

## **2.2. Canadian Foreign Policy Today, Kim Richard Nossal (McMaster University)**

Kim Richard Nossal suggested that the dichotomy between interests and ethical values in foreign policy discourse is false. In reality, values cannot be seen as separate from interests. He said that promoting interests and values which do not reflect public sentiment creates a gap that may prove politically unsustainable. This gap brings into focus the question of whose interests and values matter. Often, policy is made by a small group of officials. Among the reasons for this is the difficulty of interpreting what are the interests and values of the governed. Despite these considerations, periodic elections ensure that foreign policy is made with the public interests and values in mind.

Contrary to Gee, Nossal argued that the majority of Canadians would hardly promote the security of others or support building and maintaining a peacekeeping force if it had a negative impact on their revenues. Canadians seem to be apathetic about the American plans to develop National Missile Defence – one of the most controversial policy decisions the Government of Canada is faced with today. According to Nossal, most Canadians think that if the U.S. wishes to build such a defence system they should go ahead. The concerns of Canadians over diminishing ODA levels have also been lukewarm. These attitudes suggest that Canadians are not so outward-looking after all. Indeed, Canadians are as self-interested as others – efforts at building foreign policy on unrealistic assumptions about the Canadian character will flounder.

## **2.3. Blurring Boundaries: Rethinking Canadian Foreign Policy Analysis, Laura Macdonald (Carleton University)**

Laura Macdonald addressed two kinds of borders: the first between states and the second between the state and civil society. She said that both have been blurring, although not disappearing. As an example she addressed the border between the U.S. and Canada. She said that while the border is disappearing when it comes to certain issues, it is reinforced at the same time when it comes to others. She referred to "seamless sovereignty" – a term used by George Haynal (former Assistant Deputy Minister, Americas, DFAIT) to describe the way Canadians see their sovereignty and security. Attempts to reassert the traditional relationship with the U.S. should be replaced by more constructive approaches, moving away from dichotomies such as the nationalist *versus* internationalist, or nationalism *versus* continentalism.

Macdonald suggested that the boundary between the state and civil society has also been transforming and blurring. The wall separating the delegates and the public in Quebec City (at the Summit of the Americas) was a turn toward traditional conceptions of the state – civil society relationship. Nonetheless, she argued that the state – civil society dichotomy is no longer valid due to increasing interactions between the two "sectors," including government-led consultations (i.e., the peace-building consultations conducted by the Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade). This trend has transformed the way both state and civil society approach certain issues and undermined the traditional cultural and institutional divide that has existed between them in the past. She also pointed to some areas where state – civil society boundaries