

---

# The Chrétien-Martin Years

Lecture 10

POL 312Y Canadian Foreign Policy

Professor John Kirton

November 20, 2017

## Introduction: The Chrétien-Martin Eras Assessed

Canadian foreign policy during the Chrétien-Martin years from 1994 to 2005, is still challenging to define (Smith 1995, Kirton 2007). Prime Minister Jean Chrétien did not set forth a comprehensive **personal vision** of foreign policy during his earlier life, his first election campaign, or his first year in office. His definitive “**Statement**” on foreign policy, on February 7, 1995 seemed quickly overtaken by the doctrine of his new foreign minister Lloyd **Axworthy**, and later by the “**Dialogue**” report from foreign minister Bill Graham in June 2003. Chrétien’s doctrines, resource distributions, and key decisions were initially designed to deal with the bright post–Cold War world abroad and the grim Canada of deficits, debt, and disunity at home. But when he left in 2003, his Liberal Party successor Paul **Martin** faced with the **great reversal** of a grim post 9/11 world at war and a strong, secure, cohesive Canada at home. Martin’s **International Policy Statement** (IPS) in April 2005 tried to cope.

## The Debate about the Chrétien Decade

For Chrétien’s foreign policy, from its start on October 25, 1993 to its end on December 12, 2003, scholars offered three major competing views. The first saw Liberal Internationalism’s (LI) **disappointing continuity**, as the prospect of immediate change from a new prime minister quickly disappeared (Stein 1994–95).

The second, much larger, more long-lived school saw Peripheral Dependence’s (PD) **isolationist decline** (Cooper 1995; Cohen 1995, 2003a; Pratt 1994–95; Helleiner 1994–95; Molot and Hillmer 2002; Stairs 2003a; Haglund 2002–03; Cohen 2003a; Welsh 2004; Granatstein 2006; Rempel 2006). Andrew Cooper (1995) argued that the end of the Cold War, Canada’s fiscal crisis, and the growing gap between Canada’s global commitments and declining capabilities, called for a retreat to selective “**niche diplomacy**.”<sup>1</sup>

---

A harsher PD variant was **isolationist retreat**. Andrew Cohen (1995, 2003a; See also Pratt 1994-5) argued that Chrétien's 1995 **Statement**, "repudiated its predecessors," and put a "less idealistic, less engaged, and less empathetic," foreign policy in its place. Chrétien's instinct "to stay home, cultivating one's own garden," produced "a retreat for this country" (Cohen 1995). Gerald Helleiner (1994-95) complained that Chrétien chose "discriminatory regional issues" reliant on the goodwill of the much more powerful U.S, and a confining "me too" role within the G7.

A subsequent **shrunk state** variant saw Canada as a "**fading power**," or an already faded one. Maureen Molot and Norman Hillmer (2002) claimed that the "hard decade of the 1990s," September 11, and the resulting war in Afghanistan suddenly brought new challenges that Canada, the "incredible shrinking country," was poorly equipped to meet. Jennifer Welsh (2004) saw Canada's influence "shrinking fast," due to an aging, indecisive and incompetent Chrétien and "an ever-more-powerful United States."

In sharp contrast, a third school highlighted Canada's complex neo-realist (CNR) rise to **global leadership**, as a rational response to a changing world that pulled Canada toward and often into a principal power place. John Kirton in 1996, said Canada was a more fully engaged global leader, in a post-Cold War, rapidly globalizing world (Kirton 1996, 1997b). After the Quebec national unity referendum was won in 1995, Canada's fiscal deficit purged in 1997, and Axworthy appointed foreign minister in 1996, others agreed (Black 1997-98; Hampson and Molot 1996b, 1998; Hampson, Hart and Rudner 1999). But the terrorist shock of September 11 and the aging Chrétien's apparent indecisiveness quickly ended this view's appeal.

### **The Thesis of Expansive Global Leadership**

Canada's **expansive global leadership** however, dominated the Chretien-Martin years. At first, it was largely limited to doctrine, given the looming national unity crisis and fiscal deficit at home. But increasingly in resource distributions and decisions Canada became far more **globally involved, intrusive** in the internal affairs of distant states, **influential** in creating a new world order in Canada's image and regularly involved in **war**.<sup>ii</sup>

**Four broad trends** stand out. **Geographically**, Canada expanded from the Atlantic and Commonwealth to Asia-Pacific and the Americas. **Functionally**, it emphasized trade, sustainable development, human

security, and the promotion of Canadian values and culture abroad. **Instrumentally**, its behaviour became much more multifaceted, interventionist, and reliant on military force, summitry, and innovative instruments to change distant societies, including principal power Russia, from within. **Institutionally**, Canada moved beyond the United Nations (UN) to pioneer new plurilateral international institutions in which Canada's interests, values and influence had a larger place.

These trends came in a **three step sequence** defined by each successive majority government that Chrétien won.<sup>iii</sup>

The **first mandate** culminated in the federalist victory in the Quebec referendum on separation on October 30, 1995, the appointment of Lloyd Axworthy as foreign minister in January 1996 and his “human security,” “soft power” doctrine (cf. Nossal 1998–99; Hampson and Oliver 1998).

The **second mandate** starting on June 2, 1997, saw Ottawa return to fiscal surplus, Axworthy shape new international regimes on anti-personnel **landmines** and the International Criminal Court (ICC), and Canada use the “hard power” of military force in Zaire in 1996 and **Kosovo** in 1999.

The record **third mandate**, starting on November 27, 2000, with Manley as foreign minister after October 2000, saw Canada go to war in **Afghanistan** on September 12, 2001 (Kirton 2007). With Bill Graham as foreign minister after January 2002, Canada stayed out of the US-led war against **Iraq** in 2003, and injected CNR impulses into the foreign policy **Dialogue**.

Also contributing were finance minister **Paul Martin**, by co-creating the Group of Twenty (**G20**) finance ministers club in 1999. Fisheries minister Brian **Tobin** led in ecological protection in the 1995 **Turbot War**. Environment minister David **Anderson** co-created the Cartagena Protocol on **Biosafety** and, helped ratify the **Kyoto** protocol on climate change. Heritage minister Sheila **Copps** led in creating the International Network on Cultural Policy (**INCP**). This shows Chrétien's preference to let individual ministers lead, but suggests that broader societal and systemic changes propelled Canada's expansive leadership in the world.

## **The Meta Theory Causes of Relative Capability and Equal Vulnerability**

Major changes came in the external determinants of **power** with the decline of Russia and rise of Germany, of **polarity** with the end of the Cold War, in **process** with the onset of intense globalization, and in **threat**, with the terrorist attacks on North America on September 11, 2001.

**Relative capability and vulnerability** changed, as the **meta-theory of hegemonic transition** charts. During Chrétien's decade, **U.S. capabilities** first declined to a new low of 38 percent of G7 ones in 1995, then rose to almost 47 percent by 1997, then leveled off in 2001, and finally declined in 2003. Conversely, **Canadian** capabilities first declined to **6.8** percent of America's by 1999, then climbed to **7.1** percent in 2000 and **rose further** in 2001 and 2002. But this CNR-generating combination of U.S. decline, systemic diffusion, and Canadian rise was **too late** and **too little** to account alone for Canada's expanding global leadership since 1994. Changes in polarity, process and above all **vulnerability** mattered too.

In the **post-Cold War** world the remnant Russia aligned with the West, open democratic societies proliferated, state sovereignty eroded, and a multicultural, outward-oriented, internationally engaged Canada entered newly accessible, welcoming societies almost everywhere. **Globalization's** global connectivity gave Canada a "first mover" advantage as the world's first and most globalized principal power (Pettigrew 1999).

Globalization also brought a **new vulnerability**, to America above all. On **February 26, 1993**, al-Qaeda-affiliated terrorists had struck the World Trade Center in New York City, **killing six** and injuring over 1,000. The U.S. government captured and convicted some of the terrorists, changed government policy to generate greater vigilance, and foiled a further terrorist attack on New York City in 1995. Yet on **September 11, 2001**, al Qaeda terrorists struck the World Trade Center again. This time, they killed more than **3,000 civilians** and destroyed the Twin Towers and the memorial to the 1993 victims erected there. Almost simultaneously they struck—for the first time—the U.S. government's national military command centre in the Pentagon, in the national capital of Washington D.C., to kill military personnel. In the following weeks, Americans from Washington D.C., to Florida, faced anthrax attacks that **killed five**. The attacks came from someone who was never caught.

On September 11, 2001, “America the **victorious**” in the long Cold War instantly, brutally, and perhaps permanently became “America the **vulnerable**” in a new age of global non-state threats killing many Americans at home.<sup>iv</sup>

This **new vulnerability** consists of deadly physical flows arising from non-state actors or natural forces anywhere that can quickly kill innocent people anywhere, despite what their powerful governments acting alone can do (Kirton 1993d). It first came to America from global **terrorism** in 1993. It secondly came, soon after from **finance**, from the 1994 Mexican peso crisis through to the collapse of American hedge fund Long-Term Capital Management (LTCM) in the autumn of 1998 (Kirton 2000c). It thirdly came from **energy**, with rising prices and supply shortages in California in 2000, new 9/11 fears that nuclear reactors were vulnerable to terrorist attack, and an electricity blackout in the Northeast in August 2003. It fourthly came from **health**, as Americans faced bioterrorism anthrax attacks in 2001, the global pandemics such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) in 2003 and an emerging shortage of vaccines as they waited for Asia’s deadly avian flu to arrive. It fifthly came from **ecology**, from extreme weather events intensified by climate change.<sup>v</sup>

These assaults showed that even the so-called “sole remaining superpower” or “hyper-hegemon”—could be vulnerable, just as lesser powers long had been. By December 2003, with Osama Bin Laden and Mullah Omar still at large, with the war in Afghanistan still not won, and with the U.S.-led coalition bogged down in Iraq, a now militarily mobilized America felt vulnerable still. America the vulnerable could even again become America the **vanquished**, should its wars in Afghanistan and Iraq be lost.

**Canada**, in sharp contrast, remained the **least vulnerable** principal power in the Group of Eight (G8) despite the deadly SARS attack that struck it in the spring of 2003. This sudden sharp shift in **relative vulnerability**, in the broader **balance of vulnerability**, and in the resulting **equalization of vulnerability**, pulled Canada into expansive global leadership in a more equally interpenetrated and pervasively insecure world (Kirton 2000b).<sup>vi</sup>

## Doctrine

### **Canada in the World, 1995**

Canada's expansive global leadership first arose doctrinally, in the highly CNR content of the government's formal foreign policy statement, "Canada in the World," on February 7, 1995 (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] 1995; Malone 2001).<sup>vii</sup> It had **five premises**. The first was Canada's **leadership** position among the open, advanced societies becoming more influential as world power dispersed and became more economically defined. The second was Canada's **geographic advantage**, as new poles of power emerged in the Asia-Pacific and Americas. The third was Canada's **bicultural and multicultural personality** giving Canada privileged access to the anglophone and francophone worlds and beyond. The fourth was Canada's **summit opportunities**, as it could "further its global interests better than any other country through key international groupings, notably by hosting the 1995 G7 Summit and the 1997 APEC [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation] Summit." The fifth, now LI, premise was Canada's **multilateral mediatory role**, based on its history as a non-colonizing power, its constructive multilateralism, and its effective international mediation.<sup>viii</sup>

Three priorities followed: first, the promotion of **prosperity** and employment through trade; second, the promotion of global **peace** to protect Canada's **security**; and third, the **projection of Canadian values** and culture for Canada's success in the world. A fourth, de facto priority of **ecologically sustainable development** crosscut the other three.

The economy had returned to first, now centred on employment and trade, in a clear CNR choice.<sup>ix</sup> Promoting peace to protect Canadian security rose to second from third.<sup>x</sup> LI's "peace" now came with CNR's "Canadian security" against the transnational human security threats that directly threatened Canadians individually in a newly vulnerable world.<sup>xi</sup>

The third priority of projecting Canadian **values and culture** was new.<sup>xii</sup> To be sure, Canadian values were specified as LI's likeminded "respect for democracy, the rule of law," and "human rights." But the inclusion of the "environment" added the distinctive national value (DNV) of environmentalism. CNR's "**Canadianization** of the global order" thus doctrinally arrived.

In all three priorities, separate **Canadian interests came first**, followed by an increasing **international interdependence** that made Canada more exposed but gave it greater ability to shape world order.<sup>xiii</sup>

### **Defence White Paper, 1994**

CNR dominated defence policy too.<sup>xiv</sup> It declared that Canada should maintain “multi-purpose, combat-capable” sea, land, and air forces, able to “fight alongside the best, against the best.”<sup>xv</sup>

It put **Canada’s protection first** and **UN peacekeeping last**. The priorities were first to protect Canada, second to cooperate with the U.S. in the defence of North America, and third to participate in peacekeeping and other multilateral operations elsewhere in the world.<sup>xvi</sup>

### **Axworthy Doctrine, 1996**

Greater CNR content came under Lloyd Axworthy. The Axworthy amendment took the “lessons” of Canada’s crusade to ban antipersonnel landmines and elevated them into a general doctrine with eight interrelated points (Axworthy and Taylor 1998; McRae and Hubert 2001; Axworthy 2003; Cohen 2003a).

The first five saw a **changing world**.<sup>xvii</sup> First, the **end** of the Cold War had transformed international politics. Second, security should now focus not on states, but on **people**, who faced the human security threats of crime, drugs, terrorism, pollution, human rights abuses, epidemics, and other pathologies arising from the now central intrastate conflicts. Third, **soft power**, not hard military force, was key. Fourth, effective **public diplomacy** was increasingly effective in a “wired world.” Fifth, vanguard nongovernmental organizations (**NGOs**) now led.

Three implications for **Canadian foreign policy** arose. First, Canada could **lead** ad hoc coalitions of the willing. Second, it could promulgate **new norms** to change world order. Third, the **priorities** were antipersonnel landmines, small arms, children’s rights, human rights, and peace-building.

**CNR dominated** (Nossal 1998).<sup>xviii</sup> The emphasis on leadership suggested initiative. The creation of new international norms suggested the modification of world order. The reliance on coalitions of the willing pointed to ad hoc plurilateralism, rather than the old fixed multilateral

coalitions of the likeminded. And the core values of the desired new world order were connected to Canada's DNV of antimilitarism.

### **Red Book Three, 2000**

These emphases survived in Chretien's platform for the general election he called for November 27, 2000 (Liberal Party of Canada 2000). Its foreign policy passage began: "Canadians are uniquely positioned to **lead and succeed** in the new global world."

### **Dialogue Report, 2003**

This CNR conviction reappeared in the "**Dialogue**" report presented by foreign minister, Bill Graham in June 2003 (DFAIT 2003b, Graham 2016). It now put the national interest of **security first** in the post-September 11 age. But it emphasized great change and uncertainty, Canada's distinctive advantages—a diverse population and geography, economic openness, "broad global interests," and Canada's "unique basis for asserting a distinctive presence in the world."<sup>xix</sup>

### Resource Distributions

These doctrinal thrusts were **largely backed** by resource distributions in the somewhat constrained instrument of **budgeting**, the highly responsive one of **summitry**, and the most difficult one of **combat**.

### **Budgets**

Budget allocation for international affairs stand at the heart of the debate about a gap between doctrine and resource distributions or between **commitments and capability** during the Chrétien years (Goldenberg 2006). There was indeed an **initial PD decline** in overall international affairs spending, driven by the need for deficit-elimination. Yet it came with an **internal shift** from LI to CNR purposes, propelling a CNR configuration and greater commitment-capability consistency between doctrine and resource distribution when fiscal surplus and increased international affairs spending returned in 1998.

When Chrétien started, spending on the international affairs instruments took about **10 percent** of federal expenditure. Of this defence (DND) took **7 percent**, official development assistance (ODA) **2 percent**, and **diplomacy** (DFAIT) less than **1 percent** (Doern and Kirton 1996).<sup>xx</sup> In February 1994,

Chrétien **cut defence** by 10 percent and **ODA** by 2 percent, while **DFAIT rose** by 5 percent.<sup>xxi</sup> In the February 27, 1995, budget all three dropped.<sup>xxii</sup> Yet within DFAIT, money automatically sent to ever more expensive LI UN-based multilateral organizations shifted to CNR national purposes through programs Canada unilaterally controlled.

On this new CNR foundation, spending rose once fiscal surplus returned in 1998. The **great CNR leap forward** came on the road to, and due to, the G8 Summit hosted by Canada in **Kananaskis** in June 2002. It mobilized about \$50 billion in global goods.<sup>xxiii</sup> [ESSAY CASE STUDY]

### Summitry

In summitry, **CNR prevailed from the start**. Chrétien's first year brought unprecedentedly intense travel abroad, with nine tours to 36 different countries (see Kirton 2007: Appendix 11). The U.S. came first, **France and Britain** second and then the other G8 partners of Japan, Germany, Russia, and Italy.<sup>xxiv xxv</sup> Canada now lived largely in a G7-APEC world. The new pull of plurilateral institutional nests dominated. Dedicated bilateral encounters virtually disappeared. The G7, APEC, and the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) rose to the fore.

By mid-1996, even more intense global involvement arose, as Chrétien had met the leaders of 124 countries. **First was France**, by a wide margin, for the **national unity imperative** dominated as the Quebec referendum of October 30, 1995, had approached. The U.S. dropped to third, tied with Russia and Italy.<sup>xxvi</sup> As Chrétien prepared to host his Halifax G7 summit in the summer of 1995, G7/8 partners ranked one through eight, along with **Ukraine** in seventh.<sup>xxvii</sup> Added was **new unilateral instrument**—the now routine **Team Canada** trade promotion tours.<sup>xxviii</sup>

Between January 1997 and January 2001, plurilateralism continued led by the G7/8, APEC and Team Canada. The U.S. returned to first,<sup>xxix</sup> followed by Britain in second, Japan in third and France in fourth, with the national unity referendum now won.<sup>xxx</sup>

### Combat Operations in War: From Two to Six

Combat operations soared, as Canada went to war more often, for longer, using more combat arms, for more offensive and deadly missions, on a greater global terrain. Mulroney and Campbell in their 10 years had mounted

only two combat operations. Chrétien in his 10 years did at least **six**: staying in the **Balkans**, entering **Haiti** in 1994, initiating the North Atlantic **Turbot** War against Spain in 1995, intervening in **Zaire** in October 1996, liberating **Kosovo** in 1999, and attacking **Afghanistan** after 2001, while allowing only minimal military participation in the war against **Iraq** in 2003 (Bow 2009).

Decisions

### The Overall Pattern

These doctrines and resource distributions translated into major decisions with striking speed, strength and scope in a **three stage sequence** of expanding ambition and accomplishment (see Appendices B, C and D).<sup>xxxii</sup>

In **trade and economics** came trade liberalization based on CNR's plurilateralism, bilateralism, and unilateralism.<sup>xxxii xxxiii</sup> LI multilateralism lingered in Canada's initiative to conclude the Uruguay Round and create the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1994, and in its support for launching the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) after the September 11 terrorist attacks. But **plurilateralism** arose with the 1994 agreement on full free trade through NAFTA, APEC, and the Free Trade Agreement of the Americas (FTAA), with the quest for a trans-Atlantic free trade agreement (TAFTA), and with the use of the G7 and Trade Ministers Quadrilateral concert forums.<sup>xxxiv</sup> **Bilateralism** came in agreements with Israel, Jordan, Palestine, Chile and Costa Rica, and negotiations with Central America, the Caribbean, and others.<sup>xxxv</sup> **Unilateralism** came with the Chretien-led Team Canada trade promotion missions, and the **Kananaskis** G8-driven unilateral elimination of tariffs on imports from Africa. Absent were PD moves to continentalism through deeper economic integration with the U.S. alone, despite the argument that this was necessary for Canada's prosperity or even economic survival in the face of globalization and the 9/11 terrorist attacks.

In **military intervention**, while the trend had been started by Mulroney. Chrétien now routinely used force multilaterally, plurilaterally, bilaterally, and unilaterally, on sea, air, and land, in even more distant global theatres (Kirton 1992; Mikulaninec 1992; Miller 1994; Rudner 1991).<sup>xxxvi</sup> Despite his initial isolationist instincts Chrétien's Canada practiced successful **multilateralism** in Europe and the Americas by remaining in Bosnia in 1993 and entering Haiti in 1994. He **unilaterally** and successfully used force against Spain in the spring of 1995. Canada led a partially productive **plurilateral** mission in Zaire in the autumn of 1996. Successful forceful

plurilateralism came in the G8-led, NATO-delivered operation in Europe with Canada flying in the first wave to liberate **Kosovo** from an impending genocide, on March 24, 1999. Canada conducted offensive combat operations with the Americans alone in distant **Afghanistan**, having dispatched air, land, and sea forces to kill al Qaeda and Taliban terrorists in the autumn of 2001 (Kirton 2007). Yet Canada participated militarily at only a very low level, in the U.S.-led coalition invasion of Iraq in the spring of 2003. This was a striking change from 40 years of combat-free peacekeeping during the Cold War after 1954.<sup>xxxvii</sup> In a reversal of the 1939 to 1941 continental relationship, it was no longer America defending Canada against an envisaged overseas threat from Hitler's Germany. Rather, in a post-1941 Pearl Harbour replay, Canada now rushed to defend a newly vulnerable America under real attack at home.

In **shaping world order**, came Canada's ambitious, accomplished global leadership based on its national interests and DNVs. The first, defensive, success on all six national interests came at home—winning the Quebec **referendum** in October 1995 through the partly PD approach of calling upon U.S. support as well as a CNR coalition of France and all other consequential countries in the world.<sup>xxxviii</sup> Then came more expansive extensions of traditional LI impulses—successfully co-creating the **WTO** in 1994, and trying, if failing, to expand **NATO** rapidly in January 1994. The first substantially CNR success was catalyzing the UN Agreement on Straddling **Fish** Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in 1995, and the Arctic Council in 1996 (English 2013). Canada had only slender success in reforming the UN-Bretton Woods system at the Halifax G7 Summit in 1995. It then moved largely beyond the UN, fostering a **G8** concert with **Russia** after 1996, creating the **landmines** convention in 1996, establishing the **ICC** in 1997, creating the **G20** in 1999, generating global **environmental** governance to control deadly pollutants and climate change, and fostering the International Network on Cultural Policy (**INCP**), and a new international agreement by 2005. At the 2002 **Kananaskis** G8 Summit, Canada created new partnerships across both the old East-West and North-South divides, through the Global Partnership on Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction and the G8 Africa Action Plan (see Appendix D).

### **Outcomes: From Failure to Success**

A systematic examination of outcomes suggests Canada did poorly in its relations with the **U.S.** in Chrétien's first two years (Norton 1998). But it did

much better on trade and environment cases in a **NAFTA** context from 1993 to 1998 (Rugman, Kirton and Soloway 1999). In its **combat** operations Canada largely succeeded, especially when compared to its combat and peacekeeping ventures from 1945 to 1990.<sup>xxxix</sup> After 1990, Kuwait was liberated, the former Yugoslavia became a peaceful functioning democracy, Spanish pirate fishers were driven from Canada's North Atlantic, and genocide prevented in Kosovo. While a functioning Haiti, terrorist-free North America, and safe, stable, democratic Afghanistan and Iraq had not appeared, there was clear progress when Chrétien left and Paul Martin arrived as prime minister.

### The Martin Years Assessed

Paul Martin became prime minister on December 12, 2003, having served 15 years in Parliament and nine as Chrétien's finance minister from 1993 to 2002 (Gray 2003, Kirton 2007, Martin 2008). He had a life-long exposure to Canadian foreign policy from his father and namesake, Paul Martin Sr., who had done it with distinction for over four decades since 1935 (Martin 1983, Donaghy ).

Paul Martin Jr. arrived with a **well-defined, highly ambitious** foreign policy vision. Its delivery was interrupted by the general election on June 28, 2004, which gave Martin only a minority. Then his government was defeated on a no-confidence vote on November 28, 2005, and in the general election of January 23, 2006.

### The Debate

Martin's foreign policy inspired a debate among four schools of thought:

The first saw a **disappointing** LI default. It reflects the letdown felt by those expecting the long awaited, highly talented Martin to bring badly needed, long overdue change. He promised the "Politics of Achievement" (Gray 2003; Martin 2003). But he was immediately hit with a financial **scandal** in the Liberal Party, a new national unity challenge in Quebec, and a **minority** government after June 2004. Martin's first Speech from the Throne had boldly promised within a year an international policy **review** of unprecedented scale and scope.<sup>xl</sup> But only on April 19, 2005, did its results arrive. Martin seemed to default to the LI path as his November 2004 African tour showed his "Pearsonian ambition to make Canada the world's mediator" (Clark 2004).

The second school saw PD **decline**. Here delay of urgently needed initiatives led to a downhill slide, to the point of no return. The money the Canadian **forces** needed to keep fighting overseas did not come, so most had to come home. Also absent was a clear plan to meet Canada's **Kyoto** commitment to control climate change (Simpson et al 2007). In distant **Darfur**, in September 2004, Martin "pleaded for humanitarian intervention in Sudan. He offered no troops. He got little attention" (Spencer 2004, 16).

The third school saw **diversion to America**. In this mild PD view Martin focused on repairing relations with the United States and with a President George W. Bush who Jean Chrétien had ignored or snubbed.<sup>xli</sup>

The fourth school saw a CNR **drive to the top** by a determined prime minister who would eventually get there if he followed the right advice. Adherents approved Martin's declaration that "the world we are going to live in for the next 10 or 20 years is going to be very different. My goal is that Canada be a **major player** in that world." Michael Ignatieff said Canada mattered because it was a G8 country in a world where the U.S. had lost the appearance of legitimate authority when it used force (Soupcoff 2004). Others applauded the ambitious international policy review and Martin's call to elevate the G20 to the leaders' level (Kirton 1999, 2004b, 2005c). John Kirton concluded that Martin "could well pull it off..." (Spencer 2004, 18). Jennifer Welsh (2004) produced "Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century" and called for Canada to be "At Home in the World." Canada 25 (2004) said Canada should move "From Middle to Model Power" by "Recharging Canada's Role in the World."

### **The Foreign Policy of Achievement**

Martin did produce a foreign policy of **achievement**, as his determined drive to the top **delivered** substantial results from the start. They flourished in the full global political system, embracing distant Africa, and in shaping world order as a whole. The centerpiece was producing as a dominant principle the "responsibility to protect" (**R2P**) and progressing toward a new leaders-level summit of the world's twenty systemically-significant countries (**L20**). They represented the most ambitious attempt of any post-1945 prime minister to transform the defining ideas and institutions of global governance. By September 2005, at the United Nations World Summit in New York, his R2P principle was accepted by all leaders in the world. As he left office

Martin, by his own estimate, was somewhere between two-thirds and three-quarters of the way to bringing his L20 to life.

His ambitious achievements were driven by American decline, system diffusion, and Canadian rise. Changes in **vulnerability** increased American dependence, diffused systemic dependence, and pushed a capable Canada to meet the need. The denser web of plurilateral summit institutions (**PSIs**), where Canada had an acknowledged status in the top tier gave it easily available instruments to act.<sup>4</sup>

Yet with such rapid American decline, diffusing capability and equalizing vulnerability, the **principal power paradox** arose in full force. External determinants became less salient and societal and government determinants more salient in driving what Canada did. Canada had a prime minister with the personal desire, international credentials and skills to put his ambitious global-shaping vision into effect (Gray 2003). However, Martin could not dominate his government the way that most of his predecessors had. The now highly salient societal determinants were a **minority** government, a large experienced group of Bloc Québécois **separatists**, and a newly **united official opposition** Conservative Party in the House. The Gomery Commission investigating Chrétien-era corruption eroded Martin's political capital. Francophone Quebec was dealt with, in part by appointing a francophone minister to foreign affairs, which had just been split from international trade (Pettigrew 1999). Apart from his highly accomplished defence minister Bill Graham, Martin was largely left to do his ambitious foreign policy alone.

### **The Meta-Theory Causes**

The **meta-theory of hegemonic transition** explains well why Martin's foreign policy of achievement arose despite these diversions at home.

#### ***Capability***

Martin's first year saw **U.S.** relative capability **decline** and systemic diffusion due to a drop in the U.S. dollar, the rapid GDP rise of energy rich Russia, China and other G20 partners, and changes in the exchange rates of the G8 and G20 countries.<sup>xliii</sup> Canada rose, as during Martin's first year its dollar rose from US\$0.75 to more than US\$0.85, where it largely remained until late 2005, erasing the great decline during the Chrétien years.

### ***Vulnerability***

Martin's first year also saw an **equalization of vulnerability**, in its old and new, deliberate and diffuse, and deadly and deprivation forms. **Terrorist** and **energy** vulnerabilities intensified, and were linked to newly acute **ecological** and **health** ones. America was among the hardest hit and Canada the least in the G8.

**Terrorism** spared both America and Canada at home. But it hit hard in Britain on July 7, 2005, Russia at Beslan on September 1–3, 2004, and Spain on the Madrid subway on March 11, 2004. Abroad, America was hit as attacks by al Qaeda–affiliated insurgents in Iraq drove U.S. troop deaths above 2,000 by November 2005. American public support for the war plunged.

**Ecological** shocks also afflicted America and its G8 allies, although not Canada in acute form. Global **climate change** arrived not with a gentle gradual warming but with sudden severe extreme weather events.

ii the summer of 2005 the warming waters of the Gulf of Mexico fuelled hurricanes **Rita and Katrina**, devastating New Orleans and America's Gulf Coast. The resulting death and devastation was unprecedented in modern American history, as 1,464 died (or half the 911 toll). An ecologically secure Canada sent its warships to help Americans rebuild. Few thought that America could cope on its own. At the end of 2004 the shock of the deadly **Asian tsunami** had dramatically displayed the global ecological threat.<sup>xliii</sup>

An **energy** shock came from Rita and Katrina too. Oil prices had risen to a new high in October 2004 of about US\$50 per barrel of oil. They were driven by the new demand from China's and India's GDP growth and the physical and psychological terrorist shocks in the Middle East that regularly cut off Iraq's oil production and threatened Saudi Arabia's oil exports. Then the two hurricanes took out almost 25 percent of America's oil and gas production and drove prices to a new peak of US\$69.50 on September 1, 2005.

Canada deployed its surplus specialized energy capability to help defend a vulnerable America. Alberta started producing at levels above its wells' sustainable level to send more energy south.<sup>xliiv</sup> Already Canada was the largest supplier of America's imported petroleum, providing 17 percent of America's imports. With improving technology now married to Canada's

skilled population and old natural resources, Canada's Athabasca oil sands became the second largest source of oil reserves in the world, behind only Saudi Arabia (Rugman 2005).

This specialized energy and broader commodity capability fuelled the rise of the Canadian dollar and Canada's overall capability relative to the United States. It fuelled Canada's new desire for CNR diversification, by exporting energy not only in PD fashion to America next door but also potentially to a booming Asia overseas. It also led a declining, more vulnerable America to search for North American solutions again.

This search for integrative solutions had been intensified by a shared energy shock in electricity. At 3:32 pm on **August 14, 2003**, the lights had gone out across north-eastern North America, in the "greatest power failure in North American history" (Welsh 2004, 100).<sup>11</sup> At the time Canada provided 100 percent of America's electricity imports, including to parts of the U.S. that were connected only to the Canadian and not the national American grid. But in the interconnected world of electricity, both grids were immediately infected by this accidental made-in-America energy attack. On a densely interconnected, mutually vulnerable continent, both countries went down together, whatever the relative capability ratio between the two. In order to strengthen energy, ecological, and broader cooperation among the U.S., Canada, and Mexico, in 2005 Bush met with Martin and Mexico's Vicente Fox in Waco, Texas, to unveil the trilateral Security and Prosperity Partnership of North America (**SPP**) (Davis 2005).

**Health** was another new vulnerability the three countries shared. After the Autumn 2001 anthrax attacks and the Spring 2003 Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic, an outbreak of avian flu arose. By the autumn of 2004, America was unable to secure half the flu shots it needed to protect its vulnerable citizens from the deadly pandemic, whose arrival was statistically long overdue (Kirton and Guebert 2010).

## **Doctrine**

These changing configurations of capability and vulnerability help explain the boldness of Martin's foreign policy doctrines.

***The Throne Speech, 2004***

The Speech from the Throne on February 2, 2004, opened with **international affairs** and a recognition of both “our history and our capacity for **change**.” It emphasized values on **war**.<sup>xlvi</sup>

It noted how Canada’s multiculturalism and “immigrants from all over the world” had enabled Canada to be “innovative in the modern world, where diversity counts for so much.” Its goal was “a role of pride and influence in the world, where we speak with an independent voice, bringing **distinctive Canadian values** to international affairs.”

This opening was predominantly CNR, emphasizing change and innovation, Canadian values being projected abroad, effectiveness, and global involvement through the Canadian military in combat half a world away. The anchor was the DNVs of multiculturalism and globalism. The goal was affecting outcomes.

Substantial LI content came too. Canada’s goal for world order was fairness and justice—values long shared with the likeminded. And the concept of “role” returned.

PD elements arose in a voice that was independent, implicitly from the imperial focus of the United States and the notion that Canada must carry its weight to meet its obligations, implicitly to the U.S.

The rest of the speech, however, offered a world of **diffusing capabilities**, where “global population” and “economic development” were “no longer restricted to the small minority of rich countries.” The speech thus promised, in CNR fashion, a **new diversification** toward the emerging giants leaping into the world’s principal power rank of China, India and Brazil.<sup>xlvi</sup>

Yet Canada’s new vulnerability had arrived, in the form of health and the resulting need to protect Canadians from global epidemics and contaminated water.<sup>xlvi</sup>

Canada would respond with a foreign policy based on **values**, and overwhelmingly on distinctive national ones. All but antimilitarism flourished in full force.

The first was **openness** in demography and economy.<sup>xlvi</sup>

The second was **multiculturalism**. In a world where multicultural diversity counted for so much, Canada's "abhorrence of racism" stood out.

The third was **environmentalism**. "Canadians, as stewards of vast geography and abundant resources, feel a keen sense of responsibility to help meet the environmental challenge." Canada would thus go beyond Kyoto on **climate change**, engage the U.S. on transboundary air and water issues and lead in environmental **technologies**.

The fourth was **globalism** — how immigrants, entrepreneurs and capital from all over the world build globally competitive firms and were global leaders in the commercialization of bright ideas.

The fifth was **international institutionalism**. The speech called for "new rules" and "multilateral institutions that work" in a world where "no one nation can manage the consequences of global interdependence on its own." It affirmed Canada's "leadership in the creation of a new international instrument on **cultural diversity**" and active participation in la **Francophonie**. New plurilateral institutional methods were thus mobilized for CNR's DNV of multiculturalism and national interest of national unity.

The speech referred directly to the national interest of unity, noting that "linguistic duality is at the heart of our identity. It is our image in the world. It opens doors for us." National security also had a prominent place.

### ***International Policy Statement, 2005***

These emphases reappeared in the International Policy Statement (IPS) on April 19, 2005 (Axworthy 2005; Schmitz and Lee 2005). Entitled "Canada's International Policy Statement: A Role of Pride and Influence in the World," it consisted of five documents—"Overview," "Diplomacy," "Development," "Defence," and "Commerce" (Foreign Affairs Canada 2005).

The Overview's five-page foreword, issued in the name of the prime minister defined foreign policy in **ambitious, interventionist** CNR terms as "how best to project Canadians' values and interests into the world and make a **real difference** in the lives of its embattled peoples, now and in the future." It noted that "the world is changing, quickly and radically." These "global **transformations**" brought challenges, "from the spectre of international **terrorism** to the threats of virulent **disease**, **climate** change

and disappearing **fish** stocks.” Amidst the “major rebalancing of world power,” independent countries with small populations such as Canada “risk being swept aside” unless they were “smart, focused, agile, creative and dogged in the pursuit of our interests.” Canada thus sought to make a “real difference in halting and preventing conflict and improving human welfare around the world” through a “doctrine of activism” and a longstanding sense of “global responsibilities” to “protect others, to raise them up, to make them safe.”

This was a **predominantly CNR** doctrine, if one with substantial LI and important PD elements. Its CNR starting point featured change, indeed global transformation. In classic realist terms it highlighted the “major rebalancing or world power.” In authentic CNR fashion, it spoke even earlier of the new **vulnerabilities** of a terrorist, health, and ecological kind. Canada sought to make a difference, by protecting others, on a global scale.

### **Resource Distributions**

These largely CNR doctrines were **reliably translated** into resource distributions.

### ***Summit Diplomacy***

In summitry during his first year, Martin took nine tours abroad, for 25 separate summit visits to meet with the leaders of most countries in the world. A full 60 percent came from four PSI events: the Summit of the Americas (SOA) in Mexico in January 2004, the G8 Summit in Sea Island, Georgia, in June 2004, the APEC leaders meeting in Santiago, Chile, in November 2004, and the Francophone Summit in Ouagadougou, Burkina Faso, in November.

Martin’s primary partner abroad was the U.S., with six meetings, followed by France and Russia with four each, and Mexico, Brazil, and Haiti with three each.<sup>xlix</sup> Martin’s favoured regions were the Americas, Europe, and Africa, rather than the Asia Pacific. There was good balance between anglophone and francophone states.

The next year, in 2005, Martin met three times each with the leaders of the U.S., Japan and China. Reinforcing this new Asia Pacific focus were Hong Kong, India and Thailand each tied for second. The Americas and Europe

also had several countries tied for second, largely due to ‘group’ summit events.

### ***Budgets***

In Martin’s budgets military spending rose. He immediately replaced the antiquated Sea King helicopters that Chrétien had proudly cancelled when he entered office in 1993. Martin then bought the new armoured personnel carriers (APCs) needed in Afghanistan. In November 2005, Martin, prompted by Defence Minister Bill Graham, replaced the aging Hercules aircraft that ferried Canadian forces to Afghanistan and elsewhere.

### ***Diplomatic Posts and Personnel***

Diplomatic instruments rose too. The February 2005 budget allocated \$641 million over five years to rebuild Canada’s diplomatic resources through new positions abroad, public diplomacy, personnel safety, and international peace and security support (Copeland 2005, 745).

### **Decisions**

Doctrines and resource distributions flowed directly into key decisions.

Martin’s decisions began with reorganizing Ottawa’s government in December 2003 and initiating the International Policy Review that culminated in April 2005. He then declined participation in US Ballistic Missile Defence (BMD), co-created the North American Security and Prosperity Partnership (SPP) in 2005, improved international health in 2003, secured the responsibility to protect (R2P) principle in 2005, and campaigned for a Leaders’ 20 (L20) from 2003-5. For the details of these cases see Kirton (2007: 190-194) and Appendix G.

### **Outcomes**

In his two years of domestically distracted minority government, Martin achieved a great deal. He sent substantial Canadian forces into frontline combat in **Afghanistan** to build a stable, secure, democracy in a multicultural, federal country where no such polity had existed before. He helped put ethnic cleansing in **Sudan** at the top of the international agenda and provided military assistance to help stop the genocide there. He started negotiations for bilateral free trade agreements with **Japan**. He helped inaugurate the **SPP** summit to give comprehensive, coherent, leaders level guidance to the North American community. Globally he pioneered and

produced as the new defining legitimate principle the revolutionary doctrine of **R2P** and the institution of the **G20 summit** that would soon arrive.

### Conclusion

In his 1993 book, Tom Keating contrasts Canada's traditional, UN-based multilateralism with "the more nationalist and unilateralist orientation of the Trudeau government" and with "Canada's attraction to and involvement in the more selective plurilateral (limited number of members) club—the Group of Seven leading industrialized countries who began meeting in annual summits in the mid-1970s" (11–12). Chrétien first signaled that he preferred the venerable Pearsonian multilateral, UN-centred ways. But in economics, security, and global governance, he quickly and increasingly chose plurilateralism, bilateralism, and unilateralism. Martin attempted and achieved an ambitious crusade to modify and replace with an antithetical alternative the defining principle and PSI on which world order had long been based. Canada was thus pulled toward—and often into—a principal power position in a rapidly changing world.

## References

- Bow, Brian (2009). *The Politics of Linkage: Power, Interdependence, and Ideas in Canada-US Relations* (Vancouver: UBC Press).
- Cohn, Theodore (2002). *Governing Global Trade: International Institutions in Conflict and Convergence* (Aldershot: Ashgate).
- Donaghy, Greg ( ). [[book on Paul Martin senior]]
- English, John (2013). *Ice and Water: Politics, Peoples, and the Arctic Council* (Toronto: Allen Lane).
- Kirton, John (2007a). Montreal Paper.
- Kirton, John (2007b). Beijing Paper.
- Kirton, John and Jenilee Guebert (2010), “North American Health Governance: Shocks, Summitry and Societal Support,” *NorteAmerica* 5(1): 221-224 (January-June).
- Kirton, John (2013), *G20 Governance for a Globalized World* (Farnham: Ashgate).
- Kirton, John and Ella Kokotsis (2015), *The Global Governance of Climate Change: G7, G20 and UN Leadership* (Farnham: Ashgate).
- Lang, Eugene and Janice Stein (2007). *Canada's Unexpected War*
- Norton, Roy (1998).
- Simpson, Jeffrey (2007), *Hot Air*.

## *Autobiography, Biography and memoires*

- Axworthy, Lloyd (2003), *Navigating A New World: Canada's Global Future* (Toronto: Knopf Canada).
- Chrétien, Jean (2007), *My Years as Prime Minister*
- Copps, Sheila (2004). *Worth Fighting For*
- Goldenberg, Eddie (2006), *The Way It Works: Inside Ottawa* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).
- Graham, Bill (2016), *The Call of the World: A Political Memoir*, (Vancouver: UBC Press).
- Gray, John (2003), *Paul Martin: The Power of Ambition* (Toronto: Key Porter).
- Martin, Lawrence, *Iron Man*
- Martin, Paul (2008), *Come Hell or High Water*

## **Appendix A: Doctrines and Distributions Under Chrétien**

### **Doctrines**

#### Foreign Policy

Canada in the World 1995

Axworthy Doctrine 1996

Red Book Three, 2000

Dialogue Document 2003

Prosperity, Security, Values, Ecology

Defence Policy 1994

Canada, North America, World (Pkg, Mult)

Throne Speeches

### **Distributions**

Budgets

Diplomatic Representation

Summitry

Bilateral Institutions

Combat Operations

## **The 2002 G8 Budget Additions**

In December 2001 Canada added \$500 million for ODA in Africa. In March 2002, it added an annual 8 percent ODA increase for each of the next five years. At the Halifax G7 finance ministers meeting just before Kananaskis, Canada added its share of the further US\$1 billion for debt relief for heavily indebted poor countries (HIPC) and the US\$23 billion for the 13th replenishment of the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA). At the Summit itself, an anti-militarist Canada added another CA\$1 billion over ten years from its priorities reserve to dispose safely of weapons of mass destruction (WMD) in Russia, as part of the G8's new US\$20 billion Global Partnership against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction. In all, Kananaskis proved to be a US\$50 billion summit, with Canada's fair share costing several billion dollars in additional investment in global public goods. The Cold War victory and September 11 alone might largely explain the billion dollars for WMD destruction that Russia received. But the G8 as an international institution with autonomous impact and perhaps Chrétien's ghost of Gabon in 1968 account primarily for the larger amount of new money that Africa and the developing world secured.

## **Appendix B: Outcomes of Decisions Under Chrétien**

	Initiator	Adjuster	Winner (Short/Long)
<b>Economic Decisions</b>			
1993 NAFTA			
1994 WTO			
1994 G7 Quad			
1994 APEC			
1994 FTAA			
1994 Plurilateralism			
1994 Bilateral FTA			
1994 Team Canada			
1997 Chile FTA			
<b>Military Decisions</b>			
1993 Bosnia			
1994 Haiti			
1995 Spain			
1996 Zaire			
1999 Kosovo			
2001 North America			
2001 Afghanistan			
2003 Iraq			
<b>Global Order Decisions</b>			
1994 WTO			
1994 NATO Expansion			
1995 Quebec Referendum			
1995 Environment			
1995 UN Reform			
1996 G8 Concert			
1996 Arctic Council			
1996 Landmines			
1996 ICC			
1997 Finance G20			
1998 Cultural Diversity			
2002 Africa			

## **Appendix C: National Interests and Values in Decisions Under Chrétien**

### **Economic Decisions**

1993 NAFTA  
1994 WTO  
1994 G7 Quad  
1994 APEC  
1994 FTAA  
1994 Plurilateralism  
1994 Bilateral FTA  
1994 Team Canada

### **Military Decisions**

1993 Bosnia  
1994 Haiti  
1995 Spain  
1996 Zaire  
1999 Kosovo  
2001 North America  
2001 Afghanistan  
2003 Iraq

### **Global Order Decisions**

1994 WTO  
1994 NATO Expansion  
1995 Quebec Referendum  
1995 Environment  
1995 UN Reform  
1996 G8 Concert  
1996 Arctic Council  
1996 Landmines  
1996 ICC  
1997 Finance G20  
1998 Cultural Diversity  
2002 Africa

## **Appendix E**

### **Major Decisions under Chretien**

#### **Economics and Trade: Competitive Liberalization**

The field of economic and trade policy clearly shows Canada's thrust toward expansive global leadership through geographic, functional, instrumental, intrusive and institutional shifts. **Geographically**, Canada's historical focus on the Atlantic world was supplemented by major involvement in the Americas, Asia Pacific, the Middle East, and Africa. **Functionally**, trade liberalization through continentalism and convoy-like multilateralism faded, while plurilateralism, bilateralism, and unilateralism arose. **Instrumentally**, these changes came through summit diplomacy, notably Team Canada. **Intrusively**, they were increasingly aimed at the internal transformation of ever more distant societies in pursuit of sustainable development, good governance, and human rights. Institutionally, Canada moved beyond its traditional focus on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) and its successor the WTO, to help pioneer a new generation of plurilateral international institutions and full free trade agreements. In these Canada, its interests, and its distinctive national values—notably environmental protection—acquired a prominent place.

#### ***North American Free Trade Agreement, 1993***

The Chrétien government's first trade policy decision arose over NAFTA, which had been negotiated by the Mulroney and Campbell governments. Chrétien's campaign Red Book had demanded four modifications to the trade agreement, and stated that abrogation was a last resort (Cameron and Tomlin 2002, Chrétien 2007: 81-88). On security of energy supplies, Chrétien had asked to remove the proportionality clause that guaranteed U.S. access to Canadian oil, gas, and electricity in times of cutback. Once elected, he got nothing here from the United States. On water transfers, where Canada's environmentalism loomed large, he got a letter clarifying that the U.S. would not use the deal to force Canada to divert lake, river, or glacier water. On government subsidies and on antidumping and countervail limitations, Canada got a working group whose results came to naught.<sup>1</sup>

But even without these last-minute changes, NAFTA and its two side agreements and organizations for the environment and labour marked a move from continentalism to trilateralism—the most limited form of plurilateralism. They brought real regional organization to North America

and thus to the Canada-U.S. relationship for the first time. They also linked trade with environmental and social values (Kirton and Maclaren 2002b). NAFTA thus marked a major move away from PD's "existing institutionalization" toward CNR's "revised" institutionalization. To be sure, hegemony and marginal universalism had helped bring about NAFTA and only limited plurilateralism was produced. But the architecture allowed some of these features to be overcome as the new regime for North American governance began its work.<sup>li</sup>

### ***Uruguay and Doha, 1994–2001***

Chrétien also inherited from the Mulroney government a Uruguay Round agreement for multilateral trade liberalization negotiated in a single undertaking, and with it a new WTO that Canadian initiative had produced. (Winham 1998)<sup>lii</sup> The Chrétien government completed the process at the Marrakesh ministerial meeting that successfully concluded the round. To this clear LI achievement, Canada added a CNR component, in 1999, infusing its distinctive national values of cultural and environmental protection into the draft preamble of a new round at the WTO's ministerial meeting in Seattle. In November 2001 in Doha, Qatar, it helped launch a new round with environmental provisions included. This "Doha Development Agenda" (DDA) focused on the development values emphasized by LI's distributive internationalism.

### ***The G7 and Trade Ministers Quadrilateral***

Canada also used its first-tier position in the inner management of the trade system—in the G7 and Quad concerts—to ensure the smooth start-up of the new multilateral machinery (Cohn 2002). This was evident at the G7's Naples 1994 and Halifax 1995 summits, in responding to the last-minute all-American initiative for "Open Markets 2000," and in dealing with a U.S.-Japan automotive trade dispute. Yet as the years progressed, the Quad proved less valuable to Canada in helping launch a new round of multilateral trade liberalization, especially after the American-produced debacle of the 1999 WTO ministerial in Seattle. The launch came only at Doha in November 2001, two months after the September 11 terrorist attacks.

### ***Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, 1994***

A broad burst of plurilateralism came with the November 1994 agreement among the APEC leaders to have full free trade among their developed country members by 2010 and among their developing country members by

2020 (Chretien 2007: 182-8). As with NAFTA, this agreement was a U.S. initiative. But it was readily supported by the Chrétien government, given its enthusiasm for trade with Asia. Moreover, APEC had a strong transoceanic, transregional scope that expanded further when Chile, Peru, and Russia were added in subsequent years. Working with Japan, Canada was able to inject its distinctive national value of environmental protection into APEC, notably at APEC's March 1994 environment ministerial in Vancouver.

### ***Free Trade Agreement of the Americas, 1994***

A further U.S.-initiated process breeding broader plurilateralism than NAFTA and APEC was the Summit of the Americas held in Miami in December 1994 (Chretien 2007: 92-6, 291-2). Canada's CNR initiative added a commitment to a full free trade agreement among the 34 democratic members of the hemisphere by 2005. Canada insisted that if it was to participate in a summit organized by the U.S. rather than by the Organization of American States (OAS), trade liberalization had to be a key component. Canada succeeded in having the summit endorse the goal of hemispheric free trade by 2005, even though some had been reluctant to specify a date. This inclusive plurilateralism bridged the old North-South divide. Yet results were slow to come. At the FTAA trade ministers meeting in November 2003, held under U.S. and Brazilian leadership, the members agreed, over Canadian, Mexican, and Chilean objections, to settle for an "FTAA Light" agreement in which each member could choose only the particular liberalization provisions it liked.

### ***Plurilateral Free Trade Agreements, 1994***

Canada also sought a free trade deal across the Atlantic. MacLaren started suggesting such a notion in March 1994, followed by Chrétien in December. But despite persistent Canadian follow-up and the presentation of different formulas, the EU proved uninterested. Canada then sought to deal with members of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA) collectively, then individually, with Norway as its first choice. But talks with the EFTA countries of Norway, Switzerland, and Lichtenstein bogged down in 2000 when Ottawa decided to resume subsidizing its shipbuilding. Plurilateralism across the old Atlantic had not arrived when Chrétien left.

### ***Bilateral Free Trade Agreements, 1994***

Far more successful was Canada's move beyond plurilateralism into bilateralism, through free trade deals with individual countries around the

world. The process started with Israel, with a summit visit agreement struck in Ottawa in November 1994 to conclude a deal within two years. In April 1995 came another summit-generated agreement, to negotiate free trade with Jordan. One with the Palestinian Authority came next.

Bilateralism next came to the Americas, with a deal with Chile, concluded on July 5, 1997. It had NAFTA-like environment and labour protections built in. Then came a similar deal with Costa Rica in April 2001. Negotiations were started with El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua on November 21, 2001, and subsequently with the Commonwealth Caribbean states. Canada next went global, opening negotiations with Singapore and exploring prospects with principal power Japan.

### ***Team Canada and Tariff Reductions, 1994***

Chrétien also employed unilateralism. Team Canada trade promotion missions, led by the prime minister and including provincial premiers, went to China, Hong Kong, and Vietnam in the autumn of 1994, and then to Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, and Hong Kong in January 1996. They focused on Canadian interests and on the economic priority at the top of the February 1995 list. Team Canada was an innovation inspired by competition from other major powers in the world's emerging markets.

Outward-oriented unilateralism also arrived in trade policy with Canada's commitment to eliminate most tariffs on imports from Africa countries. The decision flowed from the G8 Africa Action Plan produced at Canada's G8 Kananaskis Summit. It took effect on January 1, 2003.

### **Military Intervention**

A further expansion came in the domain of hard power. During the ten Chrétien years, military force was used six times. This reveals **eight trends**, all of a CNR kind. The first is increasing **frequency**—to the point where going to war, and suffering combat casualties, became routine. The second is a global **geographic** expansion, from proximate Europe, the Caribbean, and the Atlantic to the more distant Persian Gulf and Afghanistan. The third is the multilateral to plurilateral and unilateral shift from UN-authorized multilateralism toward **plurilateral** coalitions of the willing in Kosovo and Afghanistan and even **unilateralism** in the Turbot War against Spain. The fourth is involvement from the **first to finish**, rather than—as in Korea

1950–54—delaying, being dragged into an operation begun by allies, and seeking to get out as soon as possible. The fifth is **multi-element** involvement—fighting on sea, air, land, and with special forces. The sixth is the willingness to engage in ever more deadly **offensive** roles—to kill and be killed. The seventh is the willingness to **lead**—to initiate the use of force against Spain and to organize and command the multinational force in Zaire. The eighth is Canada’s **success** in shaping outcomes in a preferred way. The early frustrations of the 1990s in Bosnia and Haiti gave way to the clear successes against Spain and in Kosovo as well as visible progress in Afghanistan when Chrétien left.

### ***Bosnia, 1993–95***

The Chrétien government’s willingness to go to war started most reluctantly with Bosnia, into which the Mulroney government had injected Canadian forces alongside France in the spring of 1992 (Chretien 2007: 88). The Chrétien government opposed any U.S.-proposed air strikes, sought admission to the Bosnia Contact Group, which directed the war, and threatened to pull out its troops if its demands were not met (Schwegmann 2001). But the government extended their tour of duty in January 1994 and again in September 1994. It pulled them out only in 1995, when the U.S. finally produced the Dayton Accords.

### ***Haiti, 1993–94***

The Chrétien government also inherited a challenge in Haiti (Chretien 2007: 90-2). Again Canada displayed an initial aversion, but an ultimate willingness, to use force. It did so to help bring democracy to a fellow francophone country in its home hemisphere by restoring the democratically elected government of Jean-Bertrand Aristide. The Chrétien government first withdrew two of the three Canadian warships blockading Haiti, and said its preferred role was to train Haiti’s police force after a transition in government had come. While working with principal powers America and France, along with Venezuela, in the plurilateral “Friends of Haiti” Contact Group, Canada resisted U.S. suggestions that force was needed to get Aristide back. When the U.S. invaded in September 1994, Canada participated only in the safer second wave. But once in, Canada moved to a more robust and muscular military involvement. It was prepared to do so without the legitimating cover of a UN resolution that could be held hostage to the desires and potential veto of China.

### ***Spain, 1995***

In the spring 1995 Turbot War against Spain, the Chrétien government used military force unilaterally, against EU member, and fellow NATO partner middle power Spain (Chretien 2007: 107-112; Tobin 2002; Bartleman 2005: 84–113). In doing so, Canada was inspired primarily by its distinctive national value of environmentalism and by its national interest of national unity, as the concerns of fishers on the Gaspésie loomed large when the Quebec referendum on separatism drew near. Spain, abandoned by its European major power allies, retreated in the face of Canadian force, to rely on other, more legal means. Thus the long deadlocked UN Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks finally passed. This was a case of successful Canadian coercive unilateralism without America, for the U.S. was virtually uninvolved in the case.

### ***Zaire, 1996***

Canada's new willingness to use force was seen in distant Africa the following year, when Canada initiated a plurilateral military intervention to halt genocide in Zaire in November 1996 (Hampson 2002, 125–49; Smith and Hay 1999; Chretien 2007: 354-; Axworthy 2003, 162–69). As Fen Osler Hampson (2002) notes, this “initiative was unprecedented in the history of Canadian foreign policy; never before had Canada led a multinational force under Chapter 11 of the UN Charter.”

Inspiring the Canadians was the memory of the recent genocide produced by the failure of the UN, with its attachment to its charter principles of sovereignty and nonintervention, in Rwanda in April 1994. When faced with a second genocide in the autumn of 1996, Chrétien phoned his G8 partners. By mid-November he had secured pledges of more than 10,000 troops from more than 20 countries, led by France, Britain, and the U.S. and including others from Europe, Africa, and Latin America. By the time the full force was ready to deploy, however, the threat had eased, and the full force was never sent in.

### ***Kosovo, 1999***

Two and a half years later in Europe, on March 24, 1999, Canada helped lead the G7 and NATO into war to dissuade Yugoslavia from completing its growing genocide in Kosovo (Dashwood 2000; Fraser 1998; Hampson 2002, 125–49; Heinbecker and MacRae 2001, 122–33; Hubert and Bosner 2001, 111–21; Axworthy 2003, 177–99). As the air war continued, without accomplishing its objectives, Canada and Britain convinced a reluctant G7 to

introduce ground troops into Kosovo in order to force the Yugoslav army out. With Canada and its G7 partners thus prepared to authorize force within the G8, where there was no immobilizing Russian or Chinese veto as there was among the Permanent Five on the UN Security Council (UNSC), the Russians were forced to choose between their old Slavic identity and loyalty to the Serbs, or their new identity as a recent member of the G8. They chose the G8. They so informed Slobodan Milosevic, who then withdrew his troops. It was left for the UNSC to give retroactive legitimation to the G7 ultimatum, by copying and approving the G7's communiqué in Resolution 1244.

### ***Securing North America, 2001***

Two and a half years later, combat operations came even closer to Canada than they had in the spring of 1995. The terrorist attack on North America on the morning of Tuesday, September 11, 2001, led Canada into an ongoing effort to secure America, Canada, and the common continental homeland from a deadly attack launched from within its borders and shores (Rudner 2002; Welsh 2004: 10–14; Chretien 2007: 292-305, 314; Goldenberg 2006: 256-79). On day one of the 9/11 crisis, Canada offered the U.S. any emergency assistance it might need, authorized American fighters in Alaska to shoot down a non-responding Korean civilian airliner flying through Canadian airspace, accepted all inbound transoceanic aircraft diverted from their U.S. destinations, stepped up security and intelligence activities, and closed its more than 600 airports to all but essential flights. Fourteen days later, on September 24, Chrétien met President George W. Bush in Washington. They agreed to review their countries' respective laws and practices to prevent terrorists from entering Canada.

### ***Afghanistan, 2001***

The 9/11 terrorist attacks then brought Canadian combat operations both closer to home and farther abroad than they had ever been before (Kirton 2007; Gimblett 2002; Welsh 2004: 14-16, Goldenberg 2006: 281-5; Lang and Stein 2007, Chretien 2007: 304-5, 314). The day after the terrorists hit the Pentagon and the World Trade Center, Canada again went to war alongside the U.S. and its ranking European allies. But this time it did so in distant Afghanistan, in the most dangerous offensive combat roles alongside the Americans alone (Gimblett 2002; Welsh 2004, 14–16).

On Wednesday, September 12, Chrétien spoke by phone with Bush and G8-host and Italian prime minister Silvio Berlusconi. Chrétien stated his support

for a U.S.-led coalition but suggested it be broadened to include G8 members Japan and Russia, which were not in NATO. Chrétien said it was clear to NATO members that “when one of our allies is attacked, we are all under attack.” He and his officials had been in contact with NATO and G8 members to discuss a “collective” response to the attacks. But Chrétien did not directly pledge Canadian military support to any U.S.-led response.

The next day, Thursday, September 13, Chrétien said that Canada was ready to join the U.S. response but would not yet commit any armed forces. He declared: “We don’t know what will be the type of action. But we’ll be with them.” On September 24, Chrétien met Bush in Washington and pledged Canadian military help if required, including troops and equipment.

On Sunday, October 7, during the Canadian Thanksgiving weekend, Chrétien pledged Canada’s military support during a ten-minute phone call with Bush. Canada thus became one of six countries to enter the military coalition assembled by Washington. Canada’s contribution came on sea, air, and land, with valuable specialized capabilities such as the Joint Task Force and scarce “snipers in the snow.” Moreover, the Canadians deployed, not with the UN mission in relatively safe Kabul, but with the Americans alone to conduct combat missions in dangerous Kandahar. With U.S. forces globally stretched in the multi-front war against terrorism, Canada’s contribution was a valuable military resource as well as a political one. But this commitment also involved a high risk of casualties, which soon came in the form of “friendly fire.”

Canada came back to combat involvement in Afghanistan in the spring of 2003. This time it did so under NATO’s International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Kabul. Within months of their deployment, the first Canadian combat casualties from the enemy had come.

### ***Iraq, 2003***

Canada’s final case of now minimal combat involvement under Jean Chrétien came in the American led coalition’s invasion of Iraq in the spring of 2003 (Welsh 2004: 16–19; Chretien 2007: 306-19; Goldenberg 2006: 1-10, 285-307). Here Canada publicly decided not to participate militarily, but in practice did so to a very limited degree.

In August 2002, Chrétien had said that Canada would not participate in any military action against Saddam Hussein without the “three proofs”—that

Hussein possessed weapons of mass destruction (WMD), that he intended to use them, and that the UN mandated a response. From this legalistic, UN-based, classic LI starting point, Canada moved toward greater verbal support for the U.S., especially after Chrétien met Bush in Detroit on September 9, 2002. But on February 12, 2003, Canada announced it would send 2,000 ground forces to Afghanistan, leaving none behind to join any coalition to invade Iraq. At the UN, Canada sought to find a compromise between the opposing U.S. and the French-led coalitions, but to no avail. As the clock ticked down, Canada privately assured the Americans that when the president declared the invasion had started, Canada, while not participating militarily, would respond by saying nasty things about Saddam Hussein and nice things about the United States.

This Chrétien only partly did. On March 17, 2003, two days before the U.S.-led invasion, Chrétien rose in the House of Commons to declare: “If military action proceeds without a new resolution of the Security Council, Canada will not participate.” But Chrétien left Canada’s considerable combat-capable air, naval, and ground forces in the theatre, in their existing combat-authorized roles. Staying there to help the coalition actively invade Iraq were Canada’s three warships and long-range patrol aircraft in the Persian Gulf, and its 31 exchange officers operating in fully integrated fashion with the American and British forces in the theatre. As Jennifer Welsh (2004, 19) says, “for all the talk of standing aside, Canada was indirectly providing more support for the U.S. in Iraq than most of the members of the “coalition of the willing,” including Australia.

At the same time, Chrétien neglected to say anything nice about the United States. Indeed, he was greeted by the thunderous applause from his backbenchers when he announced that Canada would have no military presence in Iraq. One of his Cabinet ministers criticized the U.S. president, while one of Chrétien’s backbenchers began an ad hominem crusade against Bush, declaring she wanted to destroy him in the end.

Canada’s complex and often confusing position was the result of the combination of two externally oriented imperatives. One was the classic LI diplomacy of constraint against an apparently unilateralist, militarist, mighty United States. The second was the need to obtain as much UN legitimation and coalition participation as possible to induce Saddam to back down before a big war broke out—just as Milosevic had done in withdrawing from Kosovo before a coalition ground invasion a few short years earlier.

But in Canada's view, the U.S. lacked the proof that the threatening WMD were really there, unlike the 1962 Cuban missile crisis in 1962. Moreover, Chrétien's ultimate decision not to join the invading coalition was caused by the CNR national unity imperative—in particular, the charge by the separatist premier of Quebec that his sovereigntists should be re-elected so that Ottawa would not take Quebecers into another Anglo-American war. With strong opposition from the francophone Quebecers in his caucus, Chrétien was determined not to give the separatists any cause to stay alive politically in Quebec. That tipped him into saying no. The result was less a case of Canada supporting the UN over the U.S. than of Chrétien's Canada supporting France, and francophone Quebec, over anglophone Britain and America and Australia plus Poland. Canada again seemed to need France on board in order to go to war (Kirton 1993a).

### **Shaping 21st-Century Global Order beyond Westphalianism**

The change toward Canada's CNR global leadership under Chrétien came in its most advanced form in Canada's approach to world order—in Canada's successful effort to generate global governance with new principles and institutions beyond the UN's Westphalian edifice of old. The initial years were spent on classic concerns, winning the Quebec referendum at home, reinforcing UN-based multilateralism by creating the LI WTO, and seeking at the 1995 Halifax G7 Summit to reform the UN institutions to meet 21st-century needs. But the failure of that G7 effort to produce the desired change led Canada to look beyond the UN, to pioneer a new generation of institutions with the G8 and Canada increasingly at the core.

### ***Winning the Quebec Referendum, 1995***

The first, defensive, challenge was winning the Quebec referendum on October 30, 1995, in a way consistent with Canada's commitment to the rights of minorities. In doing so, Canada sought to prove to the world that the immediate post-Cold War process of the dissolution of federal countries in Europe was not the way ahead. In this struggle President Clinton, in the U.S. interest, offered strong support. He repeated the U.S. mantra: "It is for the people of Canada to decide but a strong unified Canada is in the interests of the United States." But France's President Jacques Chirac showed himself, through his restraint, to be an effective supporter of the federalist side. No one else in la Francophonie or elsewhere supported Quebec. This was a sharp contrast from the 1960s, and a consequential factor in Canada's

narrow referendum success. The whole world showed it valued Canada the way it was.

### ***Creating the World Trade Organization, 1994***

In its concern with international institutions the Chrétien government began with expansive extensions of traditional impulses—bringing to life the frustrated designs of the 1940s now that the Cold War was over. Its first success was creating the WTO in 1994. This was a Canadian initiative, in accordance with the classic LI logic (Winham 1998). It realized a Canadian dream dating back to the American veto of the International Trade Organization in 1948.

### ***Expanding the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, 1994***

Another extension of the old LI logic, again to realize the vision of the 1940s in the post-Cold War years, came in the political-security sphere. This was Canada's effort to expand NATO rapidly to include the newly liberated and democratic countries of eastern Europe (Chretien 2007: 88-9, 304-5, 329-33). In January 1994, almost alone in the Atlantic alliance, Canada argued the NATO's far-reaching expansion eastward, through the rapid admittance of the Czech Republic, Poland, and Hungary, and the inclusion of Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia as well.<sup>liii</sup> Canada was unsuccessful at the start, but the latter three were ultimately admitted at the NATO Summit in November 2002, along with Bulgaria and the three Baltic states.

### ***Reforming the United Nations, 1995***

Canada's largest and last major effort to modernize the 1940s LI edifice came with its largely unsuccessful effort at the Halifax G7 Summit in 1995 to reform the UN and multilateral system to meet the needs of the 21st century (Chretien 2007: 29-30, 213, 326). The original idea was a U.S. initiative, offered by Clinton at the 1994 Naples Summit. But Canada succeeded in keeping its G7 partners focused on this priority in the year leading up to Halifax. At the summit it had its partners endorse a comprehensive, far-reaching plan of international institutional reform, with new principles such as sustainable development given pride of place. Its work in the area of reform of the international financial system served as a blueprint for action in the years ahead. But, on the whole, the Halifax effort had little lasting impact as the vulnerabilities bred by intensifying globalization took hold. The 1996 host of the G7 Summit, France, largely

failed to follow up and the G7's attention turned to quite different things when the U.S. hosted the following year.

### ***Creating a G8 Concert, 1996***

From that experience Canada moved to build a new institutionalized order largely beyond the UN. It did so by fostering a G8 concert, with Russia increasingly included, starting at the G7 summits of Naples in 1994 and Halifax in 1995, as well as at the Winnipeg ministerial conference in the autumn of 1994. Here Canada had sought both to give Russia more equal inclusion in the G7 through a new Political Eight (P8) and to balance a bolstered Russia with a revived Ukraine. The next major steps came with the Moscow Nuclear Safety Summit 1996, the G8 “Summit of the Eight” in Denver 1997, and the Birmingham 1998 G8 Summit. Canada succeeded in making Russia a fully equal member at Kananaskis in 2002.

### ***Creating the Landmines Convention, 1996***

Canada's most celebrated effort to build a new global order beyond the immobilizing procedures of the UN came with its campaign to ban antipersonnel landmines (Hampson 2002; Kirchen 2001–02; Chretien 2007: 335-8; Axworthy 2003, 126–55). From the very start, Axworthy chose to emphasize not the UN and its disarmament machinery but a newly created, Canadian-controlled “Ottawa process” that followed different rules. Through the work of Chrétien, most notably at the 1997 Denver G8 Summit, all of Canada's principal power partners joined the new regime, save for the United States. As a result Canada successfully created new international law, in the interests of human security, if not of any national interest or distinctive national value (beyond a mild form of antimilitarism) of Canada itself.

### ***Inventing the International Criminal Court, 1996***

A further Canadian-led effort to construct a new global order with new principles and institutions came in the creation of the ICC (Hampson 2002; Axworthy 2003, 200–13; Chretien 2007: 338). As with the landmines crusade, this was an effort initiated but then abandoned by America that Canada took over and led to success. In doing so, Canada came to diverge and compete with the U.S. government. Canada again succeeded in creating a new international law and institution. It put the Canadian distinctive national value of multiculturalism's protection of minorities in first place.

### ***Constructing a New International Financial System and the G20, 1997***

A further Canadian move came in reforming the international financial system and creating the G20 from 1997 to 1999 (Kirton 2001b, 2001c, 2005c, 2007b). Here the U.S. provided the initial impetus. But Canada's Paul Martin Jr., as finance minister, quickly took over to fashion a body that brought G8 and "systemically significant" emerging countries together, in a broader consultative forum than the G7, to find consensus on global governance in a globalizing world. The participants were finance ministers and the formal agenda first dealt with financial stability. But Martin soon broadened the agenda to include a wide array of related topics, including Canada's distinctive national value of environmentalism. Within a few years, he had the group fashion a new "Montreal consensus" on socially sustainable globalization to replace the neoliberal "Washington consensus" of old.

### ***Generating Global Environmental Governance, 1995***

A further Canadian contribution came in generating global environmental governance for fisheries, persistent organic pollutants (POPs), the Arctic, and climate change. Canada's first major regime-building success was the UN Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in 1995. A second was the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants (Axworthy 2003, 329). A third, outside any UN framework, was the creation of the plurilateral Arctic Council, which held its inaugural meeting in Canada in September 1998 (Axworthy 2003, 329–36).

The fourth was the Kyoto protocol on climate change from 1997 to 2003 (Axworthy 2003, 314–41; Simpson et al. 2007). Canada proved willing to act without the U.S. or likeminded middle power allies such as Australia. It used its G8 diplomacy, notably at Genoa in 2001, to bring about a deal to enable the legally ratified regime to be born. Here Canada's partners were its fellow G8 members of Russia and Japan, rather than its Atlantic principal power partners of old. Throughout the long process, Canada's ecological capabilities and distinctive national value of environmentalism served as the core cause, although its national interests of sovereignty and territory in the Arctic were known beneficiaries as well.

### ***Inventing the International Network on Cultural Policy, 1998***

Along with the environment came culture. Inspired by the 1992 Convention on Biological Diversity and a 1998 UN meeting of culture ministers, Heritage minister Sheila Copps invited 20 culture ministers to Ottawa in

June 1998 (Azzi and Feick 2003; Azzi 2005). There they formed the INCP and sought to create a legally binding international instrument to affirm the value of cultural diversity over that of trade. The leadership was provided by Canada, along with France, Mexico, and Greece. By 2002, the INCP had produced a first draft and sought to identify where the instrument was to be housed. With the U.S. return to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) promising to bring a hitherto absent America into the process, sympathy grew for creating a new institution apart from the established UN body.

### ***The Kananaskis G8, 2002***

Canada's effort to construct a new global order for the 21st century culminated at the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit. Here, across the old East-West and North-South divides, Canada delivered the Global Partnership and the G8 Africa Action Plan, and US\$50 billion in new money for disarmament and development in the world (Kirton 2002a).

### **The Three Perspectives Applied**

All three perspectives are needed to account fully for Chretien's decisions. **LI** patterns remained. Trade minister Roy MacLaren argued consistently that his plurilateral and bilateral initiatives were done to catalyze WTO-based multilateralism. In the former Yugoslavia, Canada strongly supported UN direction and command of the forces, argued against the U.S. use of force, and eventually accepted it under NATO command. Canada's efforts vis-à-vis the UN were initially aimed at reform rather than modification or replacement of the system to meet 21st-century needs.

The **PD** pull was present. Some of the free trade regimes in which Canada participated were projects conceived, initiated, and driven by the U.S., notably NAFTA, APEC, and the Miami Summit of the Americas, if not the latter's specific FTAA component that Canada introduced. Even with the international community now devoid of an intrusive, divisive de Gaulle, and with a US again standing behind a united Canada during the Quebec separatist referendum there remained doubts about whether a strong, self-confident Canada would survive (Doran 1996).

Some **CNR** initiatives were stillborn or never succeeded in modifying regional or world order in the end. One was Canada's failed quest for

membership in the Bosnian Contact Group. Another was Axworthy's questioning of the need for NATO's nuclear first-strike doctrine in a post-Cold War world. This value-driven, antimilitarist, antinuclear weapons initiative, however logical, met with overwhelming American antipathy and was quickly dropped. In the end, it was U.S. military intervention that accomplished Canada's objectives of bringing peace to Bosnia and restoring Haiti's democratically elected, if subsequently disappointing, government of President Jean-Bertrand Aristide. NATO's slow and limited extension was defined by the United States. In these cases, Canada's CNR divergence from American positions had little real influence on American behaviour, the outcomes, or the order that emerged (Axworthy 2010).

Yet, on the whole, **strong CNR change** came. It can be charted against an analytic **five-point scale**. The first point is **continentalism**—an arrangement with the U.S. alone, as the imperial-focused interaction of PD predicts. The second is **multilateralism**—the broadly based, open-to-all, inclusive arrangements with a universalist thrust, as LI predicts. The third is **plurilateralism**—arrangements of deliberately restricted membership based on defining principles, as CNR predicts.<sup>liv</sup> The fourth is **bilateralism**—separate arrangements with individual countries other than the imperial U.S., as the autonomous bilateral involvement of CNR predicts. The fifth is **unilateralism**—acting alone, setting the rules for oneself and the world, as the unilateralism and modification and replacement of CNR predict.

## **Appendix F: Doctrines and Distributions Under Martin**

### **Doctrines**

International Policy  
Diplomacy (Foreign Policy)  
Defence  
Development  
Throne Speeches

### **Distributions**

Budgets  
Diplomatic Representation  
Summitry  
Bilateral Institutions  
Combat Operations

**Appendix G:  
Outcomes of Decisions Under Martin**

	Initiator	Adjuster	Winner
(S/Lon)			
<b>Economic Decisions</b>			
2005 SPP Summit	US	Canada	Both
<b>Military Decisions</b>			
2005 Afghanistan			
<b>Other Decisions</b>			
2004-5 Asian Tsunami			
2005 Montreal COP/MOP			
<b>Global Order Decisions</b>			
2004-5 G20 Summit Campaign C/3 yrs	Canada	All but US	US/S,
2005 R2P			

## **Appendix H:**

### **Major Decisions under Martin**

#### ***Reorganizing Ottawa***

Martin's first decision, taken in December 2003, was to reorganize the foreign policy machinery of government. He started with the Cabinet, the Privy Council Office, and the split of DFAIT into separate foreign affairs and trade parts (Welsh 2004, 83; Bélanger 2005; Schmitz and Lee 2005).

#### ***International Policy Statement***

The second decision was to launch an ambitious, integrated international policy review. The process, devoid of serious parliamentary or public participation, was an elitist throwback to the review done by Pierre Trudeau from 1968 to 1970. The ambitious effort to link diplomacy, defence, development, and trade in an integrated "whole of government" approach led to much interdepartmental competition, dozens of drafts, and delay. Finally, Jennifer Welsh, a Canadian teaching at Oxford, was retained to extract thematic unity by writing the overview. The result appeared, to mixed reviews, on April 19, 2005.

#### ***Managing America***

A further step was managing America, both well before and immediately after a re-elected U.S. president George W. Bush started his second term. The pre-emptive strategy included Martin's speech on deeper integration in Sun Valley to American chief executive officers on July 7, 2004. It included an initiative for enhanced diplomatic representation in the United States. It presented a sophisticated, respectful approach, without gratuitous public criticism by government ministers and members of Parliament.<sup>13</sup>

Immediately after Bush's re-election, came a congratulatory phone call, a reminder of Canada's softwood lumber and cattle concerns, arrangements to meet on the margins of the forthcoming APEC Summit in Santiago, and an invitation to visit to Canada—probably before the president's inauguration took place. Martin scolded an outspoken Liberal member of Parliament for her critical pronouncements on the U.S. and President Bush. Then Martin took quick trips to Haiti on Florida's doorstep and to Darfur, about which Bush's Christian Conservative base cared a great deal. This were backed by a broader "meet your American counterpart" initiative, led by Deputy Prime

Minister Anne McClellan and Tom Ridge, the Secretary of Homeland Defense in the United States. Substantively, Martin dealt well with the American priorities of homeland security, counterterrorism, and renewal of the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD).

### ***Declining BMD Participation***

Another decision was declining participation in ballistic missile defence (BMD). After delaying and signaling that Canada might join, Martin finally said “no” to save his minority government by satisfying his restive caucus in Quebec.

### ***Building North America***

Building the trilateral North American community was another priority. At the SOA in Monterrey, Mexico, on January 12–13, 2004, Paul Martin, George Bush, and Vicente Fox agreed to launch a new “North American Initiative” to extend economic cooperation and supplement it with new collaboration in energy, science and technology, and regional security (Welsh 2004, 61). Martin outlined his vision in his Sun Valley speech in July. In 2005 came the first stand alone trilateral summit since 1956, at the president’s ranch in Crawford, Texas. It launched an SPP on the three pillars of security, prosperity and the quality of life, a Trudeauvian concept that contained Canada’s environmentalist DNV.

### ***Europe***

Another priority was Europe, in its modern version of a continent extending from the west to the centre and the east. Martin visited France in the west, went to the Progressive Governance Summit in Hungary in central and eastern Europe, and travelled to Russia further east.

### ***Asia Pacific***

In the Asia-Pacific region, Martin got off to a slower start. He went to the APEC leaders meeting, on November 20–21, 2004, where he promised to explore a bilateral free trade agreement with South Korea. He took a summit tour to Japan, China, and India in late January 2005. In Japan, he advanced discussions aimed at the possibility of concluding a bilateral Canada-Japan free trade agreement. In all three countries, he sought support for his plan to create an L20. When a major **tsunami** devastated Indonesia, Thailand, Sri Lanka, and other countries on December 26, 2004. Canada quickly mounted

a major relief effort, which put it in the front ranks of global donors. For more on this topic, see [www.kirton.nelson.com](http://www.kirton.nelson.com).

### ***Americas***

The Americas constituted an important personal priority for Martin, who went to the SOA in January and Haiti and Brazil in the autumn of 2004. He also promised to intensify talks aimed at a free trade agreement with the Caribbean CARICOM. Yet he was unable to conclude a deal or have the FTAA concluded by its target date of 2005.

### ***Africa***

In Africa much more achievement came. Martin made Canada the first G8 country to license generic anti-AIDS vaccines. In November 2004, he visited Sudan (Lang and Stein, 2007). On November 26–27, 2004, the 47 leaders at the Francophone Summit in Burkina Faso endorsed Canadian initiatives for securing free elections in Haiti, protecting civilians in Sudan, and ending violence in the Ivory Coast. In the latter case, Martin insisted that those responsible for the killing be brought to justice. He invited the Francophonie's foreign ministers to Canada to follow up on the summit's Canadian-driven agenda on conflict prevention and human security.

### ***Middle East***

In the broader Middle East Canada became a major player through Martin's meetings and commitments at the G8's Sea Island Summit in June 2004 and his troop commitments in Afghanistan.

### ***The G8***

At the G8's Sea Island Summit on June 8–10, 2004, Canada adjusted America to serve Canada's goals on Africa, polio and AIDS, private sector development, Haiti, and Darfur (Kirton 2005b). At the Gleneagles Summit on July 6–8, 2005, Canada supported the British chair's emphasis on African development and climate change. Canada also succeeded in having the summit endorse its desire to explore how to modernize the concept and counting of ODA, in ways consistent with the 21st-century paradigm for development that the G8 and its African partners had produced.

### ***United Nations Reform***

Another ambitious effort to shape world order was through reform of the UN. This process culminated with the World Summit in New York on

September 14–16, 2005. Here, Canada achieved some of what it wanted, across a broad front.

Driven by its distinctive national value of antimilitarism, one key Canadian priority was to curb the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (**WMD**), especially in their nuclear form. But the divisions between the established nuclear powers and the others were too severe to change.

A second Canadian effort was to upgrade the capacity and credibility of the UN Commission on Human Rights (**UNCHR**). Here the summit agreed in principle to replace the commission with a Human Rights Council. But no action immediately or automatically followed from this vow.

A third Canadian priority was to create a UN **Peacebuilding Commission**. The summit agreed in principle on the idea of forming a commission to help stop countries from sliding back into civil war. But there was no consensus at the UN on how to proceed from there. Canada's idea was to have a commission comprising the permanent United Nations Security Council (UNSC) members and key economies. Canada took the lead in coordinating donor countries position in the commission.

A fourth concern was **management reform**. But the summit took no action to change the UN's prevailing patronage system, even in the wake of the investigation into the Oil-for-Food Programme into alleged corruption and fraud on the part of UN officials.

The fifth and most prominent item was **Security Council reform**. Here Canada lost on its specific proposals but won on its central preference, even if the UN did not. Germany and Japan had demanded permanent seats on the UNSC and the latter secured the support of the U.S. But Chinese opposition to the Japanese bid stopped any change. Canada, despite its DNV of environmentalism and its sense of G8 solidarity, opposed the addition of any new permanent members or vetoes. It argued that additional vetoes would make the UNSC even more ineffective than it already was.

### ***Responsibility to Protect (R2P)***

Canada's greatest success, however, came not in stopping change to defend the old 1945 bargain but in securing change to replace the old central security principle with a 21st-century antithesis. Martin's most ambitious and successful initiative to shape world order was securing global

acceptance of the Canadian-pioneered doctrine of the international responsibility to protect (**R2P**). This Canadian crusade sought to eliminate as the defining principle of world order the doctrine of non-interference in the internal affairs of sovereign states, first affirmed by the Treaties of Westphalia in 1648 and enshrined as Article 2(7) in the United Nations Charter in 1945.

R2P was the third phase of a Canadian conceptual revolution that had begun as the post-Cold War era dawned. Its first phase of “humanitarian intervention” had been initiated by Brian Mulroney and Kim Campbell in their campaign against apartheid in South Africa, in the new doctrine of human rights, democratic development, and good governance unveiled in Mulroney’s Stanford Speech (see Chapter 22), and in Kim Campbell’s authorization of Canadian combat action to prevent ethnic cleansing in Medak Pocket in the Balkans in September 1993. The second phase of “human security” came under Jean Chrétien’s foreign ministers, André Ouellet, Lloyd Axworthy, John Manley, and Bill Graham. Shocked by the mounting genocides in Rwanda in April 1994, Srebrenica in 1995, and Zaire in 1996, appalled at the failure of the UN to prevent them and inspired by the successful G8-led intervention in Kosovo in 1999 and APEC-incubated intervention in East Timor, Canada led in financing a commission to develop a new globally acceptable doctrine for the new age.

From the start, prime minister Martin was a forceful developer and practitioner of the evolving doctrine. He demonstrated his seriousness by visiting Sudan. At the G8 Sea Island Summit he worked with the Americans to add Darfur to the agenda and have the G8 issue a warning to the government of Sudan. Martin pushed the R2P doctrine at the Francophone Summit in Burkina Faso in November 2004. Its communiqué endorsed the idea that the UN needed reform to improve the protection of human rights, thus supporting Canada’s efforts to consolidate democracy and governance structures in fragile states. Martin also reported that most Francophonie leaders were open to the concept of expanding the UN mandate to intervene when countries failed to stop internal violence. Martin calculated that building such a broad consensus among nations would force the UN to accept R2P. Then the Secretary General’s High-Level Panel endorsed the concept in its report, released on December 2, 2004, on the need for UNSC and broader reform.

The climax of Canada's campaign came on September 14–16, 2005, when the UN 60th Anniversary World Summit took place in New York. As this largest ever gathering of world leaders approached, Canada and other states, including some African ones, sought an affirmation that sovereignty involved responsibility, and that states would receive respect for their sovereignty only if they met their responsibility to protect their own people within their state. Many consequential countries opposed this R2P concept because it appeared to link sovereignty with responsibility. They feared that judgments about responsibility were in the eye of the beholder. Russia, for example, worried that the R2P doctrine could justify international intervention in Chechnya. The ideological leaders of the Nonaligned Movement (NAM) such as India, Algeria, Egypt, Pakistan, and Cuba were also wary or opposed. Beyond the rich north, only Mexico offered clear support.

At the time, the U.S. perspective was unknown. To the Canadians it seemed as if the Americans wanted someone else to forge the deal. The U.S. sat on the fence, waiting to see the outcome of the debate. It did not want to be seen opposing R2P, especially if it was well received. One group in Washington feared that R2P might create new obligations for an America already stretched to its military limits in Iraq and Afghanistan. A second group believed that the obligations were the right ones for America and the world to adopt. A third group believed these obligations already existed.

A few weeks before the summit, Allan Rock, Canada's Ambassador to the UN, sent distress signals to Ottawa, highlighting his fear that the evolving consensus toward endorsing R2P might break down. Foreign Affairs recommended to the prime minister that he personally call the leaders of countries that were holding out. This Martin did. Each of the leaders he called, even though they did not like R2P, chose to support it as a favour to Martin. The U.S. eventually supported the consensus as well.

Thus Canada and other countries were able to get from the summit an agreement of the new principle. R2P created new obligations for state action, including by the United States. It was the most important outcome of the UN summit. It showed what kind of influence, friendship, and success could emerge from summit level-contact, without media attention.

### ***From G20 to L20***

If Martin achieved his revolutionary idea for a new approach to world order, in its institutional equivalent he secured only half a loaf. His crusade to create a leaders'-level G20, or L20 took him, in November 2004, to the APEC leaders meeting, Brazil, Sudan, and the Francophone Summit in Burkina Faso, China, Brazil, South Korea, and Indonesia. Their leaders approved of the L20 idea. As Martin's two years as prime minister came to an end, France and China publicly supported the proposal. Only a still skeptical U.S. remained to be convinced. But Britain at the 2005 G8 Gleneagles summit created a new G8 plus five that took global governance half way to where Martin wanted it to be.

### **Endnotes**

---

<sup>i</sup> Cooper acknowledged that "Canada's hybrid standing in the world, marked by its dual position as both a Group of Seven (G7) nation and a middle power, confers upon it a comprehensive set of international obligations." Yet his declinist interpretation yielded a prognosis that this retreat could lead at best to "an updated mode of middle power diplomacy," focused on Canada's role as a facilitator for the increasing number of nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), private voluntary organizations, and international NGOs involved in international relations.

<sup>ii</sup> The new prime minister brought instinctive Pearsonian internationalism and Trudeauvian nationalism after 26 years of experience in government, including brief stints as foreign minister and finance minister, had first been introduced to the complexities of foreign policy by his political mentors Lester Pearson and Mitchell Sharp in the 1960s. Moreover, he was ripe for socialization into Pearsonian orthodoxy, having displayed few fixed convictions about foreign affairs during his earlier years (Chrétien 1985; Martin 1993). During his time as opposition leader, Chrétien had opposed Canada's 1990–91 decision to go to war to liberate Kuwait.

<sup>iii</sup> Unlike Trudeau, there were now no minority governments or opposition interruptions to break the self-confident cadence of this expansive trend.

<sup>iv</sup> This was despite what the American government, acting unilaterally, could do by way of building a wall or a better, affordable national defence (Keohane and Nye 1977).

<sup>v</sup> The UK in 2000 had experienced its wettest autumn in almost 300 years. In Europe in 2002 severe floods caused 37 deaths and US\$16 billion in direct damage. In the summer of 2003 a severe heat wave killed 14,000 in France alone and 30,000 across Europe, in the continent's worst "natural" disaster in 50 years.<sup>10</sup> This exponential increase in deaths was far more than America had experienced at the World Trade Center between 1993 and 2001, as the jump came within one year, not eight, and killed ten times more.

<sup>vi</sup> Within the G8 there was a diffusion of vulnerability, as number two Japan was hit by a deadly sarin gas attack on the Tokyo subway in 1995.

<sup>vii</sup> The opening three pages reflect in full measure Chrétien's personal intervention, offered in private during the Cabinet meeting of January 28, 1995, and influenced by the personal lessons he had acquired during his recent trip to South America. This process of

defining foreign policy inductively through foreign relations, notably personal summit diplomacy, was also important in the early Mulroney government and would become so in the Harper government afterward.

<sup>viii</sup> Taken together, this pentarchy presented a world where power was becoming economically redefined, and thus dispersed to the advanced industrial societies and rising political and economic powers in the Americas and Asia Pacific. In this more diffuse system of more equal major powers, Canada had rising capabilities from its unique geographic, cultural-linguistic, demographic, and international institutional advantages. It could thus assume leadership and pursue its global interests in every part of the world, by operating through the key plurilateral international institutions, notably the G7 and APEC. Absent from this vision was any sense of vulnerability, limited capabilities, and a consequent reliance on working with the likeminded countries of the Atlantic world through NATO and the UN. Only in a supporting last place came the LI roles of mediation and multilateralism.

<sup>ix</sup> For only the second time since 1945 (the previous being under Trudeau), the economy had been placed first. For the first time ever, the macroeconomic conception of this priority—Trudeau’s economic growth and Mulroney’s economic prosperity—had been replaced by a microeconomic conception (employment). This was a target fully focused on Canadian interests alone. Primacy had been accorded to the outward-oriented instrument of trade. The unique cross-cutting priority attached to environmental protection did not translate into decisions in all areas, as Canada’s increasing greenhouse gas emissions during the Chrétien years showed.

<sup>x</sup> It replaced the “sovereignty and independence” first introduced by Trudeau, which had occupied the second position under both Trudeau and Mulroney.

<sup>xi</sup> These were listed as “mass migration, crime, disease, environment, overpopulation, and underdevelopment.”

<sup>xii</sup> Trudeau’s “quality of life” and St. Laurent’s “values of a Christian civilization” provide pale and conceptually different predecessors. Clearly CNR was its emphasis on Canadian values and culture, and on assertively “projecting” rather than defensively “protecting” them through the cultural nationalism of old (MacMechan 1920).

<sup>xiii</sup> Globalization, technology, and the scale of human development brought unwelcome intrusions into Canada. But they also made societies abroad increasingly open to and accepting of Canadian values and culture.

<sup>xiv</sup> The defence white paper appeared in November 1994, three months before the foreign policy one. This marked a reversal of the Trudeauvian dictum that foreign policy should drive defence policy. But the Department of National Defence (DND) and the defence policy community wished to get there first, to pre-empt what they feared the foreign policy review might contain.

<sup>xv</sup> Canada was to be a full-scale, first-tier, military power, able to fight and win—if not alone—at least alongside anyone, against anyone, anywhere in the world.

<sup>xvi</sup> The paper stated: “Given that the direct military threat to the continent is greatly diminished at present, Canada will reduce the level of resources devoted to traditional missions in North America. It will, however, remain actively engaged in the United Nations, NATO, and the Conference on Security and Co-operation in Europe. It will become more actively involved in security issues in Latin America and the Asia-Pacific

region.” Canada’s military was going global in its involvement in a changing world. The foreign policy statement subsequently affirmed this defence doctrine. Moreover, the government’s more detailed response to the recommendations of a parliamentary committee, which accompanied the white paper, directly rejected the committee’s recommendation to make the LI icon of peacekeeping the centre of Canadian defence policy.

<sup>xvii</sup> The following is an adaptation of Hampson and Oliver (1998).

<sup>xviii</sup> The Axworthy doctrine did have some **PD** elements, notably in ignoring interstate relations and intergovernmental institutions, downplaying most forms of hard power, focusing on minor issues, relying on moral leadership and reputation, and living in a world dominated by U.S. NGOs. It also had **LI** components, especially with its emphasis on building its specified international norms.

<sup>xix</sup> It ended by highlighting a broad definition of security, a Canada active abroad, a wider sharing of the benefits of globalization, making Canada’s diversity and expertise better known abroad, making citizens’ involvement central to foreign policy making, and the “reform and renewal of multilateral forums of governance.”

<sup>xx</sup> In the 1992–93 fiscal year, the last full fiscal year before the Chrétien government came to power, this 10 percent had been divided as follows: defence took 7 percent, or \$11.2 billion, of the federal budget (compared to 12 percent in the year of post-war peace of 1947–48); ODA, largely through CIDA, took 2 percent, or \$2.7 billion; DFAIT took less than 1 percent (0.8 percent) or \$1.35 billion.

<sup>xxi</sup> The government increased DFAIT spending by 5 percent (or \$74.1 million to a new total of \$1,408,479 billion).

<sup>xxii</sup> As the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) fell 15 percent, and DFAIT now by 7 percent (It was reduced 7 percent, or \$105 million, to \$1.3 billion for the 1995–96 fiscal year).

<sup>xxiii</sup> By the 2001–2 fiscal year that ended on March 31, 2002, Ottawa had a \$8.9 billion surplus, down from a \$18.1 billion surplus the previous year. Ottawa’s debt as a percent of GDP was down to 49.1 percent from a peak of 71 percent six years before. Interest payments on the debt took only 22 cents of every dollar of revenue, down from a peak of 36 percent—the lowest level since 1981. For 2001–02 government program spending came in at \$126.7 billion, substantially up from \$119.3 billion the year before.

<sup>xxiv</sup> During his first four months in office, Chrétien made two visits, to the first APEC leaders meeting in Seattle and the NATO Summit in Brussels. He saved his first dedicated bilateral for a March 1994 trip to Mexico. During his first year as a whole, Chrétien’s most frequent partner was U.S. president Bill Clinton, despite the Red Book rhetoric of “independence.”

<sup>xxv</sup> Next came China, Indonesia, South Korea, Malaysia, and NAFTA and APEC partner Mexico. This pattern is broadly similar to that established by Brian Mulroney during his first 30 months in office, but represents, relative to Mulroney, an increased focus on the United States. It is thus reminiscent of the much more U.S.-focused, if far less frequent, summit travels of Pierre Trudeau in his early years. Further evidence of this shift comes in the pattern of opening and closing of resident diplomatic missions, with the opening of an office in Vietnam.

<sup>xxvi</sup> Even when Chrétien's national unity campaign was doing badly in Canada, he did not turn to Washington for help as desperately as Trudeau had done.

<sup>xxvii</sup> These trends are even more striking if one imposes a rational, realist control and considers Canada's summit partners by the number of visits they should have attracted given their weight (relative capability) in the world (if not distance, democratic affinity, and wartime affiliation). On this weighted basis, there is a heavy underrepresentation of the world's largest powers—the neighbouring U.S. and distant Japan. There is, conversely, a heavy overrepresentation of France, Britain, Russia, Italy, Ukraine, and Europe writ large.

<sup>xxviii</sup> The pull of cooperative plurilateral institutions was now reinforced by the advent of this unilateral and competitive instrument. The Chrétien government's attachment to trade and its promotion as well as the pull of the national unity imperative are evident here. From November 23-25 1996, Chretien was in the Philippines for the APEC conference. Following the conference, Chretien traveled to China and met with Premier Li Peng to discuss trade issues. He continued on his Asian expedition, visiting Japan from November 27-30, where the Canada-Japan forum was created. And in December 1996 he ventured to Portugal for the OSCE meeting, where the Dayton Peace Accord was discussed and bilateral meetings occurred with the leaders of Ukraine, Poland, Germany, Spain and Ireland.

<sup>xxix</sup> Thanks largely to the plurilateral nests of the G7/8 and APEC and the unilateral Team Canada instrument, Chrétien's mature summit diplomacy came to map the distribution of relative capability in the world much more closely and rationally. Among the major powers, Britain and France remained overrepresented. Among the lesser powers, free trade partners Mexico and Chile were.

<sup>xxx</sup> The top dozen comprised the rest of the G8, Canada's new free trade partners Mexico and Chile and fellow APEC members China and Singapore.

<sup>xxxi</sup> This transformation was thanks to the deficit reduction and preoccupation with national unity of 1995—factors that forced a change in Canadian foreign policy, in the direction of global leadership rather than niche diplomacy or isolationist retreat.

<sup>xxxii</sup> This is where the Chrétien government's first priority was, where the elements and diffusion of power in the post-Cold War world were pronounced, and where Canada's relative capability was relatively high.

<sup>xxxiii</sup> Canada initially addressed its initial PD difficulties with the United States by accepting the trilateral NAFTA, by concluding the multilateral Uruguay Round and creating a more legalized and multilateral WTO, and by relying, in CNR fashion, on its concert clubs of the G7 and Quad to advance its trade agenda.

<sup>xxxiv</sup> This is the quest to create free trade areas with restricted membership through NAFTA, APEC, and the FTAA, and to initiate a process to secure a TAFTA (with Europe as a whole) and a free trade agreement with Norway, Switzerland, Liechtenstein, and Iceland—all members of the European Free Trade Association (EFTA).

<sup>xxxv</sup> Bilateral initiation of free trade went beyond Canada's one PD bilateral free trade agreement with the United States. It added ever more CNR autonomous bilateral ones, starting in the Middle East with Israel in 1994, and continuing with Jordan and Palestine. In the Americas, Canada signed a free trade agreement with Chile in 1996, Costa Rica in

2002, and launched negotiations with the four Central American countries of El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, and Nicaragua as well as with the Commonwealth Caribbean. It then went to Asia to negotiate with Singapore and explore talks with Japan.

<sup>xxxvi</sup> This behaviour can be defined as the deployment and employment of Canada's armed forces in combat situations with a capability and mandate to use force (or, in the parlance of the UN "all necessary means").

<sup>xxxvii</sup> Canada changed from defence in the regional Euro-Atlantic theatre and peacekeeping globally to fighting globally.

<sup>xxxviii</sup> Here, in regard to its core national interest of national unity, Canada managed the international reaction to the Quebec referendum of October 30, 1995. It also succeeded in securing the virtually unanimous support of all countries in the world for a united Canada and maintained its distinctive national values of multilateralism and the rights of minorities.

<sup>xxxix</sup> The Korean War had ended in stalemate, with North Korea eventually becoming a nuclear-armed and missile-laden threat. The 1956 peacekeeping force in the Middle East had been withdrawn in defeat in 1967 and the region, from Egypt to Lebanon, had become a regular source of terrorism and war.

<sup>xl</sup> Even though there had just been a foreign policy review completed by his foreign ministers in the summer of 2003 (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] 2003).

<sup>xli</sup> Veronica Kitchen (2004, 708–09) wrote that "under the new Martin government, Canadian-American relations became even more of a central concern ... Paul Martin took office with the declared intention of improving Canadian-American relations." Thus Martin created the Department of Public Safety and Emergency Preparedness and Canada's first national security strategy, both to mirror counterparts in the United States. He also created and chaired a Cabinet committee on Canadian-American relations, appointed a parliamentary secretary of his own to deal it, and established a secretariat in Washington to lobby Congress. Martin reaped the desired reward with Bush coming to Canada on November 30, 2004, even before the formal start of the president's second term. Bush thus gave Martin's Canada the dedicated bilateral visit to Canada that Chrétien's Canada never got during Bush's first four years.

<sup>xlii</sup> Exchange rates changes brought strong American decline, system diffusion, and Canadian rise. During the first 11 months of 2004, the U.S. dollar dropped more than 4.5 percent against the euro. Britain's pound hit an 11-year high against the U.S. dollar. Japan's yen also appreciated strongly. In the summer of 2005, China's currency was allowed to rise. In GDP, America grew substantially, while Europe stagnated and Japan only slowly started to grow. But rapid growth arose in Russia and in the rising G20 powers, led by China, with a sustained growth rate of more than 9 percent per year. Even once crisis-ridden Brazil started to grow again.

<sup>xliii</sup> These shocks also aroused an awareness of the ecological vulnerability shared by the U.S. and Canada. In 2004 the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment reported that the **Arctic** was warming at nearly twice the rate as the rest of the world (Arctic Council 2004). This promised massive ice melts, sea level rise, wild weather fluctuations, the depletion of the

Gulf Stream, increased ultraviolet radiation, and breaks in the food chain and habitat. Canada and America alike faced real threats to their Arctic development and aboriginal populations. Canada faced a particular threat to its national interest of sovereignty and territory over the Northwest Passage with now more open and internationally penetrated waters, and to its DNV of ecological protection and sense of custodianship or responsibility to protect the world's climate. At the end of the year the chock of the deadly **Asian tsunami** dramatically displayed the global ecological threat.

<sup>xliv</sup> All knew that even with its Strategic Petroleum Reserve and the possible opening of the Alaska National Wildlife Reserve (ANWR), America would be unable to cope alone. In 2004 America's domestic oil reserves could meet U.S. needs for only three to four more years.

<sup>xlv</sup> It began: "We have our Canadian values and we can bring them into the international sphere in a humanitarian and effective way. As Governor General and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces, I have the privilege of seeing our values as Canadians in action." It then spoke of the Canadian troops in Kabul and the casualties they suffered there.

<sup>xlvi</sup> The old diversification had been bred by a protectionist America and by a newly invulnerable Canada looking to old powers in Europe and Japan in response (Dobell 1992). This new diversification was built on Canada's successful relationship with an open America and proactively aimed at opening rising powers in Asia and the Americas. It represented Martin's longstanding personal assessment of where world power was going (Gray 2003).

<sup>xlvii</sup> "The shock of **SARS** demonstrated vividly our **vulnerability** to infectious diseases that may be incubated anywhere on earth. Diseases such as SARS and the recent **avian flu** pose threats which increased global mobility can only make worse." The government would thus "ensure that Canada is linked, both nationally and globally, in a **network** for disease control and emergency response."

<sup>xlviii</sup> The Throne Speech celebrated "our openness to immigrants and refugees" because "immigrants have helped to build Canada from its inception and will be key to our future prosperity." "A 21st-century economy is an economy open to the world," and Canada must "safeguard access to world markets."

<sup>xlix</sup> With two each came the UN, G8 partners Britain, Japan, and the European Union, APEC partner Korea, and the new partners from the greater Middle East, Afghanistan, Jordan, and Iraq.

<sup>l</sup> Canada initiated the request for modifications, based on its interests of curtailing countervailing and antidumping duties and its distinctive national value of environmentalism in regard to energy and water. The initiative was imperial focused, and largely unsuccessful. Only in regard to the distinctive national value of environmentalism with regard to water did Chrétien secure something useful.

<sup>li</sup> The move from the Canadian-United States Free Trade Agreement (CUFTA) to NAFTA can be considered CNR's diversification to the extent that Mexico emerges as a principal power, or at least a systematically significant one.

<sup>lii</sup> The initiative and persistent diplomacy of Canadian G7 sherpa Reid Morden and Canadian trade minister Thomas Hockin, in the lead-up to and at the G7 Tokyo Summit in July 1993, had produced the market access agreement among the major powers that was critical in breaking the larger logjam and speeding the long overdue Uruguay Round to a successful conclusion by December 1993. Under Chretien, Canada continued to seek early ratification of the Uruguay Round and startup of the new WTO. It wanted the new generation of trade issues, notably environmental and labour conditionality, to be discussed first in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and injected into the negotiating forum of the WTO only at a much later stage.

<sup>liii</sup> This was largely LI, but there were some signs of a distinctive approach to regional order—an alternative “plan.” Moreover, Canada’s quest to include Romania, Slovakia, and Slovenia can be attributed to subnational interests—the hope of future Candu nuclear reactor sales—but also to distinctive national values, namely the rights of minorities and of stabilizing countries to be free from the ethnic conflicts destroying their Balkan neighbour.

<sup>liv</sup> Concerts, with only major powers included, or regional institutions, whose members are all contiguous with at least one other member, are special kinds of plurilateral institutions.