



ROYAL MILITARY COLLEGE OF CANADA
Department of Political Science and Economics
POE416 – Canadian Foreign and Security Policy
Winter 2020

Instructor: Major Mike G. Fejes
Office: Girouard Building, Room 416
Phone: 613.541.6000 ext. 6425
Email: michael.fejes@rmc-cmr.ca
Office Hours: Friday, 1100-1300, or by appointment
Class Times: Friday, 0800-1050
Location: Sawyer Building 3411

Course Description:

"You [Canada] have a lot of opinions about what the world order should be but relatively little interest in actually engaging to make it so," Dr Fred Kagen

This course offers a study of how Canada's foreign and security policy is developed and implemented. Particular attention will be paid to the actors and their respective interests, at the individual, domestic, international and global levels of analysis that influence the formulation of Canada's foreign and security policy. Learning objectives include: illustrating the decision-making and implementation process of Canada's foreign and security policy; classify actors at different levels of analysis that influence Canada's foreign and security policy; distinguishing between national and foreign factors, including social, political, economic, security and infrastructure concerns, which are a condition of policy-making; and infer policy directions from the interests of actors

Learning Outcomes:

- To better understand the different conceptualizations of Canadian Foreign and Security Policy;
- To be able to analyze the various theories presented over the course of the term on the different aspects of Canadian Foreign and Security Policy;
- To apply the various concepts to events in the world today and in the recent past, both to assess the applicability of the concepts and to gain insights into the key dynamics of these events;
- To improve individual research and writing skills in both short and long forms via the course assignments;

- To develop an ability to articulate opinions and arguments via course participation and the presentations at the end of the term; and
- To develop an ability to discern the policy implications found within Canadian Foreign and Security Policy decisions.

Academic Misconduct: Plagiarism and Complementarity

Academic misconduct, including plagiarism, cheating, and other violations of academic ethics, is a serious academic infraction for which penalties may range from a recorded caution to expulsion from the College. Academic misconduct is a grave offence in any university, but even more so at RMC, because it is intrinsically counter to CAF values and as future commissioned officers, to your individual morals and ethics. Any assignment handed in to me is subject to entry into RMC's plagiarism detection software

The RMCC Academic Regulations Section 23 defines plagiarism as: *“Using the work of others and attempting to present it as original thought, prose or work. This includes failure to appropriately acknowledge a source, misrepresentation of cited work, and misuse of quotation marks or attribution.”* It also includes *“the failure to acknowledge that work has been submitted for credit elsewhere.”* If you plan on writing on related topics in different courses, you must inform the instructors and discuss what will be acceptable in terms of overlap, and what is not. Failure to notify the faculty members will be viewed unfavourably should there be a suspicion of misconduct

Plagiarism is a serious offence which cannot be resolved directly with the course's instructor. The Faculty conducts a rigorous investigation, including an interview with the student, when an instructor suspects a piece of work has been plagiarized. As an additional reminder, plagiarism can include:

- reproducing or paraphrasing portions of someone else's published or unpublished material, regardless of the source, and presenting these as one's own without proper citation or reference to the original source;
- submitting a take-home examination, essay, laboratory report or other assignment written, in whole or in part, by someone else;
- using ideas or direct, verbatim quotations, or paraphrased material, concepts, or ideas without appropriate acknowledgment in any academic assignment;
- using another's data or research findings;
- failing to acknowledge sources through the use of proper citations when using another's works and/or failing to use quotation marks; and
- Submitting substantially the same piece of work for academic credit more than once without prior written permission of the course instructor in which the submission occurs.

All students should consult the published statements on Academic Misconduct contained in the Royal Military College of Canada Undergraduate Calendar, Section 23. When in doubt, cite it or ask the instructor.

Academic Accommodation and Extensions:

RMC's *Academic Policy Directive (APD) 5: Policy on Accommodation of Learning Disabilities* lays out the criteria for an academic accommodation. While unlikely, you may need special arrangements to meet your academic obligations during the term for reasons such as Pregnancy, Religious obligations, Personnel Crisis, or any other recognized Disability. For an accommodation request, please contact the Registrar's Accommodation Office prior to contacting the instructor. After requesting accommodation, you will arrange to meet with the instructor in person to ensure accommodation arrangements are made. Afterwards you will be provided with a written response detailing what is expected of you to complete the course.

To request an extension, you will provide a written request (e-mail is acceptable) to the instructor during as soon as possible after the need for accommodation or extension is known to exist. Your request will include the reasons for requesting an extension and how much additional time is required in order for you to complete the assignment in question. Afterwards you will be provided with a written response detailing what is expected of you.

Electronic Policy:

The internet can be both a benefit and a nuisance during class. Please turn off cell phones at the start of class. If you choose to text or answer a call during class, I will ask you to leave the class and you will lose credit for participation. Laptops can also be helpful or harmful to the discussion. If I find that laptops are inhibiting discussion, I will ask students to put them away.

Required Texts:

- Kukucha, Christopher John, and Duane Bratt, eds. *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic debates and new ideas*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2007. ISBN: 0199008310
- Nossal, Kim Richard, Stéphane Roussel, and Stéphane Paquin. *The Politics of Canadian foreign policy*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP, 2015. ISBN: 1553394437

Other Suggested Texts:

- Don Munton and John Kirton, eds. (1992), *Canadian Foreign Policy: Selected Cases* (Toronto: Prentice Hall).
- Heather Smith and Claire Turenne Sjolander, eds. (2013), *Canada in the World: Internationalism in Canadian Foreign Policy* (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press).
- Beier, J. Marshall and Lana Wylie (2010), *Canadian Foreign Policy in Critical Perspective*, Don Mills: Oxford University Press Canada.
- Brian Tomlin, Norman Hillmer and Fen Osler Hampson (2008), *Canada's International Policies: Agendas, Alternatives, and Politics* (Oxford University Press: Toronto).

- Andrew F. Cooper (1997), *Canadian Foreign Policy: Old Habits and New Directions* (Scarborough: Prentice Hall). A classic textbook.
- David Dewitt and John Kirton (1983), *Canada as a Principal Power* (Toronto: John Wiley).
- Patrick James, Nelson Michaud and Marc O'Reilly, eds. (2006), *Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Toronto: Lexington Books).

All other course material is available on line or will be provided to you directly. You should be able to find the majority of articles on your own through the library's access to online journals or google scholar. If there is an issue with access to an assigned reading, contact the instructor.

Course Requirements and Expectations:

The course requirements consist of reading, participation, and writing. The course will have both discussions and presentations and it is your responsibility to do the assigned work. If you need some sort of accommodation, such as extension, or face some kind of challenge, please see the instructor as soon as possible, when there are more options available. Do not wait until the last minute or after the fact.

- First, you are expected to attend the lectures each week. In order to prepare for the seminar, it is important to read the required texts. The mandatory readings are an integral part of the course for evaluation purposes and will not always be summarized during the lectures.
- Second, all assignments must be submitted before the end of the term, whether these will be marked or not. If all work has not been submitted, the instructor reserves the right not to grade your final exam. This policy reflects RMC regulations:
- Third, it is your responsibility, both as a student enrolled in this class and as a Canadian citizen, to keep abreast of current issues. This is important - as a student enrolled in this class, as a Canadian citizen, and as a citizen in a democracy - but also as an Officer in the Canadian Armed Forces. Get into the habit of skimming headlines on a daily basis and reading an article or two that catches your eye. Alternatively, (or as a complement) there are several excellent podcasts that can give you quick, concise, and reliable insights into Canadian Foreign and Security Policy. Each week I will be asking you to discuss what is going on in Canadian Foreign and Security Policy and I expect informed answers. Some examples of good sources of reliable, accessible, and easily digested information are listed below:
 - Canadian International Council, www.opencanada.org, for a Canadian perspective on what is going on around the world.
 - SOMNIA - Spotlight on Military News and International Affairs, for the latest daily news on global events as they relate to Canada, <https://www.cfc.forces.gc.ca/254-eng.html>

- The Globe and Mail has Canadian, World and Politics sections that you may find useful. <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/politics/>
- Finally, you can expect that I will guide you in an engaging and dynamic manner throughout the semester. I will be ready to meet you to discuss the teaching material or any challenge you may be facing regarding this course. You can also expect from me that I provide useful feedback, in a timely manner, after each evaluation. While I will not proofread drafts, I will very happily discuss the main arguments you wish to make or any questions you have during my office hours.

Final Grade Evaluations:

EVALUATION	% OF 100	DUE DATE
Class participation	20%	NA
Short paper	20%	14 Feb 20
Research paper	30%	3 April 20
Presentation #1	15%	TBC
Presentation #2	15%	TBC

- **Participation (20%):** This course is a seminar will follow a seminar format based on discussion and debate. Students are expected to challenge the opinions of their classmates, but to do so in a respectful manner through paying attention, making constructive points, and sharing their perspective. The quality of the course experience depends on the effort each student puts into it. The participation mark is based on the quality – *NOT THE QUANTITY* – of the participation in each week's class. The thoughtfulness of comments is far more important than their frequency. You should complete all the readings for each week ahead of time so that you come into class armed with questions, informed opinions, and perhaps even an improved background on the relevant issues. *ATTENDING IS NOT EQUAL TO PARTICIPATION*. To get an A grade for participation, the student must be engaged, providing informed input that is relevant, on a consistent basis. If you do not participate, do not expect a grade better than a C on this part of the course. Students who arrive late at the beginning of class or after a break may be considered absent for the purpose of grading that week's attendance. After approximately 80 minutes, the class will take a 10-15 minute break.

POINTS	MARK	BASIS FOR PARTICIPATION ASSESSMENT
4	A	Student has made an exceptional contribution to discussion in the form of particularly insightful and original comments or questions that reveal an especially nuanced and sophisticated understanding of the material.
3	B	Student has offered a thoughtful, well-reasoned and constructive comments or question, such as those that spur further discussion or debate or reveal a sound grasp of the material
2	C	Student is present and has made a minor contribution to the discussion in the form of a question or comment.
1	D	Student is present made no effort to contribute to the class discussion
0	F	Student is absent.

- **One short paper (20%):** Over the course of the term, you will write one 5-10 page paper (double space, 12pt.). You will take a reading and apply it to a current event

(broadly defined to mean something happening within the past 2-5 years). The first paper must be turned in by 14 Feb 2020 (*happy Valentine's Day!*). *Submit the assignment electronically to the instructors @rmc e-mail address no later than 23:59h of the due date. Late assignments will be penalized 1/3 of a letter grade per day (3%). Assignments handed in more than 14 days late will receive an automatic 0 grade.*

- **One Research Paper (30%):** For the end of the term, you will write one 15-20 page paper on a topic of your choosing, applied to any issue related to this class in the distant or recent past (double space, 12pt.). The paper will NOT be about something that is currently in process in the world and will NOT be speculative. The research paper must be turned in by 3 April 2020. *Submit the assignment BOTH electronically to the instructor's @rmc e-mail address no later than 23:59h of the due date. Late assignments will be penalized 1/3 of a letter grade per day (3%). Assignments handed in more than 14 days late will receive an automatic 0 grade.*

Final Essay Marking Rubric	Explanation for Critical Essay Grade	Grade
Research Question And Statement	- Are your research question and thesis statement clear and coherent? - Does your "roadmap" clearly explain what your paper will do and how each part of the paper ties into your argument?	/20
Depth, Breadth, And Length Of The Analysis	- Are your ideas original? - Do you make proper use of facts and concepts studied in class?	/20
Research And Sources	- Do you make reference to existing literature? - Do you rely on primary or secondary sources? - Do you make proper use of citations and footnotes/endnotes?	/20
Argument Structure And Flow	- Is your paper structured and well organized? - the emphasis paper should be on analysis and NOT repetitive description	/20
Expression	- Clarity of writing (style), spelling, grammar, etc.	/20
Total		/100

- **Two Individual Presentations (2 x 15%):** Each student will be required to select two classes where they will present a brief literature review on ONE of the week's readings. Each student should select one presentation date before the break and one after.
- The aim of the presentations is not to summarize the readings, **but to draw out key themes and topics for discussion**. The presentation will be evaluated based on how well it captures the central points and debates in the week's readings. Students will be required to provide a **20 minute MAXIMUM presentation**. Students are encouraged to use creative media such as Power Point, maps, video, images, art, etc. However, these should not be a distraction – media should enhance the points being made. Further, should not take up too much time. Students should not read off of their notes and speak actively. Students will be given an individual mark for the quality of their delivery. You should:
 - a) Give **one important insight** and/or fact that you gained from **per reading** in one sentence each. What do you know understand or know that you didn't before doing this reading? What was most valuable to you about this reading?

- b) Give **one major critique per reading**. Consider methodology, logic, biases, and any omissions. Does the author prove his/her argument convincingly? Avoid lazy or cheap criticisms like quantitative work is not useful or that the case may not be generalizable. If the latter, you must argue why it is not generalizable.
- c) If you heard the author present this work at a conference, what **one question** would you ask him or her?
- d) Given the readings of the week, what is the **one policy implication** you would want to tell a government official?
- e) And finally, prepare **several questions** that you would like the class to address and which you believe will contribute to a class discussion on the subject.

Week	Date / Topic:	Presenter #1	Presenter #2	Presenter #3	Presenter #4
1.	10 JAN 20; Introduction to the Course	NA	NA	NA	NA
2.	17 JAN 20; The Context of Canadian Foreign Policy				
3.	24 JAN 20; Canadian Foreign Policy Actors and Processes				
4.	31 JAN 20; Foreign Policy Strategies since World War II:				
5.	7 FEB 20; Canada and US Foreign Relations				
6.	14 FEB 20; Canada and Asia-Pacific Relations <i>Short paper due</i>				
7.	21 FEB 20	NA	NA	NA	FALL BREAK
8.	28 FEB 20; Canadian Defence History				
9.	6 MAR 20; Canada, NATO and the UN				
10.	13 MAR 20; Re-occurring themes in Canadian defence Policy				
11.	20 MAR 20; Defence Budgeting				
12.	27 MAR 20; Defence Procurement				
13.	3 APR 20; Contemporary and				

	Future Canadian Defence Challenges <i>Research paper due</i>				
14.	TBC Apr 20: Swing Class as Required: The Defence Policy Review				

Week One (10 Jan 20): Introduction to the Course

Readings: Course Syllabus

Week Two (17 Jan 20): The Context of Canadian Foreign Policy

Readings:

- Kukucha, Christopher John, and Duane Bratt, eds. *Readings in Canadian Foreign Policy: Classic debates and new ideas*. Don Mills, Ont.: Oxford University Press, 2007, pg 28-41. (Chapter 3).

Kim Richard Nossal, Stéphane Roussel and Stéphane Paquin, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 4th edition (McGill-Queens University Press, 2015), pp. 1-180 (Chapters Introduction-5).¹

Supplemental:

- Lee, Steve. "Canadian values in Canadian foreign policy." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 10, no. 1 (2002): 1-9.
- Eric Tremblay and Bill Bentley, "Canada's Strategic Culture: Grand Strategy and the Utility of Force," *Canadian Military Journal* vol 15, no 3, Summer 2015

Week Three (24 Jan 20): Canadian Foreign Policy Actors and Processes

Readings:

- Kim Richard Nossal, Stéphane Roussel and Stéphane Paquin, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 4th edition (McGill-Queens University Press, 2015), pp. 181-322 (Chapters 7-10).²

Supplemental:

¹ Students will divide the readings into three.

² Students will divide the readings into four

- Kim Richard Nossal, Stéphane Roussel and Stéphane Paquin, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*, 4th edition (McGill-Queens University Press, 2015), pp. 323-376 (Chapters 11-12).
- Douglas L. Bland and Roy Rempel, "A Vigilant Parliament: Building Competence for Effective Parliamentary Oversight of National Defence and the Canadian Armed Forces," *Policy Matters*, vol. 5, no. 1 (February 2004).
- Philippe Lagassé, "Accountability for National Defence: Ministerial Responsibility, Military Command and Parliamentary Oversight," *IRPP Study* No. 4 (2010) <http://www.irpp.org/en/research/security-and-democracy/accountability-for-national-defence/>
- Christopher Dunn, "Canada Needs a War Powers Act," *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 30/3 (2007). (2) <http://www.revparl.ca/english/issue.asp?art=1247¶m=182>
- Nicholas A. MacDonald, "Parliamentarians and National Security," *Canadian Parliamentary Review* 34/4 (2011). <http://www.revparl.ca/english/issue.asp?param=208&art=1460>
- Roy Rempel, *The Chatter Box: An Insider's Account of the Irrelevance of Parliament in the Making of Canadian Foreign and Defence Policy* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2002).
- Philippe Lagassé, "The Crown's Powers of Command-in-Chief: Interpreting Section 15 of the Constitution Act, 1867," *Review of Constitutional Studies* 18/2 (2013).

Week Four (31 Jan 20): Foreign Policy Strategies since World War II:

Readings:

- Louis St. Laurent, "The Foundations of Canadian Policy in World Affairs," Duncan and John Gray Memorial Lecture, University of Toronto, January 13, 1947. <http://www.russilwvong.com/future/stlaurent.html>
- Canada. Ministère des affaires extérieures. *Foreign policy for Canadians*. Queen's Printer, 1970. http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/ForeignPolicyforCanadians_1970_Intro.pdf
- Canada. Dept. of External Affairs. Competitiveness and Security: Directions for Canada's International Relations. *Minister of Supply and Services Canada*, 1985. http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Competitiveness_and_Security_Overview_1985.pdf
- Lloyd Axworthy, "Canada and Human Security: The Need for Leadership," *International Journal* 52:2 (1997), pp. 183-96. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40203196>
- Stephen Harper, "Reviving Canadian Leadership in the World," October 5, 2006. <http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Harper.html>

- Chrystia Freeland, “**and** Address by Minister Freeland on Canada’s Foreign Policy Priorities,” June 6, 2017. https://www.canada.ca/en/global-affairs/news/2017/06/address_by_ministerfreelandoncanadasforeignpolicypriorities.html

Supplemental:

- Government of Canada. "Canada in the World: Government Statement." (1995). http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/Canada_in_the_World_1995.pdf
- Canadian Council for International Co-operation (CCIC). "A Role of Pride and Influence in the World: Canada's International Policy Statement; A CCIC Commentary." (2005). http://aix1.uottawa.ca/~rparis/IPS_2005.pdf

Week Five (7 Feb 20): Canada and US Foreign Relations

Readings:

- Robert W. Cox, “A Canadian Dilemma: The United States or the World,” *International Journal* 60:3 (Summer 2005), pp. 667-684.
- Kitchen, Veronica, 2004. Smarter Cooperation in Canada-US Relations. *International Journal* LIX(3), 693-710. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/40204055>
- Bow, Brian, and Adam Chapnick. "Teaching Canada–US relations: Three great debates." *International Journal* 71, no. 2 (2016): 291-312.
- Charles Doran, “The United States and Canada: In Search of Partnership,” in David Carment and Christopher Sands, eds., *Canada-US Relations: Sovereignty or Shared Institutions?* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2019), pp. 17-38. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-05036-8_2
- Bruno Charbonneau and Wayne S. Cox, “Global Order, US Hegemony and Military Integration: The Canadian-American Defense Relationship,” *International Political Sociology* 2/4 (2008).

Supplemental:

- Lagassé, Phillipe, 2014. A Common “Bilateral” Vision in Jonathan Paquin and Patrick James, eds. *Game Changer: The impact of 9/11 on North American Security*. Vancouver, UBC Press, 193-211.
- Howard G. Coombs and Richard Goette, “Supporting the Pax Americana: Canada’s Military and the Cold War,” in Bernd Horn, ed. *The Canadian Way of War: Serving the National Interest* (Toronto: Dundurn Press, 2006),

Week Six (14 Feb 20): Canada and Asia-Pacific Relations

Readings:

- Manicom, James, 2014. Canada's Role in the Asia-Pacific Rebalance: Prospects for Cooperation. *Asia Policy* 18, 111-130.
- Dewitt, David, Mary Young, Alex Brouse, and Jinelle Piereder. "AWOL: Canada's defence policy and presence in the Asia Pacific." *International Journal* 73, no. 1 (2018): 5-32.
- Sloan, Elinor. "America's rebalance to the Asia-Pacific: The impact on Canada's strategic thinking and maritime posture." *International Journal* 70, no. 2 (2015): 268-285.
- Paltiel, Jeremy. "Resolute ambivalence: Canada's strategy toward China and the Asia-Pacific." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 22, no. 1 (2016): 40-53.

Supplemental:

- Manicom, James. "Canada's Role in the Asia-Pacific Rebalance: Prospects for Cooperation." *Asia policy* 18 (2014): 111-130.
- Manthorpe, Jonathan. "*Claws of the Panda*." (2019).

Week Seven (21 Feb 20): SPRING BREAK!!

Week Eight (28 Feb 20): Canadian Defence History

Readings:

- Leuprecht, Christian, and Joel J. Sokolsky. "Defense Policy "Walmart Style" Canadian Lessons in "not-so-grand" Grand Strategy." *Armed Forces & Society* 41, no. 3 (2015): 541-562.
- Philippe Lagassé and Paul Robinson, "Reviving Realism in the Canadian Defence Debate," *Martello Paper* No. 34 (Kingston: Queen's Centre for International Relations, 2008), pp. 13-39.
- Joel J. Sokolsky, "A Seat at the Table: Canada and Its Alliances," *Armed Forces and Society* 16 (Fall 1989).
- R.J. Sutherland, "Canada's Long-term Strategic Situation," *International Journal* 17/3 (1962).
- Joe Jockel and Joel Sokolsky, "Lloyd Axworthy's Legacy: Human Security and the Rescue of Canadian Defence Policy," *International Journal* 56 (2000-2001).

- Joel J. Sokolsky, "Realism Canadian Style: National Security Policy and the Chrétien Legacy," *Policy Matters* vol. 5, no. 2 (Montreal: Institute for Research on Public Policy, 2004).

Supplemental:

- David S. McDonough, "Afghanistan and Renewing Canadian Leadership: Panacea or Hubris?" *International Journal* 64/3 (2009).
- Breede, H. Christian. 2014. Defining Success: Canada in Afghanistan 2006-2011. *The American Review of Canadian Studies* 44(4), 483-501
- Desmond Morton, *A Military History of Canada*, 5th edition (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 2007), chapters 4-5.
- Howard G. Coombs with Richard Goette, "Supporting the Pax Americana: Canada's Military and the Cold War," in Bernd Horn, ed. *The Canadian Way of War: Serving the*
- Sean M. Maloney, *Learning to Love the Bomb: Canada's Nuclear Weapons During the Cold War* (Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, 2007).
- Elinor Sloan, "Homeland Security and Defence in the Post-9/11 Era," in David S. McDonough, ed. *Canada's National Security in the Post-9/11 World: Strategy, Interests, and Threats* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), chapter 5. (Library E-book) (16 pgs).
- Douglas L. Bland and Sean Maloney, *Campaigns for International Stability: Canada's Defence Policy at the Turn of the Century* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2004).
- David S. McDonough, "Getting it just right: Strategic Culture, Cybernetics, and Canada's Goldilocks Grand Strategy," *Comparative Strategy* 32/3 (2013).
- Eric Lehre, *At What Cost Sovereignty? Canada-US Military Interoperability in the War on Terror* (Halifax: Centre for Foreign Policy Studies, 2013).

Week Nine (6 Mar 20): Canada, NATO and the UN

Readings:

- Joseph T. Jockel and Joel J. Sokolsky, "Canada and NATO: Keeping Ottawa in, expenses down, criticism out...and the country secure," *International Journal* 64/2 (2009).
- Benjamin Zyla, "NATO and post-Cold war burden-sharing: Canada 'the laggard'?" *International Journal* 64/2 (2009).

- Greco, Sara, and Stéfanie von Hlatky. "Soft contributions are hard commitments: NATO and Canada's global security agenda." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 24, no. 3 (2018): 273-285.
- Vucetic, Srdjan, and Bojan Ramadanovic. "Canada in the United Nations General Assembly from Trudeau to Trudeau." *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 09 (2019).
- Walter A. Dorn, "Canadian Peacekeeping: Proud Tradition, Strong Future," *Canadian Foreign Policy* 12/2 (2005).
- Robert W. Murray and John McCoy, "From Middle Power to Peacebuilder: The Use of Canadian Forces in Modern Canadian Foreign Policy," *American Review of Canadian Studies* 40/2 (2010).

Supplemental:

- Auerswald, David P., and Stephen M. Saideman. *NATO in Afghanistan: Fighting together, fighting alone*. Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Desmond Morton, " 'No More Disagreeable or Onerous Duty': Canadians and Military Aid to the Civil Power," in David B. Dewitt and David Leyton-Brown, eds. *Canada's International Security Policy* (Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc., 1995), pp. 129-152.
- Seligman, Steven. "Canada and the United Nations: Legacies, Limits, Prospects by Colin McCullough and Robert Teigrob, eds." (Montreal; McGill-Queen's University Press, 2018).

Week Ten (13 Mar 20): Re-occurring themes in Canadian defence Policy (Arctic defence and BMD)

Readings:

- Greaves, Wilfred, 2011. For Whom, from What? Canada's Arctic Policy and the Narrowing of Human Security. *International Journal* 67(1), 219-240.
- Rob Huebert, "Submarines, Oil Tankers, and Icebreakers: Trying to Understand Canadian Arctic Sovereignty and Security," *International Journal* 66/4 (2011).
- Andrea Charron, "The Northwest Passage: Is Canada's sovereignty floating away?" *International Journal* 60/3 (2005).
- Philippe Lagassé, Canada, strategic defence, and strategic stability: a retrospective and look ahead," *International Journal* 63/4 (2008).

- Brian Bow, "Defence dilemmas: Continental defence cooperation, from BOMARC to BMD," *Canadian Foreign Policy* 15/1 (2011).

Supplemental:

- James Fergusson, *Canada and Ballistic Missile Defence, 1954-2009: Déjà Vu All Over Again* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010).
- Lackenbauer, P. Whitney, and Paul Kikkert. "The Canadian Forces and Arctic Sovereignty: Debating Roles, Interests and Requirements, 1968-1974. Waterloo: Laurier Centre for Military Strategic and Disarmament Studies." (2009).

Week Eleven (20 Mar 20): Defence Budgeting

Readings:

- Andrew Richter, "Forty Years of Neglect, Indifference, and Apathy: The Relentless Decline of Canada's Armed Forces," in Patrick James, Nelson Michaud, and Marc J. O'Reilly, eds. *Handbook of Canadian Foreign Policy* (Toronto: Lexington Books, 2006), pp. 51-82.
- Bill Robinson, "Canadian military spending 2010-11," *Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives*, March 2011.
<http://www.policyalternatives.ca/sites/default/files/uploads/publications/National%20Office/2011/03/Canadian%20Military%20Spending%202010.pdf>
- David Perry, "Canada's Seven Billion Dollar War: The cost of Canadian Forces Operations in Afghanistan," *International Journal* 63/3 (2008).
- David Perry, "The Privatization of the Canadian Military: Afghanistan, Canada First, and Beyond," *International Journal* 64/3 (2009).
- David Perry, *Defence Austerity: The Impact to Date*, *Conference of Defence Associations Institute*, 2013.
http://www.cdainstitute.ca/images/Defence_Austerity_Budget_2013.pdf

Supplemental:

- John M. Treddenick, "The Defence Budget," in David B. Dewitt and David Leyton-Brown, eds. *Canada's International Security Policy* (Scarborough: Prentice Hall Canada Inc., 1995), 413-454.
- Douglas L. Bland, ed. *Canada Without Armed Forces?* (Kingston: School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 2004).

- LCol Ross Fetterly and Maj Richard Groves, *Accural Accounting and Budgeting in Defence*, Claxton Paper 9, Defence Management Studies, School of Policy Studies, Queen's University, 2008.

Week Twelve (27 Mar 20): Defence Procurement

Readings:

- Aaron Plamondon, *Equipment Procurement in Canada and the Civil-Military Relationship: Past and Present*, Calgary Papers in Military and Strategic Studies, Occasional Paper No. 2, 2008.
- Craig Stone, "Defence Procurement and Industry," in David S. McDonough, ed. *Canada's National Security in the Post-9/11 World: Strategy, Interests, and Threats* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2012), chapter 4.
- Philippe Lagassé, *Recapitalizing the Canadian Forces' Major Fleets: Assessing Lingering Controversies and Challenges*, CIC/CDFAI Strategic Studies Working Group, December 2012.
<http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/Recapitalizing%20the%20Canadian%20Forces%20Major%20Fleets.pdf>
- Craig Stone, *A Separate Defence Procurement Agency: Will it Actually Make a Difference*, CIC/CDFAI Security Studies Working Group, February 2012.
<http://www.cdfai.org/PDF/A%20Separate%20Defence.pdf>
- Berkok, Ugurhan. "Canadian defence procurement." in Markowski, Stefan, Peter Hall, and Robert Wylie, eds. *Defence Procurement and Industry Policy: A small country perspective*. Routledge, 2009, pp. 229-247.

Supplemental:

- Public Works and Government Services Canada, *Supply Manual*:
<https://buyandsell.gc.ca/policy-and-guidelines/supply-manual>
- Aaron Plamondon, *The Politics of Procurement: Military Acquisition in Canada and the Sea King Helicopter* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2010).
- Aaron Plamondon, "Amnesia in acquisition: the parallels of the F-35 procurement and the Sea King replacement projects," *Canadian Foreign Policy* 17/3 (2011).
- Alan S. Williams, *Reinventing Canadian Defence Procurement: A View from the Inside* (Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2006).
- Alastair Edgar, "Growth Pains or Growing Strains: The Limits of Neighbourliness and the Politicization of Canada-US Defence Industry Integration," *Canadian Foreign Policy* 8/2 (2001).

Week Thirteen (03 Apr 20): Contemporary and Future Canadian Defence Challenges

Readings:

- Chapman, Bert. "The Geopolitics of Canadian Defense White Papers: Lofty Rhetoric and Limited Results." *Geopolitics, History, and International Relations* 11, no. 2 (2019): 7-40.
- Roland Paris, "Alone in the World? Making Sense of Canada's Disputes with Saudi Arabia and China," *International Journal* 74:1 (March 2019), pp. 151–161.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0020702019834652>
- Gilley, Bruce. "Middle powers during great power transitions: China's Rise and the Future of Canada-US relations." *International Journal* 66, no. 2 (2011): 245-264.
- Jackson, Nicole J. "Canada, NATO, and Global Russia." *International Journal* 73, no. 2 (2018): 317-325.
- Carroll, Michael K. "Peacekeeping: Canada's past, but not its present and future?" *International Journal* 71, no. 1 (2016): 167-176.

Supplemental:

- Nossal, Kim Richard, Stéphane Roussel, and Stéphane Paquin. *The Politics Of Canadian Foreign Policy*. McGill-Queen's Press-MQUP, 2015.
- Saideman, Stephen M. *Adapting in the dust: Lessons learned from Canada's war in Afghanistan*. University of Toronto Press, 2016.
- Jocelyn Coulon , *Canada is Not Back: How Justin Trudeau is in over his Head On Foreign Policy* (Lorimer; Toronto, 2019).

Annex A – GRADING ASSESSMENT:

MARK	SCORE	BASIS FOR GRADING ASSESSMENT
A+	94-100	Work of exceptional quality; meets all criteria for an “A”, but the ideas presented are original and add to existing debates in the field. This work could be submitted for publication in an academic journal.
A	87-93	Excellent work that meets all the criteria and exigencies of the exercise. The argument is clearly exposed; the demonstration is convincing and rests on coherent empirical and/or theoretical analysis; the work demonstrates an excellent capacity to think and write synthetically and a good comprehension of concepts and sources mobilized . The work incorporates concepts and ideas learned in class and in readings . The work is structured in a coherent manner . Language and syntax are of excellent quality. References and bibliography correspond to scientific standards.
A-	80-86	The work is of great quality, but there is still space for minor ameliorations regarding coherence of the argument, concepts, sources, and/or quality of language.
B+	76-79	The quality of this work generally meets the requirements for a “good” grade but is outstanding in a particular aspect, be it the quality or the coherence of the argument, the mastery of concepts and/or the structure and language quality.
B	73-75	Good quality work that generally meets the requirements of the exercise, but there is space for amelioration. For example, the argument is clear but could be enounced more explicitly and the demonstration could be more coherent. The text demonstrates a good understanding of the teachings of the course, but some elements are missing. A text that tends to resume the authors’ arguments or the course’s contents rather than to use them to build an original argument usually deserves a “B”. The text is well structure and the quality of language is satisfying but there is space for amelioration.
B-	70-72	Some weaknesses in the criteria mentioned for a “B” grade. No errors or major weaknesses in the content, but certain aspects need work in the coherence and clarity as well as structure. Some elements may be confusing or superfluous.
C+ C C-	66-69 63-65 60-62	This work meets assigned requirements but has important weaknesses either in the content, the structure, and/or language. For example, the argument is not clearly enunciated, or it is incoherent with the rest of the submission; the demonstration does not rest on factual elements or on a proper theoretical background. It does not incorporate adequately elements learned in class. Structurally, the text lacks cohesion, there are no links between the different elements, or there is no logic to the flow of the argument. Language and syntax are poor and make it difficult to read the text.
D	50-59	The text meets minimal requirements for passing. Important weaknesses are found in the coherence or structure of the text; the argument is not clearly enounced or is confusing; there are important missing elements either theoretically or factually. Language, syntax, and structure are unsatisfactory and/or the text does not follow the expected guidelines in terms of format, length, references, etc.
E	40-49	Unacceptable work. Presentation and contents are weak. The topic is not corresponding to the guidelines, the arguments is incomplete, confusing, demonstrates little or no understanding of elements learned in class; structure and language do not correspond to university standards.
F	0-39	Botched or incomplete work; absolutely does not meet minimal requirements. Insufficient effort or plagiarism.