

dictatorships, the end of apartheid, and growing social pressures for democracy on a global scale.⁶¹ Those changes prompted a number of scholars to develop "post-internationalist" and critical positions that challenge the traditional approach to multilateralism.

What is clear from the above overview is that the intellectual approach to multilateralism is undergoing a shift from the traditional (and problem-solving) rationalist to a reflectivist (and critical) scholarship. The impetus for the post-internationalist position on multilateralism was begun with the work of James Rosenau and Martin Rochester, among others. The more critical approach to multilateralism owes its beginning to the work of Robert Cox and the MUNS network of scholars who drew heavily on Cox. This latter approach is critical in that it does not take the existing structures of the world as a given, but rather enquires into their origins and transformations. It exhibits "realism" in the sense that it recognizes the limitations of existing power structures and the ideas (such as neo-realism and liberal institutionalism) that continue to persist. The method of enquiry tends to be hermeneutic, dialectic and reflectivist, rather than positivist and problem-solving in nature as much of the liberal institutionalist and neo-realist scholarship have been. Its perspective privileges bottom-up approaches to multilateralism to counter the heavy influence of top-down approaches. In this sense it has a strong normative commitment. Finally, its overall approach can be considered holistic in that it is concerned with world order as a whole and with the link between multilateralism and changing world order.

One can discern from the MUNS studies different forms of alternative multilateralisms: 1) hybrid; 2) emergent; 3) new or potential. One is also made to recognize that there are forces opposed to multilateralism. Some of these forces are anti-systemic (such as the freeman, militia movements). Yet other transnational forces can be considered the underbelly of multilateralism (drug cartels, mafia, hell angels, terrorists). Overall we can label the MUNS approach a "new" multilateralism. The term "new multilateralism" was coined by Bjorn Hettne in reference to a "potential" multilateralism that is distinct from existing institutionalized forms. Its basic characteristics are its decidedly normative thrust and the fact that it focuses upon a bottom-up approach to multilateralism undergirded by a "broadly articulated global society."

Conclusion

A critical theory of foreign policy should stand apart from the prevailing wisdom about the how such policy is formulated and asks what are the underlying forces and pressures responsible for particular foreign policy positions and directions. Such a perspective would naturally challenge traditional approaches to Canadian foreign policy that have generally been state-centered (e.g. realist, neo-realist and liberal - pluralist-- institutionalist perspectives). This paper lays the foundation for such a challenge.

Most of the traditional analyses of Canadian foreign policy tend to revolve around the issue of whether or not the Canadian state projects an image to the international community of that of a *principal*, *satellite* or *middle power*. The first impression one is given from such analyses is that Canada is a rational unitary actor capable of channelling a multiplicity of domestic interest into a relatively coherent foreign policy that projects a particular image of Canada's capabilities to the rest of the states that form the international system. But is this really the case? It is also generally assumed that Canadian foreign policy has been remarkably consistent (reflecting laudable normative goals) and reasonably static (associated with privileging international peace,