

## Where does Canada fit in a world ruled by the ‘law of the jungle’?

Derek Burney

Globe and Mail, December 27, 2018

As the new year beckons, the international mood is tense. The trade-tariff battle between the United States and China is sending negative ripples around the world. Some wonder whether Donald Trump is intent on rectifying the hefty trade imbalance or whether he, as some of his hawkish advisers would prefer, is determined to undermine the basic tenets of China’s economic power. Either way, the issue that will define the next year and beyond will be how the United States and China choose to manage their increasingly fractious relationship.

That will involve issues that go beyond trade. Washington is wary of Beijing’s “One Belt One Road” project, which seeks to expand its influence into neighbouring regions and across the African continent – but American efforts to counter these moves have been stymied by the White House’s lack of strategic coherence.

Meanwhile, China has flexed its military muscle to strengthen territorial claims in the South and East China seas, although in this area, the United States remains dominant; in the meantime, targeted cyberspace attacks are, for now both countries’ preferred weapon.

Amid this superpower showdown, Canada has been drawn into the crosshairs. By acquiescing to the terms of our extradition treaty with the United States in the case of Huawei executive Meng Wanzhou to the United States from Vancouver, Canada became a pawn, if not a punching bag, for China. Two Canadians have been detained cavalierly under dubious charges. Eschewing diplomacy, China’s ambassador to Canada has threatened more of the same.

Mr. Trump made a bad situation worse by saying that, if he made progress on trade, he might relent on the extradition demand. So much for the rule of law. But his crude intervention may just give Canada’s court an escape hatch the government would welcome.

Before Mr. Trump, successive U.S. governments had hoped that, with its expanding economy, rising middle class and membership in key multilateral economic organizations such as the World Trade Organization and the International Monetary Fund, China would become a “responsible stakeholder,” helping preserve stability, respect for international norms and even some political freedoms at home.

That was a naive assumption. China under Xi Jinping has only become more authoritarian at home and abroad, and more intent on serving exclusively its own interests.

China's single-minded assertiveness has been abetted by the abysmal state of affairs in most Western democracies. Mr. Trump is as unpredictable as he is unconventional, and his "America First" approach is the antithesis of reliable alliance leadership. Nuance – often the essential ingredient for diplomacy – is not part of his vocabulary. But Mr. Trump's impulse is toward quick results in part because investigations on the home front are building. Meanwhile, complete disarray in Britain over Brexit has sapped Prime Minister Theresa May's tenure, while full-scale "yellow vest" protests in France have humbled the once-popular Emmanuel Macron. Even Angela Merkel is no longer an oasis of stability in Europe.

By contrast, Mr. Xi, as "President for Life," draws patience from having the luxury of the long game. The example presented by these troubled Western democracies has little appeal to those ruling in Beijing, making the West's fog of dysfunction debilitating on many fronts.

Meanwhile, Russia represents a wild card in the Sino-U.S. dispute. When Moscow intensified its flagrant violation of Ukraine's sovereignty by assaulting small naval ships and kidnapping 24 sailors, the West simply shrugged, offering little more than rhetorical denunciations.

Despite Mr. Trump's desire for constructive relations with Vladimir Putin, the mood is not sanguine between the United States and Russia – and Robert Mueller's pending revelations may not brighten the prospects.

Dimitri Simes, the president of the Center for National Interest, cautioned that China and Russia may find greater scope for co-operation based on their mutual dislike of being bullied by the United States. "There is no path to responsible policy-making," he wrote, "that does not begin with the understanding and the accounting for unintended consequences of confronting two great powers simultaneously."

The extensive economic interdependence between China and the United States may be our saving grace. But the atmosphere is brittle, and prone to accident.

This all means that it's every country for themselves now. And under this global law of the jungle, countries such as Canada have little room to independently manoeuvre – the tangle around Ms. Meng only confirms that – and we've seen that global tensions only inflame domestic challenges, and vice versa. It's time for Canada to take a hard look at its priorities and deliver clearer assertions of the national interest, so regional disputes at home do not inhibit the essential task of dealing with this survival-of-the-fittest world order.

.....

## Canada Amid Chaos: Quo Vadis?

Jeremy Kinsman Policy.ca. January 2019

Amid a level of existential churn in Western democracies unseen since the Second World War, Canada—whose commitment to multilateralism, human rights and democracy has been a defining national characteristic—can turn crisis to opportunity by leading the global fight against authoritarianism. That begins with an investment in our relationship with the United States that looks beyond Donald Trump.

November 11, 2018: 70 world leaders walked shoulder to shoulder in the pouring rain up the Champs-Élysées, toward the Arc de Triomphe and the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, a clump of black umbrellas, clustered around the president of France. They came to honour and reflect upon the 1914-18 “War to End All Wars” that, in Winston Churchill’s words, left “a crippled, broken world.”

However—ominously—two neo-nationalist leaders, the presidents of the United States and of Russia, didn’t walk the rainy walk but stepped out of their limos at l’Étoile, and only after the others were in their seats. Had China been present, there would probably have been a third ego-limo at the Arc.

They sat stone-faced as French President Emmanuel Macron warned that “old demons” were re-surfacing, especially nationalist populism. Justin Trudeau knows nationalism constitutes a wrenching challenge to Canada’s interests and values. As would re-kindling the nuclear arms race between the U.S. and Russia.

History shows that the punitive terms of the 1918 armistice, aggravated by a crippling world depression, spawned competitive economic nationalism, and the rise of populist, nativist regimes, notoriously in Germany, where a short-lived democracy died.

The ensuing catastrophe of the Second World War forced victors and losers alike to construct, at last, a cooperative global system that might truly prevent war by mitigating destructive nationalist ambition. This time, instead of staying aloof, an enlightened America led the way. Canada made multilateral cooperation its foreign policy mantra.

Of course, not all wars were ended. Global power alignments played out in proxy conflicts for the Cold War that held a divided world hostage to the shadow of mutually assured destruction.

But in 1989, the Cold War’s collapse made it easy to believe cooperative liberal internationalism was the triumphant new norm. Over the next decades, “globalization,” driven by a ubiquitous digital technology revolution, lifted more than a billion people out of poverty.

The demonic attacks of September 11, 2001 pole-axed our complacent priorities. The disastrous U.S./U.K. war of arbitrary reprisal against Iraq combined with what remains

a perpetual war in Afghanistan turned the Middle East into the first failed region, whose refugees de-stabilized the iconic post-war project for a European Union that would end Europe's murderous wars forever.

The 2008-09 financial crisis that ruined middle class lives with barely any retribution or systemic reform left a bitter impression that greedy interests kept the system fixed so that, as Leonard Cohen put it, "The poor stay poor, the rich get rich, that's how it goes. Everybody knows."

As change accelerated, disrupting old certainties of identity, populist nationalist leaders stoked the cynicism, sense of victimization by the political caste, and fear and distrust—of migrants, of "globalism", of expertise, and even of democracy—all fired up by distorting and irresponsible social media. The New York Times labelled Twitter as "a super highway of hatred."

In 2016, fear and reactive nationalism prompted the U.K.'s narrow but catalytic Brexit referendum result, sending the country into its gravest—and still unresolved—crisis since the Blitz. Months later, angry Americans elected Donald Trump, whose populist and nationalist mantra of "America first, always America first" made it "a new ball game" for the world, and rationalized an otherwise unthinkable withdrawal of U.S. leadership.

Trump began to trash international institutions and longstanding partnerships. He withdrew the U.S. from critical cooperative pacts, such as the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Iran nuclear deal, while weaponizing unilateral tariffs against U.S. allies, even disrupting international Summits—the G7, NATO—with egregious personal hostility.

No wonder Macron asked rhetorically whether the group photo from November 11, 2018 will be viewed years hence as the last moment before things totally fell apart. Indeed, French rioters took to the streets shortly afterward. As the absence of international leadership became top of mind, Richard Haass of the Council on Foreign Relations Tweeted: "The Merkel era is close to ending, leaving the West and the post-WW2 international order without a leader. The U.S. of @realDonaldTrump has abdicated. The U.K. is distracted. Canada lacks means. Macron is too weak. Bodes poorly for stability, prosperity, freedom."

His observation about Canada is revealing—that we are seen as a leader; but that we lack the means. In this critical year ahead, Canada needs to acquire the means we need to defend our interests; democracy, human rights, and multilateralism.

Canada has so far escaped disruption by powerful forces of disaffection. But, as John Manley recently said, "Canada has never been so alone in the world."

Our contextual status quo is gone. We need to work hard to put substance into our ambitious goals of political and economic diversification toward the EU, and with China, Japan, India, and Asia. Yet, our primary outward challenge is our relationship with the

U.S. It is complicated by the stark Trudeau-Trump comparison: Trudeau had campaigned on a message of free trade, and getting Canada back in the forefront of liberal internationalism. Trump campaigned opposing free trade and on pulling the U.S. away from liberal internationalism.

How do we reconcile our defining commitment to cooperative multilateralism with our economy's dependence on access to the U.S. market, given that the superpower neighbour with which we lived in an easy-going extended family setting has gone rogue internationally, and eschewed old friendships? Unilateral U.S. threats to Canada's economic security and the repeated assaults against truth make it unlikely anyone now in high office in Ottawa will trust this U.S. president again.

We need to be in permanent campaign mode to remain engaged with America. Most Canadians are repelled by the relentlessly divisive aggressiveness Trump shares with his identity-driven nationalist base. But the U.S. narrative is not one-dimensional. Canadians need to channel to the totality of Americans our trust in them and their history to help divert the U.S. from its current trajectory of internal and external hostilities, international disruption, and possible national failure. Meanwhile, we must work professionally with U.S. officials on an everyday basis to optimize as much operational cooperation as possible between the two economies and societies.

Working now to salvage the machinery and motifs of international cooperation could facilitate U.S. re-entry in time, provided increasingly hostile U.S.-China relations don't again split the world in two.

Canada has the means to help lead. Only weeks before the recent contentious APEC Summit (which Trump skipped), Canada convened an informal meeting of Trade Ministers of internationalist democracies and the EU (not the U.S., China, Russia, or India) to strategize on defending the World Trade Organization by reforming it and thereby encouraging the U.S. to stay in as a cooperative member. At the subsequent Buenos Aires G-20 Summit, the U.S. welcomed the effort to reform the WTO, albeit truculently. But the meeting otherwise achieved little, as the U.S. resisted a joint declaration condemning protectionism and reiterated its refusal to take climate change seriously.

As the China-U.S. rivalry becomes the dominant U.S. foreign policy preoccupation, China-phobia is a rare issue that is shared by both U.S. political parties.

Canada must succeed with China, indeed with the whole Pacific region (which now accounts for 20 per cent more trade for Canada than does Europe). There had been concern that the re-negotiated NAFTA agreement (the USMCA in Trumpese) contained clauses constraining Canada's freedom to negotiate a trade agreement with China. It seemed over-blown.

We need a Canada-China set of trade and investment agreements. They will take years to finalize. We cannot condone China not playing by international trade rules. But the Vancouver arrest of Huawei's Meng Manzhou to accommodate a dubious U.S.

extradition request cost us credibility. We can't go along with U.S. muscle plays meant to hobble China's rise to global rivalry.

Life will probably be complicated by a global economic turn-down. Canada has specific economic vulnerabilities, especially from the low price of Alberta oil, hemmed in by lack of pipeline capacity to bring it to market.

Given other re-defining upheavals such as the U.K.'s Brexit mess and France's turmoil, the temptation—particularly in an election year—will be just to steer the ship, limit the damage, stay transactional, and, in Trump's pet phrase, “see what happens.”

But higher levels of ambition are called for. Others see us as the “other North America.” Playing that role wisely will be a challenge.

Canada's profile has arguably not been higher since Lester Pearson's role in resolving the Suez crisis in 1956, nor its reputation more enviable—because of rare stability, inclusivity, self-confidence, and our values, when “values” are top of mind in other democracies under stress. Few countries were as legitimately forthright in condemning recent human rights outrages in Saudi Arabia,

That won't get Canada elected to the UN Security Council against two worthy contenders, Ireland and Norway. It was a rookie PMO mistake to inflate that secondary contest into a major event years before the actual UN election, just to show that “Canada's back.”

Canada is, in fact, substantively ‘back’ as one of a group of key liberal democracies determined to defend the multilateral system and rules-based international order. Public interest and support for that effort are essential. There will be Canadians who admire Trump's “America first” antipathy to sharing sovereignty, who believe we should mimic it, and confine ourselves to mercantile self-interest.

The counter-case of a deeper national interest in constructive international engagement and defending democracy needs to be made, and not just by our government, but by civil society. A committed coalition of scholars and advocates is mobilizing outward from the University of Ottawa as an optimistic and solidly grounded sign of Canadian confidence in our creative potential in a chaotic world.

Relationships matter. Ours are enviable, on every continent. Trudeau's and those of Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland are wide-ranging and valuable. They are supported by multiple relationships of Canadians across the world. But China's retaliatory grab of two Canadians darkens the Canada-China atmosphere, making our objectives harder to reach. Freeland will now have a new priority for 2019—trying to re-set our understandings with China going forward.

We have vital interests to defend and pursue, including positive inclusive democracy itself. We have solidarity allies, including among like-minded Americans. We need to be

careful and comprehensive, but we should not feel we are vulnerable because we are alone. We are many.

---

## Donald Trump has ushered in a new global order. Here's how Canada can protect itself

Colin Robertson

Globe and Mail, January 22, 2019

After two chaotic years under U.S. President Donald Trump, the world is a messier and more dangerous place. Unless constructive powers such as Canada step up, the multilateral system is headed down the drain. Constructed after the Second World War, with its emphasis on rules-based order, it underwrote decades-long peace and prosperity, lifting billions out of poverty. And now it's under threat.

With Mr. Trump cheering the way, nationalism and competition are dominant global trends. As with Harry Potter's Lord Voldemort, this President personifies and appeals to the darker forces. If two years of Mr. Trump have taught Canada and its allies anything, it is that he cannot be trusted and that we need to take a collective stand against his bullying.

Unfortunately, populism, protectionism and polarization will persist after his presidency. So will conflicting U.S. partisan priorities. Consistency in U.S. policy and bipartisan support for alliances and multilateralism no longer apply. Canada and its allies need to adapt.

As with Mr. Trump, Presidents Xi Jinping of China and Vladimir Putin of Russia also see the world differently. They are building authoritarian systems based on state capitalism. Western hopes that they'd become "responsible stakeholders" were ill-founded. Instead, they are weaponizing cyberintrusion, surveillance and big data to ensure domestic stability. Now they are using these tools to subvert democracies.

Together with Mr. Trump, they share a contempt for the rules-based order. They'd rather see a concert of great powers, each exercising respective spheres of influence. Thucydides long ago described this school of international affairs: "The strong do what they can and the weak suffer what they must."

As the Huawei situation clearly shows, China is giving Canada a taste of what life will be like in this new order. This future would be a disaster for liberal democracies such as Canada.

Mr. Trump's policy of "America First" leaves a vacuum that all constructive powers need to fill. No one country can do it alone, but working together, we can shore up the system. Even while multilateralism is taking a beating, recent global compacts on climate and migration and a raft of regional trade deals demonstrate its worth.

But multilateralism needs constant reinvigoration. This means repairing or reforming what is breaking down in the face of technological, climatic and demographic changes. We have to help those hurt by change.

Security must be the first priority. Our top general warns of great-power dynamics, especially Russia and China. All allies have to reinvest in the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). It's time to expand our durable, collective-security alliance into the Indo-Pacific and the Arctic. Australia, Japan, Korea and New Zealand are already NATO partners. They should be full members.

Given the growing maritime challenges, Canada needs more investments in its navy: procuring the next generation of submarines with under-ice operability and a half-dozen "hospital" ships for rapid deployment to increasing numbers of natural and man-made disasters in coastal areas.

Securing our democratic institutions is also vital as we prepare for an election later this year. Our intelligence agencies warn that our electoral process is not immune to bad-actor interference. Are we ready to tackle bot-controlled disinformation?

Our second priority should be to shore up the global trading system that generates our prosperity. Mr. Trump has a point about its ineffective dispute-settlement process. The solution is to fix it as Canada and others will continue to do this week when they meet in Davos, Switzerland.

The third priority must be addressing climate change. Rather than fixate on carbon pricing, we need to collaborate – on global knowledge in battery storage, renewables, and efficiencies in building codes. Use COSIA – (Canadian Oil Sands Innovation Alliance) with its commitment to sharing technological innovations that mitigate environmental damage – as a model.

As with Humpty Dumpty, the global operating system has had a great fall. Mr. Trump and his fellow travellers will eventually face an accounting, but, until then, we need to focus on fixing rather than blaming.

Canada and other constructive countries know that we all do better when we agree that rules are the principle upon which we base our order. They level the playing field and establish norms of behaviour. Multilateralism is worth fighting for.

---

## We must finally see China for what it truly is

David Mulroney

Globe and Mail, December 28, 2018

What a difference a year makes. In December, 2017, Canada's biggest foreign policy problem was the Prime Minister's failure to persuade China to accept a progressive trade agreement, one that included commitments relating to labour, gender and the environment. In December, 2018, we are facing China's fury for complying with a U.S. request to arrest Meng Wanzhou, the chief financial officer of the Chinese telecom firm Huawei, an act that has already cost Canadians Michael Kovrig and Michael Spavor their freedom.

Although the punishment China is meting out to us is cruel, it is, sadly, not unusual. Australia, Britain and Sweden have seen their nationals detained by Beijing on similarly flimsy pretexts. Nor is the experience new to us. In 2014, Canadians Kevin and Julia Garratt were imprisoned in the wake of Canada's decision to extradite Chinese citizen Su Bin to the United States, where he admitted to having stolen military secrets. Julia Garratt was released in January, 2015, while her husband would spend 19 months in detention.

China's furious response to Ms. Meng's arrest has unsettled some Canadian observers who have commented that we should simply have looked the other way and allowed Ms. Meng to slip out of Vancouver. Thinking along these lines was encouraged by a typically clumsy intervention by U.S. President Donald Trump, who said he might use Ms. Meng as a bargaining chip if it helped him get a better deal in his trade negotiations with China.

As frustrating as the President's comments were, we should not succumb to the belief that there is some moral equivalence between the United States and China. Our interests and values are still far more closely aligned with those of the United States than they are with China's.

Mr. Trump's conduct may be appalling, but he faces powerful counterbalancing forces in the U.S. government, media and civil society. Chinese President Xi Jinping, however, holds uncontested power: His word is law – or what passes for it. Having abolished the term limits set by his predecessors, Mr. Xi is likely to be with us for some time.

We need to understand that China behaves the way it does because it works. This is enabled by a chorus of advisers in the West who don't seem particularly discomfited by how China treats people at home or abroad. The global consulting firm McKinsey, whose bullish line on China is avidly consumed by our own government, recently held a

lavish retreat for its executives in Xinjiang, in China's far west, ground zero for the country's repression of its Muslim Uyghurs.

Our attention all too quickly shifts from stories about China's assertiveness and repression to stories about its gleaming cities and globe-trotting ultra-rich. We seem incapable of seeing it whole.

The current China crisis has many subplots: concerns about China as a violator of Iran sanctions, about the possibility that it uses corporations such as Huawei to vacuum foreign technology and about the stunning disregard it displays for the rights of citizens – foreign and Chinese. But they all connect to a larger narrative that is finally taking hold, one that concedes that China is an increasingly irresponsible power and partner, one that feigns compliance with international norms only when it is convenient to do so.

The current crisis offers an opportunity for new thinking. We can't ignore China, nor should we disrespect it. But we need to consider whether our engagement of China should be as circumscribed and conditional as is China's participation in our rules-based international order.

While our immediate objective is freeing our citizens, a larger theme is emerging, one that offers Canada a chance to show leadership.

We should be discussing with allies how we can do a better job protecting sensitive technologies in our private and academic sectors, how we can more effectively ward off Chinese interference in our democratic political systems and how we can more effectively hold China accountable for respecting human rights at home and abroad.

For too long the preferred approach to each successive China crisis has been to get back to normal as quickly as possible without doing or saying anything that might possibly harm China's delicate feelings – or cause it to change its behaviour.

It's time for a new normal.

---

## Michael Kovrig's detention has ushered in a disturbing new reality for diplomats working in China

David Mulroney

Globe and Mail, January 16, 2019

It has been a month since the detentions of Canadians Michael Kovrig, a former diplomat now working for the International Crisis Group, and Michael Spavor, an

entrepreneur who specializes in organizing high-profile visits to North Korea. In the absence of any credible evidence to the contrary, we have to assume that both were seized by China in retaliation for the arrest in Vancouver of Meng Wanzhou, chief financial officer of the Chinese telecom firm Huawei.

The Kovrig detention ushers in a disturbing new reality for diplomats in Beijing. Up until now, they have been confident that their immunity from prosecution allowed them full scope to do what they were sent to China to do – understand what’s happening there and why it matters. Importantly, the Vienna Convention, which governs these things, extends this immunity in time, meaning that an individual can’t be prosecuted for prior diplomatic work after diplomatic status has been relinquished.

But it now appears that Mr. Kovrig’s interrogation by Chinese officials has been focused on his former role as a diplomat. (On Thursday, Hua Chunying, a spokesperson for the country’s Foreign Ministry, said that Mr. Kovrig “does not enjoy diplomatic immunity” and that China has “been completely in line with the requirements of international law, including the Vienna Convention.”) This explains the Prime Minister’s recent statement of concern about Mr. Kovrig’s diplomatic status having been violated.

This concern is justified.

It is normal for diplomats to return to China later in life to do research, attend conferences or pursue business interests. Now, they must worry that some visit or conversation that was a legitimate part of their diplomatic work years earlier will make them vulnerable to the kind of retaliatory detention that appears to be China’s diplomatic weapon of choice. This may persuade diplomats, or the people who deploy them, that it is safer to do their work remotely, drastically cutting back travel and reducing their contacts with the Chinese people.

That would be a tremendous loss, because diplomacy is ultimately about trying to understand and communicate with real people. And just as it is important for foreigners to understand China, China has a huge stake in being better understood. Understanding is not agreement, but it reduces the prospect that relations will be entirely governed by suspicion, and creates space for sympathy and respect. Experienced, professional observers such as Mr. Kovrig make us aware of the enormous challenges China faces, and of many local-level innovations and reforms that are otherwise invisible to the wider world.

To be sure, diplomats in China need energy, ambition and thick skins if they are to see and understand anything. I was alternately requested, instructed and harangued by Chinese officials not to do things that were central to my job, such as visiting the family of a detained Canadian, calling on beleaguered Catholic priests or, on a visit to Tibet, meeting local people rather than spending my time in Chinese government briefings and banquets. I politely ignored such interference, but struggled to stay a step ahead of the Chinese Foreign Ministry handlers who shadowed me whenever I left Beijing.

The Kovrig case means that diplomats are joining the world inhabited by the larger community of China watchers and interpreters, a broad category that includes journalists, academics, business people and employees of non-governmental organizations.

As with these others, the first thing that diplomats will have to get right is the precise location of the ever-shifting line that separates the topics and people judged by the Chinese government to be off limits from those deemed to be acceptable. This lack of clarity is hugely advantageous to China's security state. Ambiguity about what's permitted causes people to self-censor, deciding not to do things that they might well get away with. And the state can always shift the line retroactively, determining that a meeting that was not problematic when it happened was, in retrospect, illegal.

Later this month, China's Vice-President, Wang Qishan, will travel to the World Economic Forum at Davos to reassure a room full of wealthy and powerful people about China's economic prospects. It will be a tough sell. The Vice-President and his audience will both be aware of the growing disconnect between China's public rhetoric about openness and reform and the increasingly discouraging reality back home.

If China truly wishes to be understood, something that is important for all of us, it should do more to protect those who actually help us understand. Meeting its commitments under the Vienna Convention would be a good start.

And if China's leaders really want to reassure foreigners, they needn't send a delegation to Davos. Allowing Mr. Kovrig and Mr. Spavor to come home would speak volumes.

.....

It's time for Canada and China to tone down the rhetoric

Hugh Stephens

The Conversation, January 17, 2019

The death sentence recently meted out to convicted Canadian drug trafficker Robert Schellenberg in China is another ratcheting up of pressure on Canada by Chinese authorities.

It came after Canada arrested Huawei CFO Meng Wanzhou in Vancouver at the request of the United States, which wants her to stand trial on charges related to breaking American laws prohibiting trade with Iran.

Prime Minister Justin Trudeau condemned China for "arbitrarily" applying the death penalty in the Schellenberg case that has, until now, languished in the Chinese justice system. Schellenberg was initially sentenced to 15 years in prison for his role in trying to smuggle 222 kilograms of methamphetamine from China to Australia in 2014.

China has responded by criticizing Trudeau for not having “the slightest respect for the rule of law” and [for making “irresponsible remarks.”](#) Both sides also escalated travel advisories for their citizens, urging [caution and evaluation of risk.](#)

### Pressure point

There is no question that the sudden attention given to Schellenberg is related to the Meng arrest and is another pressure point that China is applying to Canada.

However, China has been somewhat more astute in highlighting Schellenberg’s case in comparison to its clumsy detentions of two other Canadians — former diplomat Michael Kovrig and businessman Michael Spavor — which occurred right after Meng’s arrest and [were ostensibly for violations of China’s national security laws.](#)

Drug trafficking is recognized as a serious crime everywhere. A number of countries — such as Singapore, Indonesia and, yes, China — apply the death penalty in many serious [drug trafficking cases.](#)

According to [media reports](#), Schellenberg has a criminal record in Canada with 11 offences dating back to 2003, including several for drug trafficking for which he has spent time in Canadian prisons.

Judging by his track record and the apparent evidence, he is no simple tourist. But does this mean that he merits the death penalty for his offences, or is he a political pawn? The timing of his sudden retrial very much suggests the latter.

But ramping up the rhetoric against China is unlikely to achieve the outcome Canada desires. In fact, just the opposite could happen.

Canada doesn’t have the death penalty, and it’s legitimate and consistent with our values to request other countries to respect that position. But not all do, [including the United States.](#)

### Touched a nerve

To publicly accuse China of arbitrarily imposing a death sentence is to touch a raw nerve in China, which maintains that it also follows the rule of law.

While there are many good reasons to question that position, China will maintain that there are plenty of precedents for imposing capital punishment for drug trafficking in China, and that they should not be expected to make an exception simply because the accused is a foreigner.

The intemperate opinion piece by Chinese ambassador Lu Shaye, which I myself [publicly criticized](#), accused Canadian “elites” of practising “white supremacy” for arguing that Kovrig’s and Spavor’s detention were unlawful while Meng’s was in accordance with the rule of law.

That kind of inflammatory language is unhelpful, but whether China actually believes that Canada is imposing double standards — one for Canadians and a different one for Chinese — or at least chooses to play that card, the fact remains that Schellenberg is vulnerable.

That's because China could easily make an example of him just to show that he is subject to the same laws and punishments as a Chinese citizen convicted of drug trafficking.

Rather than accusing China of arbitrariness and [political motivation in this latest case](#), it would be better to acknowledge the seriousness of the allegations against Schellenberg and propose that Chinese punishment be tempered with mercy.

Asking for clemency

In fact, there are provisions in Chinese law for the death penalty to [be suspended or commuted](#). For China to take that position in Schellenberg's case would strengthen its position that this case has not been politicized, but is being dealt with according to law.

Foreign Minister [Chrystia Freeland has said](#) that Canada has asked China for clemency in this case. That's the right approach. While [there are reports](#) that China has rejected Canada's appeal, so far there has been no final decision by the Supreme People's Court.



Chrystia Freeland poses with China's Foreign Minister Wang Yi as she arrives for a meeting at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Beijing in August 2017. (Wu Hong/Pool Photo via AP)

Pushing China into a corner and escalating the condemning language on this case is a high-risk proposition. If the Chinese can be convinced to spare Schellenberg's life, it won't be due to threats. Lowering the temperature on the rhetoric on both sides can only help.

It's tempting to respond with strong language and threats of consequences, as some have suggested. But now is the time to give China the chance to show the world that while the Chinese justice system can mete out punishment, it can also exercise compassion, demonstrating that Chinese justice can be a combination of both retribution and rehabilitation.

Whatever his sins, Schellenberg deserves that chance. Let's hope that China rises to the occasion.

.....

## The Chinese embassy shows how not to win friends and influence people

Hugh Stephens

Globe and Mail, January 11, 2019

Embassies do tremendous work to promote their home countries' interests abroad, staffed as they are by bright, worldly people. But they can't do it all. Quite often, especially in complicated situations, embassies employ a local PR firm to assist them in managing media requests and putting their best foot forward in their country of accreditation, to ensure that they're taking local sensibilities into account.

If the Chinese embassy in Ottawa has such an adviser, I would hope that the advice provided to Ambassador Lu Shaye is the equivalent of "Shut up already."

The point of media outreach is to balance the narrative, and at the very least, to "do no harm." Mr. Lu would be wise to consider this. After his initial op-ed on Dec. 13 in The Globe and Mail in which he described the Vancouver arrest of Meng Wanzhou, on the basis of a U.S. Justice Department arrest warrant and extradition request, as a "groundless detention," Mr. Lu has upped the ante with another missive. In The Hill Times, he accused Canadians who have criticized China's arbitrary detention of Michael Kovrig and Michael Spavor on alleged national security violations of "Western egotism and white supremacy," alleging there is a double standard on justice for Canadians and Chinese.

Actually, on this last point, he is correct. The treatment that Ms. Meng has received in Canada, while no doubt unwelcome from her point of view, has been transparent, correct, expeditious, and fair. She was given access to legal counsel, her bail hearing was open, and she is now out on bail resting comfortably, one presumes, in the confines of her Vancouver home. Exactly the opposite is the case for the two Canadians who have

been detained, but not yet charged in China. They have been provided very limited consular access, there have been no charges or bail hearings, they have been provided no access to legal counsel, and we can only speculate on what conditions they are being held in.

It is worth noting that the process of Chinese law is different from that in Canada, which is based on the presumption of innocence until proven guilty, with evidence adjudicated on an adversarial basis. China follows a civil law system, as is the case in other countries like Germany, Japan, and Korea; that system is adjudicated inquisitorially, instead. In other words, accused are held and extensively investigated by a prosecutor before charges are laid. If charges are forthcoming, the result is a high rate of conviction. That is the situation Carlos Ghosn is facing in Japan – but there, Mr. Ghosn has legal counsel and open bail hearings.

The slowness of China's civil system is compounded by vague national security laws, where detainees can be held for up to six months while investigations continue. According to Mr. Lu, taking a page from Donald Trump's book, "elites" in Canada "completely dismissed China's law and presumptuously urged China to immediately release their citizens." Of course, when China learned of Ms. Meng's detention on Dec. 5, China called for her "immediate release."

If China truly wants other countries to respect its legal system, this can be accomplished with actual transparency.

China has also claimed that there is no connection between the detentions of the two Canadians and Ms. Meng's arrest. "Those who accuse China of detaining some person in retaliation for the arrest of Ms. Meng should first reflect on the actions of the Canadian side," Mr. Lu wrote in *The Globe and Mail*. But make no mistake: Mr. Kovrig and Mr. Spavor are hostages. As Donald Clarke, professor of law at George Washington University in Washington, D.C., has noted, the critical element of a hostage-taking is that the perpetrator must tell you that it is a hostage-taking, and what his demands are, or otherwise the whole point is lost. As Mr. Clarke states: "The Chinese ambassador to Canada has not just admitted it; he has also proclaimed it in an op-ed."

Then there is the issue of Huawei and whether it can be trusted to participate in the installation of 5G equipment in Canada. In *The Hill Times*, Mr. Lu noted that some people in Canada have been promoting the idea that Chinese law requires Chinese companies to collaborate with the government in espionage activities. Without denying this, he goes on to point to the hypocrisy of programs like PRISM – which allowed the U.S. National Security Agency to eavesdrop on its own citizens, as exposed by Edward Snowden – in effect implying that Huawei would co-operate in the same way with the Chinese authorities as some U.S. companies did with the NSA. This is hardly reassuring. In fact, new Chinese security laws require that any organization and citizen shall "support, provide assistance, and co-operate in national intelligence work." Whether "national intelligence work" is different from "espionage activities" no doubt depends on your point of view. It is not surprising that Huawei, a Chinese company, would bow to

the will of the Chinese government if push came to shove, just as many U.S. companies apparently did by co-operating with the NSA, but two wrongs don't make a right.

It is his playing of the "white supremacy" race card that is the most offensive. Canada has a history of discrimination against Asian minorities; no one denies that. But to equate that history with the unequal legal treatment being meted out to a Chinese national in Canada and to two Canadian nationals in China in 2019 is to stand logic on its head. Using inflammatory language may play well back home – and perhaps his messages were intended more for a domestic audience, rather than a Canadian one. But for a Chinese diplomat, Mr. Lu's utter lack of diplomacy has not helped China's case.

.....

## CANADA AND CHINA: WHAT HAPPENS NEXT?

Written by: Hugh Stephens

University of Calgary, School of Public Policy, December 21, 2018

Canada's arrest of Huawei CFO Meng Wanzhou on a provisional US Department of Justice warrant on December 1, and the subsequent retaliatory detention in China of two Canadians, Michael Kovrig and Michael Spavor (and now reports of a third Canadian detainee), raise the obvious question as to what damage has been done to Canada-China relations over the short and longer term—and what will happen going forward. You would have to have a crystal ball to divine the inner workings and thinking of the leadership of the Chinese Communist Party, who after all are the ones ultimately calling the shots on this, but looking at past precedents as well as the state of play of current issues allows us to make some educated guesses.

First the detention of at least one Canadian in a tit-for-tat measure was predictable, given the experience of Kevin and Julia Garratt. The Garratts, long-time residents of China who were running a coffee shop on the China-North Korea border, were picked up and detained on national security charges in 2014 shortly (in effect held hostage) after Canada had facilitated the extradition to the US of a Chinese national resident in Canada accused by the US of cyberespionage. It took almost two years of lobbying for the Canadian government to get the Garratts released. Therefore the knee-jerk reaction by the Chinese of detaining a Canadian after Meng's arrest did not come as a surprise, as much as it was unjustified and reprehensible. What was a bit more surprising was China's detention of a second Canadian a few days later, Michael Spavor, like Kovrig apparently accused of violating China's notoriously vague national security laws. Now a third Canadian has reportedly been detained, and while the charges appear to be different from the two earlier hostage cases, one can never be sure. It is common practice for China to respond quickly to what it regards as "provocations", in part for internal consumption to show that the government and Party are "standing up for the Chinese people". Chinese public opinion is important despite a lack of direct democracy

in China, and the government is expected to defend Chinese interests vigorously. Moving beyond detentions, China has other measures that it can employ ranging from delaying or cancelling high level visits to making life difficult for Canadian companies operating in or exporting to China by invoking various regulatory measures as harassment. This kind of action has been employed in the past against Japanese, Korean and Norwegian companies.

So far, Chinese response has not moved to the next level, although Tourism Minister Melanie Joly delayed her planned trip to China to mark 2018 being Canada's "year of Chinese tourism". China is not going to be welcoming any Canadian cabinet ministers to celebrate the closeness of bilateral ties until the Meng situation is resolved, although high-level dialogue is badly needed. There have been suggestions that Foreign Minister Chrystia Freeland should go to Beijing but there is little point in her doing so until the Chinese indicate they are ready for dialogue. Until there is a clearer indication of Ms. Meng's fate, this is unlikely to happen. The Chinese will be looking for signs that she will be released but that decision, in the first instance at least, rests with the Canadian courts not the Canadian government.

What is likely to happen next? If common sense prevails China will hold off on any further escalation, allowing time for the legal process in Canada to run its course. There appears to be a reasonable prospect that the US may have difficulty in convincing a Canadian court that Ms. Meng has violated Canadian law, a necessary precondition for extradition to the US. China is doing itself no favours with its hostage tactics, sending signals to the international community that anyone working in China is potentially vulnerable. Another factor is the issue of Huawei's access to participation in building out Canada's 5G network, with Canada not yet having made a decision to follow the US lead and block Huawei as a security threat. Worth considering is that much of Huawei's 5G research is conducted in Canada and the company has invested heavily in R&D here, so the economic consequences for Canada in blacklisting Huawei are greater than for the US. Sooner or later however Canada will have to announce its decision, and the timing of that decision could trigger a further Chinese reaction if the decision is negative. At the same time, the more China plays hardball with Canada over Ms. Meng, the more they risk pushing Canada into the US camp regarding Huawei.

(The US could play an important role in resolving the situation. If US-China 90 day trade truce leads to positive results, there would be a considerable lowering of the temperature. The US could also play a more active behind the scenes role in convincing China to release the Canadians in detention and cease targeting Canada with further measures. Canada has taken a bullet for the US but the extent to which Washington is prepared to actively help defend Canadian interests is an open question.)

Canada and China have had a robust diplomatic and economic relationship for many years and both countries derive significant economic benefit through bilateral trade in goods and services, investment, tourism and student exchanges. That relationship has weathered storms in the past, and over the longer term it is likely that the Meng affair will not cause permanent damage. However, China's new assertiveness and retaliatory tactics, combined with unhelpful comments and lukewarm response from the US, and Chinese unwillingness to accept that the Canadian government cannot just "make this

go away” risks further escalation over the short term. Both Canadian individuals resident in China and Canadian businesses should be cautious until the Meng case is resolved, making sure that their personal affairs in China are in good order.

---

## Does Canada Need a Foreign Policy Review

Randolf Mank

January 2019

Canadian Global Affairs Institute

### Executive Summary

Canada’s contemporary foreign policy has been shaped by deep integration with, and dependence on, the United States, offset by multilateral support for a rules-based international order. The Trump administration’s confrontational nationalism, combined with other global events and trends, has now disrupted Canada’s position and assumptions.

This raises the question of whether or not it’s time for a Canadian foreign policy review.

While the Trudeau government deserves credit for several initiatives, a series of discontinuities in Canada’s domestic and foreign policies suggests that our interests could be better served.

The Canadian government has two main options: it can follow its current path of adjusting its policies in an ad hoc fashion, while waiting out the Trump administration and hoping for more favourable successors, or it can attempt to set Canada on a new path, in which case a foreign policy review would be warranted.

The review option would only be useful if everything were on the table, including what to do about bilateral relations with the U.S., the future of our multilateral commitments, and domestic policies on such critical global issues as energy and the environment. The ultimate goal should be to advance Canada’s national interests through better aligned domestic and foreign policies.

### Introduction

Though far from perfect, Canada has been blessed with a favourable geographic location, enviable natural assets and effective democratic governance over the years.

Today, in Justin Trudeau, the country is led by a prime minister who fits the idealistic mold of the polite, decent and earnest Canadian, intent on tackling the difficult task of managing conflicting constituency interests at home, while advocating progressive social issues abroad. His government deserves credit for concluding important trade deals and championing the liberal international order. It also deserves credit for undertaking several domestic policy initiatives, ranging from encouraging women in the workforce to incentivizing business investment.

Yet, like all others before it, the Trudeau government has faced criticism, fair or otherwise, over its handling of foreign policy since it took office in November 2015. Contentious Canada-U.S. relations around NAFTA renegotiations, missteps during bilateral visits to China and India, weak NATO commitments and even frictions with Saudi Arabia, have been among the targets.<sup>1</sup> Domestically, criticisms have included the growing fiscal deficit and national debt, and problems in the energy sector.

Meanwhile, the global context is changing, with fundamental challenges arising from an ascendant China, a re-assertive Russia, and Britain's withdrawal from the E.U. This, against a backdrop of portentous changes in technology, energy markets and the global climate, along with mounting global debt, a growing wealth gap, failing states, religious conflict and massive refugee movements.

But by far the most important and unanticipated development for Canada has been the Trump administration's ardent nationalism. The president's apparent disdain for maintaining mutually beneficial bilateral relations with Canada and other key allies has been a wake-up call. Moreover, the Trump administration's disregard for the Wilsonian tradition of promoting democratic values and international institutions has created new risks for global stability.

The question arises: have we reached a point where a full-scale foreign policy review is necessary in Canada? Is this the right time for it, and what might it achieve?

Let's look first at what foreign policy is and what it is meant to do.

What is foreign policy?

A country's foreign policy is both an expression of its international intentions and a roadmap for achieving its national interests beyond its borders. A country's international interests are highly dependent on its internal affairs and domestic policies, as well as its historical and geographic position and culture.<sup>2</sup>

Components of an effective foreign policy normally include strategies for protecting national security, promoting trade and economic interests, and playing a role on the global stage. Political leaders and officials pursue these strategies through bilateral and multilateral institutions, using whatever levers of power and influence are at their disposal in conducting international relations.

Foreign policy interests can be further divided into the vital and non-vital.<sup>3</sup> Vital interests are those upon which a country's very survival depends. These usually endure over time and involve the security of the population and borders, along with the viability of the economy and the political system itself.

Non-vital interests relate more to satisfying aspirations for influence in the world and often reflect moral values. Initiatives in this category can actually help advance a country's interest in maintaining beneficial international rules. They can also provide a sense of national purpose. Yet, a country's existence is not directly threatened (though it may be indirectly at risk) if these aspirations are not realized.

George Kennan, who led the U.S. State Department's policy planning function during the Cold War period, drew an important distinction between state interests and morality.<sup>4</sup> Unfortunately, the pursuit of non-vital interests, if taken too far, can blur the hard necessity of protecting vital ones. To paraphrase British Lord Palmerston's famous 1848 remark, countries do not have permanent friends, only permanent interests.<sup>5</sup> The recent American zero-sum approach to NAFTA renegotiations and Mexico's move to cut a bilateral deal without Canada were useful reminders of this reality.

How has Canada's foreign policy evolved?

We can't know where we want to go if we don't know where we've been. History shows a struggle to find balance between vital and non-vital interests and between dependence and independence in Canada's foreign policy.

Colonial ties to Great Britain, including to this day a shared head of state, shaped Canada's national and foreign policies following the country's formation in 1867. Resisting the pull of the U.S. was the central nation-building priority from the very start.<sup>6</sup> The construction of a national railway to connect the east and west, coupled with the national policy centred on erecting a high tariff wall against U.S. imports, were key components of the national project designed to achieve this goal. Aggressive immigration policies of the early 1900s, aimed at settling Canada's western regions, were also part of a foreign policy designed to resist the pull of the more natural bilateral partner.<sup>7</sup>

But geography is destiny in foreign policy and so, gradually and inevitably, the partnership with the southern neighbour grew closer. Already in the early 1900s, Canada and the U.S. had begun co-operation on trans-boundary water issues, which eventually led to the establishment in 1912 of the International Joint Commission for co-operative management of the Great Lakes watershed.<sup>8</sup>

Canada gained control of its own foreign and defence policy from Great Britain following passage of the Statute of Westminster in 1931.<sup>9</sup> Canada's entry into both world wars preceded U.S. entry, and was based on enduring ties to Great Britain.<sup>10</sup> But, by the 1950s, aided and abetted by the postwar baby boom and advances in transportation and

communications technology, especially television, Canada slowly began to accede to the logic of closer integration with the U.S.

Overt resistance to the U.S. in Canada's foreign policy was gradually channelled into a strong internationalism centred on defining Canada's role in the world. Former prime minister Louis St. Laurent signalled this focus in a seminal foreign policy speech in 1947.<sup>11</sup> In helping to resolve the 1956 Suez crisis, itself one of many events marking the ultimate sunset of British imperial power, Canadian diplomat and later prime minister Lester Pearson opened up a new multilateral role for Canada in international peacekeeping.<sup>12</sup>

However, the tensions and even contradictions between strong nationalism and closer bilateral integration continued into modern times, with a noteworthy burst of anti-Americanism in the 1960s, partly fuelled by opposition to the Vietnam War.<sup>13</sup> This occurred despite already deeply integrated bilateral economic and security arrangements in the form of the Auto Pact, the bi-national North American Air Defence (NORAD) arrangement, as well as the multilateral North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). To add to the contradiction, some 20,000 Canadians reportedly volunteered to fight in Vietnam.<sup>14</sup>

Former prime minister Pierre Trudeau and his successors carried Canadian internationalism forward in the 1970s and 1980s with occasional displays of foreign policy independence from the U.S.<sup>15</sup> Examples included maintaining bilateral relations with Cuba during the Cold War, extending official recognition to China in 1970, ahead of the U.S., and later declining to participate in the "Star Wars" Strategic Defence Initiative (SDI) program the Reagan administration introduced.



**Figure 1:** Mexican President Carlos Salinas de Gortari, U.S. President George H. W. Bush, and Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney, at the initialing of the draft North American Free Trade Agreement in October 1992. (Source: Providence)

The notion of a more integrated North America still met with great resistance in the 1980s. Fear of American dominance led to deeply divisive national debates in 1987-1988 prior to concluding the first Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement.<sup>16</sup> Equally fractious debates preceded the 1994 signing of the trilateral North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), which brought Mexico into the arrangement. Liberal leader Jean Chrétien ran a successful campaign in 1993 opposing then-prime minister Brian Mulroney's NAFTA deal, but once in office concluded the agreement with former president Bill Clinton who, interestingly, needed side agreements on labour and the environment to gain congressional support.<sup>17</sup> As if to salve the shift in his own position, as prime minister Chrétien initiated a fundamental review of Canada's foreign policy, which resulted in a government white paper published in 1995, again emphasizing Canadian multilateralism.<sup>18</sup>

Since then, however, national debates over whether or not to have such bilateral trade agreements have largely given way to broad public recognition of their benefits, with the only arguments being what provisions should or should not be in them. In that sense, the country has changed fundamentally, with resistance to the economic pull of the U.S. largely replaced by its embrace.

Under the surface, however, deep cleavages still remain in Canada. As economist and historian Harold Innis illustrated in his "staples theory", the country has developed economically and politically from east to west around the exploitation of specific natural resources, from fish and furs to forests, grains and minerals.<sup>19</sup> The development of western energy resources, with political tensions over their control, very much fits this pattern. The struggle to balance these interests has been further complicated by a federal-provincial political structure, French-English linguistic duality and Indigenous people's rights, all of which pose fundamental domestic challenges to the pursuit of a united, interests-based foreign policy.

What are Canada's foreign policy interests?

This brings us to where we are today. It would be difficult to deny that Canada's overarching vital interest is to maintain a secure and open border for bilateral trade and a strong security alliance with the U.S. Some 75 per cent of our exports go to the U.S., our main economic sectors are deeply integrated, and our security depends on bi-national joint command arrangements with the world's pre-eminent military power.<sup>20</sup>

Other vital interests include defending our sovereign borders, and protecting ourselves and the global system through a strong NATO alliance, a viable United Nations organization, and a rules-based global trading system adjudicated by the World Trade Organization (WTO).

The pursuit of even these interests, however, requires careful management of Canada-U.S. relations. For example, the U.S. does not accept Canadian sovereignty over the Northwest Passage. Similarly, the U.S. applies pressure on Canada (and other allies) to

spend two per cent or more of GDP on defence, which is about double the amount that Canada has recently been willing to spend. Meanwhile, Canada's passionate advocacy of the post-Second World War rules-based international order and its international institutions – founded and funded by the U.S – have now been called into question by the Trump administration, with potentially destabilizing consequences.

The multilateral side of foreign policy includes promoting human rights, advocating international conventions via the UN, participating in peacekeeping and so on. Pursuing these interests not only signals support for the international order upon which we depend, it also has domestic value for creating a sense of national purpose.

Unfortunately, however, might is right has been a reality in international affairs throughout history. Even in the modern world, advocating basic human rights can lead to bilateral tensions, as for example in the August 2018 bilateral dispute with Saudi Arabia over the arrest of Samar Badawi, sister of imprisoned Saudi activist Raif Badawi.<sup>21</sup>

The space for such internationalism has always largely depended on Canada's status as a client state, first of Great Britain and now the U.S. As “a state that is economically, politically, or militarily subordinate to another more powerful state”,<sup>22</sup> Canada could confidently advance a globalist agenda as long as its dominant partner was set on the same path. In effect, this has meant that foreign policy decisions taken in Washington D.C. have been as consequential to Canada's interests as our own foreign policy decisions. The Bush administration's decisions after 9/11 – the temporary closure of the Canada-U.S. border and the decision to go to war in Afghanistan – were just two very clear demonstrations of this reality.

Of course, Canada has still been able to pick and choose its points of resistance. Canada did not follow the U.S. into war with Iraq in 2003. But Canada has nevertheless had to leaven its differences with shows of support. So, for example, Canada quickly fell into line with the U.S. perimeter defence strategy for North America post-9/11, passing a security budget with almost C\$8 billion in spending within months of the attacks.<sup>23</sup>

Yet, the Trump administration's new hardline approach forces Canada to address the fundamental question of whether or not its foreign policy continues to serve its national interests.

Is Canada's foreign policy aligned with its interests?

The Trudeau government's foreign policy can be discerned from the Liberal Party platform prior to its election,<sup>24</sup> by ministerial speeches and statements in public forums and the House of Commons,<sup>25</sup> by already completed development and defence policy reviews<sup>26</sup> and by budgetary spending.<sup>27</sup> Officially, the priorities are to promote international order, advance feminism, pursue progressive trade and maintain constructive relations with the U.S.<sup>28</sup>

Whereas an effective foreign policy should cohere with domestic policy and advance national interests, unfortunately we see a series of real discontinuities. Let's look at arguably the three biggest.

The first is in the area of Canada-U.S. trade. A proactive strategy of renegotiating NAFTA was clearly not among the Trudeau government's priorities when it was sworn in. But the Trump administration's threat to withdraw from NAFTA vaulted the bilateral trade relationship to the top of Canada's foreign policy priority list where, in reality, it always belonged.

Canada attempted to make a virtue of necessity by quickly signalling support for modernizing NAFTA, but the objective really became to preserve as much of the existing agreement as possible. Despite fielding a strong negotiating team, the government was clearly unable to control the agenda and appeared to be on the back foot throughout. As the negotiations wore on, the U.S. eventually sidelined Canada in favour of concluding a deal with Mexico first. In the end, presented with a take-it-or-leave-it proposition, Canada had little choice but to declare victory on several hard-fought points and concede the rest.

Though not yet ratified, the new U.S.-Mexico-Canada Agreement, (USMCA) will clearly perpetuate economic integration with the U.S., which is both positive and negative. The positive side is that Canada will retain favourable access to the world's pre-eminent market. Already highly integrated economic sectors should also avoid major disruption. The negative side is that Canada will remain subject to potentially damaging trade protectionist policies, including tariffs on steel and aluminum and on goods from China and elsewhere, and to U.S. domestic policy moves around taxation, deregulation and the like. America's economic vitality itself is potentially undermined by an annual fiscal deficit approaching US\$1 trillion, a growing national debt now at US\$21 trillion (100 per cent of GDP), and mounting state, corporate and consumer debt.<sup>29</sup> Deep bilateral integration means that, by choice, Canada is subject to any negative consequences of these factors.

A second major discontinuity concerns domestic and foreign policy on energy and the environment. The government's commitment to limiting carbon emissions, in line with the UN Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris climate change agreement,<sup>30</sup> has been fundamentally undermined by the Trump administration's withdrawal from that accord. Canada's commitment has also been contradicted by its support for pipeline construction to sell oil and gas to Asian markets. The government's purchase of the stalled Trans-Mountain pipeline project from Kinder Morgan in 2018 appeared to demonstrate its intention to see the project through to completion.<sup>31</sup> However, ongoing efforts to pass bills C-48 and 69, which would further tighten environmental regulations around oil tankers and pipeline construction, have sent contradictory signals to the industry.<sup>32</sup>



further alienated the energy sector.<sup>37</sup> Several provincial governments have also rejected the tax, setting the stage for a rupture in federal-provincial relations.

As an aside, while controversy has surrounded the morality of selling C\$15 billion in armoured vehicles to Saudi Arabia,<sup>38</sup> Canada has imported over C\$20 billion worth of oil from the Kingdom during just the past 10 years for energy needs that arguably could have been met at home.<sup>39</sup>

The third major discontinuity arises from the government's decision to conduct development and defence policy reviews without the umbrella of an overall foreign policy review to provide context. The government's gender priority again drove the aid review, which was published as *Canada's Feminist International Assistance Policy*.<sup>40</sup> More critically, the defence review, *Strong, Secure, Engaged*, failed to set out a convincing plan for meeting Canada's own needs and its NATO military spending commitments.<sup>41</sup> The U.S. decision to create a new space force came later, and Canada's role in it is therefore left undefined.<sup>42</sup> Persistent problems surrounding defence equipment procurement also remain unresolved. The situation has festered to the point that the former commander of the navy is facing trial for allegedly trying to expedite shipbuilding inappropriately, and the government has been forced to purchase used aircraft from Australia to fill the gap caused by a decade of delays in the jet fighter replacement program. In sum, unfortunate timing and poor sequencing rendered both policy reviews far less relevant to changed circumstances than they could have been and, as a result, leave Canada looking out of step.

While these may be the three biggest discontinuities, there are certainly others. Canada's demand that Russia return Crimea to Ukraine has been accompanied by sanctions and military support for the region, including military training in Ukraine<sup>43</sup> and a deployment to Latvia.<sup>44</sup> Yet, the more fundamental foreign policy questions around NATO enlargement up to the borders of Russia, and the longer term viability of denying spheres of influence to Russia and China, have yet to be considered in the broader geopolitical context. With the U.S. in the clear lead, Canada significantly lacking military capacity and Canada's Foreign Affairs Minister Chrystia Freeland barred from even visiting Russia,<sup>45</sup> Canada's reach probably exceeds its grasp on Eastern European diplomatic and security issues.

Last, after a delay of many years the government has finally committed Canada to a new peacekeeping role. But its decision to send an air support mission to Mali<sup>46</sup> is widely seen as a move to bolster Canada's bid for a non-permanent UN Security Council seat in 2021.<sup>47</sup> Aside from the merits of the Mali mission itself, there is no clear agenda for what we would hope to achieve in the Security Council role.

These discontinuities suggest gaps in Canada's foreign policy thinking and a lack of alignment with, and clarity about, a range of its key interests.

## Addressing global challenges

In addition to these policy discontinuities, there have certainly been global changes in recent years that affect Canada. President Donald Trump's disruptions go beyond the bilateral relationship. Language in the USMCA deal that effectively constrains Canada's latitude to negotiate a free trade deal with China is one significant example.<sup>48</sup>

But there are many other challenges. Great Britain's decision to withdraw from the European Union following the Brexit referendum continues to unfold and will have profound implications for Europe. Canada needs to position itself for the effects of the split. At minimum, Canada will need a new trade agreement with Great Britain, while working with the private sector to reap benefits from the still new Canada-Europe Comprehensive and Economic Trade Agreement (CETA).<sup>49</sup>

Re-emergent Russian aggression in regional hotspots has been mentioned.<sup>50</sup> But Russia's alleged meddling in the 2016 U.S. presidential election<sup>51</sup> also raises issues of Canada's own election security. To its credit, the Canadian government initiated a cybersecurity review in 2016, led by Public Safety Canada, and its rollout is ongoing.<sup>52</sup> But the convergence of rapid technological advances around computing power, Big Data, social networking, artificial intelligence, robotics and nano-technology raises unprecedented security threats and suggests the need for a new kind of quantum diplomacy.<sup>53</sup> The arms control and disarmament treaties of the future may well centre on these areas.

Asia is another area deserving special focus, given its size and growth prospects. China's move to extend sovereignty over the South China Sea by building artificial islands and placing military installations on them has changed fundamental security calculations in the region. China's Belt and Road Initiative, designed to revive the old Silk Road trade routes over land and sea, has further regional and global implications.<sup>54</sup>

Though the successful conclusion of the Comprehensive and Progressive Trans-Pacific Partnership (CPTPP) Agreement<sup>55</sup> has assured Canada an improvement in market access in Asia – most importantly in Japan – we continue merely to study the desirability of a free trade agreement with the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN).<sup>56</sup> In the absence of such an agreement, Canada is shut out of the ongoing negotiations to create a regional comprehensive economic partnership (RCEP). While largely ignored in Canada, when negotiations are completed in 2019, the RCEP will become the world's largest liberalized trading zone with a combined population of 3.5 billion people and a GDP of US\$25 trillion, linking China, India, South Korea, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and ASEAN.<sup>57</sup>

Elsewhere, the near-collapse of Venezuela, combined with stresses in the Middle East and Africa, has increased the potential for economic disruption and conflict. Debt and foreign exchange crises in various countries have posed threats to global economic stability. Massive refugee movements have put strains on immigration and social services in Canada and other countries. The thawing of the polar ice cap and the

increased interest in shipping through the Northwest Passage portend yet another disruptive development.

In short, change is constant and the challenges numerous. But would a foreign policy review help?

When are foreign policy reviews conducted?

A case can be made for re-examining foreign policy whenever the global context has changed substantially, as it has now. But timing is a crucial consideration and the electoral cycle is key. The last Canadian foreign policy review was begun in early 2001, and was characterized at the time as a modest “update”.<sup>58</sup> The Chrétien government had been re-elected to its third mandate in November 2000 and was looking for fresh ideas.

With Lloyd Axworthy in the foreign minister role from January 1996, there had been some genuine achievements in the multilateral arena: the Ottawa Convention banning anti-personnel landmines, the establishment of the International Criminal Court (ICC) and the UN’s Responsibility to Protect initiative. However, the U.S. did not accept the ICC’s jurisdiction and the court’s proceedings were slow and inconsistent. Canada’s rhetoric about the responsibility to protect was contradicted by even its own reluctance to get involved in the messy internal affairs of other countries when it came to specific cases. And the commitment of resources to peacekeeping had actually declined.

The shift to a new foreign minister, John Manley, in late 2000, meant the timing was right to take a fresh look. The foreign affairs policy planning team at the time believed that the goal should be to achieve a better balance between the pursuit of interests and values, and between the use of bilateral and multilateral instruments. As an explicit proposal, it meant admitting that managing practical relations with the U.S. had to be Canada’s top foreign policy priority, with government spending aligned accordingly, rather than looking for new multilateral initiatives.

As a counter-balance, it also meant prioritizing other key bilateral, instead of mainly multilateral, relations in foreign policy. This included bilateral relationships with other G7 partners, the U.K., Germany, France, Italy and Japan, along with other emerging giants such as Mexico, Brazil, China and India.

The proposal to place Canada-U.S. relations front and centre failed to gain traction at the political level even up to the summer of 2001, not because the U.S. relationship wasn’t obviously important, but because the Canadian public would not necessarily want to hear it formulated so explicitly. After all, as St. Laurent had said: “It is not customary in this country for us to think in terms of having a policy in regard to the United States.”<sup>59</sup>

The terrorist attacks of Sept. 11, 2001 changed that and demonstrated how thoroughly U.S. imperatives could shape Canadian priorities. The low-key foreign policy update

suddenly became an urgent action item. Proposals for strengthening Canada-U.S. relations, including better management of the border, became top priorities, with the post-9/11 emergency security budget focused on precisely these measures. The U.S. invasion of Afghanistan drew Canada's military into a major deployment of its own. Canada assumed the chair of the G8 process in 2002 and, at the U.S.'s insistence, delivered not only a counter-terrorism action plan, but also a \$20 billion Global Partnership Against the Spread of Weapons and Materials of Mass Destruction. As its contribution to this, Canada itself committed an unprecedented \$100 million annually for 10 years.

Subsequent rifts in the Liberal caucus, which led to Paul Martin taking the prime ministerial role in December 2003, along with changes in foreign ministers, shifted the still ongoing foreign policy review to the back burner after that. It took several more years to draft, consult and, finally in 2005, publish the official documents. A Global Fund for Peace and Security was established as a key deliverable. But by then, the world and Canada had moved on. The new Stephen Harper government, which took office in February 2006, promptly shelved and ignored the review.<sup>60</sup>

As for the current situation, Canada faces a similar timing problem for a foreign policy review, three years into the Trudeau government and less than one year from the next federal election. The renegotiation of NAFTA has been completed and, if ratified, has arguably already affected Canadian interests beyond any other policy initiative that might be conjured up.

The government certainly has the valid option of sticking with its current policies and waiting to see how events unfold. Yet it is open to the criticism that its foreign policy directions have not been subjected to broad public debate or a more comprehensive search for areas of improvement.

What foreign policy options might be considered?

If the government's ambition extends only to minor adjustments, there are certainly things that could be done, with or without a foreign policy review. Ideas left on the table after the last review include the creation of a special agency for trade policy along the lines of the U.S. Trade Representative (USTR), further improvements in Canada-U.S. border management and crossing facilities, the strengthening of defence co-operation, including ground-based ballistic missile defence, and the doubling of the Trade Commissioner Service to assist companies abroad and attract foreign investment.

However, the truth is that none of these will address the more fundamental problems in Canada's foreign policy. For that level of ambition, a foreign policy review would be useful. But it would only be truly productive if everything were on the table for Canadians to consider and debate, including the discontinuities outlined previously, as well as the fundamental connections between domestic and foreign policies. If such a review resulted in a conscious choice of even closer co-operation with the U.S., then

devising a package of initiatives to strengthen relations would yield the benefit of driving improved policy coherence.



**Figure 3:** Minister of International Trade Diversification, Jim Carr, brought together a collection of Ministerial delegates from 13 members of the World Trade Organization on Oct. 25, 2018 in Ottawa. This meeting was generally seen as a preliminary step to restarting broad discussions on how to reform the WTO. (Source: The Canadian Press)

However, a review might also reveal that Canadians wish to reduce dependence on the U.S. The Trudeau government created a new Minister of Trade Diversification portfolio in July 2018, already seeming to signal its intention to move Canada away from its current level of trade dependency. However, such a move will require more than a change in ministerial title. It will require pulling off the delicate trick of preserving as much benefit as possible from the relationship with the U.S., while investing heavily in the conditions for its reduction in relative importance over time.

As the world's second largest economy, China is sometimes viewed as the key to diversification, but a free trade deal with China must be approached cautiously. First, the caveat implicitly requiring U.S. approval of such a free trade deal, under the USMCA, limits Canada's scope of action. More fundamentally, increased trade with China would bring a different set of problems, especially around security, human rights and democratic governance. The December 2018 arrest in Vancouver of Meng Wanzhou, Huawei's chief financial officer, in response to a U.S. request for her extradition, and the subsequent retaliatory detentions of two Canadians in China, illustrate just how exposed Canada is in the U.S.-China rivalry. It also demonstrates that, despite Canada's spirited defence of international law, powerful countries often play by different rules when their interests are at stake.

In any case, China will be less amenable to increased trade with Canada until the Huawei issue is resolved. Of course, China isn't Canada's only option for diversification. But any concerted move in that direction would require a deep review of the policies

necessary to achieve it, along with broad buy-in from the Canadian public and provinces.

### In Conclusion

Foreign policy reviews are intensive exercises. They should not be undertaken lightly and shouldn't be begun at all if there is no appetite for real change.

The Trump administration's actions against NAFTA and the post-Second World War global order pose a profound challenge to Canada's foreign policy assumptions. While 9/11 drew the two countries closer together bilaterally, the Trump administration's moves have driven a wedge into the relationship. Whether it will endure into the future, no one can predict. In the meantime, global geopolitics are changing profoundly, as well.

In the end, the Canadian government can choose between two main options: it can follow its current path and only adjust foreign policy as necessary, while waiting out the Trump administration and hoping for more favourable successors, or it can try to set Canada on a new path. The first option has the benefits of being cheaper and less time consuming than a full policy review. It also preserves flexibility, though at the cost of ceding initiative.

The second option would require greater cost and effort, but there would be merit in looking for new ways to reset Canada-U.S. relations, perhaps even searching for some new leverage. This might mean options for even closer co-operation on border efficiency and security, as well as on continental defence, including a joint space force and ballistic missile defence.

Following the bruising NAFTA renegotiations, looking for ways to reduce our dependence would also be justifiable, not least because of the signal it would send bilaterally. Of course, the Brexit experience offers a cautionary tale; Canada cannot defy its geographic destiny. Reducing economic dependence on the U.S. even over a decade or two, though not impossible, would require a national project with costly and divisive elements.

In sum, Canada has arrived at an inflection point. Given the deep issues at play, a full foreign policy review would seem warranted, if not prior to the 2019 election then early in the new government's mandate. Given the country's historical evolution and today's geopolitical realities, Canada could only benefit from an opportunity to define and pursue its national interests more clearly and purposefully. Change is being thrust upon the country and Canadians should have a voice in how their government is handling it.

.....

Serbia's Agony in The Great War

Esprit de Corps Magazine, Volume 25 Issue 12

James Bissett

On July 26 of this year a commemorative plaque was unveiled at the Ottawa City Hall by Mayor Jim Watson and the Serbian Ambassador to Canada Mihailo Papazoglu, to honour the first and the last soldiers killed in WW1. The first soldier to killed was a 16year old Serbian, Dusan Djonovic of the Babunski Detachment, killed by a shell fired into Belgrade from an Austria-Hungarian monitor on the Danube river on the night of July 28 1914. The last soldier killed was a Canadian, George Lawrence Price of the 28th Battalion ,Canadian infantry, who was shot by a German sniper at 10.58 A.M. on November 11 1918.

Not surprisingly, few Canadians are aware of the role played by Serbia in the Great War of 1914-1918, and in all of the recent articles and ceremonies celebrating the 100th anniversary marking the end of that catastrophic event, there has been little, or no mention of the terrible sacrifices paid by Serbia's contribution to the allied victory. As well, few are aware of the strong connection between Canada and Serbia during the conflict.

Shamefully, at the gathering of world leaders in Paris to celebrate the ending of the War, the President of Serbia, Aleksander Vucic was denied by his French hosts a place on the platform of the Arch de Triumph, along with the other Heads of State . Adding insult to injury, Hashim Thaci, the President of Kosovo was among the world leaders on the platform. Although the French ambassador to Belgrade has apologized for this outrage there has been no satisfactory explanation offered by France. During the war Serbia had proven to be the staunchest ally of France and paid a dreadful price for being so. An insult of this magnitude cannot be forgiven even if one hundred years have gone by.

The event that triggered the beginning of WW1 was the assassination on June 28 1914, of Crown Prince Franz Ferdinand. of Austria-Hungary by a young Serbian patriot. In reality, both Austria -Hungary and Germany had already set out detailed plans for an expected war against France and Russia. Both countries feared the rapidly industrial capacity of Russia and its military alliance with a vengeful France. Time was on the side of Russia and the killing of Franz Ferdinand gave them the perfect pretext for a preemptive war.

.Austria - Hungary issued a provocative ultimatum to Serbia, drafted in collaboration with Berlin, which was worded to ensure it would be rejected. As expected it was rejected by the Serbs. Austria-Hungary declared war. A chain reaction followed, and within days Russia, France, and England were at war with Germany and Austria-Hungary. The Great War had begun.

Germany's well prepared war plan was put into effect immediately. It was based on the need to avoid as quickly as possible a war on two fronts. The first phase was to knock France out of the war in 40 days by a lightning strike through Belgium, At the same time, Austria - Hungary was to launch a massive offensive against the Russian in Galicia and holding them there until, after defeating the French, the Germans would join them. As history has shown, these well laid plans did not work out.

The Germans were stopped at the battle of the Marne and the Austrian-Hungarian war lords decided to send a large part of their forces to punish Serbia. But, by doing so found their army in Galicia facing a much superior Russian enemy. Moreover, they had badly underestimated the fighting power of the Serbian army. In 1914 Serbia's population was only 4 million but it was able to raise an army of close to 500,000 battle hardened troops led by highly qualified officers. The Serbian army was a formidable fighting force as was soon to be shown.

Austria - Hungary in 1914 had a population over just over 50 million. Its peacetime army totaled 450,000 and after mobilization it expanded to 3.350,000 men. However, the army was poorly trained, led by incompetent officers. Its ranks contained a variety mix of different ethnic groups, many of whom were of Slavic origin and not enthusiastic about fighting fellow Slavs. Nevertheless, few military experts expected Serbia able to withstand the Hapsburg onslaught.

The invasion of Serbia, as expected, took place along the river Drina, the border between Austrian -held Bosnia and Serbia. The Austrians crossed the river but were met with a fierce and skillful resistance. The battle, named after Mont Cerna, lasted for ten days and the Austrians were forced back across the Drina in full flight suffering heavy casualties. Vienna received the news with shock and embarrassment and mourned the fate of one of its famous military unit's the Deutschmeister Regiment that had only 450 men left out of 8000 who had crossed the Drina.

Serbia knew that over time it could not win a war against the Hapsburg empire but hoped it could hold out long enough to get help from its French and British allies. However, these allies were at the time in full retreat in France. Serbia was on its own. The second invasion attempt took place in September with more initial success and on December 2 Belgrade fell to the invaders.

The Serbian forces had also taken heavy casualties and were on the verge of exhaustion. Nevertheless, their commander, with the aging and ailing King Peter at his side, urged his troop to make one last charge against the Austrian trenches. Incredibly, the Serbs were successful, retook Belgrade and drove the Austrians out of Serbia.

This battle known as the battle of the Kolubara river was a major victory and not only for the Serbs, but also for their French and British allies who were struggling to withstand German advances in France and Flanders. After the battle of Kolubara river the fighting in the Balkan sector died down. and the Austrians did not launch another invasion. The fighting had cost both sides heavy losses. The Serbian casualties amounted to 170,000, killed, wounded, captured or missing ,while the Austrian-Hungarian losses were approximately 215.000.

However, the respite was short lived. The following year, in 1915, the Balkans again became strategically important. The British and ANZAC landings in Gallipoli threatened to take Turkey out of the war and the Germans were forced to react. They did so by leading another attack against Serbia aided by Austria - Hungary and Bulgaria who had

entered the war on the side of Germany. The importance of this campaign to the Germans was stressed by the commander chosen to lead the invasion; Field Marshall, August von Mackensen , considered to be the most successful commander of WW1.

On the eve of the attack on Serbia the Field Marshall addressed his troops with the following warning :

“You are not going to the Italian, or the Russian, or French front. You are going into a fight with a new enemy who is dangerous, tough, brave , and smart. You are going to the Serbian front, to Serbia, and the Serbs are a people who love their freedom and who are willing to fight for it to their last .Do your best so this miniscule enemy does not overshadow you,”

Encountering overwhelming force the Serbian army was forced to retreat but refused to surrender. Instead they decided to cross into neighboring Albania and the mountains of Montenegro in the middle of winter to reach the Adriatic coast where they hoped to be rescued by the allies. Incredibly, it was not only the army that set out on this amazing trek but also the government, the diplomats, the Royal Court and the King and thousands of civilians joined. Over 140,000 lives were lost to famine, exhaustion, disease or sniping by Albanian gangs, but an equal number of the troops survived and reached the coast where they were transported by Italian and French ships to the Greek island of Corfu.

Within three months these survivors were formed into a strong fighting force and were moved to the Salonika front to join with French and British armies to act as shock troops against German and Bulgarian defenders who were dug in to strongholds in the treacherous Balkan mountain terrain. In a campaign that has received little attention by WW1 historians the so-called Balkan front played a key role in the latter part of 1918 to break the back of the German forces. The British and French commanders involved give particular credit to the Serbian troops, who in September 1918, liberated Belgrade and continued to pursue the enemy until the war ended.

Serbia and its people paid a dreadful price for the sacrifices and contributions made during WW1. Quite apart from the military deaths the civilian population also suffered terribly. The occupation by the Austrian-Hungarian and Bulgarian army was brutal with hundreds of men and women hanged or shot; thousands died of famine, typhoid and other diseases. There were over a million deaths and 65% of the men between the ages of 15 and 65 died during the conflict. Unfortunately, all of this is unknown or forgotten except for the Serbian relatives of the dead who remain proud of their country's heroism.

## Links

Jeremy Kinsman  
Canada-China Parliamentary Delegation

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1SgYWzN7KpHHw1h7wtZF75G4yAGiURbNo/view?usp=sharing>

CTV News January 15, 2019

Brexit Deal Defeat

<https://www.facebook.com/CTVNewsChannel/videos/558400737972693/>