



THE CANADIAN
NARRATIVE PROJECT

*Starting a national conversation
about our shared and separate
stories and who we are*

CANADA

STILL THE UNKNOWN
COUNTRY

WILLIAM A. MACDONALD

Copyright © William A. Macdonald 2014

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced by any means without prior permission of the author.

For more information or additional copies of this publication, please contact:

W.A. Macdonald Associates Inc.
120 Adelaide Street West, Suite 1201
Toronto, Ontario, Canada M5H 1T1
T: 416-865-7091, Ext. 201
E: wam@wamacdonald.com
W: www.wamacdonald.com

This publication is also available online at www.canadiandifference.ca

We encourage and appreciate your views and comments.

Cette publication est disponible en ligne à www.differencecanadienne.ca

Nous encourageons et apprécions vos opinions et commentaires.

THE CANADIAN
NARRATIVE PROJECT

*Starting a national conversation
about our shared and separate
stories and who we are*

CANADA
STILL THE UNKNOWN
COUNTRY

*Will mutual accommodation be
Canada's contribution to the world
in the 21st century?*

WILLIAM A. MACDONALD

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Launching the discussion for the Canadian Narrative Project 7

BACKGROUND

The Narrative Project: What is it about? 9

Why understanding our narrative of mutual accommodation
is important to Canada and to the rest of the world 12

Multiple Canadian narratives 14

Current issues facing Canada 21

The Canada–U.S. relationship narrative 24

Into the future: Challenges on many fronts 26

Biographical notes 30

Launching the discussion for the Canadian Narrative Project

Throughout the Western world, in the advanced economies initially and now in Russia and China too, the generations that lived their prime years between 1945 and the end of the 20th century enjoyed unprecedented peace and prosperity—in stark contrast to the two world wars and depression period endured by their parents. In the new century, the hard-won inclusive world order threatens to break down in the face of a number of geopolitical crises, economic and financial instability, as well as climate change, resource management, huge population growth, and unprecedented displacement of people.

Canada is in a unique position to survive and to contribute to the solutions to these problems. Throughout its history it has used a series of mutual accommodations to overcome whatever severe problems arose, whether of geography and climate, sharing the North American continent with a dominant and sometimes expansionist neighbour, regional tensions, political rivalries between the federal and provincial governments, and language, religious, and cultural divisions among its population.

Before we Canadians can fully use and share this governance model effectively, we must first collect the stories of our successful and failed mutual accommodations, absorb them, and articulate them for others. We already know some of them partially, some instinctively, but the time has come to begin a national conversation that we call the Canadian Narrative Project, about our shared and separate stories and who we are. Only then can we truly appreciate our own country and play the global role that the world needs us to play right now.

“The Canadian genius for compromise is reflected in the existence of Canada itself”

– NORTHROP FRYE –

“Like hockey, Canada, I think, is a ‘find-a-way’ country ... I believe that the 21st century will be a ‘find-a-way’ century”

– KEN DRYDEN –

“Canada is one of the world’s rare and privileged countries in terms of peace, justice, liberty and standard of living”

– ROBERT BOURASSA –

“Canada gives you what you give to Canada”

– YEMENI MUSLIM TAXI DRIVER IN OTTAWA –

The Canadian Narrative Project: What is it about?

Canada's greatest achievements are founded on mutual accommodation

Canada has accomplished three great achievements. First, despite severe challenges of geography, history, and society, it has survived—not just as a nation but as one that includes a distinctive Quebec within it. Second, despite its enormous size and small population located north of the powerful and prosperous United States, it has established a politically stable and economically successful coast-to-coast country occupying half a continent. Finally, despite its divisions of nationality, culture, language, and religion, it has developed a political and socio-cultural outlook that works, based on mutual accommodation and a supportive shared order.

THE MAIN SHAPING IDEAS

Seven ideas shape the mutual accommodation story of “Canada—Still the Unknown Country” set out in this document. The unknown-country idea came from the title of the book Bruce Hutchison wrote in 1942. The idea of usable history comes from William Pfaff’s *New Yorker* discussion of the post-Soviet collapse, where he said Russia’s problem was that it had no usable history. The idea that shared stories are the stuff of usable history has many sources.

The four other ideas are, I think, original to me—which means they are largely unfamiliar to others. The first is the basic idea of mutual accommodation. The more I think about Canada and about everything that is going on in the world today, the more this idea becomes central to Canada and increasingly to everything else. The second is the likelihood that we will have another “Sir John A. Macdonald moment,” so-called because what it will demand when it initially appears, like the first Sir John A. Macdonald moment, will be completely improbable and require much boldness and patience. The third is external to Canada—that we are at a very difficult

time in history (like 1815, 1914, 1945, or 2001), in which the dominant forces and momentum that have overcome everything standing in their way seem to weaken and the path forward becomes uncertain again.

The final idea is that greatness is important for countries and for leaders, and that great leaders and great countries make many mistakes—some of them big ones—but that they get the greatest thing right. Laurier and Canada, for instance, became great by getting mutual accommodation right.

Courage supports bold action and helps to confront hard challenges. Shared stories can strengthen courage. These two ideas lie behind the Canadian Narrative Project. Bill Innes and I, who have collaborated on this project, are not historian wannabes who think we have a better grasp of Canadian history than others. Bill has spent his career in the global oil industry in Canada, Europe, Japan and the United States. He sees Canada’s mutual accommodation story as a crucial advantage. I see several decades of challenge ahead at least on the scale of what happened internationally after 1910. We will

get the policies we need only if, through a national conversation, we find the story that captures where Canadians are now and how they see things. This conversation is key to everything else before us.

This mutual accommodation is the opposite of the drive toward individual rights and division, the never-ending struggle between good and evil. In the demanding decades ahead for Canada and the world at large, as the global order faces real risks of serious destabilization, mutual accommodation looks more and more to be the key ingredient needed for the survival of our world as we know it. Essentially, Canada can contribute to a different model for our joint occupation of the earth and to a set of frameworks for better understanding what is happening in the world today, what needs to happen, and how we can respond to these challenges.

There are three kinds of stories: the “how” (the journey itself); the “where” (the journey’s destination); and the “what” (specific events along the way). Mutual accommodation is a how story—a way of doing politics and social living. It is how the whats and the wheres are gone about. Science is another great how story—the whats (the discoveries) and the wheres (the specific investigation goals) take place within the science way of doing things. Mutual accommodation is not itself a memorable event, although it can make possible uniquely remarkable events. In the years since the Renaissance, science has changed the world by the way it goes about the world of knowledge and technology. Mutual accommodation changed Canada—and it can also change the world.

THE PROJECT

Canada’s mutual accommodation story began when Samuel de Champlain arrived at Quebec in 1608 with a vision for a new nation based on cooperation between the native inhabitants and the incoming French settlers. Once Canada became a nation through Confederation in 1867, it spent its first 150 years in consolidating its northern half of

the North American continent into a viable country—again through mutual accommodation between the provinces and the federal government, French and English, Quebec and the rest of Canada, settlers and immigrants, though with the glaring omission of the First Nations. The next 100 years will likely be dominated by serious threats to the world’s economic and geopolitical order and stability—a world in which Canada’s rare combination of physical bounty and socio-political understanding could well make a significant contribution. This project is a call for action by Canadians to begin talking about their shared history and to use it purposefully in the years ahead for the benefit of all peoples. Moving ahead always requires resilience—and resilience in countries requires a usable history, a shared story. Canada has that shared story—but it needs now to articulate it and use it to build strength and pride.

THE CASE

The shared Canadian narrative that made possible this country is its drive toward mutual accommodation. This practice has made it a unique and great country by the standards of history. As Quebec premier Robert Bourassa put it, Canada is for its citizens “one of the world’s rare and privileged countries in terms of peace, justice, liberty and standard of living.” To date, Canada’s focus has been on its own internal development and on coping with the United States. The focus of its future, however, will be more external, extending beyond the United States. Canada has the water, food, space, minerals, resources, politics, economy, and societal and cultural ways that the rest of the world increasingly finds in short supply. These diverse advantages provide both opportunity and risk. If Canada is to seize the opportunities and avoid the risks, it needs to have a national conversation about the shared and separate stories of its different peoples and parts of the country—a sense of how it got where it is, how to envisage its future, and how to seize its place in the world.

THE MESSAGE

Canada is still in some sense an unknown country to itself and to others. It needs to begin a national conversation about many important issues—but above all about its shared mutual accommodation narrative and how it captures what most Canadians feel about their country. Many first-class historians have already brought much of the past into the conversation. Nonetheless, most Canadians still do not appreciate how well our shared way of dealing with differences and setbacks has worked for us. If we articulate this message well and deepen our understanding of its power, it will continue to work for us and others in the future. Stories, ideas, and choices together shape individuals, societies, and civilizations and allow us to explore possibilities and test limits. Vision—the sense of what can be and what should be—lures and drives all three.

As Northrop Frye said, identities are always about who you aspire to be, not who you are now.

THE GOAL

The goal of the Narrative Project is to create a national conversation about Canada's shared narrative and thereby enable Canadians to draw on mutual accommodation as they address future challenges. The project will set up an engaging, interactive website where everyone can post their stories and views and join in the conversation about what it is to be Canadian and live in this country. Every Canadian has something to contribute—academics, artists, trades people, First Nations people, immigrants, and old settlers.

Recent developments in social media technology allow large numbers of people simultaneously to engage in discussions about common subjects. The project's interactive website will break down the narrative into a number of related topics where people can express or exchange views and record their narratives. It will also host relevant articles and links to other materials of interest. The aim is to keep it fresh and rewarding, so followers will check it frequently and add to the national dialogue.

The technology will also enable analysis of the web data to identify and stimulate discussion around emerging themes or among specific communities of users. Ultimately it will form a permanent record in the public domain of Canadians' views on this important subject.

THE PROCESS

The project is establishing collaborations with Canadian Studies programs at universities to identify and initiate the discussion among those with a professional interest in the subject. From this base we want to broaden the user population to other communities of interest—university alumni, educational institutions, and eventually the population at large. As the user base expands, the discussion will be promoted through marketing channels and by discussions in print and other media.

This exciting project not only deals with an important subject but represents a groundbreaking opportunity to harness the power of social media to stimulate social awareness and change on a national level.

Why understanding our narrative of mutual accommodation is important to Canada and to the rest of the world

THE CANADA WE KNOW

Canada has been forged from a hard geography and a demanding history, both internal (French/English) and external (in relation to the United States). In the coming decades we will face new choices around how we use and protect our valuable yet increasingly scarce assets and the purposes to which we put them. The choices we make will determine the role Canada will play in a changing world of huge peril and opportunity. It is a world in which working within limits may become as critical as pushing possibilities has been in the past. Limits drive creativity—the key element in survival and thrival. Canada's mutual accommodation story is overwhelmingly one of creatively overcoming the limits of human governance in ways that many other societies have failed to do.

CANADA IN THE YEARS AHEAD

The national focus of the last 150 years has been on consolidating the transcontinental nation formed by Sir John A. Macdonald; on achieving independence from Great Britain; and on avoiding domination by the United States. The focus for the rest of this century will be more external—on our global role and on what we choose to stand for in human history. Currently Canada faces a large number of immediate economic policy challenges and will soon face huge political challenges for the longer term as well. They will require vision, much discussion, political fights, and long struggles. What if the 21st century for the world's peoples is primarily about resources, creativity, innovation, governing diversity, and achieving essential levels of collective action? What if the population explosion, resource limits, and

climate change make management of the planet increasingly difficult? What if the demands of an inclusive global order prove too much for too many important countries? How might Canada fit in?

That question is the biggest of all for Canadians—and the answer will be a long time coming. The challenge for the world will be to decide what kind of global, separate, and differently connected orders are needed to move on from the current inclusive order ranged around the West to one that will involve virtually every country in ways that some major countries may not be able to handle. This is the world's great mutual accommodation challenge. Like Canada, it will take a long, long time to get there.

CANADA'S CHANGING ROLE FROM A BACKWATER TO A GLOBAL ROLE IN HUMAN HISTORY

Just as England in the early 16th century had a rule of law and constitutional democracy gospel to spread, Canada today has a mutual accommodation gospel to share as the only lasting way to achieve sustainable individual and collective purpose. Rather than entrenching its message through occupation, as England did, Canada can see its approach advance only by example—by how Canada works together with others on current challenges. (Canadian business and professional people are already sharing their mutual accommodation expertise and experience internationally.) Mutual accommodation is based on the idea that multiple purposes are valid and that, where there is good faith, ways can be found to accommodate one another's purposes. It allows for hard fights, but requires that all participants know when to stop and how to negotiate.

There is no real mutual accommodation in the soft idea of going along to get along when important matters are at stake.

Narratives can be fatefully powerful for both good and ill. History has shown that robust and resilient peoples and individuals are most lastingly sustained by strong, soundly based narratives and by a clear understanding of whom and what they are like—and not like. Today’s Canada falls short on both counts. Its strength has been that its actions are often ahead of its understanding of its own nature and achievements. Its weakness is that it will need in the future to draw upon a usable history that it still knows little about. Successful narratives, such as Canada’s stories of mutual accommodation, need both leaders to articulate what happened and followers to respond.

Canada has become a good and great country,

unlike any other, but it is largely unknown to itself and to others. As Marshall McLuhan said, “Canada is the only country in the world that knows how to live without an identity.” It can no longer afford the luxury of remaining quite so unknown and unaware—the challenges ahead are just too great, both domestically and internationally. Canada’s special relationships through the connectedness of its citizens to every corner of the world and its mutual accommodation skills are both relatively scarce. They will be needed as the world becomes simultaneously more disconnected and yet interconnected. Speaking for myself, I can say that Canada gave me the space and the scope to own my life and to pursue both individual and shared purposes. And Canada works well for newcomers too: as a Bangladesh engineer, now a taxi driver in Toronto, said, “I can live with integrity and hold my head high in Canada.”

*“Canada is the only country in the world
that knows how to live without an identity”*

– MARSHALL MCLUHAN –

Multiple Canadian narratives

If multiple accommodation is a key characteristic in Canada's shared narrative, how do personalities and events from our past and a variety of issues and ways of doing things in this country illustrate this theme?

HISTORICAL NARRATIVES

Canada's great overarching and common narrative started at its very beginning, with the European traders' and settlers' early reliance amid a difficult geography on the Aboriginal people. Over the centuries, through mutual dependency and support, the nation that has emerged is one of mutual shaping and accommodation. In 1942 Bruce Hutchison, a western Canadian journalist and editor, wrote a book about Canada that he titled *The Unknown Country*. It was a start, but 70 years later Canada is still largely unknown to itself and to others. As we go into the 21st century, Canadians need to understand the challenges and choices our predecessors have faced and made and what we have become. Canada is a different kind of country: it has not been entirely free of wars or violence, but its primary markers have been a blend of vision and of what works on the ground.

VISIONS OF CANADA'S GREATEST AND BOLDEST LEADERS

Canada's three greatest visionary leaders—Samuel de Champlain, John A. Macdonald, and Wilfrid Laurier—each combined vision, practical boldness, and an ability to work and get along with a range of diverse people. Two other politicians, Robert Baldwin and Louis-Hippolyte LaFontaine, proved that political and social reform could be achieved

by non-violent means. Mackenzie King was the great consolidator of their achievements, which required a type of vision and boldness different from theirs. Today all these leaders would recognize that many of their visions are embedded in the fabric of modern Canada.

Champlain

Champlain's vision was for a new kind of society—one where people, both Aboriginal and European, could live together in amity, without violence and with mutual respect. Unlike the individualism underlying the American dream—the “life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness” for each individual that is reflected in both the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution—the Canadian dream comes from the toughened vision of this war-weary French soldier who had experienced the horrors of violence and who is best known in history as an explorer.

Champlain had many particular dreams—colonization of New France, which he succeeded in doing; and a passage to China, which he failed to find because it did not exist. His greatest dream was one of humanity and peace. In North America, Champlain became a political leader and statesman who, through his ability to get along with very different people, was able to convert his dreams into reality. Without doubt, Canada's dream

includes individual desires for freedom and happiness, just as America's dream includes wishes for a better, fairer, and more equal and open society. But the initial dreams in the two countries were and remain different: as the American poet Robert Frost put it in another context, "and that has made all the difference."

LaFontaine and Baldwin

The vision of LaFontaine and Baldwin manifested itself in 1848, when they led the only reform movement in the West of that year which prevailed as responsible government and never lost its democracy. The French Roman Catholic LaFontaine in Lower Canada needed the strength of the English Protestant Baldwin from Upper Canada to overcome the anti-reform position of much of the Quebec clergy. Baldwin in turn needed the strength of the French Catholic LaFontaine to sustain his ability to overcome the anti-reform power of the Family Compact.

Both these leaders had to collaborate before they could achieve their objectives. They were able to work together successfully at a time when differences of religion and nationality were very intense. When LaFontaine lost his Quebec seat, and Baldwin lost his Ontario seat, each ran successfully in the other province, despite these divisions. This accommodation showed early on, 20 years before Confederation, that a shared public purpose pursued through compromise could trump nationality and religion with Canadian voters.

But the idea of restraint (not always a notable feature in Europe or the United States) is perhaps the most striking element in this story. LaFontaine stood down the anti-reform mob in Montreal by asserting that reform would prevail without recourse to violence. That was a century before Mahatma Gandhi championed non-violence in India, Nelson Mandela in South Africa, or Martin Luther King in the United States. The story of these two men alone should make Canadians want to understand better what it was about Canada that

could produce such leaders and such followers—and what that can still mean for Canada and the world in the decades ahead.

Macdonald

Macdonald's vision was national—for a transcontinental country in the northern half of North America able to accommodate people of French and English heritage, of Catholic and Protestant faith, a country ready to stand up to the United States and to build a sound economy. He remains the country's greatest builder, striving for a nation of "one people, great in territory, great in enterprise, great in credit, great in capital." Macdonald got the three biggest things of his era right: Confederation, the Canadian Pacific Railway from coast to coast, and an end to American expansionism. He also got English-French politics mostly right, though the execution of Louis Riel aggravated the political challenges from both western Canada and francophone Quebec.

When the country needed a looser federation than Macdonald sought, Confederation allowed it. His "old country, old flag" vision proved impractical for the longer term: Canada was neither British nor European; rather, it was North American, but not American.

Macdonald found in his partnership with George-Étienne Cartier a way forward on the Quebec political front that endured for more than one hundred years. And he recognized how fundamental essential mutual respect was to mutual accommodation: "Treat them as a nation, and they will act as a free people generally do—generously," he said. "Call them a faction and they become factious." Macdonald himself, in a private letter a few weeks before July 1, 1867, described what he felt had been achieved: "By the exercise of common sense and a limited amount of the patriotism which goes by the name of self-interest, I have no doubt the Union will be good for the Country's weal."

Confederation was a first: no previous colonials had written their own constitution. It set in motion a coast-to-coast country that has survived. Canada

has also emerged as one of the world's best places to live and one of the great countries of history for its achievements in mutual accommodation.

Laurier

Laurier's vision was neither societal nor national but political. It was to achieve public purpose through compromise and accommodation. Laurier and Canada each became great because each got right perhaps the most important of all the lessons of the 20th century (if not all human history)—the central necessity of mutual accommodation to the achievement of peace, prosperity, and deep and lasting human purpose.

Laurier said that the 20th century would belong to Canada. In many ways that proved true, in the sense of the relative goodness of life available in Canada to “regular” individuals and their families. It became true primarily because Canada followed the Laurier vision of public achievements through compromise and restraint. The very election of Laurier as prime minister, a French-speaking Quebecer and Roman Catholic, by English non-Catholics only 30 years after Canada's formation is amazing. In those days, the French did not much like the English, and the Protestants did not much like the Catholics—and vice versa. The fact that few inside or outside Quebec at the time seemed to think this choice was all that significant is in itself amazing.

This approach was so powerful and suitable to Canada that it kept the federal Liberal Party in office three out of every four years over the following 110 years. It was so powerful that the less flexible (instinctively either/or, win/lose) Canadian leaders have been either restrained by it or, along with their party, later made to pay the price. The federal Liberal Party is still paying the price, 30 years later, of Pierre Trudeau's non-mutual accommodation unilateralism and his lack of restraint on both the Constitution and the National Energy Program. The Conservative Party similarly paid a 65-year price in Quebec for Robert Borden's inability to find the

conscriptio compromise needed in the First World War (though many would say the Conservative decline started earlier, with Riel's execution). Great leaders make many mistakes, including big ones, but they get the greatest things right. And so it is with countries, too.

The result of the various visions

Canada has been shaped by all these visions in ways that have been mutually reinforcing. Champlain's vision of a diverse and peaceable society remains a dominant, but not yet fully realized, Canadian vision of society. Much still remains to be done in mutual accommodation with the First Nations. Baldwin and LaFontaine's vision of reform through non-violent means has become the Canadian way. Macdonald's vision has led to the good country Canadians know and love today. Laurier's way of doing politics has been followed even by those leaders whose natural leadership instincts run counter to it, though it will never be able to declare final victory. Together these visions have made Canada a great country by the standards of history.

CANADA'S TWO NON-POLITICAL VISIONARIES

Mutual accommodation involves two fundamentals: effective two-way communication and an underlying belief that a shared and meaningful order exists at the heart of things. Geography creates one kind of communication problem. It explains why western Canadians can feel alienated from Ottawa and Toronto, and why mid-western Americans disdain Washington and New York.

But breaking away from history can result in much bigger and deeper communication challenges than holding onto it. The American Civil War was violent and lasted for four years; the aftermath still persists and contributes to the nation's current political turmoil. Canada, in contrast, did not have an abrupt break in its history. Rather, its English and French connections gradually became less relevant over the years. Where the American rupture between

North and South was sudden and destructive, followed by subsequent reconnections, Canada's recent existential crisis concerning Quebec was peaceful and lasted for decades. These differences have produced distinctive communication, institutional, and socio-cultural results in both countries. It's no accident, perhaps, that Canada's two greatest non-political visionaries in the mid-20th century addressed these communication issues.

Northrop Frye and Marshall McLuhan

Frye and McLuhan were both professors at the University of Toronto in the mid-20th century. Each had a Canadian, as distinct from an American, sense of the fundamental shared order at the heart of things. Between them they captured better than anyone else the nature of the transformational communication and identity changes of the post-1945 era which underlay the vast and more visible political and economic changes of the period.

McLuhan grasped the scale and scope of the incipient revolution of modern communications technology, along with some of its socio-cultural implications. For him, the medium was the message. Because the technology was global, the world had become a global village—a prophecy that has proved in the years since his death in 1980 to be remarkably insightful.

Frye grasped the reality that culture is fundamental and that all culture is local in expression. Whatever your culture or nation, it comes from a shared order, and all literature has the same anatomy. The global village is also a globe of villages. The successful or unsuccessful reconciliation of the global village with the globe of villages is what the next decades will be largely about. For Frye the world of the imagination (inner) is the only place of unlimited individual freedom, unlike the physical (outer) world of limits. The Americans more than any other society have a never-ending drive for outer freedom in search of new possibilities, with the fewest possible limits.

Frye argued that free individual responses, rather

than manipulated responses (the world of mass media), would produce genuine and sustainable human cohesion. He saw the media as too often a world of manipulated mass response, leaving less space for individual reflective response—and, I would add, for real mutual accommodation that lasts.

The U.S. media may be a particular problem for Canadian culture. But, as Frye once famously said, the problem was even greater for American culture. Culture for Frye was not simply high culture, but the response of individuals and groups to what is put in front of them. Canadians in their characteristic responses lean more toward the “underlying unity and order” view, while Americans tend more to the “struggle between good and evil until the final moment of victory or judgment” idea. Alarming, the drive toward unresolvable divisions produces a world of slippery slopes and apocalyptic dangers that make democratic politics and mutual accommodation much more difficult.

MORE RECENT CANADIAN NARRATIVES

Canada used its first 150 years to consolidate the initial thin coast-to-coast thread of an improbable country into a strong and viable country. It withstood the centrifugal forces within the country and the external expansionist instincts of the United States. It has survived the huge global convulsions of two world wars and a great depression.

Not surprisingly, multiple narratives have emerged from the many challenges, successes, and turmoil in such a vast country and with such diverse peoples from so many different parts of the world. These, however, have rarely been national stories. Far more commonly they are regional and close to the ground of everyday real life—from western Canada, the North, First Nations, immigrants, the Québécois, and francophone Canadians outside Quebec. Only Ontario, particularly since 1945, has consistently regarded Canada in a more national way. This may now be changing, as Ontario now finds itself inside a Canada that no longer works for its economy.

Canada's glue is still its unknown shared narrative. Its future lies in a return to the boldness that created Canada back in 1864–67. Yet even as the country enters this new era with exceptional strengths, it will, paradoxically, become more vulnerable than ever to those who need or want what Canada possesses. Our greatest defence against these inroads will be to articulate our stories in order to understand who we are and what we stand for.

Currie and his Canadian fighting men

Leaders with the right followers, and followers with the right leaders, can do great things. Both came together for Canada in the final year of the First World War—a definite coming-of-age moment for Canada. Sir Arthur Currie, the top general, had to fight to keep his Canadian Army together as the British tried to break it up and absorb it into its own forces. The Canadian Corps then achieved the well-known victory in April 1917 at Vimy Ridge, alone among all the armies on the Western front in four years of war to capture a fortified ridge. During the Hundred Days offensive in September–October 1918 the Corps outflanked the German army, which led to its only real defeats in that war at the Drocourt-Quéant line and at Canal du Nord. Both battles were key turning points in ending the war.

Currie and his army had the special Canadian mix of qualities of socio-cultural egalitarianism, acceptance of complexity, a flexibility not inhibited by traditions, a focus on what works, and a reliance on what they observed rather than on what they had been told. It was the blend of boldness and an accommodating “both/and” approach that enabled them to win their unique trio of uncompromising “either/or” victories. It was an early example of how Canadians can win at either/or in a Canadian way that is simultaneously restrained and advanced by their both/and instincts.

It was also the occasion of one of Canada's most amazing choices—Currie's decision to make his Vimy Ridge plan (but not the date) available to every soldier, so, as the battle unfolded, everyone

would understand what was going on and be able to operate without direction if needed. No other country was culturally flexible enough to do that. Even today, few chief executives would take that kind of a risk.

Mackenzie King and the Laurier way of governing Canada

William Lyon Mackenzie King was the first (and still the most important and longest-serving) heir to the Laurier way of politics. He understood from the beginning what all successful and democratic political leaders must come to know: that you can achieve your public purposes through compromise and patience, and that you can win elections by following that route. Canadian historian Frank Underhill put it best at the time of King's death: while he, Underhill, always knew what was best for Canada, King knew how to govern Canada. Later, Robert Stanfield, the Progressive Conservative opposition leader during the Trudeau years, said that King was Canada's greatest prime minister because he had the most patience with the Canadian people.

Europe during these same years experienced two world wars, a holocaust, its own near-suicide, and the massacre of millions of people in the Soviet Union—largely because of differences among the various countries and particular views that overrode any drive toward mutual accommodation. If we compare the political fallout from Canada's two conscription crises—Borden's failed attempt in 1914–18 and King's success in 1939–45, we see immediately how well the “King way” suits Canada. In his own but different way, King was also a political visionary. The consolidation of a vast, regionally centred country requires its own form of vision, albeit one different in nature from the visions of Champlain, Macdonald, and Laurier.

Mackenzie King consolidated the Laurier political way after it was torn apart by the conscription crisis during the First World War. He did not abandon Laurier as other English-speaking Liberals did.

Laurier stood by Québécois voters, and King stood by Laurier. This way proved to be the indispensable path back from the edges of the abyss caused by the Riel crisis and by failures of mutual accommodation first by Macdonald and then by Borden.

King also helped to overcome the political impact in Quebec of Laurier's earlier failures to achieve mutual accommodation on imperial war policy and French-language school rights outside Quebec. He overcame the western Canada divisions over the control of natural resources in the 1920s and the divisions of Quebec over conscription during the Second World War. These two divisions largely shaped the post-1945 Canada we now have.

More recent politicians have also followed the Laurier way

Quebec premier Robert Bourassa was an underappreciated player in the successful outcome of Canada's existential crisis and of Quebec's journey from the pre-modern world to the post-modern world. His natural instincts were more conciliatory than those of the other two main Quebec leaders of the period—Pierre Trudeau and René Lévesque. After a turbulent Quebec Liberal Party meeting following the defeat of Meech Lake, he uttered the most eloquent one liner about Canada I have read: Canada is "one of the world's rare and privileged countries in terms of peace, justice, liberty, and standard of living."

A few months later I met with Bourassa and two business leaders in Toronto. At the end of the session he said that, even if Quebec voted to separate, it could never happen, because "we are too intertwined." Just three months before he died, he told me that Quebecers know that they cannot survive as a "separate redoubt in the north-east corner of North America." He understood Quebec's collectivity aspirations and Québécois nationalism. But he never deviated from his belief that Quebec's future depended primarily on its own economic strength—and that this strength depended on being part of Canada. Today's Canada and today's Quebec are

closer to the Bourassa vision than the vision of any other of these Quebec leaders.

René Lévesque and Lucien Bouchard accommodated that point in some way in their sovereignty-association formulation. What Lévesque more than Bouchard (a fiscal and economic realist) may not have understood was that political sovereignty and economic association would not likely work or be politically acceptable. The European Union is now learning this same hard lesson. The eurozone does not work: a high economic and social contract price is being paid, and there is no obvious way out of the predicament.

Lester Pearson and Brian Mulroney followed intuitively with the same accommodation instinct. Neither, however, possessed King's political mastery. Pierre Trudeau and Stephen Harper were not naturally drawn temperamentally to the Laurier way. Eventually, however, each of them did much of what their times required for what became mutual accommodation outcomes.

Trudeau faced enormous centrifugal tensions, especially in an existential form from separatists in Quebec. When he chose a strong anti-Québécois nationalist stance, it may or may not have been essential. Moderate Québécois nationalism might have become engulfed by separatism. Trudeau chose not to run that risk but to confront it. That meant he had to fight three-quarters of franco-phone Quebecers, rather than only the one-quarter who were separatists. He succeeded in keeping Canada together. However, his decision came at considerable cost to Canada and the Liberal Party, which lost the essential Québécois part of the Québécois/western Canadian Laurier/King coalition. Unfortunately, like Mulroney later, Trudeau was never able to understand the West.

Trudeau was also forced by Laurier's Canada to abandon his initial unilateral constitutional approach and to grant the "notwithstanding clause" political override to most of his cherished Charter of Rights and Freedoms. So the man that his friend Laurent Picard, a former CBC president, once privately

called the biggest yes/no guy in the business found Laurier's yes/yes, both/and Canada to be stronger than his own natural either/or instincts.

Somewhat surprisingly to many, Harper has generally done well on that file in terms of its outcomes. He lowered the federal-provincial quarrelling temperature and took the last steps away from excessive efforts to centralize social policy in Ottawa after the post-war Canadian economic recovery made it less necessary. He did not allow himself to be drawn in by Pauline Marois's Charter of Values dispute. He actively worked to prevent other premiers from being drawn into it and the subsequent Quebec provincial election. And he moderated the sense of western Canada alienation

by focusing on the West and its economic base—something that had been missing since the time of Laurier and King.

Also, Harper was able to do something that Trudeau never would. He set out the difference between the nation and the state in a House of Commons resolution that recognized the Québécois nation within a united Canadian state. Later, he issued the apology to the First Nations and established the Truth and Reconciliation Commission. If Harper were now able to use his office to get Canada onto the path to lasting mutual accommodation with the First Nations, he would leave an important nation-building legacy, no matter what future elections hold for him.

Current issues facing Canada

The mutual accommodation way continues with a variety of current domestic issues

QUEBEC AND CANADA: FOUR QUEBECS

Quebec has moved from the 300-plus years of survival mode for its language and culture in an often hostile political environment to a society we could call “thrival” (if I am allowed a word that many people have told me they like in this context). The province has gone through four phases: from pre-modern (before 1960) through a transition (the 1960 Quiet Revolution) to modern (1965–95) and finally to post-modern. Few societies have experienced such huge changes over so short a time with so little violence and so much economic and socio-cultural advance. What Québécois Quebec has achieved rests essentially on its own powerful sense of self and its strong internal solidarity. But the mutual accommodation culture in Canada, in which Quebec forms an indispensable part, was also crucial to this achievement. It allowed Quebec the space first to survive and now to thrive.

Quebec separated from Europe long before English Canada did from the United Kingdom. So it felt being independent and “Canadian” first. Quebec was also a major bulwark against excessive centralization in Ottawa. Most people outside Quebec do not yet appreciate how helpful that has been for the country as a whole. In a world about to become both more disconnected and more interconnected than it has ever been, Canada’s strongly Quebec-influenced federalism will likely prove even more valuable than it has been so far. If Quebec had been an English-speaking province, the Canada of mutual accommodation would almost certainly not have happened. Its provincial

autonomy assertiveness enabled Canada to escape an unworkable centralized federal government. For this reason, along with Canada’s smaller size, Canadians are more accepting than Americans of the idea that governments can work to good purpose.

Quebec’s determination to make its own choice whether to stay or to leave Canada produced a 40-year existential struggle in this country. Separatism emerged as an outcropping of the Quiet Revolution. It now seems to be dying as the impact of the Quiet Revolution transition recedes. It has been overcome by a new mutual accommodation for what is about to become a new world for everyone on the planet.

Psychologist Abraham Maslow’s hierarchy of needs is one way of looking at what has happened in Quebec since 1608. For much of its history, survival—level one of the hierarchy—was its primary challenge. Today, a growing number of Québécois are responding to the final three levels—internal cohesion, making a difference in the world, and embracing a purpose beyond Quebec for humanity and the planet.

Quebec’s astonishing survival-to-thrival story

No shared Canadian narrative will likely prove possible if there is not a central place within it for two remarkable themes. One is the original Champlain vision for a harmonious and progressive multicultural society in the colony he had founded. This vision is increasingly the only possible one for 21st-century Canada and for the 21st-century world. The other is the astonishing Quebec survival story

from 1608 to 1960, followed by the province's choice in 1960 to participate in modernity and its subsequent economic and socio-cultural thrival story.

Now, two-thirds or more of Quebecers want to move beyond the sovereignty-federalist fight that dominated Quebec between 1970 and 2011. The best description of where Canada stands in Quebec today may come from the younger generation of Quebecers who, for the most part, say they are Quebecers first and Canadians second—not federalists or separatists. This is a very Canadian both/and mutual accommodation conclusion, but also a very Quebec both/and conclusion.

Since 1754 Quebec and Canada have each evolved a sophisticated understanding of what the Québécois collectivity needs to survive. From 1608 to 1960, it rested heavily on the institution of the parish church. From 1960 through 2011, survival has rested more with Quebec francophone control of the Quebec government (rarely do minorities have a government at their disposal as Quebec francophones have almost always had). Now, in the new globalized world, Québécois survival and thrival will primarily rest on its own economic performance and living within its means. The political question for Quebecers in 2014 is how best to participate in Canada and in the world on a confident, forward-thinking, and outward-looking basis consistent with who they feel themselves to be.

Inner and outer mutual accommodation in Quebec

Canada's powerful mutual accommodation narrative seeks to make all Canadians feel that they are somebodies. Since 1960, Quebecers have increasingly come to feel that way both within and beyond their own borders. Nevertheless, numerous cultural and language anxieties remain around the Québécois identity, and some sovereignty aspiration will likely persist for some time. These factors will make it more difficult for Quebec politics to move outward and forward, rather than inward and backward.

The federal government has little interest in interfering in areas of provincial jurisdiction. We live in a world where the ideas of nations and nationalism and the reality of nation states are changing, though they still exist. The Québécois collectivity survival and thrival challenge does not and never did come primarily from the rest of Canada. It has always come from inside Quebec, fuelled by its long-time dominant and insensitive anglophone business community (no longer applicable), its disadvantaged French-language job seekers (no longer applicable), its still serious living-beyond-its-means fiscal position, certain serious areas of corruption, and by the need to become more competitive and economically prudent in a perilous and rapidly changing globalized economic world.

These challenges are shared with Canada as a whole, so overall federal economic policy is crucial for both Canada and Quebec. The not quite 40-year attempt to separate forced many inner mutual accommodations within Quebec—among families and neighbourhoods, and within individuals too—as they tried to balance their nationalist hearts with their realist heads.

THE WEST

The long-standing struggle of an emerging and ever-growing western Canada, far from the political, commercial, and financial centre of the country, to assert its autonomy, needs, and rights opposite central and eastern Canada is seriously misunderstood. As far back as 1913 the “Group of Three,” the premiers of Alberta, Saskatchewan, and Manitoba, united after a difficult meeting with Prime Minister Borden and sparked the West's first “quiet revolution” against the Rest of Canada's condescending attitude toward them. The final battle came over the ownership and control of natural resources.

In many ways, resources are to the West what language and culture have been to Quebec. They are symbols but also important elements in the development of political and economic autonomy

—of being somebodies in a world dominated by the distant aliens in central Canada. No Canadian prime minister really understood this point before Mackenzie King, who in 1925, with much devious skill, delivered that control of resources.

Lougheed

Peter Lougheed knew fifty years ago in 1965 that Albertans were ready to be senior partners in Confederation. He became one of the four key political leaders in Canada during the 1980s, when the centrifugal forces of Quebec separatism and western Canadian alienation were at their height. Twenty years later, when Lougheed stepped down as premier, indications were strong that Canada would unfold in a way closer to his view of the country than to those of Prime Minister Trudeau, Quebec premier Lévesque, or Ontario premier Bill Davis.

Lougheed was a great Canadian leader in the mutual accommodation mode. He knew that you sometimes had to fight very hard to attain the “mutual” part of the equation. He took on the “toughest guy in the West,” Trudeau, on resources (the National Energy Program) and on the “notwithstanding clause” in the Charter of Rights and Freedoms, forcing Trudeau to become on that issue a reluctant “mutual accommodation” leader.

The regions today

The new western Canada has more power and feels more confident. Canada will again need leaders to build bridges among its various regional economies. This task is probably beyond the capacity of any federal government on its own, as it was when Ottawa had to depend on Ontario during the early stages of the existential crisis with Quebec.

The timelines for both western Canada and Quebec accommodation have each been long. In the end, it seems fair to say that, by the standards of history and of whatever the best humans are able to achieve, mutual accommodation, for real people in a real world, has proved preferable to any other practical alternative available to Canadians.

CANADA'S MUTUALLY SHAPED MULTICULTURE

A century and a half ago the challenges stemming from the French/English and U.S. relationships set the mutual accommodation story in motion. The European immigration to western Canada under Laurier at the beginning of the 20th century initiated Canadian multiculturalism.

Today's Canada is not primarily an aggregate of many cultures, let alone a melting pot. It has become more a mutually shaped multiculture that includes within it a number of smaller mutually shaped cultures, which in turn are also on the way to becoming multicultures. Canada gives its citizens confidence to take that risk. The only shared, distinctively Canadian story many people have is the drive to mutual accommodation. It allows almost everyone to live as they want to (within the bounds of essential Canadian values) while simultaneously participating in Canada.

John Buchan, an author of spy thrillers and later, as Lord Tweedsmuir, governor general of Canada, told Canadian Ukrainians in 1930 that the more they remained Ukrainian, the more Canadian they would become. Much more recently, the *Globe and Mail* columnist Doug Saunders wrote in his Donner Prize-winning book, *Arrival City*, that the cities around the world who do best with immigrants reflect Buchan's idea. Those individuals start off with a toehold in their new land by living there among their own. They use this safe place to venture out into the wider and strange world of their new country.

Saunders rated Toronto high on the list for enabling immigrants to remain themselves and, at the same time, to begin becoming participants in their new world. This combination has so far enabled Canada to have levels of visible minority immigration that work even as those same levels are creating backlashes in Europe.

The Canada–U.S. relationship narrative

CANADA AND THE UNITED STATES AS NORTH AMERICAN COUNTRIES

Over the last one hundred years both Canada and the United States have gained a great deal from their relationship and from each other. Once the United States abandoned its expansionist ambitions toward Canada, the relationship became yet one more example of mutual accommodation. Within Canada itself, prime ministers have been judged on their ability to manage Canada–U.S. relations. Laurier lost an election over trade reciprocity with the United States in 1911. However, the changing U.S. attitude to the rest of the world following the First World War led to a golden age in Canada–U.S. relations from 1920 until very recently.

Canada is part of North America, but it is not the United States. Indeed, Canada's responses to being a new country in North America have in some ways been the opposite of those of the United States. Although Canada was initially slower in shedding its overt ties of history and politics, it quickly found that the divisions of European and English society and politics did not work in Canada. By contrast, the United States was quick to shed its overt ties of history and politics, but it has still not shaken off all the multiple sources of division that have dominated Europe's history.

CHANGING CONDITIONS FOR THE CANADA–U.S. RELATIONSHIP

Today Canada faces a United States that is still dominant and powerful but pulling back from its overreach of recent decades. Meanwhile, at home, the U.S. is embroiled in an intense political turmoil not seen since the Civil War. These changes are happening at a point where the United States is less reliant on Canada for energy and for the kind of international support it needed during the Cold War. Indeed, the United States, thanks to oil, may be becoming less interdependent with the external global economy. Meanwhile, the behaviour of other countries should begin to push the United States into greater political and economic isolationism.

At this troublesome time, a strong sense of Canada's shared narrative could become important in managing what has already become a much more difficult relationship with the United States. The long, hard global road ahead almost guarantees that the United States will need a model for mutual accommodation that only Canada can provide.

A more fractious United States will also mean, for Canada, an economy that is far more challenging to manage. The Canadian politics of getting along with the United States was once described by former Prime Minister John Turner in these words: "The Canadian voter will punish you if you get too close to the United States or too far from it. Sometimes it is impossible to know where that line is." At the time, the United States was not in the political turmoil it is experiencing now. That strife will make it more difficult for Canada to deal with its southern neighbour. It may also make it easier to discover that hard-to-find domestic political thin line.

**CANADA'S SPECIAL POSITION IS IN TRANSITION
BUT IS STILL POTENTIALLY POWERFUL**

Canada continues to hold a special position in dealing with the United States—a point that needs to be appreciated in Canada, the U.S., and other countries. First, for 150 years, Canada has lived next to the United States, a country that has ten times its population, its strength, and its wealth. Canadians and Americans have in many ways become each other's best friends and have each prospered greatly from their relationship.

Second, Canadians and Americans are not afraid to have their fights, but, for the most part, they fight fairly and for good reasons. Each one prefers to negotiate a resolution rather than risk a breakdown in the relationship.

Third, for some 50 years, there has been a broad overall balance in the current account payments and receipts between the two countries (though that is now changing adversely for Canada).

Fourth, Canada, having been exposed earlier than most countries to globalization through its dependence on international trade and international financial markets, has much accumulated historical experience that may well be valuable for the kind of world that lies ahead.

Finally, as we saw earlier, for all its history Canada has been involved with the governance of diversity. This vast experience should assist Canada in its future relations with the United States and also enable it to be useful to other countries as they move forward.

Into the future: Challenges on many fronts

HOW THE 17TH-CENTURY UNITED KINGDOM MOVED BACK FROM CIVIL WAR TO STABILITY AND ONTO ITS PARTICULAR VERSION OF MUTUAL ACCOMMODATION

I had a recent discussion on Canada's mutual accommodation story with Martin Wolf (the chief economic commentator of the *Financial Times*). He referred me to a book written almost 50 years ago by Cambridge historian J.H. Plumb on the subject of how England moved beyond civil war, revolution, and constant turbulence in the 17th century toward stability based on the right blend of authority (good institutions) with freedom. His description sounded something like Canada from its beginning, but without the civil war, revolution, or turbulence.

In response, three ideas came to me. Each reflects the importance of balance to stability and of stability to mutual accommodation. First, mutual accommodation not only helps to create stability but also requires it. Second, the Great Britain of the 18th century had two great strands of political thought—the liberal (enlightenment and the centrality of freedom and rights, leading on to the American Constitution, and Pierre Trudeau's Charter of Rights and Freedoms) and the conservative (Edmund Burke and his theory of the organic relationship of history and community). Canada's path has always been a blend of the sociological and of freedom and rights. Third, I learned almost 40 years ago from the great Japanese anthropologist Che Nakane about her perspective that Japanese society is deeply vertical (relationship based) rather than the Western horizontal (rights based).

I once explained this theory to a group of

Canadian CEOs in New Testament terms: "The rain falls on the just and unjust" (horizontally—it does not matter who you are) and "the hairs of your head are numbered" (vertical—which is all about who you are). I said what it meant was that people want simultaneously to be equal and special. I wondered what their response would be. It was not what I expected. Every one of them said they faced this quandary every day. I realized this recognition led to a stabilizing approach to the human relationships in their business. It made needed mutual accommodation easier to achieve. Stability and balance go hand in hand over a broad range of human behaviour in underpinning mutual accommodation where it is needed.

CANADA IN RELATION TO EUROPE AND THE UNITED STATES

Where Canada inclines toward mutual accommodation, both Europe (especially before 1945) and the United States have strong internal drivers toward division. Canada is less instinctively fearful of collective action through government than is the United States. It is, however, generally less attracted to government involvement and intervention than is most of Europe. Canada is deeply different from Europe and the United States, both socio-culturally and politically. At the political level, the United States seems at times to be a combination of unsophisticated/underinformed voters alongside a very sophisticated political system with some very sophisticated leaders. The overall effectiveness, however, is constrained by the lack of voter sophistication, the role of money, and the challenge of size and diversity.

Canada's voters and leaders have from the beginning been forced by the hard geography and demanding history to be politically sophisticated, at both the provincial and federal levels and among both leaders and followers. Simon Reisman, the negotiator of the initial Autopact and the later Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement, observed that "Canada takes a lot of ruining." And, fortunately, the needed leaders and followers have for the most part been there whenever hard acts of mutual accommodation were needed. The big question for the next several years is whether they will be there for the still unresolved First Nations challenges.

TWO VERY DIFFERENT NEW COUNTRIES IN NORTH AMERICA

Canada, like the United States, is a very new country by the standards of history. Also like the United States, it is part of Western civilization and a North American country with Aboriginals among its citizens. These are enormously important shared characteristics. But they are matched by major differences. Today's Canada is a country that was formed in an evolutionary manner over more than two-and-a-half centuries. The United States is a country formed after winning a war, by the stroke of a pen and at a single moment in time. Canada was formed and has survived through painful ongoing persuasion over very long stretches of time. The United States was formed by the Revolutionary War and preserved by the Civil War through force.

Canada has had no such defining moments. Canada is more inclusive (both/and) than divisive (either/or), although it is both. The United States is the reverse. Canada is not afraid of government, but the United States is distrustful. Canada has divisions, but its drive is toward mutual accommodation. The United States has used mutual accommodation at very big moments, but its drive is toward division. These are significant differences. They have resulted in different strengths and weaknesses for each country. They are primarily socio-cultural, but with political and economic

implications. It will help both countries if they understand these differences better. In many ways the greatest global challenge of the rest of this century could well be the mutual accommodation of different socio-cultures as the best, if not the only, way to achieve political mutual accommodation.

CANADA AND EUROPE

Canadians have been shaped by both Europe and the United States, but in different ways. Canada's initial immigrant foundation was European. It is heir to the Western world through those immigrants. But at the socio-cultural and political levels, it has moved beyond the divisions that have characterized Europe since the Middle Ages in a way the United States has not yet done. Canada's colonial past required it to achieve political and socio-cultural independence from its imperial parent, and it did so incrementally over many years through political persuasion, not force.

The challenge of its external geographic closeness to the United States—a much larger, wealthier, more powerful, and highly dynamic country—was omnipresent. It intensified Canada's internal French-English division challenge. It also brought the French and English elements together at crucial moments—for instance, the Civil War impetus that led to Confederation. The challenges from Europe and the United States did not lead to a world of winners and losers for Canada but, rather, to the achievement of mutual accommodation as the only way to address them. This characteristic is now Canada's most dominant and distinctive political and socio-cultural feature—and, perhaps, the needed characteristic most absent in today's world.

MODERN EUROPE MIGHT HAVE FARED BETTER BY FOLLOWING A MORE CANADIAN WAY

We could argue that Europe and the eurozone would not be facing the challenges they face today if Europeans had understood earlier that Europe, like Canada later, was facing ongoing challenges of survival. Too often they did not know how to deal

with their challenges in any way other than by fighting over them. As a result, Europe has had a long history of non-accommodation. It ended in Europe's near suicide in 1939–45 (saved only by others).

Europe has made great strides on its divisions since 1945. But they are still alive enough in the current eurozone crisis to make finding a lasting solution very difficult. This crisis reveals that despite the enormous progress since 1945, the idea of a “dark continent” (the title of a brilliant book written by English historian Mark Mazower) is still relevant to understanding events in today's Europe.

CANADA'S 21ST-CENTURY CHALLENGE

In 1900 the global population was 1.4 billion; by 2000 it was 6.0 billion; it could reach 9.0 billion by 2100. Amid this huge increase, three factors become very globally important: resources, technology, and successful internal and external governance of the diversity of the world. Canada now has an unmatched combination of positive elements for addressing the world ahead. It has spent the last 150 years navigating its domestic mutual accommodation challenges. Whether it wants to or not, it will spend the rest of this century navigating its own and the world's external mutual accommodation and containment challenges. The outcome will be either a new great country called Canada or a failed Canada. I like to call this 21st-century challenge a second Sir John A. Macdonald moment. To succeed, Canada will have to move forward on more than one front with the same boldness that Macdonald brought to Confederation and the transcontinental railway.

Canada will have to continue to manage the opportunities and the pressures resulting from its great resources of food, water, energy, and minerals, as well as its vast land mass, frontage on three oceans, and its political, socio-cultural, and good neighbourhood advantages. It could also have a second key set of strengths: a high level of IT innovation capability in a century where innovation will

match, if not exceed, resources in importance. Canada could have a head-start from the institutional and cluster critical mass in Waterloo, Ontario, rooted in the new Second Quantum Revolution fundamentals.

WHAT THE GLOBAL ECONOMY NEEDS

Two things are required if the world is to avoid economic stagnation and a too great weakening of the inclusive global order: major structural adjustments and a boost from new technology. Canada needs to work hard to become a significant participant by seizing this potential. If it could achieve a good balance between its rich natural resources and high-tech innovation, it would emerge as a new and stronger country rooted in the political and socio-cultural strengths that other nations admire about Canada.

To achieve this end, Canada's economic policy and the business community will have to do better in providing competitive opportunities and rewarding the best people, so they will make their careers and establish their new business ventures here. One advantage Canada can use is the greater willingness of Canadians, compared to Americans, to use governments to advance national public purpose. Another advantage is Canada's culture of mutual accommodation, which should allow the tradeoffs essential to environmental scientists working to reverse climate change—the intensifying need for a better mutual accommodation between nature and mankind.

THE GREAT HUMAN GOVERNANCE ACHIEVEMENTS OF THE 20TH CENTURY

Humans have always faced two primary challenges—coping with nature and coping with each other. Nature is hard, but human nature is often harder. Through all the hell of the 20th century, three great governance achievements emerged. Each one will almost certainly be vital to the future well-being of humanity. Interestingly, they all include Laurier's central political principle that some purposes are

properly called public and that the way to achieve them is not through physical or political force but through compromise:

- the non-violent resistance movements led by Mahatma Gandhi, Nelson Mandela, and Martin Luther King;
- the great post-Second World War statecraft of the United States that rested on two tracks: to broaden the inclusive order of the world, and to contain (not win) what is not at any given moment includeable—and do so through collective, not unilateral, action; and
- the Canadian story of mutual accommodation.

CANADA'S FEDERALISM AND MUTUAL ACCOMMODATION WAYS AS THE PATH FORWARD TO A NEW STABILITY

Could it be that Canadian federalism and its mutual accommodation way of governing diversity will provide the fundamental long-term stable way forward beyond traditional nationalism and the nation state? The United States, China, and Russia

are all powerful states with powerful nationalisms, and each of them has nuclear weapons. It is reasonable to expect that state-based nationalism will be a powerful force in these three countries for years to come. They are the three big either/or force-based powers in the world. Canada's role will always be different because of its lack of competitive either/or strengths.

Stability is essential for mutual accommodation to succeed. Each promotes and reinforces the other. It's fair to say that the combination of stability, balance, trusted institutions, and equal and special treatment are the central elements that have made the mutual accommodation ways of Canada possible. Let us recognize them and use them to our own benefit—and the world's benefit—in the challenging decades ahead.

Canada and the world must each become bold. Only mutual accommodation can provide the firm base needed to succeed.

William A. Macdonald

Biographical note

WILLIAM A. MACDONALD, a former senior partner of the McMillan law firm in Toronto, is president of W.A. Macdonald Associates Inc., a consulting firm on Canadian and global government relations and economic policies. For more than 45 years he has been involved in a broad range of policy issues for governments and business, as well as specific major resource projects for large corporations involving both the provincial and the federal governments. He acted for Ontario in the fight against federal tax reform (1969–73); in the seizure of five loan and trust companies; and on the huge Syncrude oil sands project. He was a director of several Canadian public companies, including National Trust Company (over 30 years) and Imperial Oil (21 years). He advised Honda primarily in Canada, but also in the United States and the United Kingdom. In addition, he continues to lead two small CEO groups which he began approximately four and three decades ago, respectively—one on Canadian economic policy and the other on the North American and global economy. For more information, visit wamacdonald.com

WILLIAM R. K. INNES spent 39 years in the petroleum and petrochemical business, first with Imperial Oil and then with ExxonMobil in Canada, Europe, Japan, and the United States. When he retired in 2005, he was president of its Research and Engineering Company based in Virginia. Since then he has been director and executive emeritus of the Continuous Learning Group—a leading behavioural science consultancy serving global clients. For more information, visit clg.com

