

Canadian Scholarship on North America

LAURA MACDONALD*

ABSTRACT

Canadian scholars have a long tradition of analysis of Canada's relations with the United States, but only recently have they turned their attention to the North American continent as a whole. This article provides an overview of Canadian scholarship on Canada's position in North America. It argues that Canadian authors and policy-makers have for decades been caught up in an economic debate between nationalist and so-called continentalist positions. These positions have been reinforced in the context of recent calls for deepened integration. Both the nationalist and the continentalist positions are, however, of limited utility for understanding the unique character of economic and political integration on the North American continent. The article reviews some recent contributions by Canadian scholars that attempt to move beyond the nationalist/continentalist dichotomy. It argues that what is currently needed is both more balanced empirical work that documents the changing realities of North American integration and an engagement with new theoretical perspectives.

Key words: Canada, North America, academic literature.

Canada's relationship with the United States has been a central theme of Canadian scholarship on the country's identity and economy since the emergence of academic analysis in this country. Indeed, Canadians find it difficult to define themselves without reference to the United States. However, Canadians' North American

* Centre on North American Politics and Society, Carleton University. E-mail: <Laura_Macdonald@carleton.ca>.

analysis has been only partial, since for the most part, Canadian scholars have ignored Mexico's presence in the region. Only since the years leading up to and following the signing of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) have Canadian authors paid serious attention to Canada's relationship with Mexico and to the evolving nature of the North American continent as a whole. In recent years, there has been a boom of academic, governmental, and think-tank publishing regarding themes of North American integration and its implications for Canadian prosperity and identity. Canadian academics have not been just passive spectators of events surrounding North American economic integration; they have played an important role both in advocating deeper forms of integration and in social movements' critiques of integration.

This article will provide a brief overview of some of the most prominent analyses of Canada's position in North America. Until recently, Canadian analysis of the emerging North American region has been caught within a rather economic and deterministic debate between nationalists on the one hand and so-called "continentalists" on the other. The nationalists adopt a state-centric mode of analysis, and tend to advocate greater state intervention in the economy, while the continentalists focus on the role of the market, and promote neo-liberal policies of market opening and a reduced role for the state (Gabriel and Macdonald, 2003). I discuss in this article that this old Canadian debate is of limited usefulness for understanding the recent changes in the Canadian and North American economies and their political implications. On the one hand, nationalist approaches continue to hold up the autonomous nation-state as the ideal, a notion that is of little relevance in a world of increased integration of production lines across nation-state boundaries. On the other hand, neo-liberal continentalist approaches fail to recognize the continued importance of the nation state (a reality that is particularly clear after September 11). They also fail to address ongoing issues of social equity and to take into account non-elite perspectives on integration. In recent years, however, some authors have begun to open up promising lines of inquiry regarding the nature of power, prosperity and security in North America that help us move beyond the old nationalist-continentalist debate.

BEFORE NAFTA: CANADA, THE UNITED STATES

Canadian scholars have long differed over the implications of Canada's close economic ties with the powerful U.S. economy. Like Latin Americans, Canadians have always been acutely aware of their place in the global economy. Commenting on

the work of pioneering Canadian political economist Harold Innis (1894-1952), W.T. Easterbrook noted that Innis, as an economic historian, was able to “attack the problems of history on a *broad* front –he was constantly faced with the fact that in Canadian development the strategic decisions, the shaping influences, had always to be sought outside the country’s political boundaries. Study of an economy so vulnerable to external forces made the writing of a national economic history out of the question” (Easterbrook, 1990: x). Even though early Canadian authors took little notice of Mexico, Canada’s position on the margins of first the British Empire and then of the massive U.S. economy fostered skills in understanding the intertwining of local, regional, and global economies that would be of great use in the NAFTA era.

Canadian political economy developed originally during the period between the two world wars, and attempted to come to grips with the fact that Canada, unlike other developed countries, remained heavily reliant upon the export of primary commodities. In this period, Canada was just beginning to emerge from the British Empire. The nationalist school has its origins in the “staples thesis,” developed by the leading political economist of this period, Harold Innis. Innis argued that Canadian development was marked by efforts by more industrially advanced countries –first Britain and then the United States– to extract a series of raw materials (fish, fur, lumber, etc.) (Watkins, 1989: 18). In the early years, the Canadian nation emerged on the margins of a prosperous and expanding U.S. economy. Like Latin American structuralists, Innis believed that Canada’s reliance upon staples created a number of structural economic distortions that limited the country’s prospects for sustained, autonomous economic development (Williams, 1983: 133). In contrast, the other founding father of the staples thesis, W.A. Mackintosh, believed that “Canada would eventually achieve economic maturity through resource trade” (1983: 137). Mackintosh thus represents an early version of the continentalist approach, which expresses confidence in the liberal market economy and the capacity of the Canadian state to prosper within an expanding North American economy.

Early Canadian writing on North America virtually ignored the presence of Mexico on the continent. A notable exception, however, was Innis’s younger colleague at the University of Toronto, W. Thomas Easterbrook (1907-1985). In a book published after his death, *North American Patterns of Growth and Development: The Continental Context* (1990), Easterbrook laid out a unique analysis of economic development in the North American continent as a whole.¹ He argued that North

¹ Easterbrook also included analyses of developments in the United States, the West Indies and Mexico in his classic text, *Canadian Economic History* (1956), co-authored with Hugh Aitken. Easterbrook spent a year in Mexico during 1971-1972, and began to include this country systematically in his teaching and research after this point (Easterbrook, 1990: xi). In his preface to *North American Patterns of Growth and Development*, the editor, Ian Parker, calls this the “only study of North American economic history that examines the *whole*

America was divided into four economic zones: Canada, the U.S. North, the U.S. South, and Mexico. The “macro-uncertainty environment” in Canada, the U.S. South and Mexico, he argued, resulted in patterns of economic growth characterized by “persistence”, i.e. relatively static economies. The U.S. North, in contrast, was characterized by “transformation” patterns of economic development, involving structural changes in patterns of decision-making and greater entrepreneurship. Easterbrook, like Innis, and the Latin American dependency theorists developed an analysis of center-margin interaction, first between the North American colonies and their European imperial centers, and later within North America between the U.S. North and its margins. Easterbrook’s work was prescient, but his inclusion of Mexico in the analysis of continental dynamics was not emulated by later writers until the events of the late 1980s and early 1990s brought Mexico to Canadian attention again.

In the 1960s and 1970s, the debate about Canada’s position in the continent intensified. The writers and policy actors who supported the continentalist school, like Mackintosh, adopted an optimistic perspective about Canada’s ability to move beyond its dependence on staples exports to develop strong patterns of industrialization (note that continentalism still understood the North American continent as comprised only of Canada and the United States). Continentalists followed the orthodox economic doctrines of comparative advantage and free trade, and argued in favor of policies of economic liberalization and free trade with the United States that would encourage greater efficiency in Canadian industry and increased exports and investment (Williams, 1983: 143-45; see also Wonnacott and Wonnacott, 1967; Safarian, 1966). While this position was most common among economists, some political scientists also underlined the potential benefits to Canada of greater North American integration (again excluding Mexico). In this view, Canadian interests in continental security, for example, as well as the need to compete with the new European Community, created integrative pressures (see Axline et al., 1974).

One of the most prominent representatives of the nationalist perspective in this period was a political conservative, George Grant. In his well-known book, *Lament for a Nation* (1965), Grant expressed his profound discontent with the decline of the Canadian nation in the face of increasing ties under the Liberal government of the period with the expanding U.S. state. Grant mourned the decline of traditional values in the face of the technological imperative. While not the last conservative to look on Canada’s growing ties with the United States with skepticism, from this point forward, nationalist positions were increasingly tied with a socialist or social-democratic perspective. Nationalists criticized the orthodox economic assumptions

of North America –Canada, the United States, and Mexico– for the period from the earliest phase of European exploration and colonization up to the twentieth century” (1990: ix).

upon which continentalist thought was based. They argued that Canada's dependence on the export of staples and the dominance of U.S. multinational investment in the manufacturing sector could only be overcome through the strategic use of state power. Writers in this school argued in favor of a national industrial strategy to encourage the development of Canadian-owned firms (Gabriel and Macdonald, 2003: 217).

In the 1970s, many nationalist authors were heavily influenced by Latin American dependency theory. Mel Watkins, an influential author in this period, summarizes this position in an article from the 1980s:

Canada is a prosperous First World country, sharing with the United States not only a continent but also its standard of living. The economy, however, is staples-biased; the industrial structure is truncated and dependent; the Canadian bourgeoisie is continentalist to the core; the society is pervasively Americanized. These factors combine to create a circle that narrowly constrains Canada (1989: 31).

Kari Levitt reasoned that U.S.-based multinationals controlled a significant portion of the Canadian economy. As a result, the profits and other benefits of investment in the Canadian economy were transferred to the United States. However Levitt, like other nationalists, based their arguments not just on economic arguments. Nationalists feared that closer ties with the United States would erode distinctive Canadian values and the autonomy of the Canadian state (Levitt, 1970).

Other writers contended, however, that the adoption of dependency theory by Canadian nationalists showed insufficient attention to the many differences between Canada's economic position and that of underdeveloped countries—in particular, the high wage structure of the Canadian economy. I would propose that a more fruitful approach, especially with regard to our understanding of recent trends in the North American region, is provided by Glen Williams.² Williams argues that Canada should be seen not as a marginal country but as a “lesser region within the center of the international political economy” (1983: 130):

Indeed, when investment, production, and trade are considered, the Canadian economy may now be usefully conceptualized as a geographically large zone within the U.S. economy. While itself regionally divided, this zone has until now maintained the capacity to reproduce its own unique social and political formations rooted in various popular and elite conceptions of a distinct Canadian nationality and culture. As continental econom-

² Williams (1983: 124-5) argues that the analysis of the Canadian dependency writers were based on a mis-reading of Innis.

ic integration has grown, however, far-reaching constraints on the ability of the federal and provincial states to challenge U.S. power in Canada with nationalist programs have resulted not only from the primacy of the continental relationship in economic policy-making but also from the continentalist definitions of the Canadian national interest found both generally within civil society and especially among state elites (1993: 132).

Williams' approach moves toward a more holistic analysis of the North American region, and highlights the limitations of state-centric approaches to understanding North America.

Moreover, writers in other parts of the country often took issue with the nationalist position. Some political scientists based in Quebec adopt a nationalist perspective, but in this case their focus is on the Quebec nation. Quebec nationalist politicians and academics identify a dual dependency, with the Quebec economy structurally dependent upon the rest of Canada, while Canada is itself economically dominated by the United States (Rocher, 1993: 454; Henry, 1976: 295). The Quebec government and Quebec sovereigntists thus have viewed North American integration as an opportunity to expand the Quebec economy and limit the influence of English Canada, rather than perceiving the U.S. as a threat (Rocher, 1993: 461). However, from a more socialist perspective, Dorval Brunelle and Christian Deblock point out the contradictions between the traditional statist orientation of Quebec nationalism and the realities of North American integration, that has followed a neo-liberal, anti-statist pattern (Brunelle and Deblock, 1989). François Rocher and Christian Rouillard (2002), also caution that international trade negotiations like those leading to NAFTA tend to increase the power of the Canadian state *vis-à-vis* the rest of Canada since only the federal government has the right to engage in international negotiations and sign trade agreements.

The debates between nationalists and continentalists culminated in the debate over the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement (1989). The decision of the Mulroney Conservative government to move toward a free trade agreement with the United States was prompted by the recommendations of the Royal Commission on the Economic Union and Development Prospects for Canada (the Macdonald Commission). The head of the commission, former Liberal cabinet minister Donald Macdonald, commissioned a huge volume of research studies of different aspects of Canadian politics and economics, from over 300 researchers. Based on this analysis, Macdonald advocated that Canada depart from the historical tendency to resist integration with the United States, and take a "leap of faith" by pursuing a free trade deal with the U.S. (McQueen, 1985).

The debate on the Canada-U.S. free trade agreement was one of the most intense in the nation's history. A flurry of books, articles and reports emerged, charting the process of the negotiations of the deal (Hart, 1994; Doern and Tomlin, 1991) and its alleged costs and benefits (Cameron and Watkins, 1993; Cameron, 1985; Cameron, 1988; Hart, 1989). By and large, the literature of this period is characterized by its strong polemical character, with authors taking one side or the other on the nationalist/continentalist debate, and with little dialogue between the two positions. There was still no recognition of Mexico's presence on the continent. Nevertheless, although Canada was not eager to share its special access to the U.S. economy, the decision of the Bush Sr. and Salinas administrations to enter into a trade deal forced Ottawa's hand. Rather than being marginalized in a hub-and-spoke situation within the continent, Canada asked for a seat at the table. The outcome of the negotiations, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA), led to a new era in North American analysis in Canada.

AFTER NAFTA: CANADA IN THE NORTH AMERICAN REGION

While some authors retained their primary focus on the Canada-U.S. relationship even after the signing of the NAFTA agreement, most authors were forced to begin to recast their arguments. Nationalist critics of free trade were concerned about the effects of the inclusion of Mexico, a lower-wage economy with generally lower standards of environmental regulation and living conditions, for Canadians. Other authors were concerned to maintain Canada's "special relationship" with the United States, and feared that Mexico would usurp this position.

One important book by Canadian authors provides a fascinating account of the NAFTA negotiations. Rather than remaining stuck in the nationalist-continentalist debate, Maxwell Cameron and Brian Tomlin (2000) use insights from game theory, approaches to bargaining and negotiation and international political economy theories. They argue that the course of the NAFTA negotiations was shaped by three major factors: "(1) asymmetries of power between the three states; (2) sharply contrasting domestic political institutions; and (3) differences in the non-agreement alternatives, patience, and risk orientations of the heads of government and their chief negotiators" (2000: 15). The research draws upon a large number of interviews with negotiators of the agreement in the three countries, and provides an important contribution to our understanding of the dynamics of these negotiations. They note that Mexico was in a weak position in the negotiations because of its lack of attractive alternatives to an agreement, resulting in Mexico making important conces-

sions on key goals. Canada, in contrast, had the Canada-U.S. FTA to fall back on if the negotiations failed, and so was in a relatively secure position.

Just as in the earlier debate about the implications of the Canada-U.S. deal, the debate on NAFTA was strongly polarized between advocates and opponents of free trade. However, the fact that some time had passed since the 1988 deal means that greater information was available to assess the actual results, in contrast with the earlier literature which was largely based on conjectures. This later literature may be divided into those who viewed the CUFTA and NAFTA as representing important watersheds in Canadian history, marking a fundamentally new pattern of development, as opposed to those who emphasized continuity from earlier periods.

Strong advocates of the continentalist approach tend to depict the two trade deals as a watershed moment in Canadian economic history. The Canadian Department of International Trade declares confidently that after ten years of NAFTA, “the verdict is clear –it has been a great success for Canada and its North American partners, and we are committed to ensuring that it continues to help us to realize the full potential of a more integrated and efficient North American economy” (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2003). More recently, the Department of International Trade claims that Canadians have experienced a wide range of benefits as a result of NAFTA, ranging from increased productivity and competitiveness for Canadian businesses, lower prices for consumers and increased movements of people within the continent, to improved environmental performance and labor rights (Department of Foreign Affairs and International Trade, 2004). Here again, the emphasis is on the gains from trade and a liberalized market, with little attention to market failures or the inequities that may result from a strategy of liberalization.

Similarly, a collection of articles from a McGill University 1999 conference on “NAFTA@10” presents largely favorable views regarding the impact of integration (MacDonald, 2000) –not surprisingly, perhaps, since many of the articles are written by negotiators or politicians who participated in the deals. Michael Hart charts the radical shift in Canada’s trade policy away from traditional opposition to free trade toward becoming a “certified free trader” (Hart, 2000: 3). He argues that the success of the FTA, NAFTA and the WTO means that the role of national economies is diminishing, but “governance continues to be organized on the basis of national policy. The result is growing conflict between national political and international economic goals” (2000: 31-32).

Economist Thomas Courchene discusses the impact of North American integration on one of Canada’s richest provinces, Ontario. In his view, Ontario has shifted from being the heartland of the Canadian state to being a “region state” within North America. Increasingly, its policies are focused on enhancing the

province's economic competitiveness within the North American region, particularly with neighboring U.S. states. Cross-border trade, investment, infrastructure, and communications capacities are expanding in a north-south manner, sometimes with a negative effect on older east-west capacities (Courchene and Telmer, 1998). The traditional territorial nation-state is thus less relevant than in the past, in this view.

Nationalist critics of free trade also view NAFTA as having had dramatic effects on Canadian society. John Foster and John Dillon contend that the real per capita growth rate of Canadian GDP averaged 1.6 percent a year during the free trade era from 1989 to 2002, a level below the average rate of 1.9 percent per year during the 8 years prior to the implementation of the CUFTA (Foster and Dillon, 2003: 84-85). Strikingly, Satoshi Ikeda argues that Canada has dropped from the core to the semi-periphery of the global economy during this period, based on the drop of per capita GNP compared to U.S. levels (Ikeda, 2004: 347).

Stephen Clarkson, in perhaps the most sustained work on Canada in North America from the left, also provides a dramatic assessment about the impact of globalization and neo-conservatism. As a result of Canada's participation in the new institutions of global governance, he argues, the Canadian political system has been restructured. The impact of the policies adopted in the last two decades "have been significant, in some cases seriously endangering the country's social fabric, economic vitality and environmental sustainability" (Clarkson, 2002: 12).

While most of these writers clearly fit within either the "continentalist" or the "nationalist" category, the work of other authors seems to suggest that integration has now gone so far that these older categories of analysis are no longer as relevant as they once were. While national borders have not disappeared, levels of ties between economies have advanced to such a level, as Williams and Courchene contend from very different ideological perspectives that the nation-state no longer occupies the position it once did. New forms of identification that span nation-state boundaries are emerging among citizens and political actors on the continent. A series of studies on various economic and social sectors underlines this point. *Driving Continentally*, edited by Maureen Molot (1993), brings together a series of articles that analyze empirically the changes in the North American automobile industry, an industry that lies at the heart of the project of North American integration. Deborah Barndt presents a very different approach to another continentally-integrated industry, the tomato industry. From a feminist and ecological perspective, she follows the production chain that connects the lives of women workers in the Mexican fields to the tables of Canadian consumers. Her chapters bring together a "globalization from above" perspective regarding the forms of production and consumption within the tomato industry, with a "globalization from below" emphasis

on forms of resistance. All of these works, from different perspectives, display the ways in which North American economic integration is increasingly shaping the choices and activities of firms, states, and social movements.

Despite these forces of transformation, some authors maintain that the nation-state still plays a powerful economic and political role. Economist John Helliwell argues that despite free trade, national boundaries still exercise a powerful influence over patterns of economic activity. Domestic trade in goods and services thus remains substantially higher than international trade as a result of network density, shared norms and regulatory frameworks within national borders (Helliwell, 2002). From a cultural perspective, Michael Adams maintains in his book *Fire and Ice* that despite years of economic integration and overwhelming influence of U.S. cultural industries in Canada, the core values of the citizens of the two countries are diverging rather than converging. While Canadians are developing more post-materialist values similar to those in Europe, the United States are reverting to more traditional values like duty, family, and patriotism (Adams, 2003). Similarly, in the edited collection *Capacity for Choice*, George Hoberg and others argue that the consequences of North American integration have not been as formidable as widely believed. While pressures for harmonization clearly exist, “Canada still retains significant room to manoeuvre [...], even in the areas of policy most affected by growing economic integration” (Hoberg, 2002: 4). In this contribution, Hoberg adopts the theory of path dependency derived from historical institutionalism that suggests that countries retain distinct policies despite economic integration because of the existence of distinct institutions and policy traditions. The survival of distinct political and social values north of the border clearly creates more political space for autonomous policies. However, the events of September 11, 2001 have created new pressures for integration and harmonization of policies and have also launched a new wave of academic studies of North America in Canada.

BEYOND NAFTA: DEBATE ON DEEPENING NORTH AMERICAN INTEGRATION

The U.S. response to the tragic events of September 11 evoked widespread concern among communities, firms, and governments in Canada. In particular, the fact that the border was virtually closed immediately after the attacks had a dramatic effect on border communities and industries. Analysts responded with a series of proposals to forestall any return to harsh border control measures by the U.S. government (see Gabriel and Macdonald, 2003). Much of this literature came from think tanks rather than from university-based academics and returned to the polemical

character of earlier free trade debates. Now, however, attention has shifted away from trade measures to examine other dimensions of integration. There has also been a renewed tendency to downplay Mexico's role, given the renewed importance of the relationship of the United States with Canada. This literature is heavily policy-oriented, and we have seen a return to the dichotomies of the nationalist-continentalist debate.

The C.D. Howe Institute, under the direction of University of Toronto economist Wendy Dobson, has published a series of "border papers" addressing various aspects of U.S.-Canada relations. Her own paper in this series, "Shaping the Future of the North American Space" (2002), promoted a "strategic framework" that became known as the "big idea". Dobson proposes to make a dramatic bargain with the United States to address U.S. concerns about security in return for the U.S. meeting Canadian business desires for greater and more secure access to the U.S. economy. Trade policy experts Bill Dymond and Michael Hart presented a similar perspective in *Common Borders, Shared Destinies* (2001), which focused particularly on the need for a new regime of border security to address U.S. fears while maintaining Canadian access to the U.S. economy (see also Hart, 2004). These contributions urge the continued deepening of the economic ties within the North American continent, arguing that any problems that exist result from too little, rather than too much, integration. Cooperation with the United States on security concerns and the construction of a North American security perimeter is seen as a reasonable concession in order to maintain and expand the gains of liberalized trade and investment within NAFTA.

In a similar vein, the Institute of Research on Public Policy (IRPP) in Montreal has also published a series of studies titled *The Art of the State: Thinking North America* that examine various aspects of the agenda of deepened integration. In this series, IRPP analyst Daniel Schwanen has published a particularly thoughtful study on a "Treaty of North America" (2004) that lays out a series of proposals for a new framework of North American governance. Unlike the other proposals mentioned here, his approach includes Mexico as an equal actor, partly for pragmatic reasons since he recognizes that it would be difficult for the U.S. to exclude Mexico from any new arrangement with Canada. He includes a proposal for a cohesion fund, similar to some of the proposals of the Mexican government, along with proposals around market opening and security similar to those advocated by other liberal authors. Schwanen is skeptical about the idea of a "grand bargain," and he suggests instead a treaty that would represent a framework for further step-by-step progress on discrete issues. He foresees the development of a "community of North Americans," to cut across the asymmetries between the three countries, rather than a "North American community" on European lines (2004: 12). Schwanen recognizes

the importance of engaging not just business interests but also consumers, environmentalists and civil society generally if such a project is to succeed (2004: 15).

Nationalist critics are, not surprisingly, skeptical about proposals for deepened integration, worried that these proposals, if adopted, would seriously undermine Canadian sovereignty and would compromise distinctive Canadian values in areas such as foreign policy, defense, and immigration and refugee policy (Clarkson, 2002; Jackson, 2003; Campbell, 2003). Nationalists thus currently maintain that any further deepening of North American integration is unwarranted, and would also entail unacceptable forms of cooperation with the bellicose and unilateralist Bush administration.

Finally, Canadian Oxford University professor Jennifer Welsh presents an extremely lucid account of Canadian foreign policy since 9/11 in her book *At Home in the World* (2004). Welsh attempts to chart a course between more idealistic and more realistic approaches to Canadian foreign policy. She calls for a “renewed and confident Canada that skillfully manages its relationship with the United States but that also contributes constructively to the resolution of global problems” (2004: 28). She also calls for an approach that goes beyond old statist images of international relations to include the role of individual Canadians. In contrast with the old-style nationalists, Welsh believes Canada does have an important regional destiny, but unlike some of the more crass continentalists, she believes Canada needs to “define that destiny in a way that is consistent with Canadian interests as well as Canadian values” (2004: 60). Like Schwanen, Welsh believes the “big idea” is unworkable and undesirable, and also believes Canadians need to develop a better understanding of Mexico, partly because Canada and Mexico share an interest in developing a body of rules to “manage the reality of U.S. power” (2004: 71). While rather vague about the details of what new policies might look like, Welsh’s account does stimulate new thinking about old shibboleths of Canadian foreign policy.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, Canadian authors have a great deal to contribute to the development of a better understanding of North America. Canadians have a long history of grappling with the realities of power on the margins of the U.S. behemoth. In particular, Canadian analysts show an appreciation for the asymmetries inherent in the North American region. Nevertheless, Canadian debates too often become bogged down in unproductive polemics and lose sight of the North American region as a whole because of the Canadian obsession with the United States. More balanced,

empirical work that documents the changing realities of North American integration after 9/11 is badly needed. However, beyond this important empirical work, I have also suggested that existing theoretical models, based on the nationalist-continentalist debate, are outdated. What is needed are bolder theoretical analyses that move beyond the old assumptions rooted in nationalism or economic neo-liberalism, and look to other theoretical perspectives, including historical institutionalism, constructivism, critical geopolitics, feminism, and post-modernism. Greater cooperation and communication across borders among North American academics can only contribute to these tasks of both empirical and theoretical exploration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ADAMS, MICHAEL

2003 *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values*, Toronto, Penguin Canada.

AXLINE, W. ANDREW, JAMES E. HYNDMAN, PEYTON V. LYON and MAUREN A. MOLOT, eds.

1974 *Continental Community? Independence and Integration in North America*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

BRUNELLE, DORVAL and CHRISTIAN DEBLOCK

1989 *Le Libre-échange par défaut*, Montreal, VLB.

CAMERON, DUNCAN, ed.

1985 *The Other Macdonald Report: The Consensus on Canada's Future that the Macdonald Commission Left Out*, Toronto, Lorimer.

1988 *The Free Trade Deal*, Toronto, Lorimer

CAMERON, DUNCAN and MEL WATKINS, eds.

1993 *Canada under Free Trade*, Toronto, Lorimer.

CAMERON, MAXWELL A. and BRIAN W. TOMLIN

2000 *The Making of NAFTA: How the Deal Was Done*, Ithaca, Cornell University Press.

CAMPBELL, BRUCE

2003 *From Deep Integration to Reclaiming Sovereignty: Managing Canada-U.S. Economic Relations under NAFTA*, Ottawa, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

CLARKSON, STEPHEN

2002 *Uncle Sam and Us: Globalization, Neoconservatism, and the Canadian State*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

COURCHENE, THOMAS J. and COLIN TELMER

1998 *From Heartland to North American Region State*, Toronto, Centre for Public Management, University of Toronto.

DEPARTMENT OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS AND INTERNATIONAL TRADE (DFAIT),
GOVERNMENT OF CANADA

2004 "NAFTA@10: A Preliminary Report," Ottawa, 2003, in <<http://www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/eet/research/nafta/nafta-en.asp#lined>>, accessed on August 17.

2003 "Canada and the North American Free Trade Agreement", in <www.dfait-maeci.gc.ca/nafta-alena/menu-en.asp>, last updated June 10.

DOBSON, WENDY

2002 "Shaping the Future of North American Economic Space: A Framework for Action," *C.D. Howe Institute Commentary* 162, Toronto, C.D. Howe Institute.

DOERN, G. BRUCE and BRIAN W. TOMLIN

1991 *Faith and Fear: The Free Trade Story*, Toronto, Stoddart.

DYMOND, WILLIAM and MICHAEL HART

2001 *Common Borders, Shared Destinies: Canada, the United States and Deepening Integration*, Ottawa, Centre for Trade Policy and Law.

EASTERBROOK, W. THOMAS

1990 *North American Patterns of Growth and Development: The Continental Context*, ed. by Ian Parker, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

EASTERBROOK, W. THOMAS and H.G.J. AITKEN

1956 *Canadian Economic History*, Toronto, MacMillan.

FOSTER, JOHN W. and JOHN DILLON

2003 "NAFTA in Canada: The Era of a Supra-Constitution," in Karen Hansen-Kuhn and Steve Hellinger, eds., *Lessons from NAFTA: The High Cost of "Free Trade"*, Ottawa, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, pp. 83-115.

GABRIEL, CHRISTINA and LAURA MACDONALD

- 2003 "Beyond the Continentalist/Nationalist Divide: Politics in a North America 'without Borders'", in Wallace Clement and Leah F. Vosko, *Changing Canada: Political Economy as Transformation*, Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's, pp. 213-240.

GRANT, GEORGE PARKIN

- 1965 *Lament for a Nation: The Defeat of Canadian Nationalism*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

HART, MICHAEL

- 1989 *Dispute Settlement and the Canada-United States Free Trade Agreement*, Ottawa, Carleton University Press.
- 1994 *Decision at Midnight: Inside the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Negotiations*, Vancouver, UBC Press.
- 2000 "The Road to Free Trade," in L. Ian MacDonald, ed., *Free Trade: Risks and Rewards*, Montreal and Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 3-34.
- 2004 "A New Accommodation with the United States: The Trade and Economic Dimension", in Thomas D. Courchene, Donald J. Savoie and Daniel Schwanen, eds., *The Art of the State*, vol. 2., *Thinking North America*, Montreal, Institute for Research on Public Policy.

HELLIWELL, JOHN F.

- 2002 *Globalization and Well-Being*, Vancouver, UBC Press.

HENRY, J.

- 1976 "La Dépendance structurelle du Québec dans un Canada dominé par les États-Unis," in R. Tremblay, ed., *L'Économie québécoise*, Montreal, Les Presses de l'Université du Québec, pp. 295-311.

HOBERG, GEORGE

- 2002 "Introduction: Economic, Cultural, and Political Dimensions of North American Integration," in George Hoberg, ed., *Capacity for Choice: Canada in a New North America*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, pp. 3-13.

IKEDA, SATOSHI

- 2004 "Zonal Structure and the Trajectories of Canada, Mexico, Australia, and Norway under Neo-Liberal Globalisation," in Stephen Clarkson and Mar-

jorie Griffin Cohen, eds., *States under Siege: Semi-Peripheral Countries under Globalism*, London, Zed Books, pp. 263-290.

INNIS, H.A.

1950 *Empire and Communications*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

1956 *The Fur Trade in Canada*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press.

JACKSON, ANDREW

2003 *Why the Big Idea is a Bad Idea: A Critical Perspective on Deeper Economic Integration with the United States*, Ottawa, Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

LEVITT, KARI

1970 *The Silent Surrender: The Multinational Corporation in Canada*, Toronto, Macmillan.

MACDONALD, L. IAN., ed.

2000 *Free Trade: Risks and Rewards*, Montreal & Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press.

MCQUEEN, ROD

1985 *Leap of Faith: The Macdonald Report*, Toronto, Cowan & Company Publishers.

MOLOT, MAUREEN APPEL, ed.

1993 *Driving Continentally: National Policies and the North American Auto Industry*, Ottawa, Carleton University Press.

ROCHER, FRANÇOIS

1993 "Continental Strategy, Quebec in North America," in Alain-G. Gagnon, ed. *Quebec: State and Society*, 2nd ed., Scarborough, Nelson, pp. 450-68.

ROCHER, FRANÇOIS and CHRISTIAN ROUILLARD

2002 "Redefining the Locus of Power," in George Hoberg, ed., *Capacity for Choice: Canada in a New North America*, Toronto, University of Toronto Press, pp. 224-251.

SAFARIAN, A.E.

1966 *Foreign Ownership of Canadian Industry*, Toronto, McGraw-Hill.

SCHWANEN, DANIEL

2004 "Deeper, Broader: A Roadmap for a Treaty of North America," in Thomas J. Courchene, Donald J. Savoie and Daniel Schwanen, eds., *The Art of the State*, vol. 2. *Thinking North America*, Montreal, Institute for Research on Public Policy.

WATKINS, MEL

1989 "The Political Economy of Growth," in Wallace Clement and Glen Williams, eds., *The New Canadian Political Economy*, Kingston, McGill-Queen's University Press, pp. 16-35.

WELSH, JENNIFER

2004 *At Home in the World: Canada's Global Vision for the 21st Century*, Toronto, Harper Collins.

WILLIAMS, GLEN

1983 *Not For Export: Toward a Political Economy of Canada's Arrested Industrialization*, Toronto, McClelland and Stewart.

WONNACOTT, R.J. AND P. WONNACOTT

1967 *Free Trade between the United States and Canada*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press.