# Lecture 1
# Introduction and Organization

POL 312Y Canadian Foreign Policy
Professor John Kirton
University of Toronto
September 15, 2009

## 1. Introduction

Welcome, *bienvenue*, to POL 312 Canadian Foreign Policy. I'm Professor John Kirton and I have been teaching this course since I returned to the University of Toronto as a professor in 1977. So if you are looking for teaching experience and research expertise on the subject, this is the course for you.

We also have an experienced Teaching Assistant, **James McKee** who could not be here with us today. James will be helping us with the marking in the course and advising you on your tests and essays. He comes to us with a strong background in Canadian foreign policy, having studied with Kim Richard Nossal at Queen's University. This is his fourth year as TA in POL 312Y.

We also have as part of the team **Zaria Shaw,** a Senior Researcher in the G8 Research Group. Zaria will be giving us a hand with the course, primarily with the mechanics and website that I will describe later. Zaria, please introduce yourself and tell students how they can contact you.

I assume everyone here is already properly enrolled in the course through ROSI — the University of Toronto's electronic "repository of student information." If not, please see me immediately after this class.

### Format

The format for our course is as follows:

- It is generally a two-hour lecture with a ten-minute break in the middle (although today we will go right through without any interruption).
- Arrive by 10h10 when we start, to hear the opening announcements, and to give us maximum time in class.
- We will try to end at 12h00 sharp so you can get to your other commitments.
- Feel free to ask questions at any time but understand that I may defer them to later or the end.
- We have no tutorials, but do come see me during my office hours, Wednesday 9.30-12 noon, Room 209N Munk Centre.

Despite our large numbers, I hope to get to know you all by the end of the year.

Throughout the year we will try to have outside **guest lecturers** to broaden the intellectual perspectives and pool of expertise you will receive.

I will also keep you posted on the most relevant special lectures or seminars on the campus.

I assume everyone has a course syllabus/reading list. It explains the basics.

### Today

Today is an introductory session. I want to:

- Have you fill out a brief **questionnaire**,
- Introduce the **subject** of Canadian foreign policy,
- Explain how the course is **organized**,
- Outline the **requirements** and assignments, and
- Discuss the **mechanics** of how to succeed.

## 2. The Questionnaire

To help us educate you as effectively as possible, I would be grateful if you could fill out and return right away the brief questionnaire we are circulating (Appendix A):

## 3. The Subject of Canadian Foreign Policy: What, Why, How

In taking up the subject of Canadian foreign policy, we confront the three basic questions of "what," "why" and "how":

A. **What** is it?,

B. **Why** do we study it?, and

C. **How** best do we study it?

The answers of each instructor, each textbook and each individual author will vary. The following answers will give you some insight into my responses, and the approach we will be taking in this course.

### A. What Is Canadian Foreign Policy?

Whenever I tell anyone that I teach Canadian foreign policy, I usually get two responses.

The first and most frequent is: "**I didn't know we had one."** This may reflect widespread doubt that those leading the federal government are **competent** enough to mount and maintain a single, integrated, coherent policy for dealing with the outside world. It may also flow from a related belief that Canada is just too **small**, in a globalized world where a single superpower or rising competitors dominate, to have the kind of strategic, proactive approach or "policy" that normal major powers have. In short, in a world where globalization or hegemony emasculates open, fragile, internationally-exposed states, Canada doesn't count and thus does not even try to count. For example, a few years ago, as the 2003 War in Iraq drew near, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien said, at the end of his September 9th, 2002 summit with President George Bush in Detroit that the president had not given him a plan so he had nothing to say on the subject.[1] Canada was presumably just too small to be expected to have a plan of its own.[2]

The second response I often get when I say I teach Canadian foreign policy is: "**Which One?"** We saw why at this time seven years ago on September 11, 2001, when Jean Chrétien and Foreign Minister John Manley had distinctively different approaches in response to the

[1] In the Prime Minister's words" "At this moment there is no plan that has been given to me by the President." Meanwhile, France was preparing a two-stage plan of its own and British Prime Minister Tony Blair was initiating phone calls to several world leaders, including Jean Chrétien. There was no evidence that Chrétien phoned anyone himself.

[2] Or recently it was difficult to discern in any detail what Canada's distinctive policy was toward Russia's invasion of Georgia in August 2008, beyond the familiar instinct to follow one's friends.

terrorist attacks on North America that took 25 Canadian lives. Subsequently, Jean Chrétien himself seemed to have several different approaches about what to do in Afghanistan, taking several decisions to get more involved in a military war and then suddenly deciding to pull out.

He also seemed to change his mind about the Iraq was in 2003, as he seemed to favour different options at different times. One was to support the 16 United Nations' (UN) resolutions that said Saddam Hussein's weapons of mass destruction (WMD) program must go. A second was to let Iraq get such weapons and their delivery systems but act only if Iraq's intent to use them could be proven. A third was to do nothing until the US could prove that Iraq was involved in the September 11th attack.[3]

Such responses suggest that Canadian leaders may be **disorganized**. But they also imply that Canada is **big** enough to have not just one but several, foreign policies. They further imply that there may be more than one simultaneously unfolding, indeed that there are different tendencies competing for dominance of Canadian foreign policy as a whole. This means that scholars need **multiple perspectives** to understand Canadian foreign policy, rather than a single, constant interpretive theme or theory, as the one and only truth. And this menu of multiple perspectives should include the possibility that Canada under certain circumstances can become, or even already is, a **country that counts** in the world.

We thus begin with a broad but focused conception of what Canadian foreign policy is and what each of its component terms means.

**B. What is "Canadian"?**

First, what is "Canadian" in Canadian foreign policy? Our focus is on governments, above all the **federal government**, as authoritative actors. To be sure, non-state actors, civil society organizations, empowered individuals and their networks matter, and we include them. But ours is a classic **state-centric** view. Nation-states still matter most, especially in today's world where Canada and many other consequential countries are regularly at war.

Thus we:

- Begin with the **prime minister** and his or her distinctive approach to the world.[4] Canadian foreign policy usually starts or stops at the top.
- We then **look at the many actors and policies within the government, beginning with the foreign** minister and his or her trade, international development, national defence and finance colleagues[5];
- We pay some attention to the **provinces**, which, under Canada's constitution, have authoritative, indeed in some respects sovereign, roles in international affairs. The current debate over climate change shows that both federal and provincial governments have a major part to play;

[3] On September 9th, 2002, the day Chrétien and Bush met in Detroit, Manley noted that Canada has not ruled out being part of a UN-approved strike against Iraq to enforce Security Council resolutions.

[4] Remember Prime Minister Kim Campbell in 1993.

[5] Remember Flora MacDonald in 1979 and Barbara MacDougall later.

- And above all, we always include **Quebec**. The Quebec question is fundamental to our subject. The "**national unity imperative**" is often a primary driver of Canadian foreign policy, even when it is not seen. Thus, "Our Canada includes, indeed begins with, Quebec." It never goes away. That is why the most important country in the world for Canada is — France.

**C. What is "Foreign"?**

Secondly, what is "foreign" in Canadian foreign policy? We should think of it simply, as connoting "**outside**." It is everything outside Canada's borders, or things within Canada that are closely connected to things outside.

To be sure, Canada is on the surface a **very normal polity**, competing with two hundred others to have its interests and values survive and thrive to shape global order in an anarchic world. However Canada is also somewhat **special**. Thus we should not think of 'foreign" as meaning "alien," nor of that outside world as being a different, distant, dangerous place. For Canada is so closely connected to so many of those "outside" countries that it does not regard them as foreign at all. With the 52 countries of the Commonwealth around the world, Canada exchanges "high commissioners" rather than "ambassadors." It shares with some of them a single "sovereign" — Queen Elizabeth, the queen of Canada and of other countries too. Canada shares with many more the Queen as the head of the Commonwealth. Over the past 20 years Canada has also come to think of the 50 or so countries of la Francophonie in a similar war. That is why Jean Chrétien's Canada wanted to dispatch Canadian armed forces to Rwanda in 1996 to prevent a genocide unfolding there. More recently Canadians are starting to think of Mexicans and citizens of the neighbouring United States as fellow members of a common North American community, now governed by an annual trilateral summit. And with Canadians coming from so many countries, living and traveling in so many countries, and often having dual or multiple citizenships, the world outside is not one really regarded as "foreign" at all.[6] It certainly is not for Canada's last two governor generals, our queen's resident representatives or deputy head of state, both of whom were born outside Canada, in other parts of the Commonwealth and francophone world. In the U.S. the constitution says you have to born inside the country to get the top job as head of state. California Governor (or "Gubernator') Arnold Schwarzeneger knows this all to well. In Canada it is exactly the opposite. The person holding the top job has never been born inside the country but always outside. In fact she lives and largely works outside the country all her life. She is like many of her subject in these respects.

**D. What is "Policy"?**

Third, what is "policy" in Canadian foreign policy? It is everything the federal government does aimed at the world outside or aimed inside Canada to deal with that world outside. Canadian foreign policy we thus define broadly as **governing and managing Canada's and Canadians'**

[6] Indeed, only after almost a century was Canada's Department of External Affairs, created at the start of the twentieth century, renamed the Department of *Foreign* Affairs. Particularly as the era of intensified globalization takes hold, it is the old name that captures the reality best.

**relations with the outside world.**[7] The policy is often reactive, confused, contradictory, and incoherent. But it can be proactive, clear, centralized and coherent as well.

In our analysis of Canadian foreign policy we focus on **measurable behaviour**. We do so in part to liberate us from the often narrow confines of current public policy discourse and debates and to uncover the often surprising patterns that lie underneath. That behaviour consists of a trilogy of components: **Declarations, Distributions of Resources and Decisions.**

*i. Declarations*

We start with declarations because **words matter**. Discourse, concepts, principles, norms, naming and framing do make a difference, as constructivist scholars of international relations emphasize.[8] Words cannot be dismissed as empty rhetoric, especially as new concepts such as "soft power," "human security," the "responsibility to protect," global "leadership," struggle and succeed in dominating Canada's way of thinking about and acting in the world. But which words matter most? We focus in particular on the authoritative statements of foreign policy which governments issue when they first take office, and the underlying ontological and epistemic understandings, and conceptions of interests, values, priorities and preferences these reflect. We will, for example, ask how well Stephen Harper's doctrine of Canada as an "energy superpower" and then "clean energy superpower" fits into our rapidly globalizing, post-September 11th world. Can Canada really be, in any sense of the term, something called a '**superpower**' in the world today?

*ii. Distribution of Resources*

Our next concern is with the *distribution of resources* available to develop and deliver these declarations, through the many instruments of foreign policy that the government can deploy. However potent "soft power" slogans and moral suasion may be, money and material resources matter. During the dismal 1990's, fiscal consolidation, government downsizing, and the ensuing debates over "niche diplomacy" and the commitments-capabilities-credibility" gap reminded us that real resources are required to develop, deploy and employ even the most attractive doctrines and ideas. After the question became how to spend the government's sustained, substantial, fiscal surplus, the questions of how much to spend and what to spent it on became acute. Should more go to health care or paying down the debt at home or to international affairs? Within the latter domain, should it go to defence, development assistance, diplomacy, sustainable development, diversity protection or democracy promotion in the world? What is the desirable configuration of "D's" Canada should deploy in Afghanistan now – or after 2011 when Canadian troops are due to depart? And how should we deploy the scarcest fixed asset in government — the prime minister's time and personal engagement.[9] What should the prime minister worry about and where in the world should he or she go – to America to see president Obama again (as he is

[7] "Canadians" include individual Canadians, such as Mr. Arar and Mr Chelil.

[8] Constructivist writings have arisen largely in Canadian foreign policy over the past decade.

[9] In the mid 1990's foreign policy adviser James Bartleman told Prime Minister Jean Chrétien he should plan to spend 20% of his time on international affairs. In practice it turned out to be more.

doing tomorrow) or to China, (as Michale Ignatieff seems to want him to do?)?[10] That is why every week we will be asking, what is the Prime Minister worrying about and where is he visiting now?

*iii. Decisions*

We are, thirdly, interested in decisions, particularly the big, foundational decisions that resolve crises or mark major turning points. It is these singular successes or defining disasters that set the policy for decades to come. None has a greater hold on the minds of older Canadians than **Suez 1956**. In Detroit on September 9, 2002, the first anniversary of 911, Prime Minister Chrétien lectured President Bush about how Canadians loved the United Nation because Lester Pearson invented peacekeeping there — proof that the legacy of Canadian diplomacy during the Suez Crisis of 1956 lived on.[11] Even today, half a century later, when conflict rages in Afghanistan, some still instinctively call for Canada to act more as a "peacekeeper," rather than take sides or use force. We will see how many references to Mike Pearson, peacekeeping or Suez pop up, like friendly ghosts, on the possible autumn election campaign trail. It is in these great decisions, even from the distant past, that we can see most closely how individual, governmental, societal and external determinants come together to shape the available alternatives, and why particular choices were made.

*iv. Differences Made*

There is a fourth "D" we should remember. With the appropriate doctrines, distributions and decisions, can Canada make a **difference** in the world? All too often practitioners and even scholars of Canadian foreign policy tend to focus on trying to get Canada to do more of the right thing, whatever the results may be. But ultimately in international politics, it is not just being there, playing the game or gaming the process, but the end product that counts. And here it is far better to win than to lose. So does Canada get what it wants? Was its policy effective in securing its desired goal?

Here, Canada just might be one of the **biggest winners** in the world. For thus far Canada has not lost any of the many wars it has fought, at home or abroad, in the past 250 years, since its defeat in British North America's civil war in 1776. More broadly, we ask: what was Canada's **influence and impact**, not only in getting what it wanted but also in shaping world order as a whole for all? These questions assume that Canada can be, under certain circumstances, big enough, focused enough, and astute enough, not just to protect its own interests but also to make a difference, to change the international system, to shape in its own image world order and global governance as a whole – to make the world look like Canada writ large.[12]

---

[10] See Appendix 1 and 2 in James Bartleman, *Rollercoaster,* to learn what Jean Chrétien's choices were.

[11] "I said to him that Canada is very strong on the role of the United Nations against Saddam Hussein…It is extremely important to follow the process of the United Nations for Canadians because of Lester B. Pearson and the creation of [peacekeeping] troops sent all over the world."

[12] Note that these four "D's" are very different that the ones that dominate the daily Canadian foreign policy debate. These are defence, development and diplomacy, where critics ask which

*Further Issues*

There are three further issues we must address in deciding what Canadian foreign policy is. These are:

- What time period do we cover?
- What issues of "high" or "low" politics do we deal with? and
- What regions of the world do we focus on?

i. What Time Period?

Firstly, we focus on the post-1945 period and continuity and change since that time. To be sure Canada was playing on the world stage for centuries before, as a country that was created in 1867, 1763, or 1608. But in 1945 Canada took a step-level jump, psychologically, behaviourally and legally, to become a more autonomous actor in the world outside. The year 1945 also marked the last general or system-wide war in the world (Ikenberry 2001). That year was thus a major breakpoint, at home and abroad.

This look at the more than half century since 1945 allows us to address several key questions:

- How much **continuity and change** in Canadian foreign policy has there been?
- Is the post-Cold War, globalizing, post-911 world and thus Canadian foreign policy fundamentally **different** now?
- How can selected forays back into the past help us **interpret** Canadian foreign policy in the new post-Cold War world?
- How much **innovation** is there in Canadian foreign policy?
- What are the degrees of **freedom**, scope for choice, and range of alternatives that Canadians can realistically assume exist and ask their governors to deliver?

ii. What Issues? High, Low and Middle Level

Secondly, we focus on both high and low politics, and indeed the middle-level politics of global issues, transnational processes or new security threats in between. We do so because:

- Political and economic subjects are often **linked**. We see this in energy and nuclear proliferation in Iran and elsewhere, in defence production and military procurement, in G7 assistance to the former Soviet Union and Russia, in economic boycotts of Iraq, Nigeria, South Africa and in much else.
- The post-Cold War globalizing system has elevated "**new security**" issues, human security issues, global issues and economic competitiveness to be leading concerns. But 911 and the ensuing war in Afghanistan have ensured that the high politics of peace and security remains in first place. Low politics have risen high on the agenda too, as environmental issues such as climate change and its impact on Canadian sovereignty and territory in the Arctic clearly show.

---

we should invest more in at home, or use more of abroad and in Afghanistan. The dreary 'three D' debate, is only about the instrument of foreign policy – part of the distribution of resources in our terms. It ignores other instruments such as 'development durable' or economically sustainable development, in English, and demographic diversity, which is arguable Canada's greatest resource.

Within the broad set, a few issues stand out. The first is **war**. Since 1990 Canada has gone to, and been at war a lot. It is now, in Afghanistan, which has become Canada's longest war. It may also be the first one, in Canada's 250 long and war-prone history that Canada might actually lose.

A second is an other existential one, of a classic sort. It is **nuclear war**. It has already happened once – in 1945 – and worries many with today's nuclear proliferation in an unpredictable Iran, North Korea and Pakistan. On nuclear war, proliferation and arms control, Canada has, physically and politically, been a global pioneer since the start.

A third issue is the other existential one, for the planet as a whole. It is **climate change**, where the evidence increasingly suggests that unless major, urgent action is taken, communities, countries and conceivably human life itself could be wiped out. It is thus understandable that this issue takes centre stage in Canadian federal elections and in the G8 summit that Canada will host here in Ontario in 2010. On climate change, Canada has also been a global pioneer since the start.

iii. What Regions?

Thirdly, we mount a **global coverage** that embraces all regions of the world. Canada may not be a global power but it is, or tries to be, a global player, with actions everywhere in the world. At a minimum Canada is affected by and often feels it has to react to events from all around the world, be it genocide in Rwanda in 1996, the fear of it in Kosovo and East Timor in 1999, or building an Afghanistan safe for democracy and diversity half a world away. The globalizing system is making many long local issues now global. For centuries, the burning issue of where Torontonians should burn their garbage was a local or least a provincial one. Now it involves Michigan and has become an issue in Canada's relations with the U.S. cross-border shopping lies in the same category. And Canada has in practice often decided to be not just a niche player but a full strength player — one that fought in the Gulf in 1991 and Kosovo in 1999, that sent troops into Macedonia (FYROM) in August 2001, and that has been at war in Afghanistan since the fall of 2001 — eight long years ago.[13] We do give particular emphasis in the course to the nearby U.S. and North America, given the weight of the U.S. in the world, where it still ranks number one. But we are equally concerned with international order and global governance as a whole, as we should be in an increasingly integrated, inter-vulnerable globalized world.

**E. Why Study Canadian Foreign Policy? Three Reasons**

If this is what we consider Canadian foreign policy to be, why do we study it? There are many reasons. One may be your career interests, with international organizations, as a foreign service officer, with internationally oriented business or nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) or even as a citizen living in Canada now and in the years ahead. Here, you will constantly encounter the outside world from SARS and swine flu to climate change and thus Canadian foreign policy, whatever you do in your daily life. Another motive may flow from intellectual ambitions:

[13] Can you remember where you were on the morning of September 11, 2001? What did you think when you first learned that North America, or was it just the U.S., had been attacked, and that many innocent civilian Canadians, or was it just Americans, had died?

Foreign policy is a chance to explore politics on the large screen, the world stage, at its biggest, broadest and most complex.

Most of the various reasons for studying Canadian foreign policy usually reduce to three.

*1. Self Defence*

The first is self-defence. We're here and so is it. Canada is the only country we've got, close at hand at least for now. As a relatively small, highly open, heavily exposed society and economy, Canada must cope with the outside world and its heavy impacts on and into the country starting with those "born in the USA" next door. Much of what is our neighbors' domestic policy—in the neighbouring U.S., France, and Russia, if not Denmark, is foreign policy for Canadians as they try to cope with these intense inflows from abroad.

*2. The Model Middle Power*

The second reason is Canada's image as a model middle power. Most analyses of international relations and foreign policy focus on the actions of the world's few great powers whose behaviour matters most to how the world works. Some also focus on the place of the many small, weak, countries, especially in north-south relations. But it is also useful to look in the middle, at the middle class of the global state system. For when these middle powers combine and act together, they can collectively matter to the world. And Canada has long thought itself to be, and been thought by others to be, a model middle power in the world. By studying Canadian foreign policy, we can thus see in purest form how middle powers do or should behave in international affairs.

*3. A Major Power that Matters to the World*

The third reason is that Canada might be a major power that matters to the world. Does Canada count all by itself? We will see, but at least we can observe that it regularly behaves as if it did. It takes initiatives, displays leadership, and is included among the select clubs of major powers trying to govern the globe. A few year ago the British newsmagazine the *Economist* held a contest for the world's most boring phrase. The winner — a "Worthwhile Canadian Initiative." It was not just a joke. They are indeed often boring. But they are often there. And they are occasionally worthwhile. Not all these initiatives are well conceived. Not all succeed. But they are launched in steady succession as a central part of Canadian behaviour abroad. Examples abound.[14] One recent case is Paul Martin's success in making the revolutionary idea of an international "responsibility to protect" (R2P) an accepted principle of world leader. Another is his crusade as prime minister to bring to life his concept of leaders meetings of the G20

[14] These include: Paul Martin and the response to 1997-9 Global Financial Crisis, b) Phillippe Kirsch and the World Criminal Court as a permanent body, c) Lloyd Axworthy and the antipersonnel landmines convention, d) 1996 Spring. Jean Chrétien's short lived Rwanda intervention, e) 1995 Spring. Brian Tobin and the Turbot War and UN Convention, f) 1994 December. The FTAA at the Miami Summit of the Americas, g) 1992 Brian Mulroney and the Biodiversity Convention, h) WTO, i) cultural diversity UNCLOS, j) Trudeau peace initiative

systemically significant countries, a club he cofounded in 1999. And Stephen Harper is now exercising what he calls leadership on global climate change.[15]

As we will see in a moment, each of these reasons for **why** we study Canadian foreign policy has implications for **how** we study CFP.

But before moving into that we should ask: Why study CFP now? This is an especially exciting time to be embarking on a study of Canadian foreign policy, for we are moving into a new world and a new Canada. There are several features of the outside world worth noting.

1. First, the **post cold war world** is still being shaped. This is a time of dramatic change in the world — a new era being defined by the end of the Cold War and by the end of the Eurocentric international order put in place in 1919 and 1945. But is the old cold war coming back – this time in Georgia, Ukraine and the Arctic too? Will the new world be marked by the rise of China, India, Russia, Brazil, Mexico and some say South Africa — the BRICSAM powers as they are known. In this new world, what is Canada's response and role?

   This new post-Cold War world has brought some real surprises. For example, it is certainly not an era of peace. Indeed, during the 1990's, for the first time in forty years, Canada started going to war. It began with the 1990-91 war in the Gulf. It ended it with the war to liberate Kosovo in the spring of 1999. And it started the twenty-first century by going to war in distant Afghanistan where it remains at war to this day.[16]
2. Second, **globalization** is now in a new intensified phase, being driven by the spread of finance and trade, the information technology revolution, open democratic ideals, and infectious disease, from SARS in 2003 to swine flu now. The cold war success in spreading markets and democratic polities around the world has brought the openness needed for Canadians to connect easily, instantly and inexpensively almost everywhere around the world.[17] Does this primarily mean new penetrations into Canada or new opportunities for Canadians' influence abroad? Does the Internet harm or help? Is it a new channel of American penetration or a global public utility that Canada, as a leading communications power, can access to propagate its soft power, distinctive national values and preferences throughout the world?
3. Third, a **new generation of global governance** is being created. It is based on new international institutions and global principles, notably those of the new comprehensive plurilateral summit institutions (PSIs) — such as the Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE), the Co-operation Council of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Rio environmental summits and secretariats for biodiversity and climate change, the G8, G8 plus five, MEM-16 and SPP. In the finance field have come the G20 and Financial Stability Forum (FSF) and now regular G20 summits too. In the trade policy there have arisen: the 1989 Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (CUFTA); NAFTA on

[15] We will soon ask "where does Canada rank" in a world of 200 states with more being added all the time! To divide the 200 up in the big, the middle, and the small, just where do you draw the line?

[16] All of Canada's neighbours are going to war too, with its invasion of Georgia in August 2008 Russia, after a long sabbatical has just joined the list.

[17] Did you email, chat or text with anyone outside Canada during the past week?

January 1, 1994, with the Commission for Environmental Cooperation (CEC) and the Commission for Labor Cooperation (CLC); the Canadian-inspired World Trade Organization (WTO) (Winhan 1998), on March 1994 March in Marrakesh; the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation Forum (APEC) in November 1993; and the Summit of the Americas. Canada's metier has long been international institutional reform — peace order and good global governance. But governance has gone global now.

4. Fourth, there is a **new generation of leaders** – Putin to Medvedev; and Obama in the U.S. and Japan. It is simultaneously a time of major transition in Canada. There is:
   - The prospect of an election and this change in policy, parties and people.
   - A *prime minister* with bold ideas. Our prime minister and his ministers, to their great surprise, have become foreign policy ministers.
   - A *new foreign policy doctrine* being incrementally unveiled. It started with the Conservative Party platform, and continued with the prime minister's speeches at home and abroad. It has come to centre on the theme of global leadership.
   - A *new party* in power, the Conservative Party, which may only partly be like the Progressive Conservative Party of old.
   - A *minority government*, which could change the party in power at any time. There is a wider array of alternatives with the remnants of the Reform Party/Canadian Alliance and the Bloc Québécois in the House of Commons and Elizabeth May's Green Party joining them on the campaign trail. They have raised fundamental, previously unthinkable questions, such as Canada being destroyed from within its own federal systems.
   - A *country with money to spend* during and after the global financial crisis. The question of "where to spend the surplus" looms large. The 1990s deficit-debt challenge required setting priorities in an age of downsizing and restructuring, and has now led to a new debate on what to spend the Canadian governments' still sound money on.
   - *Domestic politics as foreign policy*, with the globalization of Canada's society and economy.

   **Demographically**, Canadian society is now an international society. Over 11% of its people have been born outside the country, compared to about 7% in the United States. Canada has a high and sustained immigrant intake, of 200,000 to 250,000 per year. Since 1996 Canada's population increase has came more from net immigration than from net natural births. Immigrants increasingly come to Canada from all around the world. Canada now has the world within. And Canadians now live in the world without, in a global diaspora that can exercise influence on Canada's behalf. Canada's diaspora can also call on Canada to rescue them when war breaks out abroad, as it did in Lebanon in the summer of 2006.

   **Economically**, the Canadian economy has become a foreign policy economy. Close to 40% of its overall gross domestic product (GDP), and half of its private sector production typically comes from exports now. The Canadian economy is now predominantly an international economy. Every one of those exports generates an estimated 10,000-15,000 jobs.

8. A **country at war** in Afghanistan, in what has become Canada's longest war. It might become the first war ever that Canada, a rather war prone country will actually lose.

**F. How To Study Canadian Foreign Policy: The Need for Theory**

How then do we best study Canadian Foreign Policy? About half of the television newscast each night is usually composed of international stories. In most of them, even when it is not mentioned, Canada is affected or involved.

Canada's relationship with the outside world is so voluminous, complex, and multifaceted, that scholars have to move beyond the endless waves of often ephemeral events to identify the underlying course and cadence of behaviour, their causes and their consequences.

To do this we need at least a conceptual framework — a set of **concepts** — to organize our data.[18]

We also need a **model** that shows how the different concepts are logically related to one another.

And we finally need a **theory**, which gives an idea why the relationship among the concepts operate the way they do. In short, we need **theoretical perspectives**.

We need this to accurately describe, parsimoniously explain and accurately predict Canadian foreign policy. Only on this foundation can we proceed to pronounce it "good" or "bad" or prescribe responsibly and reliably how it can be improved.

As citizens or as professionals, we need theoretical perspectives to produce policy change. What are the sources of change, the leverage points? What variables will have the largest impact and are open to our influence? Will actions that we find instinctively appealing and readily available really have the desired effects? Why have they worked in the intended way when they have been tried before?

Hence we approach our subject with the use of three competing perspectives.

**G. Summary**

To Recap: the distinctive emphases of the course are as follows:

- Theory — the use of three distinct, competing theoretical perspectives
- Choice — Among three perspectives and the alternative policies Canadian foreign policy decision-makers have
- Change — in Canada and the world
- Prime Ministers — where all the pressures come together and where foreign policy is often decided, developed and delivered
- National Unity — the national unity imperative, essential for Canada's survival, is always at work
- France First — especially for the many Prime Ministers that come from Quebec
- America the Vulnerable — rather than "America the Victorious," as in 1945 and 1989. Perhaps it will soon become "America the vanquished" in Iraq, Afghanistan and the global war on terrorism, as it was in Vietnam in 1975.
- Winning Wars — Canada fights a lot of wars, and has won them all, thus far
- Transforming Global Governance — through its' dominant institutions and ideas. Here Canada's major contributions include the Commonwealth 1917, la Francophonie 1985, the United Nations 1955, the G8, the G20 finance ministers and summit, and R2P.

[18] Here James Rosenau's pretheory is the classic starting point.

## 4. The Organization of the Course

Thus we start, as you can see on your syllabus with theory, and move to evidence. We examine in turn:

1. Three Competing Perspectives;
2. Behavioural and Historical Evidence, from 1945 to the present;
3. The Foreign Policy Making Process: Governmental, Societal and External Determinants;
4. Relations with the United States and the new North American Community;
5. Canada's Relations with the Regions Beyond; and
6. Canada's Approach to Global Governance, notably toward the global systems of the United Nations and G7/G8.

## 5. Requirements

There are four assignments for the course:

1. A mid term **Quiz** (worth 10%) held in class on October 27 in this room, the George Ignatieff Theatre
2. A first-term **Test** (worth 25%) held in the final class in this term on December 1, 2009, in Room xxx.
2. A February **Essay** (worth 40%) due on the first class after reading week (February 23, 2009).
3. A final **Test** (worth 25%) held in the final class of the year (March 30, 2010).

If this system of evaluation does not suit you, you should seek your intellectual destiny in another course now. For the syllabus is the equivalent of a legal contract, that cannot be changed.

**Essay topics** are listed on pages 10-11 of the course syllabus.

The **late penalty** for overdue essays is 1% per day, including weekends and holidays. You may get exemptions in advance from the instructor for allowable cause. These include medical, personal or professional reasons. Scheduled vacations, workloads in other courses or extra-curricular involvements do not count, no matter how worthy they might be.

**Weekly readings** are largely drawn from the four textbooks and major works. They average a manageable 90 pages or so of reading each week, seasonally adjusted to reflect the other demands in the course and in your life.

These textbooks you should buy and use. They are all available for purchase at the bookstore. They are, in order of importance:

1. John Kirton (2007), *Canadian Foreign Policy in a Changing World* (Toronto: Thomson Nelson). It was designed as and serves as the core textbook for this course. Its chapters and content map the structure of the lectures. It is relatively new, and current up to May 6, 2006. You should start by reading the designated chapter(s) from it each week and do so before the lecture on the subject.

   It also comes with a course website: <www.kirton.nelson.com>.

   You should consult it regularly. I would be grateful for your comments over the year about what works well in the book and on the website, and what could be improved.
2. Duane Bratt and Chris Kukucha, eds. (2007), *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic Debates and New Ideas* (Toronto: Oxford University Press). This is the core reader.
3. Andrew F. Cooper and Dane Rowlands, eds. (2005), *Canada Among Nations 2005: Split Images* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press). This is a recent policy

update. It is purposely the 2006 one.

4. Michael Fry, John Kirton and Mitsuru Kurosawa, eds. (1998), *The North Pacific Triangle: The United States, Japan, and Canada at Century's End* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press). This book, while old, contains systematic treatments of Canada's relations with the U.S. and Japan.

The basic library you should use is the new John Graham library at Trinity College. It is located in the Munk Centre for International Studies at 1 Devonshire Place. All weekly readings are on reserve there.

You should also use several websites, including those noted in the Bratt-Kukucha book, on the Foreign Affairs Canada website at <www.international.gc.ca> and the G8 Information Centre at <www.g8.utoronto.ca>, where I will also try and post materials of use to you in this course.

## 6. Mechanics: How to Succeed

To succeed in this course, there are several basic rules to follow:

1. Keep up with the lectures. At the start they will stay close to the material in the textbook and weekly readings so we can be confident you have mastered the basic building blocs. But soon they will increasingly diverge, and the lectures will increasingly assume that you have read and mastered the material in the book.
2. Do the key weekly readings, which deliberately include views that do not correspond with my own.
3. Offer your own answers. Anyone can answer and ask questions about Canadian foreign policy, given the novelty of the challenges that Canada's currently faces in a rapidly changing world.
4. Start your essays soon – in the coming weeks, and rely on scholarly writings for them – not whatever other materials may be available on the web.
5. See me in my office hours, rather than relying on e-mail in hopes that I will have the time to find and reply to your message and the 100+ other emails that I receive each day.

# POL 312Y Questionnaire

September 15, 2009

Name: _____
Email Address(es): _____
In what countries have you lived? _____
What languages do you:
Speak: _____
Read _____
What citizenship(s) do you have? _____

1. Is Canada's position in the world best described as a (choose one)
   __ Middle Power
   __ Small Penetrated Power
   __ Principal or Major Power

2. What are the three most important countries, in order, for Canada in the world?
   a. _____
   b. _____
   c. _____

3. What are the three most important issues, or problems, in order, facing Canada in the world?
   a. _____
   b. _____
   c. _____

4. What are the three most important international institutions, in order, for Canada in the world?
   a. _____
   b. _____
   c. _____

5. Which Canadian(s) have won the Nobel Peace Prize, when and why?
   _____

6. Should Canada acquire an independent nuclear weapons capability of its own? (Check one)
   __ Yes
   __ No

7. Should Canada export bulk water on commercial terms to those abroad? (Check one)
   __ Yes
   __ No