312 Canadian Foreign Policy
The Chrétien-Martin Years

Lecture 11
POL 312Y Canadian Foreign Policy
Professor John Kirton
University of Toronto

Introduction: The Chrétien-Martin Eras Assessed

In interpreting Canadian foreign policy during the Chrétien-Martin years, scholars face unusual difficulty (Smith 1995). Unlike Pierre Trudeau and Kim Campbell before him, Prime Minister Jean Chrétien did not set forth during his earlier life, his first election campaign, or his first year in office a comprehensive personal vision of what his foreign policy would be. His definitive "Statement" on foreign policy, unveiled on February 7, 1995, appeared to have been overtaken within a year by a very different doctrine from his new foreign minister Lloyd Axworthy, and ultimately by the "Dialogue" report released by foreign minister Bill Graham in June 2003. Moreover, Chrétien's foreign policy doctrines, resource distributions, and key decisions were designed at the start to deal with the bright post–Cold War world abroad and the grim world of deficits, debt, and disunity at home. But by the end of the Chrétien decade, his Liberal Party successor Paul Martin had to cope with the great reversal of a grim post 9/11 world at war abroad and a strong, secure, cohesive Canada at home. Martin's effort to do so, in his April 2005 International Policy Statement, demonstrated the difficulties of doctrinally doing so.

The Chrétien Decade: The Debate

In assessing Jean Chrétien's decade as Prime Minister from October 25, 1993 to December 12, 2003, scholars offer three major competing schools of thought. The first sees LI's **disappointing continuity**, as once again the prospect of immediate change from a new prime minister was quickly snatched away. For Janice Stein (1994–95), in 1994, Chrétien's foreign policy featured an adherence to the status quo, in a world of radical change.

A second, much larger and more long-lived school sees PD's **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). In its mainstream variant, scholars such as Andrew Cooper (1995) argue that "Canada could no longer operate on the assumption that it could be a 'global boy scout'." With the end of the Cold War, Canada's fiscal crisis, and the growing gap between Ottawa's global commitments and Canada's declining capabilities, Cooper called for a discrete rather than diffuse approach and a retreat to "niche diplomacy."[1]

A harsher PD variant of isolationist retreat is advanced by Andrew Cohen (1995, 2003a; See also Pratt 1994-5). In his view, the Chrétien government's February 1995 **Statement**, like that of

[1] 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.

Trudeau's in 1970, "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 ... a dilution—even a denial—of those principles which have driven Canada's foreign policy for half a century" (Cohen 1995). An equally disappointed Gerald Helleiner (1994–95) complained that Chrétien discarded multilateralism in favour of "discriminatory regional issues" reliant on the goodwill of the much more powerful U.S, and of a confining "me too" role within the G7.

By the end of the Chrétien era many others concluded that Canada was a "fading power," or an already faded one. In this variant of Canada as a shrunken state 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) too felt that Canada's influence in the world was "shrinking fast." She blamed an aging, indecisive and incompetent outgoing Prime Minister Chrétien for this sad state, while noting that the 21st century featured "an ever-more-powerful United States" as the only superpower left in the world.

In sharp contrast, a third school highlights Canada's rise to **global leadership** during the Chrétien years. It sees Canada's complex neo-realist (CNR) rise as a rational response to a rapidly changing world that pulled Chrétien's Canada toward and often into a principal power place. First offered by John Kirton in 1996, this school points to Canada's transformation into a more fully engaged global leader, in response to the emergence of a post–Cold War, rapidly globalizing world (Kirton 1996, 1997b). After the Quebec national unity referendum was won, Canada's fiscal deficit was gone, and Axworthy arrived as foreign minister, others started to agree (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 in response quickly killed any easy acceptance of this view.

The Thesis of Expansive Global Leadership

This thesis of Canada's global leadership has, however, stood the test of time. To be sure, at the start, any lust for global leadership was largely limited to the doctrinal sphere, given the looming national unity crisis and fiscal deficit at home. But increasingly Chrétien's instinctive Pearsonian internationalism and even Trudeauvian nationalism were put aside.[2] Canadian foreign policy became far more **globally involved, intrusive** in the internal affairs of distant states, and **influential** in creating a new world order in Canada's image. Canada also became a country that regularly went to **war**. **Expansive global leadership** thus dominated Canadian foreign policy during the Chrétien years.

Four broad trends marked this expansion. **Geographically**, Canada's historic focus on the Atlantic and Commonwealth was supplemented by a shift to the Asia-Pacific and Americas. **Functionally**, the earlier emphasis on Pearsonian "peace and security" and Trudeauvian "economic growth" was replaced by a new outward-oriented priority on trade, sustainable

[2] The new prime minister, with 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.

development, human security, and the promotion of Canadian values and culture abroad. **Instrumentally**, Canadian foreign policy became much more multifaceted, forceful, and interventionist, relying routinely on military force, summitry, and innovative instruments to change distant societies, including principal power Russia, from within. **Institutionally**, Canada largely abandoned its traditional support for the United Nations (UN) to help pioneer a new generation of plurilateral international institutions in which Canada's influence, interests, and values had a prominent place.

Much like under Trudeau before, these trends unfolded in a **three step sequence** defined by each successive majority government that Chrétien obtained. But now, there were now no interruptions from minority governments or interludes on the opposition benches to break the cadence and self-confidence of this expansive thrust.

During Chrétien's **first mandate**, these trends were enhanced by the federalist victory in the Quebec referendum on separation on October 30, 1995. They were aided by the appointment of Lloyd Axworthy as foreign minister in January 1996 and the "human security" and "soft power" concepts he popularized (cf. Nossal 1998–99; Hampson and Oliver 1998).

Chrétien's **second mandate** on June 2, 1997 brought a return of Ottawa's fiscal surplus. Axworthy's concepts helped Canada shape new international regimes, on landmines and the International Criminal Court (ICC). Chrétien and Axworthy ultimately employed the "hard power" of military force—most notably with Canada's leading involvement in the war to liberate Kosovo in 1999.

Chrétien's record **third mandate** on November 27, 2000, started the third phase. Under foreign minister John Manley, appointed in October 2000, Canada went to war in Afghanistan on September 12, 2001 (Kirton 2007). After Bill Graham became foreign minister in January 2002, Canada briefly shifted to a more liberal internationalist (LI) approach in the war against Iraq in the spring of 2003. But then an innovative foreign policy "Dialogue" brought CNR impulses back.

Throughout the Chrétien decade **other ministers** contributed to Canada's emerging global leadership. Finance minister Paul Martin led in building a new international financial architecture and creating the Group of Twenty (G20) systemically significant finance ministers club in 1999. Fisheries minister Brian Tobin led in ecological protection in the 1995 Turbot War. Environment minister David Anderson led in creating the Cartegena Protocol on Biosafety and along with his predecessors, in negotiating and ratifying the Kyoto protocol on climate change. Heritage minister Sheila Copps led in creating the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP). The collective contribution of so many different Chrétien ministers suggests that, beyond Jean Chrétien's preference to let his individual ministers take the lead, broader societal and systemic changes propelled Canada's expansive leadership in the world.

The Causes of Relative Capability and Equal Vulnerability

At the systemic level there were major changes in 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.

Underlying all were changes in **relative capability and vulnerability**. During Chrétien's time, the U.S. share of G7 capabilities first declined to a new low of 38 percent in 1995, then rose in the goldilocks-like "Clinton revival" to almost 47 percent by 1997. But they then leveled off as

recession hit America in 2001, and finally declined as the U.S. dollar plummeted in 2003. Conversely, Canadian capabilities first declined to 6.8 percent of America's by 1999. But they then climbed to 7.1 percent in 2000, and rose further as Canada's gross domestic product (GDP) outgrew that of the U.S. and all the other G7 countries in 2001 and 2002 and as the Canadian dollar subsequently rose. Thus the CNR-generating combination of U.S. decline, systemic diffusion, and Canadian rise appeared. But these relative capability changes were too late and too little to account alone for Canada's expanding global leadership that started in 1994. Changes in polarity and process and above all vulnerability mattered too.

The emerging 21st-century system had begun with the arrival of the **post–Cold War** period, when the Soviet Union's Mikhail Gorbachev sent his historic letter to the G7 leaders gathered in Paris for their annual summit in 1989. After the Soviet surrender and allied Cold War victory, open democratic societies proliferated, state sovereignty eroded, and a multicultural, outward-oriented, internationally engaged Canada was pulled more strongly into now accessible and welcoming societies almost everywhere outside Cuba, North Korea and the Middle East. **Globalization's** global connectivity gave Canada, as the world's first and most globalized principal power, a "first mover" advantage in shaping the new world (Pettigrew 1999).

But globalization also brought the dark side of a **new vulnerability** to America. First seen abroad in Iran in 1979 and Lebanon in 1983, it arrived in North America one decade later with shocking force. On **February 26, 1993,** in the year the Chrétien decade began, terrorists affiliated with al Qaeda struck the World Trade Center in New York City with a car bomb containing cyanide, killing six and injuring over 1,000 more. The U.S. government captured and convicted some of the terrorists, changed government policy to generate greater vigilance, and foiled a further terrorist attack against New York City in 1995. Yet on **September 11, 2001,** in the eighth year of the Chrétien decade, al Qaeda terrorists again struck the World Trade Center. This time, they killed more than 3,000 civilians and destroyed both the Twin Towers and the memorial to the 1993 victims that had been 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 DC. There, they killed civilians and military personnel alike. In the weeks that followed, Americans in the triangle bordered by Washington DC, Florida, and New Jersey were subject to anthrax attacks that killed five. The attacks came from someone who, six years later, had not been identified or caught.

When the terrorists struck the Pentagon on September 11, "America the victorious" in the long Cold War instantly, brutally, and perhaps permanently became "America the vulnerable" in a new age of global threats killing Americans in large numbers at home and abroad. They could do so despite what the American government, acting unilaterally, could do by way of building a better, affordable national defence (Keohane and Nye 1977).

This **new vulnerability** consists of deadly physical flows arising from non-state actors or natural forces anywhere that can instantly kill innocent civilians and military personnel anywhere, despite what the world's most powerful governments acting alone can do (Kirton 1993d). It first came to America, through New York City, in the form of global **terrorism**. It came second, soon after, in the form of **finance**, from the 1994 Mexican peso crisis through to the collapse of American hedge fund Long-Term Capital Management (LTCM) and the freezing of the American financial system in the autumn of 1998 (Kirton 2000c). It came third in the field of **energy**, with rising prices and supply shortages starting in California in 2000, new 9/11 fears that existing nuclear reactors were openly vulnerable to global terrorist attack, and by an electricity blackout in the Northeast in August 2003. It arose fourth in the field of **health**, as Americans faced bioterrorism at home thanks to the 2001 anthrax attacks, the 2003 import of global pandemics

such as Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) that were only a plane ride away from anywhere, and an emerging shortage of vaccines as they waited for Asia's deadly avian flu to arrive.

These assaults confirmed that even the most capable state—the so-called single remaining superpower or even "hyper-hegemon"—could be as vulnerable as the least capable major powers or lesser powers long had been. This was true even if the leading country had more capabilities to adapt to the damage that the new vulnerabilities brought. As the Chrétien decade ended in December 2003, with Bin Laden and Mullah Omar still alive and at large, with the war on terrorism in Afghanistan not won, and with the U.S.-led coalition bogged down with a rising body count in Iraq, a now militarily mobilized America still seemed and felt as vulnerable as it had suddenly become on September 11, 2001. There was even the possibility that America the vulnerable might again become America the vanquished, should its wars in Afghanistan and Iraq end in defeat.

Canada, in sharp contrast, remained in many ways the least vulnerable country among the principal powers of the G8. It was still largely immune from major terrorist, financial, energy, health and environmental shocks on its own soil, despite the blackout and SARS attack it shared with its neighbour to the south and an ice storm all its own. This sudden sharp shift in relative vulnerability, in the broader balance of vulnerability, and in the resulting "equalization of vulnerability," pulled Canada into successful global leadership in a more pervasively insecure and more equally interpenetrated world (Kirton 2000b).[3]

Doctrine

Canada in the World, 1995

The clearest sign of expansive global leadership came at the doctrinal level, in the highly CNR content of the government's formal foreign policy statement, "Canada in the World*,"* released on February 7, 1995 (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] 1995; Malone 2001).[4] It had five premises. Its first was Canada's **leadership** position among the open, advanced societies becoming more influential as world power dispersed and became more economically defined. Its second was Canada's **geographic advantage**, as new poles of power emerged in the Asia-Pacific region and the Americas. Its third was Canada's **bicultural and multicultural personality**, which gave Canada privileged access to the anglophone and francophone worlds and beyond. The fourth was Canada's **opportunities in summitry**, as Canada 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 premise was Canada's **multilateral mediatory role**, based on its history as a non-colonizing power, its constructive multilateralism, and its effective international mediation.[5]

---

[3] Within the G8 there was a diffusion of vulnerability, as number two Japan was hit by a deadly saran gas attack on the Tokyo subway in 1995.

[4] 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.

[5] 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

There followed three priorities: 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. There was a fourth, de facto priority: **ecologically sustainable development** was highlighted as an imperative crosscutting the other three.

After its demotion under Mulroney, the economy again came first, now with a microeconomic identity that centered on employment and trade. This was a clear CNR choice.[6] The second place for promoting peace to protect Canadian security was a promotion from the bronze medal position under both Mulroney and Trudeau.[7] And the LI "peace" now came with CNR's Canadian security against the transnational human security threats that threatened Canadians directly and individually in a newly vulnerable world.[8]

The third priority—projecting Canadian **values and culture**—was entirely new.[9] 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). To be sure, Canadian values were specified as the LI, likeminded "respect for democracy, the rule of law," and "human rights." But the inclusion of the "environment" added the distinctive national value of environmentalism. CNR's "Canadianization of the global order" had thus doctrinally arrived.

In the outline of all three priorities, separate **Canadian interests came first**, followed by an increasing international interdependence that made Canada more internationally exposed but gave it greater ability to shape global order. Globalization, technology, and the scale of human development were bringing unwelcome intrusions into Canada. But they were also making societies abroad increasingly open to Canadian values and making it more likely that Canadian values and culture would be "adopted internationally."

---

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.

[6] 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.

[7] It replaced the "sovereignty and independence" first introduced by Trudeau, which had occupied the second position under both Trudeau and Mulroney.

[8] These were listed as "mass migration, crime, disease, environment, overpopulation, and underdevelopment."

[9] Trudeau's "quality of life" and St. Laurent's "values of a Christian civilization" provide pale and conceptually different predecessors.

Defence White Paper, 1994

CNR was also dominant in the defence policy doctrine. The defence white paper was released in November 1994, three months before the foreign policy statement appeared.[10] It explicitly rejected the many suggestions, fuelled by the "Canada 21" lobby group and others, that the Canadian Armed Forces should become a lightly armed constabulary. Rather, it declared that they should remain "multi-purpose, combat-capable" sea, land, and air forces, able to "fight alongside the best, against the best." Canada was to be a full-scale, first-tier, military power, able to fight and win—if not alone—at least with anyone, against anyone, anywhere in the world.

The paper then endorsed a list of priorities that placed **Canada's protection first** and UN-based 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. The paper continued: "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.[11]

Axworthy Doctrine, 1996

The Chrétien doctrine acquired an even greater CNR content when Lloyd Axworthy became foreign minister in January 1996. The Axworthy amendment took the "lessons" of Canada's crusade to ban antipersonnel landmines and elevated them into a general doctrine composed of eight interrelated elements (Axworthy and Taylor 1998; McRae and Hubert 2001; Axworthy 2003; Cohen 2003a).

The first five dealt with the **changing world**.[12] They argued that the end of the Cold War had transformed international politics. Security should now focus not on states, but on people, who faced the threats of crime, drugs, terrorism, pollution, human rights abuses, epidemics, and other pathologies arising from the now central intrastate conflicts. Soft power, not hard military force, was key. Effective public diplomacy was increasingly effective in a "wired world." Vanguard nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) were leading this new diplomacy.

This had three implications for **Canadian foreign policy**. Canada could lead ad hoc coalitions of the willing. It could promulgate new norms to bring international change. The priorities were antipersonnel landmines, small arms, children's rights, international human rights, and peace-building.

The Axworthy doctrine had 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

[10] 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.

[11] 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.

[12] The following is an adaptation of Hampson and Oliver (1998).

also had LI components, especially with its emphasis on building international norms. Yet CNR elements dominated (Nossal 1998). The emphasis on leadership suggested initiative. The creation of new, indeed revolutionary, international norms suggested Canada could and should modify world order. The reliance on coalitions of the willing suggested ad hoc plurilateralism, or free-floating associations, rather than the fixed multilateral coalitions of the likeminded of old. And the core values at the heart of the desired new world order were connected to Canada's distinctive national value of antimilitarism.

Red Book Three, 2000

These emphases survived in "Opportunity for All: The Liberal Plan for the Future of Canada." Usually referred to as Red Book Three, it was produced for the general election Chrétien 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 the new minister of foreign affairs, Bill Graham, in June 2003 (DFAIT 2003b). It reordered the 1995 priorities to put **security first** in the post–September 11 age. But it emphasized, a time of 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." It concluded by identifying several central messages: 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."

Resource Distributions

This decade-long doctrinal thrust toward expansive global leadership was largely backed by resource distributions. The thrust appeared in the somewhat constrained instrument of budgetary reform, the highly responsive one of summit diplomacy, and the most difficult one of combat operations and war.

Budgets

Budget allocation for international affairs stand at the heart of the recurrent charge that there was a gap between doctrine and resource distributions or between commitments and capability during the Chrétien years (Goldenberg 2006). The evidence shows there was indeed an initial PD decline in overall international affairs spending, driven by the need for deficit-elimination or "fiscal consolidation." Yet it came with an internal shift from LI to CNR purposes, setting the stage for a CNR configuration and greater consistency between doctrine and resource distribution when fiscal surplus and increased international affairs spending returned in 1998.

When Chrétien arrived in office, spending on international affairs subjects—defence, development, and diplomacy (DFAIT)—accounted altogether for about 10 percent of federal expenditure. Defence took 7 percent, official development assistance (ODA) 2 percent, and DFAIT less than 1 percent (Doern and Kirton 1996).[13] In the first Chrétien budget of February

[13] 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,

1994, defence spending **declined** by 10 percent and ODA by 2 percent, while DFAIT spending actually rose.[14] In the second budget, of February 27, 1995, defence dropped again, development through the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) fell 15 percent, and DFAIT was now slashed by 7 percent.[15] Yet within DFAIT a **CNR change** took place. The money automatically sent by DFAIT to ever more expensive UN-based multilateral organizations was redirected to national purposes in programs the Canadian government unilaterally controlled.

On this new CNR foundation, new spending rose once fiscal surplus returned in 1998. The **great CNR leap forward** came in 2002, on the road to, and due to, the G8 Summit hosted by Canada in Kananaskis in June 2002.[16] 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 (HIPCs) and US$23 billion for the 13th replenishment of the World Bank's International Development Association (IDA). At the Kananaskis Summit itself, Canada added another CA$1 billion over ten years of new spending 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 an autonomous impact accounts primarily for the larger amount of new money that Africa and the rest of the developing world secured.

Summitry

In summit diplomacy, CNR patterns prevailed from the start. Chrétien's first year brought unprecedented, intense travel abroad, with 9 tours to 36 different countries (see Kirton 2007: Appendix 11). The U.S. came first, but almost equal attention was given to the G7 partners of France and Britain, followed by Japan, Germany, Russia, and Italy.[17] Next came Asia and the Americas.[18] Canada was indeed now living largely in a G7-APEC world. The new pull of

---

largely through CIDA, took 2 percent, or $2.7 billion; DFAIT took less than 1 percent (0.8 percent) or $1.35 billion.

[14] The government increased DFAIT spending by 5 percent (or $74.1 million to a new total of $1,408,479 billion).

[15] It was reduced 7 percent, or $105 million, to $1.3 billion for the 1995–96 fiscal year.

[16] 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.

[17] 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."

[18] These were 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

plurilateral institutional nests was overwhelming. Dedicated bilateral encounters virtually disappeared, and the G7, APEC, and Organization for Security and Co-operation in Europe (OSCE) rose to the fore.

The subsequent year and a half, from December 1, 1994, to July 5, 1996, brought even more intense global involvement, as Chrétien 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, drew nigh. The U.S. dropped to third, tied with Russia and Italy.[19] As Chrétien prepared to host his Halifax G7 summit in the summer of 1995, G7/8 partners ranked one through eight, save for the intrusion of Ukraine in seventh place.[20] Evident also was the pull of a new unilateral instrument—the now routine use of the Team Canada trade promotion tours.[21]

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.

Between January 1997 and January 2001, plurilateralism led by the G7/8, APEC and Team Canada continued. The U.S. again became the first-placed partner, thanks largely to its unique position as a member of both the annual G7/8 and APEC.[22] Then came Britain in second, Japan in third, and France down in fourth, now that the national unity referendum had been won. Rounding out the top dozen were the rest of the G8, Canada's new free trade partners Mexico and Chile and fellow APEC members China and Singapore.

Combat Operations

Beyond the Team Canada mission, another new instrument was the regular use of combat operations. Under Chrétien Canada went to war more frequently, for more lengthy periods, using more combat arms, for more offensive and deadly missions, on a greater global terrain (see Appendix 12). The Mulroney-Campbell governments during their decade had mounted two

---

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.

[19] 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.

[20] 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.

[21] 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.

[22] Thanks 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.

combat operations, in the Persian Gulf in 1990–91 and in the Balkans from 1992, culminating in the secret success of the Battle of Medac Pocket in September 1993. The Chrétien government followed, by the broad definition, engaged in seven: staying in the Balkans, entering Haiti in 1994, initiating the North Atlantic Turbot War against Spain in 1995, intervening in Africa's Great Lakes region in October 1996, liberating Kosovo in 1999, attacking Afghanistan after 2001, and allowing minimal military participation in the 2003 war against Iraq.

Decisions

The Overall Pattern

The Chrétien government's new foreign policy doctrines and resource distributions were translated into major decisions, in a three stage sequence of expanding ambition and accomplishment with striking speed, strength, and scope.[23]

This progression was first evident in trade and economics.[24] Here came outward-looking trade liberalization, based on CNR's plurilateralism, bilateralism, and unilateralism.[25] LI multilateralism lingered on 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 came for the first time since the 1930's period with the 1994 acceptance of full free trade commitments 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.[26] Bilateralism came in negotiations and some agreements with Israel, Jordan and Palestine, Chile, Costa Rica, Central America, the Caribbean, and others around the world.[27] Unilateralism came with the Team Canada trade promotion missions led by the prime minister, and the Kananaskis G8-driven elimination of tariffs on imports from Africa. During the Chrétien decade, there were no PD moves to continentalism through deeper economic

[23] 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.

[24] 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.

[25] 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 concerts clubs of the G7 and Quad to advance its trade agenda.

[26] 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).

[27] 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.

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.

Expansive global leadership also arose in military intervention. This trend had been started by the Mulroney government in the Gulf War of 1990–91 and continued under the Campbell government in September 1993 (Kirton 1992; Mikulaninec 1992; Miller 1994; Rudner 1991). Under Chrétien, Canada routinely used force multilaterally, plurilaterally, bilaterally, and unilaterally, on sea, air, and land, in more distant global theatres.[28] Despite its initial isolationist instincts, and preference for a UN framework, Chrétien's Canada practiced successful multilateralism in Europe and the Americas by remaining in Bosnia in 1993 and entering Haiti in 1994. It unilaterally and successfully used force against Spain in the spring of 1995. It used force again with its partially productive plurilateralism in Zaire in the autumn of 1996. It engaged in successful forceful plurilateralism in the G8-led, NATO-delivered operation in Kosovo, flying in the first wave when the war to liberate Kosovo from genocide began 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). And Canada participated militarily, if at a very low level, in the U.S.-led coalition invasion of Iraq in the spring of 2003. This cadence was a striking change from the 40 years of combat-free peacekeeping during the long Cold War, from 1954 to 1990.[29] In a reversal of the 1939 to 1941 continental relationship, it was no longer America defending Canada against an envisaged threat from Hitler's Germany overseas. Rather, in a 1941 replay, now with the new vulnerability, Canada rushed to defend an America under real attack at home.

Ambitious and accomplished global leadership emerged finally in Canada's increasingly effective shaping of world order, in accordance with Canada's national interests and distinctive national values. The first, defensive, challenge came at home—winning the Quebec referendum in October 1995 through the partly PD approach of calling upon the support of the U.S. as well as a CNR coalition of France and all other consequential countries in the world.[30] Then came more expansive extensions of traditional LI impulses—successfully creating the WTO in 1994, and trying, if failing, to expand NATO rapidly in January 1994. The first substantially CNR success came in catalyzing the UN Agreement on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks in 1995. The most comprehensive effort came with Canada's ultimately slender success in reforming the UN system at the Halifax G7 Summit in 1995. Canada then moved to build a new institutionalized order, largely beyond the UN, by fostering a G8 concert with Russia after 1996, creating the landmines convention in 1996, establishing the ICC in 1997, reforming the international financial system and creating the G20 from 1997 to 1999, generating global environmental governance to control deadly pollutants and climate change, and fostering the International Network on Cultural Policy (INCP), which yielded a new international legal agreement by 2005. The effort culminated at the 2002 Kananaskis G8 Summit, with the creation of new partnerships across both the old East-West and North-South divides, through the Global

[28] 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").

[29] Canada changed from defence in the regional Euro-Atlantic theatre and peacekeeping globally to fighting globally.

[30] 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.

Partnership on Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction and the G8 Africa Action Plan. For more on this topic, go to www.kirton.nelson.com.

The Three Perspectives Applied

All three perspectives are needed to account fully for Canada's major foreign policy decisions during the Chrétien years. 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. And Canada's efforts vis-à-vis the UN were aimed in the first instance at reform rather than modification or replacement of the system to meet 21st-century needs.

The PD pull was also 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 specific FTAA component that Canada introduced. Even with the international community now devoid of an intrusive, divisive de Gaulle standing behind a united Canada during the Quebec separatist referendum period there remained some questions about whether a strong, self-confident Canada would endure (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 inherited first-strike nuclear doctrine in a post–Cold War world. This value-driven, antimilitarist, antinuclear weapons initiative, however logical, met with overwhelming American antipathy and was quickly abandoned. In the end, it was U.S. military intervention that accomplished Canada's objectives of bringing peace to Bosnia and restoring to Haiti the 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. [cite Axworthy here]

Yet, on the whole, the Chrétien decade brought strong CNR change. This change can be charted on a 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.[31] 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.

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

[31] 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.

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.[32]

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.[33]

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)[34] The Chrétien government completed the

[32] 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.

[33] 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.

[34] 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

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 chose 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

---

Co-operation and Development (OECD) and injected into the negotiating forum of the WTO only at a much later stage.

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 seven times. This reveals eight important 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 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 the very end, 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 at the time 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 led 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 Slovodan 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 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 Quebeckers 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

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.[35] 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-

[35] 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.

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).

Outcomes

A systematic examination of Canada's success suggests it did poorly in Canada's relations with the U.S. in Chrétien's first two years (Norton 1998) but much better on trade and environment cases in a NAFTA context from 1993 to 1998 (Rugman, Kirton and Soloway 1999). Its combat operations were also largely successful operations, especially when compared to the combat and peacekeeping ventures during the decolonization–Cold War period from 1945 to 1990. 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. Yet since 1990, Kuwait had been liberated, the former Yugoslavia had been transformed into a peaceful functioning democracy, Spanish pirate fishers had been driven from Canada's North Atlantic, and genocide had been prevented in Kosovo. The desired outcomes of a functioning Haiti, a terrorist-free North America, and a safe, stable, democratic Afghanistan and Iraq had yet to be delivered. But in all cases the cause was not lost when Chrétien left.

Introduction: The Martin Years Assessed

After Jean Chrétien stepped down, Paul Martin took office as Canada's prime minister on December 12, 2003. Martin had already served 15 uninterrupted years in Parliament, including five on the opposition benches from 1988 to 1993 and nine years as Chrétien's finance minister from 1993 to 2002 (Gray 2003, Martin 2008). Martin also had a life-long exposure to Canadian foreign policy from his father and namesake, Paul Martin Sr., who had practiced it with great distinction for over four decades since 1935 (Martin 1983). Paul Martin Jr. thus arrived with a well-defined and highly ambitious vision of what his foreign policy would be.

The task of delivering it was interrupted on June 28, 2004, when Paul Martin went to the polls. In sharp contrast to Jean Chrétien, Brian Mulroney, Pierre Trudeau, and Louis St. Laurent on their first outings, Martin came back with only a minority government. Everyone who had waited for the election before offering judgments about Martin's foreign policy thus had to ponder what it would be under Canada's first minority government in 25 years.[1] They had to wait again when, on November 28, 2005, his government was defeated in the House of Commons on a no-confidence vote, and subsequently defeated in the general election of January 23, 2006.

The Debate

The competing schools of thought about Paul Martin's foreign policy thus come largely from the quick judgments of public commentators and advocates, rather than from the considered conclusions of scholars calculating with the discipline that their profession demands. Yet these judgments offer a debate among four schools: disappointment; decline; diversion to the U.S.; and a drive to put Canada in a principal power place.[2]

The first school sees a **disappointment** through a default LI. It reflects the letdown felt by those who had great expectations that the long awaited, highly talented Paul Martin would bring badly needed change, after the apparently never-ending, ever stagnating Chrétien years. Martin had promised the "Politics of Achievement," with a bold new foreign policy vision a key part (Gray 2003; Martin 2003). Disappointment first came when the newly installed prime minister was suddenly afflicted by a financial scandal in the Liberal Party that caused a national unity challenge in Quebec, then by the minority government the election brought. Martin's first Speech from the Throne had boldly promised within a year an international policy review of unprecedented scale and scope, even though there had just been a foreign policy review completed in the summer of 2003 (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade [DFAIT] 2003). But only on April 19, 2005, did the results of Martin's overdue review arrive.

In such a situation, Martin seemed to default to the cautious LI pattern that his father had practiced for so long at Mike Pearson's side. As one observer concluded, Martin's November 2004 African tour was the coming out of his "Pearsonian ambition to make Canada the world's mediator" (Clark 2004). But there was still no proof that "his plan to make Canada the honest broker will also make it a power broker" in the world.

The second school sees **decline.** In this strong PD view delay yet again of urgently needed initiatives led directly to a downhill slide, approaching or even passing the point of no return. In this view the major investments the Canadian military needed to keep them fighting overseas were not forthcoming, and thus most Canadian combat troops abroad were forced to come home forthwith. Also absent was a clear plan to implement and achieve Jean Chrétien's Kyoto commitment, let alone a plan to go beyond the Kyoto protocol, even as the melting ice threatened Canada's national interests of sovereignty over its ecologically vulnerable Arctic territory and its distinctive national value of Arctic environmental custodianship too (Simpson et al 2007). In distant Darfur, as one critic put it, in September 2004 Martin "pleaded for humanitarian intervention in Sudan. He offered no troops. He got little attention" (Spencer 2004, 16).

The third school sees **diversion to America**. In this mild PD view Martin took as his priority the need to repair relations with the United States and with a President George W. Bush who Jean Chrétien had ignored or snubbed. Veronica Kitchen (2004, 708–09) wrote that "under the new Martin government, Canadian-American relations became even more of a central concern than they had been in the last years of Prime Minister Jean Chrétien's government. ... 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 with the subject, and established a secretariat in Washington to lobby Congress. Members of this school see Martin reaping the desired reward with Bush's decision to come 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.

A fourth school sees a **drive to the top** by a determined, if occasionally dithering, prime minister who would eventually get there if he followed the right advice. Adherents noted with approval 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 calculated that 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 Paul Martin's historically ambitious international policy review and his call to elevate to the leaders' level the Group of Twenty (G20), which he had founded as a finance minister in 1999 (Kirton 1999, 2004b, 2005c). John Kirton concluded that Martin "could well pull it off, there's good momentum there" (Spencer 2004, 18). Approving his bold beginnings here and elsewhere, such analysts were prepared to give Martin time to deliver and put at least some of his innovative global changes into effect. Others tried to help by telling him what to do. 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) argued that Canada could and should move "From Middle to Model Power" by "Recharging Canada's Role in the World."

The Foreign Policy of Achievement

The evidence shows Paul Martin produced a foreign policy of achievement, as his determined drive to the top delivered substantial results from the start. These results are most apparent by looking not within Canada or on the home continent but at the full global political system, embracing distant Africa and the creation of a new world order as a whole. Its centrepiece was producing as a dominant principle the "responsibility to protect" (R2P) and progress toward creating a new leaders-level summit of the twenty systemically-significant countries (L20) in the world. Together these quests represented the most ambitious attempt ever mounted by any Canadian prime minister to transform the defining ideas and institutions of global governance. As the end of his first year drew nigh and George Bush was about to arrive in Canada, Paul Martin was, by his own estimate, somewhere between two-thirds and three-quarters of the way to brining his L20 to life. By September 2005, at the United Nations World Summit in New York, his R2P principle was accepted by all the leaders of the world.

Martin's foreign policy of achievement was driven first by the international system, where highly favourable conditions arose. Changes in capability saw American decline, system diffusion, and Canadian rise. Changes in vulnerability generated enhanced American dependence, a diffusion of systemic dependence, and a strong incentive for a capable Canada to meet the need. The dense web of the changing plurilateral summit institutions (PSIs), where Paul Martin's Canada had a first-ranked place, offered an easily available international level instrument for such action.[4]

Yet with such rapid American decline, diffusing capability and equalizing vulnerability, the principal power paradox took effect with full force. External determinants became less salient and societal and government determinants became more salient in driving what Canada did. Within Canada stood a prime minister with the personal desire, international credentials and skills to put his ambitious global-shaping vision into effect (Gray 2003). However, Paul Martin could not dominate his government the way that most of his predecessors had. The now highly salient societal determinants featured a minority government, a large and experienced group of Bloc Québécois separatists, and a newly united official opposition Conservative Party in the House. Prime ministerial attention would be diverted to domestic demands and national unity, with foreign policy forced to take full account of them, until Liberal Party fortunes recovered and the prospect of a majority government returned. Francophone Quebec would have to be dealt with, in part by appointing a francophone minister to the portfolio of foreign affairs, which had just been split from international trade (Pettigrew 1999). Apart from his highly accomplished defence

minister Bill Graham, Paul Martin was largely left to do it alone, diverted and driven by the minority government, a reinvigorated separatist threat, and a new national unity challenge at home.

The Meta-Theory Causes

The meta-theory of hegemonic transition explains well why the foreign policy of achievement arose during Paul Martin's years, despite the diversions at home.

Capability

During Martin's first year, the U.S. faced relative capability decline, driven by the rapid rise in gross domestic product (GDP) of Russia and the new G20 partners, changes in the exchange rates of the G8 and G20 countries, and a decline in the U.S. dollar itself.

In GDP, America grew substantially, while Europe stagnated and Japan only slowly started to grow. But outside the old G7 rapid growth came 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.

More importantly, changes in exchange rates showed a strong, pattern of 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 sterling 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.

American decline and system diffusion created Canada's rise. During Martin's first year the Canadian dollar rose from US$0.75 to more than US$0.85, where it largely remained until his government fell late in 2005. The great currency decline during the Chrétien decade and the near death experience of the 1995 Quebec referendum had been erased by the end of Paul Martin's first year.

Vulnerability

Paul Martin's first year also saw an equalization of vulnerability, in its old and new, deliberate and diffuse, and deadly and deprivation forms.[9] The now familiar vulnerabilities of terrorism and energy intensified, and were linked to the newly acute ones of ecology and health. In the resulting interconnected quadrumvirate, America was hit among the hardest and Canada the lightest within the G8.

Terrorism

At home, terrorism spared both America and Canada, even as it hit hard in Britain on July 7, 2005, in Russia at Beslan on September 1–3, 2004, and in Madrid on the subway on March 11, 2004 (see Appendix 8). But abroad, America was hit heavily as attacks by al Qaeda–affiliated insurgents in Iraq drove the cumulative body count among the U.S. troops above 2,000 by November 2005. American public support for the war plummeted, and congressional calls to pull the troops out rose.

Ecology

The second deadly vulnerability came from a succession of ecological shocks that afflicted America and its G8 allies, although not Canada in acute form. As scientists had long known,

global climate change arrived not with a gentle gradual warming but with sudden severe extreme weather events. In Europe, in 2000, Britain had its wettest autumn in almost 300 years. In 2002 severe floods in Europe 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.[10] This exponential increase in the body count in Europe was similar to that America experienced at the World Trade Center between 1993 and 2003. But in these ecological attacks on Europe, the jump came within one year, not eight, and killed ten times more.

In the summer of 2005, the ecological attacks came to America. The warming waters of the Gulf of Mexico fuelled severe hurricanes that devastated New Orleans and America's Gulf Coast in two concentrated strikes. The resulting death and devastation was unprecedented in modern American history (1464 died). In sharp contrast Canada was largely spared such strikes and even the snow and ice storms it had suffered through in previous years. An ecologically secure Canada sent its warships down to the Gulf to help Americans rebuild their devastated lives after the storm. Few thought that America, through its Federal Emergency Management Agency, could cope on its own.

Amidst these shocks arose an awareness of the ecological vulnerability shared by the U.S. and Canada. In 2004 the Arctic Climate Impact Assessment, conducted by more than 300 scientists, reported that the Arctic was warming at nearly twice the rate as the rest of the world (Arctic Council 2004). This raised the prospect of 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 distinctive national value of ecological protection and sense of custodianship or responsibility for the future of the world's climate system.

Energy

America's ecological shock from hurricanes Rita and Katrina instantly created an energy shock that again directly hit the U.S. alone. Before the hurricanes hit, oil prices rose to a new high in October 2004 of about US$50 per barrel of oil (see Appendix 9). They were driven by two forces from abroad—the new demand side pull of China's and India's GDP growth and the supply side physical and psychological terrorist shocks in the Middle East that regularly cut off Iraq's oil production and threatened Saudi Arabia's oil exports. Now, America was struck at home with an ecological assault on its own supplies. The assault 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 under ecological attack. Alberta started producing at levels well beyond its wells' sustainable level to send more energy south. It was clear to all that, even with its Strategic Petroleum Reserve and Alaska National Wildlife Reserve (ANWR) prospectively opened, 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. 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 tar sands became the second largest source of oil reserves in the world. Canada now stood second as a global oil reserve power, behind only Saudi Arabia, and ahead of Iran, Iraq, Kuwait, and everyone else (Rugman 2005).

This specialized energy and broader commodity capability fuelled the rise of the Canadian dollar against its American counterpart, and Canada's overall capability rise relative to the United States. It also 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. Furthermore, it led a declining and more vulnerable America in decline to search for North American solutions again.

This search for integrative solutions had been intensified by a shared energy shock. At 3:32 pm on August 14, 2003, the lights went out across north-eastern North America, in the "greatest power failure in North American history" (Welsh 2004, 100).[11] At the time Canada provided 100 percent of America's electricity imports, including those to parts of the U.S. that were connected to only the Canadian grid rather than the national American one. 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 went down together, whatever the relative capability ratio between the two. In order to strengthen energy, ecological, and other forms of 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

Another new vulnerability approaching America, also shared by both North American neighbours, came in health. At first, in the form of HIV/AIDS, infectious disease was something that had been largely solved as a public health problem in America. The new health threat was brought home to America in the wake of 9/11 by the autumn 2001 anthrax attacks and the fear that terrorists could use smallpox and other infectious diseases to do their deadly work. In 2003 America narrowly escaped the deadly Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) epidemic that afflicted Canada next door. But SARS was soon followed by an outbreak of avian flu in Asia. 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.

Doctrine

These changing configurations of capability and vulnerably help explain the boldness of the foreign policy doctrines the new Paul Martin government set out. They were first presented by the prime minister himself in his throne speech in 2004.

The Throne Speech, 2004

The Speech from the Throne on February 2, 2004, read by Governor General Adrienne Clarkson, opened with international affairs and a recognition of both "our history and our capacity for change." Its emphasis was on values and on war. 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, the casualties they suffered there, and Canada's desire "to create a world where fairness, justice and decency reign."

The speech further 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."

These opening passages were predominantly CNR. The emphasis was on change and innovation, on Canadians values being projected abroad, on effectiveness, and on global involvement through the Canadian military in combat half a world away. The anchor was the distinctive Canadian national values of multiculturalism and globalism. The goal was affecting outcomes by exercising influence to "create a world." Indeed, never before had a throne speech begun with such a bold declaration of a desire to change the world order that prevailed.

Yet there was substantial LI content as well. The emphasis on history connoted continuity. Canada's goal for world order was fairness and justice—values long shared with the likeminded. And the internationally contextual concept of "role" had returned.

PD elements also arose. They came first in the form of a voice that was independent, implicitly from the imperial focus—the United States. Another element was the notion that Canada must carry its weight to meet its obligations, implicitly to the U.S., if not the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) or the UN or the global community as a whole.

In the remainder of the speech, however, the Martin government 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 called, in CNR fashion, for a new diversification toward the emerging giants leaping into the world's principal power ranks. It promised "more attention will be focused on such newly emerging economic giants as China, India and Brazil."

The old diversification had been bred by a protectionist America and by a no longer traditionally vulnerable 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 the new generation of opening rising powers in Asia as a whole and the Americas as well. It represented a personal assessment of where world power was going, one that Paul Martin had developed long before he finally got the prime minister's job (Gray 2003).

If the old vulnerability had disappeared for Canada, the world of the new vulnerability had arrived. It came in the form of health and the resulting need to protect Canadians from global epidemics and contaminated water. "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." Thus the government would "ensure that Canada is linked, both nationally and globally, in a network for disease control and emergency response."[12]

To cope with this more globally diffuse capability and this new vulnerability, 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, led by demography. It arose in the celebration of "our openness to immigrants and refugees" because "immigrants have helped to build Canada from its inception and will be key to our future prosperity." There was also a recognition that "a 21st-century economy is an economy open to the world," and that Canada must "safeguard access to world markets."

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 changes and engage the U.S. on transboundary air and water issues. It would also be a leader in environmental technologies, focusing on the commercialization of science "in areas where we can be world leaders."

The fourth was globalism. The speech highlighted how immigrants from all over the world build globally competitive firms. Canada was a magnet for capital and entrepreneurs from all around the world—global leaders in 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." While unilateralism was rejected, the choice was for 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 the CNR ends of the distinctive national value of multiculturalism and the national interest of national unity.

While distinctive national values took pride of place, the speech also took the national interest of unity as a referent, 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 were largely repeated in the government's International Policy Statement when it was finally unveiled 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 began with a five-page foreword, issued in the name of the prime minister himself. Here foreign policy was defined in ambitious, interventionist CNR fashion 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 a substantial LI inheritance and some important PD elements. Its CNR starting point featured a world of change, indeed global transformation. In classic realist terms it highlighted the "major rebalancing or world power." In authentic CNR fashion, it spoke—even before this characterization of relative capabilities—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

This process started with the summit diplomacy conducted by Paul Martin during his first year. From December 12, 2003, to November 30, 2004, Paul Martin took nine tours abroad (see Appendix 11). During these tours he made 25 separate summit visits to meet with the leaders of a majority of the countries in the world. A full 60 percent (or 15) of these 25 visits were as a consequence of his attendance at 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, also in November.

Martin's first-ranked summit partner abroad was the U.S., with six meetings. It was followed in turn by France and Russia with four each, and Mexico, Brazil, and Haiti with three each. Coming in next with two each were 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. Martin's favoured regions were the Americas, Europe, and Africa, rather than the Asia Pacific, which Chrétien had focused on. As both cause and effect of this country and regional pattern, there was good balance between anglophone and francophone states, with the bulk of the francophone visits coming after the election on June 28, 2004.

In 2005, Martin's first-ranked summit partner was a three-way tie with the U.S., Japan and China all having met three times with the Prime Minister. Martin seemed to be focusing more the Asia Pacific region now, perhaps because of his neglect there in 2004. On top of Japan and China coming in first, Hong Kong, India and Thailand all tied for second place. And while the Americas and Europe also had numerous countries tied for second place, this was largely the result of 'group' summitry events, as opposed to the Asian meetings that were planned on Canada's behalf.

Budgets

Martin's bold new directions were also seen in the budgetary realm, especially in his determination to reinvest in the hard military capabilities that many felt had been dangerously depleted during the Chrétien years. Martin immediately decided to buy replacements for the antiquated Sea King helicopters. Chrétien had proudly cancelled such replacements when he first came into office in 1993. Martin then bought new armoured personnel carriers (APCs) that Canadian troops need to prevent casualties in dangerous theatres such as Afghanistan. And just before he was defeated in the House in November 2005, his government, prompted by Defence Minister Bill Graham, decided to purchase replacements for the aging Hercules aircrafts that ferried Canadian forces to Afghanistan and elsewhere.

Diplomatic Posts and Personnel

New investments were also made in diplomatic instruments. The February 2005 budget allocated $641 million over five years to rebuild Canada's diplomatic resources. The money was broadly allocated to 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. For more on this topic, go to www.kirton.nelson.com.

Reorganizing Ottawa

Martin's first step, taken in December 2003, was to reorganize the foreign policy machinery of his own 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 step 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 greater than normal interdepartmental competition, dozens of drafts, and much 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 Paul Martin's speech on deeper integration in Sun Valley to American chief executive officers in July. It included an initiative for enhanced diplomatic representation in the United States. And it presented a sophisticated, respectful approach, where gratuitous public criticism by government ministers and members of Parliament was disavowed.[13]

Immediately after the president's re-election, came a congratulatory phone call, a reminder of Canada's softwood lumbar and cattle concerns, arrangements to meet on the margins of the forthcoming APEC Summit in Santiago, and an invitation to pay a state 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 came quick trips to Haiti on Florida's doorstep and to Darfur, about which Bush's Christian Conservative base cared a great deal. They 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). On the issue of ballistic missile defence (BMD), however, after delaying and signalling 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). Paul Martin outlined his vision to American corporate executives in Sun Valley on July 7, 2004. In 2005 came the first stand alone trilateral summit since 1956, at the president's ranch in Crawford, Texas, and an SPP to chart the path ahead. The latter was launched on three pillars –

security, prosperity and the quality of life, a Trdeauvian 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. He 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.

Americas

The Americas constituted an important personal priority for Martin. It unfolded at the SOA in January, and in Martin's trips to 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 able to make only limited progress. Canada failed to have its desired FTAA concluded by its target date of 2005.

Africa

There was much more achievement in Africa. Martin proceeded with the generic licensing of anti-AIDS vaccines, making Canada the first G8 country to do so. 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

Under Martin, Canada also become a major player in the broader Middle East. This arose through his meetings and commitments at the G8's Sea Island Summit in June 2004. Martin's troop commitments in Afghanistan represented a further major step.

The G8

At the Sea Island Summit on June 8–10, 2004, Canada adjusted America to serve Canada's goals. It did so on Africa, polio and AIDS, private sector development, Haiti, and Darfur (Kirton 2005b). At Gleneagles 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. The UN did nothing here.

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. 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 reform of the Security Council. 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 led to no change. Canada, despite its distinctive national value of environmentalism and its sense of G8 solidarity, opposed the addition of any new permanent members or vetoes. It did so on the grounds 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 seuring change to replace the old central security principle with a 21st-century antithesis. The most ambitious of Paul Martin's initiatives to shape world order was his effort to secure 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 at the outset of the post–Cold War era. 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 combat action by Canadian forces 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 took the lead 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 making a summit visit to Sudan. At the Sea Island G8 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. The next step came when 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 for international approval came on September 14–16, 2005, when the UN 60th Anniversary World Summit took place in New York. As this was the 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 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 Paul 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 an 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. Here their leaders added their approval of the L20 idea. As Martin's two years as prime minister came to an end, France and China were publicly supporting the proposal. Only a still skeptical U.S. and Japan 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.

Outcomes

In his two years of domestically distracted minority government, Paul Martin achieved a great deal in the foreign policy domain. He sent substantial Canadian forces into combat on the front lines in Afghanistan to build a stable, secure, democracy in a multicultural, highly federal country where no such polity has existed ever 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. In trade he initiated negotiations for bilateral free trade agreements with Japan. In North America he helped inaugurate the SPP summit to give comprehensive, coherent, leaders level guidance to the regional community Canada sought to shape. And globally he pioneered and produced as the new defining legitimate principle the revolutionary doctrine of R2P.

Conclusion

In his 1993 book, Tom Keating contrasts Canada's traditional, long celebrated 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). The Chrétien government faced that same choice when it entered office in 1993. It instinctively signalled that it preferred the venerable Pearsonian multilateral, UN-centred ways. But it soon changed. In its economics, security, and global governance behaviour, Canada increasingly chose plurilateralism, bilateralism, and unilateralism, rather than the old multilateralism or continentalism, as it moved into the 21st century. Under Paul Martin it attempted and achieved an ambitious crusade to modify and replace with an antithetical alternative the defining principle on which world order had long been based, In doing so, Canada was pulled toward—and often into—a principal power position in a rapidly changing world.

References

Chrétien, Jean (2007), *My Years As Prime Minister*

Cohn, Theodore (2002). *Governing Global Trade: International Institutions in Conflict and Convergence* (Aldershot: Ashgate).

Copps, Sheila (2004). *Worth Fighting For*

Goldenberg, Eddie (2006), *The Way It Works: Inside Ottawa* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart).

Gray, John (2003), *Paul Martin: The Power of Ambition* (Toronto: Key Porter)

Kirton, John (2007a). Montreal Paper.

Kirton, John (2007b). Beijing Paper.

Lang, Eugene and Janice Stein (2007). *Canada's Unexpected War*

Martin, Paul (2008), *Come Hell or High Water*

Norton, Roy (1998).
Simpson, Jeffrey (2007), *Hot Air*.

Appendix A:
Doctrines and Distributions Under Chrétien

Doctrines

Foreign Policy	
Canada in the World 1995	Prosperity, Security, Values, Ecology
Axworthy Doctrine 1996	
Red Book Three, 2000	
Dialogue Document 2003	
Defence Policy 1994	Canada, North America, World (Pkg, Mult)
Throne Speeches	

Distributions

Budgets
Diplomatic Representation
Summitry
Bilateral Institutions
Combat Operations

Appendix B:
Outcomes of Decisions Under Chrétien

	Initiator	Adjuster	Winner (Short/Long)
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 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 AOEC
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 Landmines
1996 ICC
1997 Finance G20
1998 Cultural Diversity
2002 Africa

Appendix D:
Achievements in World Order Under Chrétien

Economic Decisions
1993 NAFTA
1994 WTO
1994 G7 Quad
1994 AOEC
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 Landmines
1996 ICC
1997 Finance G20
1998 Cultural Diversity
2002 Africa

Appendix E:
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 F:
Outcomes of Decisions Under Martin

	Initiator	Adjuster	Winner (Short/Long)
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 Landmines			
1996 ICC			
1997 Finance G20			
1998 Cultural Diversity			
2002 Africa			

Appendix G:
National Interests and Values in Decisions Under Chrétien

Economic Decisions
1993 NAFTA
1994 WTO
1994 G7 Quad
1994 AOEC
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 Landmines
1996 ICC
1997 Finance G20
1998 Cultural Diversity
2002 Africa

Appendix H:
Achievements in World Order Under Chrétien

Economic Decisions
1993 NAFTA
1994 WTO
1994 G7 Quad
1994 AOEC
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 Landmines
1996 ICC
1997 Finance G20
1998 Cultural Diversity
2002 Africa