

a wholly Canadian character. Unfortunately, such a rationale does not exist and one cannot be invented.²²

Hellyer rejected this "little Canada" concept and tried but failed, to win support in Cabinet for a fuller, more mature strategy for Canada in the 1960s. Though many things have changed since that report was written, some might say that not much has changed at all in the way some Canadians think about Canada's place in international affairs and multilateral coalitions.

Certainly, Canada cannot expect to lead the major powers, but is it true that Canada can only act on its own behalf in coalitions led by others? This is an assumption that needs to be tested. Neither Canada's interests nor those of the international community can be well served if the major powers, especially the United States, must lead every international coalition or if Canadians think of themselves as merely helpful followers.

New Players, New Methods Coalitions today, as usual, are created around states and their diplomats, armed forces, and other agencies. But multinational coalitions now also include various mixes of non-traditional allies and entirely new allies from national and international NGOs and from international organizations. Diplomatic and military leadership may come from states or from international organizations, principally the United Nations and NATO. Arrangements, therefore, within coalitions are seldom sure at the outset and often ambiguous in the field, especially where NGOs are important actors. Nevertheless, these arrangements can have a significant impact on Canada's interests, domestic and foreign policies, and on the lives of members of the Canadian Forces. But arrangements are complicated in some new coalitions because they are predicated not only on sovereign states and their rights and laws, but also on the assumed rights of non-state actors and the international standing of various multi-jurisdictional entities. Officials and officers preparing a national strategy for Canada must consider in their deliberations the terms and conditions that will underpin future Canadian commitments to multinational/multi-jurisdictional coalitions and the rules governing Canadians assigned to such coalitions.

Trusting Canadians Public support for foreign policy is of paramount importance to the successful implementation of such policies over the longer term. This fact is especially pertinent whenever Canada acts through coalitions in an environment where every step in the field may be recorded and broadcast immediately by the media. An agenda for a forum on a national coalition strategy for Canada must include some consideration of how Canadians will be informed of the choices Canada faces in international relations. This may be a daunting assignment in a crisis, if the public and the commentators are ignorant of Canada's real capabilities and the circumstances in which Canadian diplomacy is played out.

Too often Canadians seem to have higher expectations of foreign policy than the circumstances suggest. For instance, many Canadians, including most members of Parliament, believe that Canada is an important participant and a leader in international peacekeeping missions worldwide. They appear convinced that Canada has "influence" in NATO and the United Nations because of the

²². As quoted in Douglas Bland, *Chiefs of Defence. Government and the Unified Command of the Canadian Armed Forces*, op. cit. p. 226.