penguin).
- Windsor, Lee (2000). "Professionalism under Fire: Canadian Implementation of the Medak Pocket Agreement, Croatia 1993." *Canadian Military History* 9 (3): 23–35.
- Windsor, Lee (2005), "The Invisible War." *Literary Review of Canada* 13 (2): 26–28.

Appendix A: Appendix B: Europe in CFP Doctrines

1947 Gray Lecture

1957 Diefenbaker

1963 Pearson

1968 Trudeau's Canada in the World

1986 Mulroney's Blue Paper

1995 Chrétien's Canada and the World

2005 Martin's International Policy Statement