

# Changing Canadian Foreign Policy

## 30-31 October 2003

### Conference Report

*Report Prepared By*

**Rachel Lea Heide**

Pre-Doctoral Fellow

Centre for Security and Defence Studies  
Carleton University, Ottawa

**Dorothée Roy**

Graduate Student/Research Assistant

Institut québécois des hautes études internationales  
Université Laval, Quebec City

**Cynthia Lacasse**

Graduate Student/Research Assistant

Institut québécois des hautes études internationales  
Université Laval, Quebec City

## Table of Contents

### Part A:

The Impetus Behind the Report *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World* and the Conference *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy* .....3

### Part B:

Summary of the Report *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World*.....4

### Part C:

Agenda of Conference on Changing Canadian Foreign Policy 30-31 October 2003 .....6

### Part D:

Session Summaries

Session 1: The World We Live in and the New Realities .....	8
Session 2: The Environment in North America.....	10
Session 3: The Environment at Home .....	12
Session 4: Basic Choices and Imperatives.....	14
Session 5: Canada, International Development, and Human Security.....	16
Session 6: Instruments and Organization.....	18
Session 7: Panel Discussion – Canada’s Place in the World: An Exchange.....	20

### Part E:

About the Hosts

Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS).....	22
Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI).....	22
Queen’s Centre for International Relations (QCIR).....	23
L’Institut québécois des hautes études internationales (IQHEI).....	23

### Part F:

Biographical Notes of Report Authors and Conference Presenters .....24

## Part A

### **The Impetus Behind the Report *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World* and the Conference *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy***

The report *In the National Interest* came out of the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute's commissioning of fifteen individual studies on various aspects of current Canadian foreign policy. Based on these fifteen studies, the report recommends the direction that its authors believe Canada should follow.

The review of these fifteen studies brought about some profound and noteworthy conclusions:

- that the world has changed drastically but Canada has lagged behind in its response;
- that it is time for a full review of Canadian foreign and defence policies;
- that limited international influence and heavy dependency on international trade makes the United States Canada's most important (and perhaps only) imperative;
- that decision-making power in Canada's government is concentrated in the hands too few people.

Consequently, the authors believe that a change in Canadian foreign policy from drifting and *ad hoc* decisions to clear, concise, and considered priorities is necessary. The aim of the conference *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy*, held 30-31 October 2003 in Ottawa, was to provide a forum for dialogue – about this topic; about the report; about Canadian policies, priorities, and potential; about recommendations; and about educating the public.

## Part B

### Summary of the Report

#### *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World*

“The CDFAI believes that Canadian foreign policy should have a single overall goal: to serve Canada’s interests.... Canada deserves to have an influential voice in the international arena based on comprehensive foreign and defence policies that express Canadian political and social values, military capabilities, and economic strength. Canada should be willing to engage in action that is timely, constructive, and credible. To succeed, Canada needs appropriate government machinery, a professional foreign service, and focused international development assistance.”<sup>1</sup>

#### Report’s Assessment of the Changes in the World, North America, and Canada Since the End of the Cold War:

- Mutually Assured Destruction and the division of the world into two major power blocs are no longer providing even a semblance of international order;
- Occurrences of international terrorism and failed states are increasing;
- United States is clearly emerging as the world’s only superpower;
- Long-held tenets of Canadian foreign policy are being undermined;
- Multilateral security institutions (such as the UN and NATO) are proving ineffective in ensuring world peace and stability;
- Europe, NATO, and the UN are failing to serve Canada as a counter-balance to American influence;
- Open societies, such as the United States, are clearly open to fanatical enemies of the democratic secular world, as shown by the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001;
- Canadian society is rapidly changing from being largely Caucasian as immigration of people from troubled parts of the world tie Canada more closely to tragic events in Africa, Asia, and the Middle East;
- Canada has been slipping badly in international influence over the last decade with the erosion of foreign policy assets, Canadian Forces capability, foreign affairs budgets, and Canadian overseas aid commitments.

---

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from Denis Stairs, *et al.*, *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World* (Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2003), p. v.

Report's Recommendations in Light of Changes Since the End of the Cold War:

- Canadians must acknowledge that the only real imperative in Canadian foreign policy is Canada's relationship with the United States and the need to maintain friendly and workable relations with the Americans;
- Canadian foreign policy should be based on serving Canadian interests rather than projecting Canadian values abroad;
- Canadians must realize that current policies espousing multilateralism as an end itself are not serving Canadian interests;
- The foreign policy machinery of the government must be better organized;
- The Canadian Forces must be allocated more resources – financial, material, personnel;
- Canadian aid programs must be provided with more resources and should be placed under the Minister of Foreign Affairs;
- The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, as well as the foreign service, must be given more resources as well.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> Summarized and paraphrased from Denis Stairs, *et al.*, "Executive Summary", *In the National Interest: Canadian Foreign Policy in an Insecure World* (Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute, 2003), pp. vii, viii.

## Part C

### Agenda of Conference on *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy* 30-31 October 2003

*Thursday October 30<sup>th</sup>, 2003*

**9:00 a.m. – Press Conference to introduce Report – “In the National Interest”**

**9:45 a.m. – Welcome**

- David Carment, Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS)/Carleton, NPSIA

**9:50-10:05 a.m. – Introductory Comments**

- David Bercuson, Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI)
- Kim Nossal, Centre for International Relations, Queen's University (Professor and Head, Department of Political Studies)
- Gérard Hervouet, Le directeur du programme Paix et sécurité internationales, Université Laval

**10:05 a.m. – Session 1 – “The World We Live In and the New Realities”**

*Moderator* – David Bercuson, CDFAI

*Presenter* – Mark Entwistle, ExecAdvice Corporation

**11:45 a.m. – Session 2 – “The Environment in North America”**

*Moderator* – Kim Nossal, Queen's University

*Presenter* – Gordon Smith, Centre for Global Studies, University of Victoria

**2:00 p.m. – Session 3 – “The Environment at Home”**

*Moderator* – Jean-Sébastien Rioux, IQHEI, Université Laval

*Presenter* – Norman Hillmer, Department of History, NPSIA, Carleton

**3:45 p.m. – Session 4 – “Basic Choices and Imperatives”**

*Moderator* – David Carment, CSDS/Carleton University

*Presenter* – Denis Stairs, Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, Dalhousie University

*Friday October 31<sup>st</sup>, 2003*

**9:00 a.m. – Session 5 “Options- Canada, International Development and Human Security”**

*Moderator* – David Carment, CSDS/Carleton University

*Presenters* – Gordon Smith, Kim Nossal, Mark Entwistle

**10:45 a.m. – Session 6 “Instruments and Organization”**

*Moderator* – Jean-Sébastien Rioux, IQHEI, Université Laval

*Presenters* – David Bercuson, Denis Stairs, and Gordon Smith

**1:00 p.m. – Debate “Canada’s Place in the World: An Exchange”**

*Moderator* – Margaret Bloodworth, Deputy Minister, Department of National Defence

*Debaters*   ▪ Andrew Cohen, Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, School of Journalism, Carleton University

              ▪ Richard Gwyn, Columnist, Toronto Star

              ▪ H.E. Paul Heinbecker, Ambassador and Permanent Representative, Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations

## Part D

### Session 1: The World We Live in and the New Realities

Presenter: Mark Entwistle (ExecAdvice Corporation)

The speaker of the first session, Mark Entwistle, set the context for the conference on *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy* by high-lighting the characteristics of the post-Cold War world, a world where Canada must choose and pursue a role for itself. The end of the Cold War has removed not only the underpinnings and under-lying assumptions of previous decades' foreign policy, but it has also removed the common enemy that bonded alliances together. This post-Cold War world now includes new threats such as biological, chemical, and other weapons of mass destruction.

Security threats are not the only new reality of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. Changes have also occurred in many nations' international standings and perspectives on the world. Canada has lost pre-eminence among middle powers. Europe is less internationally focused as it turns its attention inward. The United States has become preoccupied solely with its Middle East and war on terrorism policies. Thus, others parts of the world are receiving much less attention from world powers than in times past.

The importance of good Canadian-American relations is not a new reality for Canada, but it has become a very important one in this post-Cold War world. The United States has clearly evolved into a uni-polar power; it is now unlikely that other NATO members have the strength to offset the power of the United States. Canadian interests are tied to the United States, not just because of the country's military power, but also because of the its close proximity and extensive trade patterns. Unfortunately, the Canadian government has damaged Canadian-American relations by the recent 'in-your-face' approach the Chrétien government took when not providing military support for the invasion of Iraq.

The future holds much potential for Canada, if the country chooses to articulate and pursue a more active foreign policy. Canada is presently held in higher esteem than its southern neighbour; hence, Canada has the credibility to influence other international actors. Because of the diversity of immigrants entering Canada, this country has the option to influence the home countries of each immigrant group.

Canada has a long history of being connected to multilateral organizations. Nonetheless, conference participants stressed that Canada should not simply give blind allegiance to multilateral organizations; these should be treated as a means, not an end in itself. This is not to say that the conference consensus was that Canada should abandon multilateral organizations such as the United Nations. On the contrary, it was acknowledged that such institutions do help Canada achieve its foreign policy interests. Conference participants also agreed that if Canada became more active in its foreign policy endeavours, this would increase the likelihood of bringing other nations into multilateral organizations. One suggested aim would be to work more cooperatively with the United States with the goal of getting this nation to replace its uni-polar view of the world with a greater acceptance of multilateralism. Another potential role for Canada's foreign policy could be to work at reforming the United Nations so that Canada's interests are satisfied to a greater extent by this institution.

The participants of the conference – speaker and audience members alike – were in agreement that the time has come for Canada to decide on its place in the international scene and to define the specific role it wants to play. The report's suggested criteria of interests guiding policy rather than the projection of Canadian values abroad caused much debate. For some, it seemed extremely pragmatic to create foreign policy objectives based on the positive impact these undertakings would have on Canada's military, financial, and commercial interests. For others, stressing values seemed more in keeping with the Canadian tradition and much less cold, calculating, and mercenary. At a time when both the United States and the Arab world are framing their foreign policies in terms of values, audience members were uncertain why Canadian foreign policy should be denigrated for wanting to project values that Canadians feel others could benefit from adopting. The compromise opinion proposed was that interests and values should be intertwined, for the positive consequences of projecting values would be in Canada's long term interests.

Although neither specific criteria for determining foreign policy nor specific policies were agreed upon, all were able to acquiesce that it is time for Canada to review its foreign (and defence) policies. The status quo and *ad hoc* decision-making cannot be tolerated any longer. An obvious decline in capacity to carry out foreign policy objectives has occurred, and consequently, Canada is not capturing its full potential on the international stage. Canada needs to assess its capabilities, make some hard choices, and increase its foreign service and defence assets where appropriate. Conference participants also agreed that these choices need to be informed choices, and that can only be done by re-educating the Canadian public that Canada needs to do more and that much more can be done in the world if this country funded more resources.

**Session 2: The Environment in North America**

Presenter: Gordon Smith (Centre for Global Studies, University of Victoria)

The conference agenda naturally progressed from looking at the world situation to looking at the North American context for developing and changing Canadian foreign policy. The over-riding theme of Gordon Smith's presentation was the undeniable presence of the United States on the continent. This presence is strongly felt by Canada in terms of its economic dependency on its southern neighbour. More than 80% of Canada's trade takes place with the United States; hence, factors hurting the American economy also hurt Canada's economic well-being. Furthermore, actions harming Canadian-American diplomatic relations can potentially have harmful effects on trade relations if linkages are made and retaliation pursued by the United States.

Because Canada is so greatly dependent on the United States, conference participants acknowledged that Canada would do better if the nation had a greater understanding of the American world view and its self-perceived place in the world. The United States clearly feels threatened in this new era of terrorism and weapons of mass destruction. Consequently, the United States wants to gain and retain world dominance to deter enemy nations from attacking this super power. This sense of vulnerability has led the American government and citizens alike to believe that they have the right to act unilaterally for the sake of defending their nation. As outsiders, Canadians would do well to try to understand American fears and rationalizations so that Canada can communicate with its neighbour meaningfully and not be seen as merely moralizing against the giant.

Better communications with the United States was a recurrent theme among conference participants. The report's authors advocated quiet diplomacy over public displays of condemnation. There was a broad consensus that Canada's decision to not commit troops to the war in Iraq would have been more favourably received if the Canadian government had quietly explained its position and reminded the United States of the support already given to the war on terrorism. Instead of explaining the country's actions, Prime Minister Chrétien displayed a very public 'in-your-face' defiance to the American request for military support.

Although some argued that the prime minister's approach was a deliberate attempt to show Canadians that the government could stand up to American pressures, many conference participants agreed that quiet diplomacy has strong merits. Canada need not always acquiesce with the United States, but by expressing these disagreements privately, the Canadian government does not publicly humiliate the United States, decreases the chances of hurting diplomatic relations, and hopefully avoids losing a voice in Washington because the government was frozen out. Maintaining a voice in Washington is imperative – for reminding the United States when their policies seem erroneous, for encouraging policies that make sense to Canada and that serve Canadian interests, and for convincing the Americans to take on policies that aid Canadian objectives. Canadian values and interests can only be met if Canada avoids American retaliation, convinces the United States that the two nations share common goals, and brings the southern neighbour on side so that Canada does not appear to be so moralistic in its criticism of American foreign policy. Concern was expressed by some conference participants that the aggressive nationalists in the United States are over-powering the neo-conservatives, and that the United States might not only withdraw from Iraq before

reconstruction is complete, but that the United States might also withdraw from intervening in world crises altogether; Canada can only try to influence its neighbour successfully if Canada has a credible voice in Washington.

In order to gain the confidence of the United States and project credible and valued opinions, Canada needs to decide what its role on the continent and in the world must be. Conference participants agreed that without an improved foreign service and military capacity, Canada cannot do much. The nation's intelligence gathering and analyzing capabilities also need to be improved, as does the decision-making process of the government. The world has been left with the distinct impression that the decision to not participate in Iraq was a foregone conclusion made on instinct rather than careful analysis of intelligence, options, benefits, and drawbacks. This must not be repeated again.

More participation of Canada in the world also requires a greater sense of the world situation by Canadians. The public needs to be educated so that the voters are not making decisions on assumed views but rather on an informed consideration and understanding of national interests. A clear articulation of Canadian goals, better relations with the United States, and more participation in international affairs also requires an executive that provides decisive leadership and guides Canadians to make the best decisions for the nation. As of yet, an informed public and a strong leadership is still lacking.

### **Session 3: The Environment at Home**

Presenter: Norman Hillmer (Department of History, Carleton University)

Presently, it is commonly accepted that Canadians are less interested in being active in foreign affairs because citizens feel that their tax dollars are better spent at home, working on domestic problems facing the nation. Speaker Norman Hillmer's historical overview of foreign policy perceptions by Canadian leaders showed, in fact, that all foreign policy is local – domestic issues influence foreign policy, which in turn reflects Canadian interests and politics. For William Lyon Mackenzie King, foreign policy started and finished in the neighbourhood, meaning that foreign policy had relevance to Canada internally. Lester Pearson also saw that foreign policy was a consequence of domestic factors. Mitchell Sharp saw foreign policy as an extension of domestic policy, while Pierre Trudeau saw foreign policy as being the external dimension of internal policies. More so today than ever before, the distinction between foreign policy and domestic policy is becoming increasingly blurred.

The multicultural nature of Canada is a domestic characteristic that has the potential to greatly impact Canada's foreign policy. Conference participants saw how the plurality and diversity of Canada's citizens presented a plethora of choices for foreign policy options. As a result of multiculturalism, there are many ethnic groups wanting the government to provide development aid to their original homelands. This proliferation of options has resulted in their being fewer clear and easy choices as to the direction Canada should take with its foreign policy.

The debate over values or interest based foreign policy came to the fore again during this session. Those in favour of creating Canada's foreign policy on a basis that reflects Canadian values spoke out most strongly. They argued that values such as diversity, pluralism, overcoming violence, enhancing the place of women, children, and minorities, as well as making peaceable societies are worthy bases for foreign policy and should continue to be considered when deciding Canada's role in the world. Canadian Forces personnel are seen to personify accountability and honesty; they stand for rule of law; and they face-down those less savoury. These international perceptions of Canada's fighting forces are clearly articulated in the language of values – values which Canadian policy makers were encouraged to continue to project.

In discussing the environment at home, conference participants once again agreed that Canada not only can be more active on the international scene, but that Canada should be more active. Canadians at large do want to be more engaged in the world; the common view of internationalism is the continuation of peacekeeping operations, funding more aid programs, and helping poor nations to help themselves. Canada can be a convener, bring options to negotiating tables, and develop possible solutions to the problems on hand.

Conference participants agreed that Canada needs to be more aggressive in shaping and pursuing foreign policy options. Because of declining foreign policy assets over the past forty years, and because of the lack of a defence capability, Canada has been losing credibility. Not only does funding for the foreign service need to be increased, but so too does the funding for Canada's military, for foreign policy cannot be expanded without a suitable Canadian Forces contribution.

Canadians have been reluctant to spend in the areas of foreign and defence policy, preferring to see this money spent at home on health, education, and multiculturalism – to name a few domestic programs viewed as high priority. In this time of high demand on the public treasury, proponents of foreign policy expansion must evoke the emotions of the populace to make sacrifices to fund foreign policy programs. Public support is needed, and domestic-political underpinning for foreign policy expansion needs to be built. Canadians need to be convinced that it is in their interest that Canada should be more active, and this campaign for the hearts and minds of Canadians would probably be most successfully if it stressed sacred values and if it showed how foreign policy objectives were relevant locally to individual Canadians.

#### **Session 4: Basic Choices and Imperatives**

Presenter: Denis Stairs (Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, Dalhousie University)

The discussion of session four centred around the report's three suggested choices for directing Canadian foreign policy. Canada could continue in its present pattern of *ad hoc* decision making and low investment in foreign policy and defence assets. Speaker Denis Stairs noted that this approach has left the international community with a negative impression of Canada – Canada does not seem to have a view of its own; instead, the nation appears to be a moralizing freeloader. Maintaining the status quo will result in the continued decline of Canada's international influence.

The second option proposed was to clearly define Canadian priorities. If the government was not prepared to increase spending on foreign policy, then it could at least methodically consider where it would be best to concentrate the available funds. This would mean that Canada would be involved in fewer areas and that some recipients would have their funding cut, but this exercise would restore Canadian credibility in the eyes of its international counterparts.

The final option suggested that Canada should not only prioritize its foreign policy options, but that the nation should also consciously invest more in foreign affairs. Difficult decisions would have to be made, but the result would be a clear articulation of what Canada was prepared to fund and prepared to cut. The nation's foreign policy focus would ideally be narrower, but then the nation would be prepared to logically justify its decisions. The proposal of these three options was based on the premise that Canada needs to not only re-evaluate its foreign policy in light of the changing international situation, but also that Canada needs to take the initiative, become more active, and move away from undervaluing this powerful tool for influencing the world for the better.

In discussing the three options, conference participants raised some themes already discussed in previous sessions. Improving and cultivating Canadian-American relations was strongly advocated. Instead of using points of disagreement as sources for political mobilization and public expressions of Canadian nationalism, quiet diplomacy should be pursued. Angering the Americans deliberately (as in the non-commitment of troops to the war in Iraq) may have given the appearance that Canada's prime minister was brave, but such actions also increase the risk of Canada being frozen out of Washington and losing any chance of influencing the Americans to change unpalatable policies or adopt policies favourable to Canada. Canada need not always agree, and Canada should express its disagreement and dissatisfaction, but this would best be done tactfully rather than with the intention of humiliating or shaming the southern neighbour.

Cooperating with the United States where it is in Canada's interest, and providing moral support and reasoned explanations when Canada cannot provide everything for which the United States asks, will ensure that Canada has sympathetic supporters in Washington when Canada finds itself threatened or under attack. Better relations with the United States also increases the possibility of the United States being more mindful and considerate of Canadian interests. When an issue is of importance to Canada, it would be ideal to have the Americans on side because they then see the value of supporting their northern neighbour.

In discussing the re-evaluation of Canadian foreign policy, conference participants stressed the need to stem the tide of declining defence capabilities in Canada.

With the funding and training cuts that have occurred already, it will take eight to ten years to restore the Canadian Forces' capabilities. At the same time, domestic demands are not abating (natural disasters, protecting northern sovereignty as global warming opens up northern sea passages), and new international crises are arising. If policy makers are not careful, Canada may only be left with soft power to offer to the world. In addition to government leaders needing to see the necessity of both soft and hard power as tools of foreign policy, government departments need to cooperate and coordinate defence and development policies and assets. Turf wars will only harm the cause of both the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade and the Department of National Defence.

Choosing the best path for Canadian foreign policy and improving cooperation with the United States needs to have the public's support. There needs to be a domestic consensus to develop defence and foreign policy assets, and an informed public is needed to lobby and persuade the government. Advocates of a reformed and strong foreign policy need to frame the need of better defence capabilities in a way acceptable to the public – these assets are not for making war, but for peace support, for humanitarian operations, and for intervening in failed and failing states. The new international situation means that Canadian lives are now being put in harm's way while on peace support missions as never has been done before; more public support for increased assets could mean that some Canadian soldier and civilian deaths can be prevented.

**Session 5: Options – Canada, International Development, and Human Security**  
 Presenters: Gordon Smith, Mark Entwistle, Kim Nossal (Queen's Centre for International Relations)

Panel speakers and audience members discussed a wide variety of options that Canada could pursue in deciding the country's role in a world that needs development and human security assistance. Canada has many options from which to choose, these options having been greatly multiplied by the number of new Canadians wanting help for their former homelands. Canada must decide what it is best able to do; Canadians need to make some difficult choices and prioritize. New priorities cannot simply be layered on old priorities, thus expecting Canada to do everything considered important in the past presently with no increased funding for these projects. Whatever policies Canada chooses (development assistance, peace support, crisis prevention, intervention in failed and failing states), public support is necessary to ensure that adequate funding and assets are provided and maintained.

Another possible focus of Canadian foreign policy discussed was the reform of present multilateral organizations. Although it was acknowledged that multilateralism is generally a positive thing, some conference participants criticized Canada's blind trust in all things multilateral. Instead, Canada should question its participation and ensure that the nation is member of the right organizations – the ones serving Canadian interests. Audience members also suggested that Canada should take the lead in working to reform the United Nations so that it accommodates Canadian foreign policy interests better. Canada is not the only nation to express dissatisfaction with the Security Council and the decision-making mechanism; hence, Canada should take the initiative and lead like-minded lesser-powers in a campaign of reform.

The selection of a new and well-considered foreign policy direction also necessitates the re-evaluation of Canada's decision-making process and leadership. Decisions cannot continue to be *ad hoc*. Peace support operations are of a different nature than previous peacekeeping operations. Canadians are now being putting into harm's way. Consequently, decision-making needs to be a slower, more thoughtful, and informed process. The weak political will that has characterized Canadian leadership needs to be replaced with decisive top-down leadership, clear support for leading reform and providing resources, and the foresight to ensure defence and development cooperation.

Numerous specific foreign policy initiatives were suggested by conference participants in this session. The Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade should be responsible for development assistance; thus, more focus could be garnered between foreign policy and development aid, for development purposes could be attached deliberately to foreign policy if one minister and one department were in charge of both. Coordination of development, diplomacy, and defence is necessary for all three to be working in the same direction. Other suggestions for foreign policy initiatives included the creation of a fund specifically for humanitarian assistance that would continually be replenished (and hence no longer taken from other budgets). Canadian embassies' Canada Fund for responding to local needs was highly praised as an excellent way of influencing governance at local levels. Conference participants clearly saw the link between aid and security – helping states avoid failure prevents security crises. This link needs to be recognized by the Canadian public and government alike.

The discussion of initiative options raised the question of what criteria to use in selecting foreign policy priorities. The report suggested that the results of Canada's foreign policy should see impact on areas that mattered to Canada. This nation should focus on countries that are of relevance to Canada, and the countries being considered for aid should also display a reasonable level of respect for democracy, human rights, and the rule of law. Those conditions increase the likelihood of successful development. If governments fail to meet these criteria, then Canada should limit its assistance to working through non-governmental organizations, thus by-passing corrupt governments completely.

Not all conference participants acquiesced with these criteria. Some felt that if a nation met the criteria, then the country was already a developed nation and hence did not need the aid. Others felt that many international actors are willing to help those with good records, and hence Canada's contribution would be small and insignificant. Consequently, Canada could make a greater impact by focusing on failed states that have received little attention and development assistance. The application of these criteria also raised debate over why the report specifically encouraged Canada's focus on Russia and China. In many ways, neither of these countries is devastatingly poor; actually, they already have a developed characters. Furthermore, they have questionable records in the area of democracy, human rights, and rule of law. The report's authors explained that in many ways, these countries are still poor; furthermore, since they will be great international powers in the future, attention and guidance would wisely be provided now. Actually, the report was not advocating an increase in funding to Russia and China. Instead, a better use should be made of what is presently allocated for them.

No firm consensus was reached by the conference participants in this session. In formulating Canada's foreign policy of the future, Canadians have many options from which to choose. Choosing priorities and deciding how to make those choices is the challenge that Canadians must acknowledged and accept now.

## Session 6: Instruments and Organization

Presenters: David Bercuson (CDFAI), Denis Stairs, and Gordon Smith

Canadians cannot decide on foreign policy priorities in a vacuum. In order to select initiatives, Canadians must also be aware of the instruments available, the impact these instruments can make, and the deficiencies Canada presently has in both defence and foreign service capabilities. Peace support operations, humanitarian missions, and interventions into failed states require military personnel and military equipment. Unfortunately, this correlation is not commonly recognized by the Canadian public, and hence, Canada's defence capability has been depleted greatly without regard to how this hurts the possibility of using defence capabilities as an instrument of foreign policy.

David Bercuson explained that Canada's military exists for three purposes: as a symbol of national sovereignty; as a means of guaranteeing peace in the nation domestically; and as an instrument of foreign policy when diplomacy fails abroad. The Canadian Forces should be combat capable, deployable, interoperable with the American forces, and they should be as joint as possible. Unfortunately, repeated cut backs have left the Canadian Forces with too few personnel and too little equipment. Capital replacement needs to occur before the rust-out stage is reached for equipment. The army should not be reduced to a second-class force, and the gulf between the regular and reserve forces must be eliminated: the reserves need to receive adequate training and equipment, not just the regular forces. Regular defence reviews need to be conducted; waiting ten years is too long between reviews, for global and budget realities are changing at a much faster pace. Canadians opposed to increasing the defence budget need to understand that 25-33% of the defence budget is not available for force expenditures since it is allocated to centrally imposed programs: money to bilingualism, equality, diversity, environmental clean-up, and pensions cannot be removed or reallocated.

Denis Stairs highlighted how more attention must be paid to the foreign service as an instrument of foreign policy. Presently, the service is over-extended, and the people are highly stressed. Conditions of employment (low salaries, insufficient promotion and advancement opportunities, difficulties in securing employment for spouses upon transfers) are such that retention of workers is becoming a serious problem. New fads, accounting systems, bureaucratic transactions, and other 'busy work' are taking time away from the real work of the foreign services – policy analysis. Not only does the foreign service need better working conditions, less bureaucracy, and more funding, but an international intelligence gathering service is needed as well. This should not be left to the domestic security agency. Any new articulation of foreign policy in Canada must also ensure that the foreign service is capable of carrying out its assigned tasks.

Gordon Smith outlined the kind of reformed organization that is needed to actually form foreign policy. He suggested that cabinet needs a mechanism for focusing on long-term planning. An international policy council should be established to advise the prime minister and to help create broader debate on these issues in the country. To ensure that an integrated review of (and approach to) defence and foreign policy is regularized, a standing committee should be instituted. Ministers should have the assistance of junior ministers, and the person in the Privy Council Office responsible for foreign and defence policy should be raised to a deputy secretary position. Canada's

ambassador to the United States should also be working at the deputy minister level. The question of rank plays an important role when considering the access these people need to minister and the prime minister in order to carry out their duties.

Conference participants, for the most part, concurred with the suggestions of the panel speakers. The necessity of public and parliamentary oversight was the main issue raised by audience members. The educated public of Canada today is growing increasingly dissatisfied with the centralization of government in the hands of a few ministers and the prime minister. In reaction to this democratic deficit, the people of Canada want public votes, as do the opposition parties. Town-halls are not the solutions for soliciting public consultation – these are often elitist in nature since only certain groups have gained access. More parliamentary oversight of the forces was stressed, and conference participants were clear in the consensus that a process needs to be built where decisions are no longer in the hands of the few. Public support and interest is needed in deciding foreign policy priorities and rebuilding the tools necessary for carrying out these policies. An important factor in gaining this support and interest is ensuring that Canadians feel they have a voice and a credible and meaningful means of participating.

**Session 7: Panel Discussion – Canada’s Place in the World: An Exchange**

Presenters: Richard Gwyn (Columnist, *Toronto Star*)  
 Andrew Cohen (NPSIA, Carleton University)  
 Paul Heinbecker (Ambassador and Permanent Representative,  
 Permanent Mission of Canada to the United Nations)

The final session of the conference on *Changing Canadian Foreign Policy* featured a debate among three distinguished speakers who all had distinctly different views of Canada’s place in the world. Richard Gwyn agreed with the report and the conference consensus that there has been a marked decline in Canada’s influence in the world. Other nations are providing more peacekeepers than Canada; there has been a decimation of foreign policy assets because of financial retrenchment; and Canada has lost its entrance into Washington and other capitals.

Although Richard Gwyn believes that Canada should be more internationally active, he did not advocate that a substantial expansion of the military should take place. Firstly, there is a large pacifist constituency in Canada who would rather the money was spent elsewhere. Secondly, the possession of a larger military capability would likely force Canada’s participation in future wars because the nation would have the assets to contribute. Richard Gwyn acknowledged that an increase in spending on the military is necessary to make it an effective instrument of foreign policy. Nonetheless, this will be a hard sell to the Canadian public, especially if there is no link between using defence and foreign policy and projecting Canadian values.

In light of the new reality of terrorism, poverty, and discontent, Richard Gwyn believes that Canada should be daring and fulfill its great potential. Canadian foreign policy should deal with urban slums in the developing world; Canada should try its hand at nation building. Because of the fear of failure, Canada has missed many opportunities to shape the world. Richard Gwyn encouraged Canadians – politicians and voters alike -- to take some risks and enter the front lines with a new and vigorous foreign policy.

Andrew Cohen agreed that there has been a decline in Canada’s foreign policy activities. Budget cuts have resulted in Canada providing half the aid it provided previously, and only one third of the amount that it promised. Because Canada has too few clear objectives, it is in too many places, and ultimately, it is not doing enough to make any substantial impact anywhere. Andrew Cohen believes that Canada should reclaim its place in the world, should stem the erosion of hard power, and should take foreign assistance more seriously.

Another weakness in Canada is its leadership. Canadians need leaders that will provide focus in choosing Canada’s role in the world. Canada needs a prime minister who is prepared to sway Canadian opinion and to lead the nation in the direction that is best for the country domestically and internationally. Instead, Prime Minister Chrétien’s Liberal government looked indecisive and unprepared on the Iraq issue as it waited to read the public’s opinion. The government also failed to prepare Canadians for the type of mission that Canadian soldiers are undertaking in Afghanistan.

Andrew Cohen argued that now is the time for review, change, and decisions. A surplus is available; a new prime minister and cabinet will be entering office; a defence and foreign policy review is long overdue. It is time to decide what Canada should be doing and what defence forces and equipment is needed to be able to carry out these new foreign policy initiatives. It is time to decide how Canada wants to see the world change

for the better. It is time to regain a voice in Washington and bring the United States back into multilateral organizations.

Paul Heinbecker focused less on the need to change the status quo and more on the foreign policy accomplishments that seem to have been so quickly forgotten by Canadians. He argued that the period between the height of Canada's Cold War activities and the present is not as dismal as some have painted it to be. It was during this period that Canada played a role in establishing the World Court, in drawing attention to the existence of blood diamonds, and in bringing Russia into multilateral organizations. Prime Minister Trudeau's foreign policy accomplishment was the G7, while Prime Minister Mulroney secured the Free Trade Agreement.

According to Paul Heinbecker, values cannot be put aside when formulating foreign policy. Foreign policy expresses a nation's purpose, which is both values based and interests oriented. American priorities are about values. Creating stable societies and eliminating the incubation of terrorists through peacekeeping, projecting Canadian values, and development assistance is clearly in Canada's interests. Values versus interests is not the only debate that can harm the formulation of foreign policy. The distinction between hard and soft power (persuading change through coercion or example) is also another misleading dichotomy. The outright rejection of hard power is harmful because it takes away not only an instrument of foreign policy, but also foreign policy initiatives. For example, in order to intervene in a failed state to protect or restore human security, military power is necessary. If no military power is available, many possible initiatives cannot even be considered.

Paul Heinbecker also highlighted the dangers of rejecting multilateralism in favour of unilateral action and decisions. Multilateral organizations such as the United Nations were set up for the distinct purpose of preserving world peace. Unilateralism challenges the very principles on which this peace has been based.

Despite divergences in opinion, the three panelists all clearly articulated the need for Canada to be involved actively on the international scene. Richard Gwyn believes Canada should undertake bold initiatives such as nation building and the elimination of urban slums. Andrew Cohen advocates doing more in the way of foreign assistance by setting clear priorities and objectives and not spreading Canada's contributions too thinly in too many places. Paul Heinbecker, on the other hand, argues that concentrating in only a few places helps too few people; hence, it is better to make many friends and do much good by being involved in numerous places. The options for Canadians are many. It is now time to make educated, informed, and reasoned choices about the world and Canada's place within it.

## **Part E**

### **About the Centre for Security and Defence Studies (CSDS)**

The CSDS at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs (NPSIA), Carleton University, is internationally recognized for its advanced research; conference, workshop, and guest lecture programs; graduate and undergraduate education; and public outreach programs on security and defence issues in the Ottawa community and across Canada. The CSDS has three principal and inter-related missions:

- to enhance interdisciplinary graduate and undergraduate teaching at Carleton University in the fields of international conflict analysis and defence and security studies;
- to promote research and publications by faculty, graduate students, and outside specialists in these fields, with emphasis on policy and security issues for Canada; and
- to support outreach activities with the Parliament of Canada, government departments and agencies, school boards, the media, NGOs, and international organizations through training programmes, professional conferences, and public discourse on international security and defence issues.

CSDS programs and activities embrace faculty from several disciplinary and interdisciplinary departments and schools at Carleton University, most notably NPSIA, the Department of Political Science, and the Department of History.

The work of the CSDS is structured around four distinct interdisciplinary modules: Force and Statecraft; Partnering, Peacekeeping, and Peacebuilding; Military and Society; and Intelligence and Policy. These modules serve to integrate research, teaching, and outreach activities around particular security and defence-related themes.

The CSDS at SPSIA is a member of the Security and Defence Forum (SDF) programme of the Department of National Defence. The SDF programme is designed to assist and support teaching and research in the fields of international security, conflict, and defence at selected Canadian universities.

### **About the Canadian Defence and Foreign Affairs Institute (CDFAI)**

The CDFAI is a non-profit, independent, non-partisan, research institute with an emphasis on Canadian Foreign Policy, Defence Policy, and National Security. The CDFAI's mission is dedicated to enhancing Canada's role in the world by helping to stimulate awareness and debate amongst Canadians about the nation's defence and foreign policies and the instruments that serve them.

The Institute provides Canadians with factual and comprehensive policy analysis to promote their understanding of Canada's foreign policy and the state of Canada's military preparedness and national security by developing and sponsoring authoritative research and education programs. The Institute studies these areas through a full range of national and international applications with an emphasis on their economic, political, and social impact on individual Canadians

The CDFAI will fulfill its mission by

- contributing, as permitted, to the public discussion of government policy in the areas of foreign affairs and national security as well as institutional preparedness to support current policies;
- supporting the development of Canadian expertise by funding research as well as professional and student conferences in relevant areas;
- establishing linkages with international organizations, government, and the private sector; and
- providing opportunities for the exchange of national and international study.

The CDFAI is a federally registered non-profit organization with charitable status. It is funded by public donations and the private sector. As well, CDFAI seeks support on a project basis from the appropriate government departments.

Primary funding sources are Canadian corporations and the private citizens with an interest in the CDFAI's research areas. These sources share the belief that an informed electorate will in turn produce an informed polity. Dissemination of information will lead to the drafting, implementation, and support of innovative and comprehensive Canadian policy in the areas of foreign affairs, defence, and security.

#### **About Queen's Centre for International Relations (QCIR)**

The QCIR was established in 1975 as an interdisciplinary research institution at Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, with a mandate to conduct research and writing in strategic studies and other aspects of international relations. It draws on the expertise and energies of Queen's faculty members, most notably from the Department of Political Studies and the School of Policy Studies. As well, it has well-established links with the Royal Military College, also in Kingston.

The QCIR has been engaged in recent years in research on Canadian and international security policy (including foreign and defence policy), European security and transatlantic relations, hemispheric security, and post-Soviet foreign and defence policies. Publications from the Centre continue to reflect these research areas.

#### **About L'Institut québécois des hautes études internationales (IQHEI)**

L'IQHEI fut créé en juin 1994. Son champ d'action est organisé autour trois axes: les relations internationales, le développement international et les affaires internationales. Avec la création de l'Institut, l'Université Laval innovait en dotant le Québec du premier institut francophone d'études supérieures et de recherche en relations internationales en Amérique du Nord. L'Institut exerce aussi ses activités en publication et en animation. L'Institut offre un programme d'études de deuxième cycle en relations internationales (MA) et des programmes d'études associés en gestion de la défense, gestion internationale, en journalisme international et en droit international et transnational.

## Part F

### Biographical Notes of Report Authors and Conference Presenters

#### **BERCUSON, David**

David Bercuson has a MA in History and a PhD in History from the University of Toronto. His academic areas of concentration include modern Canadian politics, Canadian defence and foreign policy, and Canadian military history.

Highlights of his academic career include being elected a fellow of the Royal Society of Canada in 1989; serving as Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at The University of Calgary from 1989 to 1996; and serving as President of the Canadian Association for Graduate Studies for 1996. In January 1997, David was appointed Director of the Centre for Military and Strategic Studies at The University of Calgary. From January to April, 1997 David was selected to serve as Special Advisor to the Canadian Minister of National Defence on the Future of the Canadian Forces. In October 1997, he was appointed to the Canadian Minister of National Defence's Monitoring Committee on Change in the Canadian Forces and the Department of National Defence, a position he continues to hold.

David currently co-writes a weekly column for *The Calgary Herald*, which also appears in five other newspapers. His book, *Significant Incident: Canada's Army, the Airborne, and the Murder in Somalia*, won the Wilfred Eggleston Award for non-fiction at the Alberta Book Awards in May 1997. Stoddart Publishing published his most recent book, *The Destruction of the Bismarck*, co-authored with Holger Herwig, in September 2001.

#### **CARMENT, David**

David Carment is an Associate Professor of International Affairs at the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs, Carleton University, Ottawa and Director of the Centre for Security and Defence Studies. His most recent books are *Using Force to Prevent Ethnic Violence: An Evaluation of Theory and Evidence* and *Conflict Prevention: Path to Peace or Grand Illusion?* In addition Carment serves as the principal investigator for the Country Indicators for Foreign Policy project ([www.carleton.ca/cifp](http://www.carleton.ca/cifp)) and is a member of the Board of Directors for The Forum on Early Warning and Early Response ([www.fewer.org](http://www.fewer.org)). His most recent work focuses on conflict prevention capacity building (see the working paper series at [www.idrc.ca](http://www.idrc.ca)); developing risk assessment and early warning training manuals for NGOs and Regional Organizations (see [www.carleton.ca/cifp](http://www.carleton.ca/cifp)) and evaluating models of third party intervention (see [www.carleton.ca/~dcarment/index.html](http://www.carleton.ca/~dcarment/index.html)).

In 2001 Carment was a Fellow at the Belfer Centre, Harvard University. While at Harvard, Carment contributed a chapter to the program's successful state failure project, an article on peacekeeping for Harvard International Review and a paper on Bias and Intervention for the BCSIA Working Paper Series.

**ENTWISTLE, Mark**

Mark Entwistle is a consultant in international affairs, trade and global business, diplomacy, government relations and operations, strategic communications, media relations, public affairs and advocacy. He is currently Senior Associate with Prospectus Associates (Canadian affiliate of Golin/Harris International), Vice-President, International and Government Affairs with ExecAdvice Corporation ([www.execadvice.ca](http://www.execadvice.ca)) and special counsel on international trade to Murphy, Frazer & Selfridge in Washington, D.C. ([www.murphyfrazer.com](http://www.murphyfrazer.com)). Mr. Entwistle is also writing a book on Cuba for *Penguin Books*.

He served for sixteen years from 1981-1997 in the Canadian diplomatic service, including assignments at the Canadian Embassies in Tel Aviv, Israel and Moscow, in the former USSR. From 1993 to 1997, Mr. Entwistle was Ambassador of Canada to the Republic of Cuba. He has also specialized in media relations and strategic communications, serving as Media Spokesperson for the Department of Foreign Affairs, Deputy Press Secretary responsible for foreign policy in the Prime Minister's Office, and later Press Secretary and director of communications to the Prime Minister of Canada. From 1999-2000, Mr. Entwistle also served as Chief of Staff and senior communications advisor to the leader of a national political party.

He is a Director of *YM Biosciences Inc.*, *Coral Capital Group*, as well as the *Canadian Urban Institute*. He is also Chairman of *Upstream Strategies International* and *Friends without Borders*, non-profit organizations involved in conflict prevention and international development financing.

**GRANATSTEIN, Jack**

Jack Granatstein is Distinguished Research Professor of History Emeritus at York University, a former Director and CEO of the Canadian War Museum, and the Chair of the Council for Canadian Security in the 21st Century. He writes extensively on Canadian history, especially military history.

**HERVOUET, Gérard**

Dr. Hervouet est professeur titulaire au département de science politique. Il est directeur du Programme paix et sécurité internationales de l'Institut québécois des hautes études internationales et co-directeur du Consortium canadien sur la sécurité en Asie-Pacifique (CANCAPS). Détenteur d'un doctorat de la Sorbonne, Dr. Hervouet se spécialise dans les questions de relations internationales en Asie et vient de publier *L'Asie menacée* aux Presses de sciences-po à Paris.

**HILLMER, Norman**

Norman Hillmer is Professor of History and International Affairs at Carleton University. Educated at the Universities of Toronto and Cambridge, he was Senior Historian at the Department of National Defence for a decade before coming to Carleton in 1990. His twenty-two books, exploring themes in Canadian politics, diplomacy and security issues, include standard accounts of the history of Canadian-American relations and Canadian foreign policy, both written with J.L. Granatstein. Norman Hillmer has won several teaching and publishing prizes, including the Canada-Japan Prime Minister's

Award (1997), and his work has been translated into Chinese, Japanese, French, Russian and Swedish. From 1997-2000 he was co-editor, with Margaret MacMillan, of the Canadian Institute of International Affairs journal, *International Affairs*, and, for the past three years, he has been co-editor of the *Canada Among Nations* series of the Norman Paterson School of International Affairs at Carleton. The latest of the *Canada Among Nations* volumes, *Coping with the American Colossus*, appeared in June 2003

### **MILLAR, Robert**

Bob Millar is President of the Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute. He has academic, corporate, government, military and not-for-profit experience. He taught briefly at the Royal Military College. Over the past 23 years, he has been an executive in several corporations ranging from oil sands development, downstream petroleum, biotechnology, private medicine and high tech research & development. His experience in corporate life ranged from administration, human resources, financial management, marketing & sales to business development and operations. In 2000 he retired with the rank of Brigadier-General from the Canadian Forces, having served 15 years in the Regular Army and 20 years with the Army Reserve. Since 2000 he has been the founding President of the Canadian Defence & Foreign Affairs Institute.

Bob has served on several Boards: Shooting Star Technologies, Alberta Children's Hospital Research Board, Citizen's Advisory Roundtable (CAR) on the future use of the former Canadian Forces Base Calgary, Alberta Children's Hospital, Canadian Petroleum Products Institute and Transportation Association of Canada. He was Chair of a private Research Ethics Board, the Alberta Children's Hospital Foundation, Prairie Petroleum Association – Marketing, Conference of Defence Associations and President of the Royal Canadian Armoured Corps Association. Currently, he is a director of the Kid's Cancer Care Foundation of Alberta, the Calgary Military Museum Society, the Museum of the Regiments, the Calgary Highlanders Regimental Funds Foundation and Reserves 2000. He is Chair of Eric Technologies Corporation and the Sharing Our Military Heritage Foundation.

Bob has a Masters of Business Administration and Bachelor of Commerce degrees from Queen's University. In 1998 he attended the Queen's University Public Executive Program. He holds the designation "Officer" in the Order of Military Merit.

### **NOSSAL, Kim Richard**

Kim Richard Nossal was born in London, England, and was schooled in Melbourne, Beijing, Toronto, and Hong Kong. He attended the University of Toronto, receiving his PhD in 1977. In 1976 he joined the Department of Political Science at McMaster University in Hamilton, Ontario, where he taught international relations and Canadian foreign policy for 25 years, serving as chair of the Department in 1989-90 and 1992-1996. In 2001, he was appointed as head of the Department of Political Studies at Queen's University.

He has served as editor of *International Journal* (1992-1997), and is at present the North American editor of *Global Change, Peace and Security* and serves on the editorial boards of several scholarly journals, including *Études internationales*, *Revista Mexicana de Estudios Canadienses*, and *Civil Wars*. He served as president of the Australian and New Zealand Studies Association of North America between 1999 and 2001, and is at

present ANZSANA secretary-treasurer. His books include: *Relocating Middle Powers: Australia and Canada in a Changing World Order* (written with Andrew Cooper and Richard Higgott, 1993); *Rain Dancing: Sanctions in Canadian and Australian Foreign Policy* (1994); *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 3rd edition (1997); *The Patterns of World Politics* (1998). His latest book, co-edited with Nelson Michaud, is *Diplomatic Departures: The Conservative Era in Canadian Foreign Policy, 1984-1993*, published by UBC Press in 2001.

#### **PAMMETT, Jon H.**

Jon Pammett is Associate Dean of the Faculty of Public Affairs and Management, and Professor of Political Science, at Carleton University in Ottawa. He is also co-Director of the Carleton University Survey Centre, and Canadian delegate to the International Social Survey Programme. He is co-author of *Political Choice in Canada* and *Absent Mandate*, books about voting behaviour in Canadian elections. He is co-editor of, and contributing author to, *The Canadian General Election of 2000*, as well as several volumes in this series on earlier elections. He has published journal articles on public opinion and voting behaviour in Canada and Russia, and has also worked in the field of political education. He is currently engaged in a study of voting turnout in Canada, and is also writing a book on Canadian elections through history.

#### **RIOUX, Jean-Sébastien**

Jean-Sébastien Rioux is Canada Research Chair in International Security at the *Institut québécois des hautes études internationales* and Assistant Professor of Political Science at Laval University in Québec City, since June 2001. After obtaining his PhD in Political Science from the Florida State University in 1996, he was a Postdoctoral Fellow at the Research Group in International Security (REGIS) at McGill University and the University of Montreal in 1997-1998, and later, Assistant Professor of International Affairs at Vesalius College, Vrije Universiteit Brussel, in Belgium, from 1999-2001.

His research interests focus on determinants of foreign policy behaviour, conflict processes and third party intervention in conflict. He has published his research in several academic journals, such as the *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, *International Politics*, *Political Research Quarterly* and *Études Internationales*. Before joining academia, he was a soldier, an international trade advisor and an amateur journalist.

#### **SMITH, Gordon**

Gordon Smith is the Director of the Centre for Global Studies, and Adjunct Professor of Political Science at the University of Victoria. Dr. Smith arrived at the University of Victoria in 1998 following a distinguished career with the Canadian Department of Foreign Affairs, which included posts as Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs from 1994-1997, Ambassador to the European Union in Brussels from 1991-1994, and Ambassador to the Canadian Delegation to NATO, from 1985-1990.

He is the author (with Moisés Naim) of *Altered States: Globalization, Sovereignty, and Governance* (Ottawa: IDRC, 2000), and co-editor (with Daniel Wolfish) of *Who is Afraid of the State? Canada in a World of Multiple Centres of Power* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001), as well as numerous book chapters and

articles. Since 1997, Dr. Smith has served as Chairman of Canada's International Development Research Centre. He currently holds positions as Senior Fellow at the Liu Institute for Global Issues, University of British Columbia, Chairman of the Canadian Institute for Climate Studies, Chairman of the International Network on Bamboo and Rattan (INBAR), Fellow of the World Economic Forum, Commissioner of the Commission on Globalization, Senior Adviser to the Rector of The University for Peace in Costa Rica, and Board Director of the International Forum de Montréal. He holds a Ph.D. in Political Science from M.I.T.

**STAIRS, Denis**

Currently McCulloch Professor in Political Science at Dalhousie University, Denis Stairs attended Dalhousie, Oxford, and the University of Toronto. A former President of the Canadian Political Science Association and a member for six years of the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, he was the founding Director of Dalhousie's Centre for Foreign Policy Studies from 1970 to 1975.

He served as Chair of his Department from 1980 to 1985, and as Dalhousie's Vice-President (Academic and Research) from 1988 to 1993. A Fellow of the Royal Society of Canada, and a member of the Board of Directors of the Institute for Research on Public Policy (among others), he specializes in Canadian foreign and defence policy, Canada-U.S. relations, and similar subjects.