

Paradoxically, the people among whom the American Loyalists were condemned to live were much stranger to them from an ideological point of view than those they had just left behind. But a stranglehold on government, the opportunity they were to have to shape the economic development of Canada almost single-handedly (since the French Canadians had neither motives for nor any interest in joining in the liberal undertaking) and, finally, immigration, slow at the outset but more pronounced towards the middle of the nineteenth century, were to enable the British in North America to establish gradually their own type of liberal society, which differed from that of the United States mainly in that it was smaller and slower to develop. It was to be a full century after the exodus of the Loyalists before the new country was created by an act of the British Parliament.

### Continuity of spirit

Immigration and the historical experience of the link with Britain were to have a significant positive influence on the development of this culture that sprang from the Loyalist spirit of the end of the eighteenth century. But I believe that the original ethos, the liberal mentality, has always guided Canada's development. In spite of the fact that American development has been unique, the cultural community between Canada and the United States is based in large part on their common origins. Without a doubt, geography and the enormous power of the neighbour to the south serve to explain the cultural osmosis between the two countries and Canadian vulnerability to the American economy and American values. But would there be this same vulnerability if a common American background had not made English-speaking Canadians cousins to the Americans?

The French Canadians do not share these common origins. However, they also turned their backs on Europe at one point; under the French regime, they also experienced a sort of American adventure, which, though not liberal, gave them certain characteristics that were somewhat similar to those of the Americans. Once out of their psychological isolation, they were also to be quite susceptible (although to a lesser degree among the elite) to the invasion by the American way of life.

Thus, as, little by little, Canada finally developed its own foreign policy, it quite naturally tended to rely on the United States. When Mackenzie King expressed Canada's reluctance to follow

Britain along the tortuous paths of European politics, it was an essentially North American reaction, and the temptation was that of American isolationism. In fact, even after it became more independent, Canada was to align itself voluntarily with the United States and — during the Cold War period, at least — share the same major objectives.

I should even go so far as to say that the primary characteristic of Canada's foreign policy is that it is North American and reflects a certain very American idealism — a world vision from which the traditional conception of European diplomacy, often based on *Realpolitik*, is noticeably absent.

There are, however, significant differences between the Canadian and American styles of diplomacy. A number of these differences stem from the fact that the United States is a great power and Canada is a middle power with no leadership pretensions. Others are the result of the two separate historical experiences since the American Revolution. Let us now turn to some of these divergent characteristics.

### National pride

As an immediate consequence of the American Declaration of Independence, the United States experienced a great national pride. It was some time before the 13 newly-independent states truly united to form one nation. But, even by 1776, an original collective identity bound all Americans together. The wars against England had given rise to an authentic American patriotism that was to become more and more pronounced throughout the history of the United States. The Americans do not like to define themselves as nationalists because this smacks of the European nationalism they reject. Nevertheless all of the criteria for nationalism are quite evident in the United States: the pride of belonging, the emotion aroused by national symbols, the feeling of experiencing something unique in the world, the desire to bring others under their flag, and even a certain more or less conscious feeling of superiority. Of course, the United States has not become involved in a racist type of nationalism (with the exception — and it is a notable one — of the difficulties in granting equality to blacks). On the contrary, it has welcomed so many immigrants that it is now the most racially heterogeneous nation in the world. But we should note that the immigrants are the ones who have quite naturally been assimilated by the original ideology. In spite of the contributions they have made to American culture, it is the culture that

*Significant differences in styles of diplomacy*