

Reclaiming Canadian Sovereignty in A Ruptured World Appendix

CONTENTS

A.	Trump US National Security Strategy President Donald Trump, National Security Strategy of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., November 2025	3
B.	The Ogdensburg Declaration Declaration by the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States of America Regarding Defence Co-operation Between the Two Countries, August 18, 1940	25
C.	The Atlantic Charter Declaration of Principles Issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, August 14, 1941	26
D.	The Louis St. Laurent Gray Lecture “The Foundations of Canadian Policy in World Affairs”: Address by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent, Inaugurating the Gray Foundation Lectureship, University of Toronto, January 13, 1947	30
E.	Chrystia Freeland: “Diplomat of the Year” in Washington Address by Minister Chrystia Freeland, Recipient of <i>Foreign Policy’s</i> Diplomat of the Year Award, Washington, D.C., June 13, 2018	42
F.	The Davos Speech Special Address by Mark Carney, Prime Minister of Canada, World Economic Forum Annual Meeting at Davos, Switzerland, January 20, 2026	50

APPENDIX A

Trump US National Security Strategy

This document was released by the United States government in the fall of 2025, and is the bluntest published assessment of the direction of US policy both globally and for the hemisphere. Many official observers at the time were reluctant to discuss it publicly, and some Canadians even took comfort that Canada did not appear to be “named” in the document. This misses the point that it puts the “Only America First” doctrine on parade, with consequences (in Venezuela and Iran) that clearly follow the views expressed in this document. It is deeply problematic for Canadian sovereignty, as has been pointed out by many of the essayists in this collection.

President Donald Trump, National Security Strategy of the United States of America, Washington, D.C., November 2025

Contents

I. Introduction – What Is American Strategy?	352
1. How American “Strategy” Went Astray	352
2. President Trump’s Necessary, Welcome Correction	353
II. What Should the United States Want?	353
1. What Do We Want Overall?	353
2. What Do We Want In and From the World?	354
III. What Are America’s Available Means to Get What We Want?	355
IV. The Strategy	356
1. Principles	356
2. Priorities	359
3. The Regions	362
A. The Western Hemisphere	363

I. INTRODUCTION

What Is American Strategy?

1. How American “Strategy” Went Astray

To ensure that America remains the world’s strongest, richest, most powerful, and most successful country for decades to come, our country needs a coherent, focused strategy for how we interact with the world. And to get that right, all Americans need to know what, exactly, it is we are trying to do and why.

A “strategy” is a concrete, realistic plan that explains the *essential connection between ends and means*: it begins from an accurate assessment of what is desired *and* what tools are available, or can realistically be created, to achieve the desired outcomes.

A strategy must evaluate, sort, and prioritize. Not every country, region, issue, or cause — however worthy — can be the focus of American strategy. The purpose of foreign policy is the protection of core national interests; that is the sole focus of this strategy.

American strategies since the end of the Cold War have fallen short — they have been laundry lists of wishes or desired end states; have not *clearly defined what we want* but instead stated vague platitudes; and have often misjudged what we *should* want.

After the end of the Cold War, American foreign policy elites convinced themselves that permanent American domination of the entire world was in the best interests of our country. Yet the affairs of other countries are our concern only if their activities directly threaten our interests.

Our elites badly miscalculated America’s willingness to shoulder forever global burdens to which the American people saw no connection to the national interest. They overestimated America’s ability to fund, simultaneously, a massive welfare-regulatory-administrative state alongside a massive military, diplomatic, intelligence, and foreign aid

complex. They placed hugely misguided and destructive bets on globalism and so-called “free trade” that hollowed out the very middle class and industrial base on which American economic and military preeminence depend. They allowed allies and partners to offload the cost of their defense onto the American people, and sometimes to suck us into conflicts and controversies central to their interests but peripheral or irrelevant to our own. And they lashed American policy to a network of international institutions, some of which are driven by outright anti-Americanism and many by a transnationalism that explicitly seeks to dissolve individual state sovereignty. In sum, not only did our elites pursue a fundamentally undesirable and impossible goal, in doing so they undermined the very means necessary to achieve that goal: the character of our nation upon which its power, wealth, and decency were built.

2. President Trump's Necessary, Welcome Correction

None of this was inevitable. President Trump's first administration proved that with the right leadership making the right choices, all of the above could — and should — have been avoided, and much else achieved. He and his team successfully marshaled America's great strengths to correct course and begin ushering in a new golden age for our country. To continue the United States on that path is the overarching purpose of President Trump's second administration, and of this document.

The questions before us now are: 1) What *should* the United States want? 2) What are our available means to get it? and 3) How can we connect ends and means into a viable National Security Strategy?

II

What *Should* the United States Want?

1. What Do We Want Overall?

First and foremost, we want the continued survival and safety of the United States as an independent, sovereign republic whose government secures the God-given natural rights of its citizens and prioritizes their well-being and interests.

We want to protect this country, its people, its territory, its economy, and its way of life from military attack and hostile foreign influence, whether espionage, predatory trade practices, drug and human trafficking, destructive propaganda and influence operations, cultural subversion, or any other threat to our nation.

We want full control over our borders, over our immigration system, and over transportation networks through which people come into our country — legally and illegally. We want a world in which migration is not merely “orderly” but one in which sovereign countries work together to stop rather than facilitate destabilizing population flows, and have full control over whom they do and do not admit.

We want a resilient national infrastructure that can withstand natural disasters, resist and thwart foreign threats, and prevent or mitigate any events that might harm the American people or disrupt the American economy. No adversary or danger should be able to hold America at risk.

We want to recruit, train, equip, and field the world’s most powerful, lethal, and technologically advanced military to protect our interests, deter wars, and — if necessary — win them quickly and decisively, with the lowest possible casualties to our forces. And we want a military in which every single servicemember is proud of their country and confident in their mission.

We want the world’s most robust, credible, and modern nuclear deterrent, plus next-generation missile defenses — including a Golden

Dome for the American homeland — to protect the American people, American assets overseas, and American allies.

We want the world's strongest, most dynamic, most innovative, and most advanced economy. The U.S. economy is the bedrock of the American way of life, which promises and delivers widespread and broad-based prosperity, creates upward mobility, and rewards hard work. Our economy is also the bedrock of our global position and the necessary foundation of our military.

We want the world's most robust industrial base. American national power depends on a strong industrial sector capable of meeting both peacetime and wartime production demands. That requires not only direct defense industrial production capacity but also defense-related production capacity. Cultivating American industrial strength must become the highest priority of national economic policy.

We want the world's most robust, productive, and innovative energy sector — one capable not just of fueling American economic growth but of being one of America's leading export industries in its own right.

We want to remain the world's most scientifically and technologically advanced and innovative country, and to build on these strengths. And we want to protect our intellectual property from foreign theft. America's pioneering spirit is a key pillar of our continued economic dominance and military superiority; it must be preserved.

We want to maintain the United States' unrivaled "soft power" through which we exercise positive influence throughout the world that furthers our interests. In doing so, we will be unapologetic about our country's past and present while respectful of other countries' differing religions, cultures, and governing systems. "Soft power" that serves America's true national interest is effective only if we believe in our country's inherent greatness and decency.

Finally, we want the restoration and reinvigoration of American spiritual and cultural health, without which long-term security is impossible. We want an America that cherishes its past glories and its heroes, and that looks forward to a new golden age. We want a people who are proud, happy, and optimistic that they will leave their country

to the next generation better than they found it. We want a gainfully employed citizenry — with no one sitting on the sidelines — who take satisfaction from knowing that their work is essential to the prosperity of our nation and to the well-being of individuals and families. This cannot be accomplished without growing numbers of strong, traditional families that raise healthy children.

2. What Do We Want *In* and *From* the World?

Achieving these goals requires marshaling every resource of our national power. Yet this strategy's focus is foreign policy. What are America's core foreign policy interests? What do we want *in* and *from* the world?

- We want to ensure that the Western Hemisphere remains reasonably stable and well-governed enough to prevent and discourage mass migration to the United States; we want a Hemisphere whose governments cooperate with us against narco-terrorists, cartels, and other transnational criminal organizations; we want a Hemisphere that remains free of hostile foreign incursion or ownership of key assets, and that supports critical supply chains; and we want to ensure our continued access to key strategic locations. In other words, we will assert and enforce a “Trump Corollary” to the Monroe Doctrine;
- We want to halt and reverse the ongoing damage that foreign actors inflict on the American economy while keeping the Indo-Pacific free and open, preserving freedom of navigation in all crucial sea lanes, and maintaining secure and reliable supply chains and access to critical materials;
- We want to support our allies in preserving the freedom and security of Europe, while restoring Europe's civilizational self-confidence and Western identity;
- We want to prevent an adversarial power from dominating the Middle East, its oil and gas supplies, and the chokepoints through which they pass while avoiding the “forever wars” that bogged us down in that region at great cost; and
- We want to ensure that U.S. technology and U.S. standards

— particularly in AI, biotech, and quantum computing — drive the world forward.

These are the United States' *core, vital* national interests. While we also have others, these are the interests we must focus on above all others, and that we ignore or neglect at our peril.

III

What Are America's Available Means to Get What We Want?

America retains the world's most enviable position, with world-leading assets, resources, and advantages, including:

- A still nimble political system that can course correct;
- The world's single largest and most innovative economy, which both generates wealth we can invest in strategic interests and provides leverage over countries that want access to our markets;
- The world's leading financial system and capital markets, including the dollar's global reserve currency status;
- The world's most advanced, most innovative, and most profitable technology sector, which undergirds our economy, provides a qualitative edge to our military, and strengthens our global influence;
- The world's most powerful and capable military;
- A broad network of alliances, with treaty allies and partners in the world's most strategically important regions;
- An enviable geography with abundant natural resources, no competing powers physically dominant in our Hemisphere, borders at no risk of military invasion, and other great powers separated by vast oceans;
- Unmatched "soft power" and cultural influence; and
- The courage, willpower, and patriotism of the American people.

In addition, through President Trump's robust domestic agenda, the United States is:

- Re-instilling a culture of competence, rooting out so-called "DEI" and other discriminatory and anti-competitive practices that degrade our institutions and hold us back;

- Unleashing our enormous energy production capacity as a strategic priority to fuel growth and innovation, and to bolster and rebuild the middle class;
- Reindustrializing our economy, again to further support the middle class and control our own supply chains and production capacities;
- Returning economic freedom to our citizens via historic tax cuts and deregulatory efforts, making the United States the premier place to do business and invest capital; and
- Investing in emerging technologies and basic science, to ensure our continued prosperity, competitive advantage, and military dominance for future generations.

The goal of this strategy is to tie together all of these world-leading assets, and others, to strengthen American power and preeminence and make our country even greater than it ever has been.

IV

The Strategy

1. Principles

President Trump's foreign policy is pragmatic without being "pragmatist," realistic without being "realist," principled without being "idealistic," muscular without being "hawkish," and restrained without being "dovish." It is not grounded in traditional, political ideology. It is motivated above all by what works for America — or, in two words, "America First."

President Trump has cemented his legacy as The President of Peace. In addition to the remarkable success achieved during his first term with the historic Abraham Accords, President Trump has leveraged his dealmaking ability to secure unprecedented peace in eight conflicts throughout the world over the course of just eight months of his second term. He negotiated peace between Cambodia and Thailand, Kosovo and Serbia, the DRC and Rwanda, Pakistan and India, Israel and Iran, Egypt and Ethiopia, Armenia and Azerbaijan, and ended the war in Gaza with all living hostages returned to their families.

Stopping regional conflicts before they spiral into global wars that drag down whole continents is worthy of the Commander-in-Chief's attention, and a priority for this administration. A world on fire, where wars come to our shores, is bad for American interests. President Trump uses unconventional diplomacy, America's military might, and economic leverage to surgically extinguish embers of division between nuclear-capable nations and violent wars caused by centuries-long hatred.

President Trump has proven that American foreign, defense, and intelligence policies must be driven by the following basic principles:

- **Focused Definition of the National Interest** – Since at least the end of the Cold War, administrations have often published National Security Strategies that seek to expand the definition of America's "national interest" such that that almost no issue or endeavor is considered outside its scope. But to focus on everything

is to focus on nothing. America's core national security interests shall be our focus.

- **Peace Through Strength** – Strength is the best deterrent. Countries or other actors sufficiently deterred from threatening American interests will not do so. In addition, strength can enable us to *achieve* peace, because parties that respect our strength often seek our help and are receptive to our efforts to resolve conflicts and maintain peace. Therefore, the United States must maintain the strongest economy, develop the most advanced technologies, bolster our society's cultural health, and field the world's most capable military.
- **Predisposition to Non-Interventionism** – In the Declaration of Independence, America's founders laid down a clear preference for non-interventionism in the affairs of other nations and made clear the basis: just as all human beings possess God-given equal natural rights, all nations are entitled by "the laws of nature and nature's God" to a "separate and equal station" with respect to one another. For a country whose interests are as numerous and diverse as ours, rigid adherence to non-interventionism is not possible. Yet this predisposition should set a high bar for what constitutes a justified intervention.
- **Flexible Realism** – U.S. policy will be realistic about what is possible and desirable to seek in its dealings with other nations. We seek good relations and peaceful commercial relations with the nations of the world without imposing on them democratic or other social change that differs widely from their traditions and histories. We recognize and affirm that there is nothing inconsistent or hypocritical in acting according to such a realistic assessment or in maintaining good relations with countries whose governing systems and societies differ from ours even as we push like-minded friends to uphold our shared norms, furthering our interests as we do so.
- **Primacy of Nations** – The world's fundamental political unit is and will remain the nation-state. It is natural and just that all

nations put their interests first and guard their sovereignty. The world works best when nations prioritize their interests. The United States will put our own interests first and, in our relations with other nations, encourage them to prioritize their own interests as well. We stand *for* the sovereign rights of nations, *against* the sovereignty-sapping incursions of the most intrusive transnational organizations, and *for* reforming those institutions so that they assist rather than hinder individual sovereignty and further American interests.

- **Sovereignty and Respect** – The United States will unapologetically protect our own sovereignty. This includes preventing its erosion by transnational and international organizations, attempts by foreign powers or entities to censor our discourse or curtail our citizens' free speech rights, lobbying and influence operations that seek to steer our policies or involve us in foreign conflicts, and the cynical manipulation of our immigration system to build up voting blocs loyal to foreign interests within our country. The United States will chart our own course in the world and determine our own destiny, free of outside interference.
- **Balance of Power** – The United States cannot allow any nation to become so dominant that it could threaten our interests. We will work with allies and partners to maintain global and regional balances of power to prevent the emergence of dominant adversaries. As the United States *rejects* the ill-fated concept of global domination for itself, we must *prevent* the global, and in some cases even regional, domination of others. This does not mean wasting blood and treasure to curtail the influence of all the world's great and middle powers. The outsized influence of larger, richer, and stronger nations is a timeless truth of international relations. This reality sometimes entails working with partners to thwart ambitions that threaten our joint interests.
- **Pro-American Worker** – American policy will be pro-worker, not merely pro-growth, and it will prioritize our own workers. We must rebuild an economy in which prosperity is broadly based

and widely shared, not concentrated at the top or localized in certain industries or a few parts of our country.

- **Fairness** – From military alliances to trade relations and beyond, the United States will insist on being treated fairly by other countries. We will no longer tolerate, and can no longer afford, free-riding, trade imbalances, predatory economic practices, and other impositions on our nation’s historic goodwill that disadvantage our interests. As we want our allies to be rich and capable, so must our allies see that it is in their interest that the United States also remain rich and capable. In particular, we expect our allies to spend far more of their national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) on their own defense, to start to make up for the enormous imbalances accrued over decades of much greater spending by the United States.
- **Competence and Merit** – American prosperity and security depend on the development and promotion of competence. Competence and merit are among our greatest civilizational advantages: where the best Americans are hired, promoted, and honored, innovation and prosperity follow. Should competence be destroyed or systematically discouraged, complex systems that we take for granted — from infrastructure to national security to education and research — will cease to function. Should merit be smothered, America’s historic advantages in science, technology, industry, defense, and innovation will evaporate. The success of radical ideologies that seek to replace competence and merit with favored group status would render America unrecognizable and unable to defend itself. At the same time, we cannot allow meritocracy to be used as a justification to open America’s labor market to the world in the name of finding “global talent” that undercuts American workers. In our every principle and action, America and Americans must always come first.

2. Priorities

- **The Era of Mass Migration Is Over** – Who a country admits into its borders — in what numbers and from where — will inevitably

define the future of that nation. Any country that considers itself sovereign has the right and duty to define its future. Throughout history, sovereign nations prohibited uncontrolled migration and granted citizenship only rarely to foreigners, who also had to meet demanding criteria. The West's experience over the past decades vindicates this enduring wisdom. In countries throughout the world, mass migration has strained domestic resources, increased violence and other crime, weakened social cohesion, distorted labor markets, and undermined national security. The era of mass migration must end. Border security is the primary element of national security. We must protect our country from invasion, not just from unchecked migration but from cross-border threats such as terrorism, drugs, espionage, and human trafficking. A border controlled by the will of the American people as implemented by their government is fundamental to the survival of the United States as a sovereign republic.

- **Protection of Core Rights and Liberties** – The purpose of the American government is to secure the God-given natural rights of American citizens. To this end, departments and agencies of the United States Government have been granted fearsome powers. Those powers must never be abused, whether under the guise of “deradicalization,” “protecting our democracy,” or any other pretext. When and where those powers *are* abused, abusers must be held accountable. In particular, the rights of free speech, freedom of religion and of conscience, and the right to choose and steer our common government are core rights that must never be infringed. Regarding countries that share, or say they share, these principles, the United States will advocate strongly that they be upheld in letter and spirit. We will oppose elite-driven, anti-democratic restrictions on core liberties in Europe, the Anglosphere, and the rest of the democratic world, especially among our allies.
- **Burden-Sharing and Burden-Shifting** – The days of the United States propping up the entire world order like Atlas are over. We count among our many allies and partners dozens of wealthy,

sophisticated nations that must assume primary responsibility for their regions and contribute far more to our collective defense. President Trump has set a new global standard with the Hague Commitment, which pledges NATO countries to spend 5 percent of GDP on defense and which our NATO allies have endorsed and must now meet. Continuing President Trump's approach of asking allies to assume primary responsibility for their regions, the United States will organize a burden-sharing network, with our government as convener and supporter. This approach ensures that burdens are shared and that all such efforts benefit from broader legitimacy. The model will be targeted partnerships that use economic tools to align incentives, share burdens with like-minded allies, and insist on reforms that anchor long-term stability. This strategic clarity will allow the United States to counter hostile and subversive influences efficiently while avoiding the overextension and diffuse focus that undermined past efforts. The United States will stand ready to help — potentially through more favorable treatment on commercial matters, technology sharing, and defense procurement — those countries that willingly take more responsibility for security in their neighborhoods and align their export controls with ours.

- **Realignment Through Peace** – Seeking peace deals at the President's direction, even in regions and countries peripheral to our immediate core interests, is an effective way to increase stability, strengthen America's global influence, realign countries and regions toward our interests, and open new markets. The resources required boil down to presidential diplomacy, which our great nation can embrace only with competent leadership. The dividends — an end to longstanding conflicts, lives saved, new friends made — can vastly outweigh the relatively minor costs of time and attention.
- **Economic Security** – Finally, because economic security is fundamental to national security, we will work to further strengthen the American economy, with emphases on:

- **Balanced Trade** – The United States will prioritize rebalancing our trade relations, reducing trade deficits, opposing barriers to our exports, and ending dumping and other anti-competitive practices that hurt American industries and workers. We seek fair, reciprocal trade deals with nations that want to trade with us on a basis of mutual benefit and respect. But our priorities must and will be our own workers, our own industries, and our own national security.
- **Securing Access to Critical Supply Chains and Materials** – As Alexander Hamilton argued in our republic’s earliest days, the United States must never be dependent on any outside power for core components — from raw materials to parts to finished products — necessary to the nation’s defense or economy. We must re-secure our own independent and reliable access to the goods we need to defend ourselves and preserve our way of life. This will require expanding American access to critical minerals and materials while countering predatory economic practices. Moreover, the Intelligence Community will monitor key supply chains and technological advances around the world to ensure we understand and mitigate vulnerabilities and threats to American security and prosperity.
- **Reindustrialization** – The future belongs to makers. The United States will reindustrialize its economy, “re-shore” industrial production, and encourage and attract investment in our economy and our workforce, with a focus on the critical and emerging technology sectors that will define the future. We will do so through the strategic use of tariffs and new technologies that favor widespread industrial production in every corner of our nation, raise living standards for American workers, and ensure that our country is never again reliant on any adversary, present or potential, for critical products or components.
- **Reviving our Defense Industrial Base** – A strong, capable military cannot exist without a strong, capable defense industrial base. The huge gap, demonstrated in recent conflicts, between low-cost

drones and missiles versus the expensive systems required to defend against them has laid bare our need to change and adapt. America requires a national mobilization to innovate powerful defenses at low cost, to produce the most capable and modern systems and munitions at scale, and to re-shore our defense industrial supply chains. In particular, we must provide our warfighters with the full range of capabilities, ranging from low-cost weapons that can defeat most adversaries up to the most capable high-end systems necessary for a conflict with a sophisticated enemy. And to realize President Trump's vision of peace through strength, we must do so quickly. We will also encourage the revitalization of the industrial bases of all our allies and partners to strengthen collective defense.

- **Energy Dominance** – Restoring American energy dominance (in oil, gas, coal, and nuclear) and reshoring the necessary key energy components is a top strategic priority. Cheap and abundant energy will produce well-paying jobs in the United States, reduce costs for American consumers and businesses, fuel reindustrialization, and help maintain our advantage in cutting-edge technologies such as AI. Expanding our net energy exports will also deepen relationships with allies while curtailing the influence of adversaries, protect our ability to defend our shores, and — when and where necessary — enables us to project power. We reject the disastrous “climate change” and “Net Zero” ideologies that have so greatly harmed Europe, threaten the United States, and subsidize our adversaries.
- **Preserving and Growing America's Financial Sector Dominance** – The United States boasts the world's leading financial and capital markets, which are pillars of American influence that afford policymakers significant leverage and tools to advance America's national security priorities. But our leadership position cannot be taken for granted. Preserving and growing our dominance entails leveraging our dynamic free market system and our leadership in digital finance and innovation to ensure that our

markets continue to be the most dynamic, liquid, and secure and remain the envy of the world.

3. The Regions

It has become customary for documents such as this to mention every part of the world and issue, on the assumption that any oversight signifies a blind spot or a snub. As a result, such documents become bloated and unfocused — the opposite of what a strategy should be.

To focus and prioritize is to choose — to acknowledge that not everything matters equally, to everyone. It is *not* to assert that any peoples, regions, or countries are somehow intrinsically unimportant. The United States is by every measure the most generous nation in history — yet we cannot afford to be equally attentive to every region and every problem in the world.

The purpose of national security policy is the protection of core national interests — some priorities transcend regional confines. For instance, terrorist activity in an otherwise less consequential area might force our urgent attention. But leaping from that necessity to sustained attention to the periphery is a mistake.

A. Western Hemisphere: The Trump Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine

After years of neglect, the United States will reassert and enforce the Monroe Doctrine to restore American preeminence in the Western Hemisphere, and to protect our homeland and our access to key geographies throughout the region. We will deny non-Hemispheric competitors the ability to position forces or other threatening capabilities, or to own or control strategically vital assets, in our Hemisphere. This “Trump Corollary” to the Monroe Doctrine is a common-sense and potent restoration of American power and priorities, consistent with American security interests.

Our goals for the Western Hemisphere can be summarized as “Enlist and Expand.” We will *enlist* established friends in the Hemisphere to control migration, stop drug flows, and strengthen stability and security on land and sea. We will *expand* by cultivating and strengthening new

partners while bolstering our own nation's appeal as the Hemisphere's economic and security partner of choice.

Enlist

American policy should focus on enlisting regional champions that can help create tolerable stability in the region, even beyond those partners' borders. These nations would help us stop illegal and destabilizing migration, neutralize cartels, near-shore manufacturing, and develop local private economies, among other things. We will reward and encourage the region's governments, political parties, and movements broadly aligned with our principles and strategy. But we must not overlook governments with different outlooks with whom we nonetheless share interests and who want to work with us.

The United States must reconsider our military presence in the Western Hemisphere. This means four obvious things:

- A readjustment of our global military presence to address urgent threats in our Hemisphere, especially the missions identified in this strategy, and away from theaters whose relative import to American national security has declined in recent decades or years;
- A more suitable Coast Guard and Navy presence to control sea lanes, to thwart illegal and other unwanted migration, to reduce human and drug trafficking, and to control key transit routes in a crisis;
- Targeted deployments to secure the border and defeat cartels, including where necessary the use of lethal force to replace the failed law enforcement-only strategy of the last several decades; and
- Establishing or expanding access in strategically important locations.

The United States will prioritize commercial diplomacy, to strengthen our own economy and industries, using tariffs and reciprocal trade agreements as powerful tools. The goal is for our partner nations to build up their domestic economies, while an economically stronger and

more sophisticated Western Hemisphere becomes an increasingly attractive market for American commerce and investment.

Strengthening critical supply chains in this Hemisphere will reduce dependencies and increase American economic resilience. The linkages created between America and our partners will benefit both sides while making it harder for non-Hemispheric competitors to increase their influence in the region. And even as we prioritize commercial diplomacy, we will work to strengthen our security partnerships — from weapons sales to intelligence sharing to joint exercises.

Expand

As we deepen our partnerships with countries with whom America presently has strong relations, we must look to expand our network in the region. We want other nations to see us as their partner of first choice, and we will (through various means) discourage their collaboration with others.

The Western Hemisphere is home to many strategic resources that America should partner with regional allies to develop, to make neighboring countries as well as our own more prosperous. The National Security Council will immediately begin a robust interagency process to task agencies, supported by our Intelligence Community's analytical arm, to identify strategic points and resources in the Western Hemisphere with a view to their protection and joint development with regional partners.

Non-Hemispheric competitors have made major inroads into our Hemisphere, both to disadvantage us economically in the present, and in ways that may harm us strategically in the future. Allowing these incursions without serious pushback is another great American strategic mistake of recent decades.

The United States must be preeminent in the Western Hemisphere as a condition of our security and prosperity — a condition that allows us to assert ourselves confidently where and when we need to in the region. The terms of our alliances, and the terms upon which we provide any kind of aid, must be contingent on winding down adversarial

outside influence — from control of military installations, ports, and key infrastructure to the purchase of strategic assets broadly defined.

Some foreign influence will be hard to reverse, given the political alignments between certain Latin American governments and certain foreign actors. However, many governments are not ideologically aligned with foreign powers but are instead attracted to doing business with them for other reasons, including low costs and fewer regulatory hurdles. The United States has achieved success in rolling back outside influence in the Western Hemisphere by demonstrating, with specificity, how many hidden costs — in espionage, cybersecurity, debt-traps, and other ways — are embedded in allegedly “low cost” foreign assistance. We should accelerate these efforts, including by utilizing U.S. leverage in finance and technology to induce countries to reject such assistance.

In the Western Hemisphere — and everywhere in the world — the United States should make clear that American goods, services, and technologies are a far better buy in the long run, because they are higher quality and do not come with the same kind of strings as other countries’ assistance. That said, we will reform our own system to expedite approvals and licensing — again, to make ourselves the partner of first choice. The choice all countries should face is whether they want to live in an American-led world of sovereign countries and free economies or in a parallel one in which they are influenced by countries on the other side of the world.

Every U.S. official working in or on the region must be up to speed on the full picture of detrimental outside influence while simultaneously applying pressure and offering incentives to partner countries to protect our Hemisphere.

Successfully protecting our Hemisphere also requires closer collaboration between the U.S. Government and the American private sector. All our embassies must be aware of major business opportunities in their country, especially major government contracts. Every U.S. Government official that interacts with these countries should understand that part of their job is to help American companies compete and succeed.

The U.S. Government will identify strategic acquisition and investment opportunities for American companies in the region and present these opportunities for assessment by every U.S. Government financing program, including but not limited to those within the Departments of State, War, and Energy; the Small Business Administration; the International Development Finance Corporation; the Export-Import Bank; and the Millennium Challenge Corporation. We should also partner with regional governments and businesses to build scalable and resilient energy infrastructure, invest in critical mineral access, and harden existing and future cyber communications networks that take full advantage of American encryption and security potential. The aforementioned U.S. Government entities should be used to finance some of the costs of purchasing U.S. goods abroad.

The United States must also resist and reverse measures such as targeted taxation, unfair regulation, and expropriation that disadvantage U.S. businesses. The terms of our agreements, especially with those countries that depend on us most and therefore over which we have the most leverage, must be sole-source contracts for our companies. At the same time, we should make every effort to push out foreign companies that build infrastructure in the region . . .

APPENDIX B

The Ogdensburg Declaration

This is the full text of the defence and mutual assistance arrangement known as the Ogdensburg Declaration, which marked a significant shift in strategic thinking in both Canada and the United States. It was followed by close Canada-US partnership during the war, as well as the establishment of the DEW line, NORAD, and many other initiatives. In May 2026, the United States announced it was “pausing” its participation in the Permanent Joint Board of Defence, whose creation was the direct result of Ogdensburg.

Declaration by the Prime Minister of Canada and the President of the United States of America Regarding Defence Co-operation Between the Two Countries, August 18, 1940

The Prime Minister and the President have discussed the mutual problems of defence in relation to the safety of Canada and the United States.

It has been agreed that a Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall be set up at once by the two countries.

This Permanent Joint Board on Defence shall commence immediate studies relating to sea, land, and air problems including personnel and material.

It will consider in the broad sense the defence of the north half of the Western Hemisphere.

The Permanent Joint Board on Defence will consist of four or five members from each country, most of them from the services. It will meet shortly.

APPENDIX C

The Atlantic Charter

President Franklin Roosevelt and Prime Minister Winston Churchill had a famous meeting off the coast of Newfoundland in August of 1941. The document they signed was the product of extensive negotiation. Churchill was doing whatever he could to persuade the United States to enter the war. Roosevelt did not feel he had the political support to do that, and was also trying to get Churchill to accept language on “self determination” that would strengthen his own hand not only with Churchill but with public opinion in his own country. The Charter’s provisions were an important step on this path. The attack by the Japanese government on December 7, 1941, led to the American declaration that a state of war existed between the Japanese Empire and the United States. Hitler declared war on the United States a few days later, which meant that the US was then part of the widest conflict known to human history. In January of 1942, a wider group of allies signed a document based on the Charter, and it in turn became an important basis for the world order after 1945.

Declaration of Principles issued by the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, August 14, 1941

The President of the United States and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, have met at sea.

They have been accompanied by officials of their two Governments, including high-ranking officers of their military, naval, and air services.

The whole problem of the supply of munitions of war, as provided by the Lease-Lend Act, for the armed forces of the United States, and for those countries actively engaged in resisting aggression, has been further examined.

Lord Beaverbrook, the Minister of Supply of the British Government, has joined in these conferences. He is going to proceed to Washington to discuss further details with appropriate officials of the United States Government. These conferences will also cover the supply problems of the Soviet Union.

The President and the Prime Minister have had several conferences. They have considered the dangers to world civilization arising from the policies of military domination by conquest upon which the Hitlerite government of Germany and other governments associated therewith have embarked, and have made clear the steps which their countries are respectively taking for their safety in the face of these dangers.

They have agreed upon the following joint declaration:

“The President of the United States of America and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty’s Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future of the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all the men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT

WINSTON S. CHURCHILL

A year later, on 14 August 1942, President Roosevelt issued the following message, commemorating the first anniversary of the "Atlantic Charter".

A year ago today the Prime Minister of Great Britain and I, as representatives of two free nations, set down and subscribed to a declaration of principles common to our peoples. We based, and continue to base, our hopes for a better future for the world on the realisation of these principles. This declaration is known as the Atlantic Charter.

A year ago today the nations resisting a common barbaric foe were units or small groups fighting for their existence. Now these nations and groups of nations in all the continents of the earth have united. They have formed a great union of humanity, dedicated to the realisation of that common programme of purposes and principles set forth in the Atlantic Charter through world-wide victory over their common enemies. Their faith in life, liberty, independence, and religious freedom, and in the preservation of human rights and justice in their own as well as in other lands, has been given form and substance as the United Nations.

Freedom and independence are today in jeopardy the world over. If the forces of conquest are not successfully resisted and defeated there

will be no freedom, no independence and no opportunity for freedom for any nation. It is, therefore, to the single and supreme objective of defeating the Axis forces of aggression that the United Nations have pledged all their resources and efforts.

When victory comes we shall stand shoulder to shoulder in seeking to nourish the great ideals for which we fight. It is a worth-while battle. It will be so recognised through all the ages, even amid the unfortunate peoples who follow false gods today. We reaffirm our principles. They will bring us to a happier world.

APPENDIX D

The Louis St. Laurent Gray Lecture

This was the critical expression of Canada's direction in foreign policy after the end of the Second World War, heralding the beginning of international multilateral engagement that was both wide and deep. It was an answer to any overhanging isolationism, and tried to explain to Canadians why engagement had to continue to be the order of the day. It heralded Canada's role in creating the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, NATO, NORAD, and a myriad of other engagements, including most notably UN Peacekeeping. Lester Pearson, successor to St. Laurent as Foreign Minister and then as Leader of the Liberal Party, won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1956 for his work on ending the conflict over the Suez Canal and his proposal for an extended role for UN Peacekeeping in the Middle East.

“The Foundations of Canadian Policy in World Affairs”: Address by Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent Inaugurating the Gray Foundation Lectureship, University of Toronto, January 13, 1947

A policy of world affairs, to be truly effective, must have its foundations laid upon general principles which have been tested in the life of the nation and which have secured the broad support of large groups of the population. It is true that differences of opinion about foreign policy must continually be reviewed in discussion and debate inside and outside of Parliament. Such discussions, however, can result in constructive conclusions only if they take place against the background of a large measure of agreement on fundamentals.

It may be objected that we are not old enough as a nation to have worked out such agreed principles. But let us not forget that much which forms the basis of our agreement in that respect is the result of

circumstances over which we have had little if any control. The century-old struggles between France and England, their rivalry in the New World, the Battle of the Plains of Abraham, the Treaty of Paris of 1763, the revolt of the Thirteen Colonies, the wave of more liberal thinking unleashed by the French Revolution, the geography, the climate, the kind of natural resources of our country, all tended to create conditions for our ancestors and tend to create conditions for our own generation which lead to almost inevitable results. They have forced French-speaking and English-speaking men and women to live side by side as members of the same community. They have inspired them to work together to obtain an ever increasing measure of self-government; they have tempered the resistance of the metropolitan government to this healthy development; they have made natural and easy the creation of an economy productive of large surpluses of certain kinds of commodities and lacking in certain other kinds and thus dependent in an extraordinary degree upon exchange and trade to get some benefit out of the surpluses and to secure the commodities not available from our own production.

We are now within close range of two significant anniversaries in the life of this nation. It is almost exactly a century since the decision was taken that the affairs of this part of the world should be conducted upon the principles of responsible government. For a hundred years, therefore, French-speaking and English-speaking people living in the valley of the St. Lawrence River and the Great Lakes, together with their fellow countrymen elsewhere across this continent, have been engaged upon the experiment of building, on their own responsibility and under their own direction, a modern nation. It is, as it had to be, a nation constructed on the foundation of two cultures and two languages. A century ago the Canadian people in winning responsible government staked their future on the political principles which had been defined in Lord Durham's famous *Report*. They staked their future equally on a denial of Durham's assertion that the country could not survive with two cultures. They said that this could be a free country, notwithstanding that it had also to be a country with both English and French culture.

For a hundred years now they have been shown to be right.

The second anniversary of which I would remind you is that of Confederation, eighty years ago. It was then that the challenge was accepted to build into a single state the scattered communities which stretched across the northern half of this continent. We have therefore been working together on this task of nation building for some considerable time. It is not too soon to look back and determine what principles have had to be and have become generally acceptable throughout this country in the conduct of our relations abroad. When we have defined these principles, we may examine the manner in which we have habitually embodied them in our relations with other states where our associations are especially close. We may also consider them with respect to the international organizations of which we are or have been members.

The Basic Principles

The first general principle upon which I think we are agreed is that our external policies shall not destroy our unity. No policy can be regarded as wise which divides the people whose effort and resources must put it into effect. This consideration applies not only to the two main cultural groups in our country. It applies equally to sectionalism of any kind. We dare not fashion a policy which is based on the particular interests of any economic group, of any class or of any section in this country. We must be on guard especially against the claims of extravagant regionalism no matter where they have their origin. Our history has shown this to be a consideration in our external policy of which we, more even than others, must be perpetually conscious. The role of this country in world affairs will prosper only as we maintain this principle, for a disunited Canada will be a powerless one.

Second among the ideas which shape our external policy I will place the conception of political liberty. This is an inheritance from both our French and English backgrounds, and through these parent states it has come to us from the whole rich culture of western Europe. It is a patrimony which we ourselves have enlarged by working out on our own soil the transition from colony to free community. These are days in which the vocabulary of political thought has been so debased that there are many familiar coins

that one hesitates to lay on the counter. I make no apology, however, for speaking to a Canadian audience of political liberty because I know that this phrase has content for us. I know, also, that we are all conscious of the danger to our own political institutions when freedom is attacked in other parts of the world. In the complex series of events which twice in a generation has led us into war, we have been profoundly influenced in our decisions by the peril which threatened the democracies of western Europe. From our joint political inheritance, as well as from our common experience, we have come as a people to distrust and dislike governments which rule by force and which suppress free comment on their activities. We know that stability is lacking where consent is absent. We believe that the greatest safeguard against the aggressive policies of any government is the freely expressed judgment of its own people. This does not mean that we have ever sought to interfere in the affairs of others, or to meddle in situations which were obviously outside our interest or beyond our control. It does mean, however, that we have consistently sought and found our friends amongst those of like political traditions. It means equally that we have realized that a threat to the liberty of western Europe, where our political ideas were nurtured, was a threat to our own way of life. This realization has perhaps not been comprehended or expressed by every group and every individual in the country with as much clarity and coherence as, looking back on the events, we should like. I have no doubt, however, that for the young men of our universities who fought in this war, it was a part of our national inheritance which they well understood.

In the third place respect for the rule of law has become an integral part of our external as of our domestic policy. The supremacy of law in our own political system is so familiar that we are in constant danger of taking it for granted. We know, however, that historically the development of this principle is a necessary antecedent to self-government. The first great victory on the road to freedom was the establishment in early modern times of the principle that both governments and peoples were subject to the impartial administration of the courts. Only then could the further step be taken by which the people gave their consent to the laws by which they were governed.

Within the past decade we have been reminded by the hideous example of the Fascist states of the evil which befalls a nation when the government sets itself above the law. Beneath the spurious efficiency of such a state, we have perceived the helpless plight of individuals who have been deprived of the primary right of an impartial administration of the law.

We have seen also the chaos which is brought to world affairs when lawlessness is practised in the field of international relations. The development of an international code of law is still in its early stages. The past decade has done much to delay and distort this growth. I feel sure, however, that we in this country are agreed that the freedom of nations depends upon the rule of law among states. We have shown this concretely in our willingness to accept the decisions of international tribunals, courts of arbitration and other bodies of a judicial nature, in which we have participated. There can be no doubt that the Canadian people unanimously support this principle.

No foreign policy is consistent nor coherent over a period of years unless it is based upon some conception of human values. I know that we live in an age when it is fashionable to speak in terms only of hard realism in the conduct of international affairs. I realize also that at best the practice of any policy is a poor approximation of ideals upon which it may be based. I am sure, however, that in our national life we are continually influenced by the conceptions of good and evil which emerged from Hebrew and Greek civilization and which have been transformed and transmitted through the Christian traditions of the Western World. These are values which lay emphasis on the importance of the individual, on the place of moral principles in the conduct of human relations, on standards of judgment which transcend mere material well-being. They have ever influenced our national life as we have built a modern state from east to west across this continent. I am equally convinced that on the basis of this common experience we shall discern the same values in world affairs, and that we shall seek to protect and nurture them.

There is a fifth basic principle which I should like also to mention before considering the background of our relations with particular countries.

That is willingness to accept international responsibilities. I know that there are many in this country who feel that in the past we have played too small a part in the development of international political organizations. The growth in this country of a sense of political responsibility on an international scale has perhaps been less rapid than some of us would like. It has nevertheless been a perceptible growth: and again and again on the major questions of participation in international organization, both in peace and war, we have taken our decision to be present. If there is one conclusion that our common experience has led us to accept, it is that security for this country lies in the development of a firm structure of international organization.

I have been speaking of certain general principles which I think underlie the conduct of our external policy. These are principles which have been defined and articulated in the practice of relations with other countries over many decades. In this application of our principles, too, we have reached certain general conclusions on which we are all agreed, and which serve as a guide to policy.

The Practical Application

We have never attempted to define in precise terms our relations with the British Commonwealth of Nations. They are nevertheless a basic consideration in the external policy of this country. In discussing them I will recall two aspects of this relationship concerning which I am sure there will be no disagreement. In the first place, the Commonwealth is a form of political association which is unique. There has never been anything like it before in history. There is no parallel to it in the contemporary world. It is the only case on record of a colonial empire being transformed to an association of free nations by experiment, by compromise, by political evolution. I have no doubt that, whatever its future, it will be regarded by the historians of another age as one of the great constructive political achievements of our time. The other fact that I would call to your mind is that the Commonwealth is in a very real sense an achievement in which Canadians can take special pride. We Canadians, perhaps more than any other of its members, have contributed to its

development. We have regarded it as an instrument which, in co-operation with like-minded people, we could use for our common purposes. It has, therefore, the vitality of a living, functioning organism which has been, and which can continue to be used for good, according to the wisdom and foresight of our policies.

It is now only twenty years since the term "Commonwealth" came into popular use as a result of the Declaration which was adopted by the Conference of 1926. Even in that short period the meaning of the word has changed. There are already important differences between the Commonwealth of today and that described in Lord Balfour's famous statement. Even while this change was taking place, however, there has been a further compelling demonstration of the fact that we are members in an association of free nations, capable of common action in an emergency, greater and more striking than that of any formal military or diplomatic alliance that the world has ever known.

Even though they are not precisely defined, the principles on which we act in regard to the Commonwealth may be clearly discerned. We seek to preserve it as an instrument through which we, with others who share our objectives, can co-operate for our common good in peace as in war. On the other hand, we should continue to resist, as in the past, efforts to reduce to formal terms or specific commitments this association which has demonstrated its vitality through the common understanding upon which it is based. We should likewise oppose developments in our Commonwealth relations which might be inconsistent with our desire to participate fully in the task of building an effective international organization on a wider scale.

Within the Commonwealth, our relations with the United Kingdom have, of course, a very special value and significance. We shall not forget the imaginative collaboration of British and Canadian leaders in our history, who, a century ago, laid the political foundations for the modern Commonwealth. Nor can we fail to be influenced by the fact that our political institutions are those of the British Isles, and that we now share with other parliamentary democracies the responsibility for preserving and developing this system. We shall not forget either the peril in which

we shared, together with other Commonwealth countries, but especially with the United Kingdom, during the dark days of 1940. This was an episode which threw in dramatic relief the measure to which we have common interests and the degree to which we are alike concerned in the establishment of a world order based on principles of freedom.

It is not customary in this country for us to think in terms of having a policy in regard to the United States. Like farmers whose lands have a common concession line, we think of ourselves as settling, from day to day, questions that arise between us, without dignifying the process by the word "policy." We have travelled so much of the road together in close agreement that by comparison the occasions on which our paths may have diverged seem insignificant. There has, however, been more to our relations with the United States than mere empirical neighbourliness. For the century during which we have been building this nation, we have kept company with an adjoining state vastly more powerful, more self-confident, more wealthy than we. It is a state with purposes and ambitions parallel to ours. One by one, the major areas of disagreement have been reduced. Our common border has long since been defined to our mutual satisfaction. The people of this country have taken a final decision to remain outside the United States. There is no longer any body of opinion in this country which looks towards annexation. The people of the United States, on their part, have come to a parallel conclusion that they will not extend their boundaries beyond their present limits on this continent. On both sides the fact has been accepted that there shall be a free and independent federation in the northern part of this continent. None of this has been achieved, however, without reflection and forethought, nor will it be maintained without constant watchfulness. I do not say this because I think there is the slightest intention on either side to move away from the present happy state of our relations. I say it merely because even the simplest relationship between human beings requires the constructive action of both parties. The relationship between a great and powerful nation and its smaller neighbour, at best is far from simple. It calls for constant and imaginative attention on both sides.

Defined more precisely, our policy in regard to the United States has come with the passage of years to have two main characteristics. On the one hand, we have sought by negotiation, by arbitration, by compromise, to settle upon the basis of mutual satisfaction the problems that have arisen between us. As I suggested a moment ago, this has been far more than the unimaginative clearing away of parochial questions. It has succeeded precisely because it is based on the determination of both nations to conduct their affairs, as a matter of policy, on this basis. The other aspect of our relations with the United States which I shall emphasize is our readiness to accept our responsibility as a North American nation in enterprises which are for the welfare of this continent. In support of this assertion, there is a long and creditable record of joint activity. In making it, however, I might add that it has never been the opinion of any considerable number of people in Canada that this continent could live unto itself. We have seen our own interests in the wider context of the Western World. We have realized also that regionalism of any kind would not provide the answer to problems of world security. But we know that peoples who live side by side on the same continent cannot disregard each other's interests, and we have always been willing to consider the possibility of common action for constructive ends.

With France also our relations rest upon principles that have emerged clearly from our history. We have never forgotten that France is one of the fountainheads of our cultural life. We realize that she forms an integral part of the framework of our international life. We have so much in common that, despite the differences between the French political system and our own, we cannot doubt for a moment that our objects in world affairs are similar. We in this country have always believed in the greatness of France, even at times when her future seemed most obscure. During the war, we were confident that France herself would play a major role in her own liberation. We gave our support to those leaders of the French people whom the French themselves were prepared to follow. We are aware of the heavy burden which invasion twice in a generation has laid upon France. We shall support her recovery not merely

out of sympathy, but because we know that her integrity is a matter of great consequence to us.

I shall not endeavour to discuss in detail the question of our relationship with other states. Rather, I shall turn now to our attitude towards international organizations. As I suggested when I was discussing the general principles which underlie our policy, we have been ready to take our part in constructive international action. We have, of course, been forced to keep in mind the limitations upon the influence of any secondary power. No society of nations can prosper if it does not have the support of those who hold the major share of the world's military and economic power. There is little point in a country of our stature recommending international action, if those who must carry the major burden of whatever action is taken are not in sympathy. We know, however, that the development of international organizations on a broad scale is of the very greatest importance to us, and we have been willing to play our role when it was apparent that significant and effective action was contemplated.

We have already given good evidence of this willingness by the record of our international activities since the war. We sent a strong delegation to the Conference at San Francisco, and I had every reason to be gratified with the delegations which accompanied me to the first part of the General Assembly in London and the second part in New York. We were elected to membership on the Economic and Social Council, and have tried to show by the attention we have paid to that body the measure of importance we attached to its creation. We have taken part in the formation of the World Bank and Fund, of the Provisional International Civil Aviation Organization, of the World Health Organization, of UNESCO, of the International Refugee Organization, of the Food and Agriculture Organization, and of the projected International Trade Organization. We have continued to support the International Labour Organization, as we did before the war. We have played a prominent part in the work of the Atomic Energy Commission and of the Peace Conference in Paris. This list is not exhaustive, but it indicates the measure of our activity. We have not found it easy to provide delegates and advisers for all the conferences

which the task of creating a new structure of world organizations has required. I think, however, that we may take pride in the work of our representatives, and that if you had observed them at any of these gatherings, you would have seen them doing competent, energetic and constructive work. I think you would find, also, that they had regularly won the respect and confidence of their colleagues from other countries.

In economic as well as political affairs we have put our shoulder to the wheel of post-war reconstruction. Our contribution to UNRRA was more than 150 million dollars, and Canadian food and equipment have been shipped into devastated areas all over the world. We supplied goods freely to our allies during the war under Mutual Aid Legislation, and we have since provided export credits on a vast scale to help in rebuilding the economic life of Europe and of China. We have done this as a matter of policy, because we believe that the economic reconstruction of the world must go hand in hand with the political reconstruction. We are aware, too, that economic revival is a matter of great importance to us. We are dependent on markets abroad for the large quantities of staple products we produce and cannot consume, and we are dependent on supplies from abroad of commodities which are essential to our well-being. It seems to me axiomatic, therefore, that we should give our support to every international organization which contributes to the economic and political stability of the world.

Seen in the light of these historic developments, the recent expansion of the diplomatic service of this country is a natural development. We are preparing ourselves to fulfil the growing responsibilities in world affairs which we have accepted as a modern state. We wish the Commonwealth to be an effective instrument of co-operation, and we have, therefore, appointed High Commissioners in the capitals of every Commonwealth country. I am glad to say that within recent weeks this process has been completed with the appointment of a High Commissioner to India. I earnestly hope that through his mission there and through the High Commissioner for India in Canada, who will soon be appointed, we may experience the same informal and helpful co-operation which has been characteristic of our relations with the Commonwealth countries.

We have also multiplied rapidly our diplomatic representation in foreign countries. Before very long, we shall have provided ourselves with diplomatic representation in the capitals of every major country in the world. We have not taken this step merely through a desire to follow a conventional practice, or to advertise ourselves abroad. We have done so because our geography, our climate, our natural resources, have so conditioned our economy that the continued prosperity and well-being of our own people can best be served by the prosperity and well-being of the whole world. We have thus a useful part to play in world affairs, useful to ourselves through being useful to others, and to play that part we must have our own spokesmen among our neighbours.

It is not only in our foreign service that this expansion is taking place. We are trying also to construct a department in Ottawa which will build upon the activities of our representatives abroad. Our own national interests compel us to take a creditable part in the international conferences which are now determining the nature of the post-war world. We are, therefore, constructing a service which can provide strong and well-informed advisers for the delegations which we must send to these gatherings. This is no easy task. It will, of course, make demands upon our financial resources. I am strengthened, however, in my determination to recommend the continuation of this policy because it is no transitory experiment. It is the natural result of a long historic process, and I feel that it will be supported by all sections of our people. And that is as it should be. Canadian policy in its external relations should not be allowed to become a matter of party political controversy at home. Of course the government in office must take full responsibility for each one of its actions in Canada's external relations as well as in the conduct of purely domestic Canadian affairs. But in its external relations the government in office should ever strive to speak and to act on behalf of the whole of Canada and in such manner as to have the support of all the Canadian peoples regardless of party affiliations..."

APPENDIX E

Chrystia Freeland: “Diplomat of the Year” in Washington

Chrystia Freeland’s speech in June of 2018 drew attention to the clear differences between Canada’s commitment to multilateralism and the rule of law, and the United States’ emerging nationalism and self-interest under President Trump. It was followed by the signing of a renewed trade agreement between Canada and the United States, known in Canada as CUSMA, which provided for a required re-assessment every six years, and some weakening of Canadian sovereignty on digital matters.

Address by Minister Chrystia Freeland, Recipient of *Foreign Policy’s* Diplomat of the Year Award, Washington, D.C., June 13, 2018

I would like to address a challenge that affects us all: the weakening of the rules-based international order and the threat that resurgent authoritarianism poses to liberal democracy itself.

I would like to start on a personal note. In the late 1980s and 1990s, I studied and worked as a reporter in what was, first, the USSR and, while I was living there, became independent Ukraine. In fact, I think some of my former bosses are here tonight.

My experience of watching from the inside as this vast, mighty authoritarian regime crumbled profoundly shaped my thinking.

It was a euphoric moment and one when it was tempting to imagine that liberal democracy was both inevitable and invulnerable. As Francis Fukuyama put it, we seemed to have reached “the end of history.”

Fukuyama wasn’t, of course, arguing that history had ground to a halt. Rather, he was saying that the half-century-long competition between

liberalism and authoritarianism had been settled and that liberal democracy had won.

What a seductive argument!

Now, we harboured no illusions that institutions such as the WTO or the International Monetary Fund or the World Bank or the United Nations were perfect. Or that our own democracies at home — with their sausage-making methods of legislating and governing — were without flaw.

But there was a broad consensus that the Atlantic economies, plus Japan, led an international system of rules that had allowed our peoples to thrive and would surely continue to do so.

Critically, this was built as a system that other nations — emerging powers — could join. And join they have. The past twenty-five years have seen the rapid rise of the Global South and Asia — most prominently, China — as major economic powers in their own right. We created the G20 — with Canadian leadership, I might add. Russia was invited into the G7, making it the G8, in 1998 and into the WTO in 2012. China has been a WTO member since 2001.

In Latin America, in the Caribbean, in Africa and in Asia, developing countries have joined these institutions and accepted their rules; and that has delivered ever-higher living standards to their people.

But although this was and remains a broadly positive evolution, with extraordinary gains in terms of reducing extreme poverty, lengthening lifespans and decreasing infant mortality, one assumption about this global shift turned out to be wrong.

This was the idea that as authoritarian countries joined the global economy and grew rich, they would inevitably adopt Western political freedoms too. That has not always happened. Indeed, in recent years, some democracies have even gone in the other direction and slid into authoritarianism — notably and sadly, Venezuela. And some countries that had embarked on the difficult journey from communism to democratic capitalism have moved backwards. The saddest example for me is Russia.

Even China, whose economic success in lifting hundreds of millions of people out of poverty is one of the great accomplishments of recent times, stands as a rebuke to our belief in the inevitability of liberal democracy.

And within the club of wealthy Western democracies, we're seeing homegrown anti-democratic movements on the rise. Whether comprising neo-Nazis, white supremacists, "incels," nativists or radical anti-globalists, such movements seek to undermine democracy from within.

Liberal democracy is also under assault from abroad. Authoritarian regimes are actively seeking to undermine us with sophisticated, well-financed propaganda and espionage operations. They seek to suborn smaller countries, those wavering between democracy and authoritarianism.

The idea that democracy could falter, or be overturned in places where it had previously flourished, may seem outlandish.

But other great civilizations have risen — and then fallen. It is hubris to think we will inevitably be different. Our prime minister likes to say, about our country, that Canada didn't happen by accident, and it won't continue without effort. The same can be said of democracy itself.

Let's set aside the malevolent actors for a moment. Why are our liberal democracies vulnerable at home?

Here's why. Angry populism thrives where the middle class is hollowed out. Where people are losing ground and losing hope — even as those at the very top are doing better than ever.

When people feel their economic future is in jeopardy, when they believe their children have fewer opportunities than they had in their youth, that's when people are vulnerable to the demagogue who scapegoats the outsider, the other — whether an immigrant at home or a foreign actor.

The fact is, middle-class working families aren't wrong to feel left behind. Median wages have been stagnating; jobs are becoming more precarious, pensions uncertain; housing, childcare and education harder to afford.

These are the wrenching human consequences — the growing pains, if you will — of the great transformative forces of the past forty years: the technology revolution and globalization. Of the two, technology is having the greatest impact. But even free-traders like me need to recognize that globalization has contributed as well.

So, what's the answer? I think we are agreed that it is not, as the Luddites unsuccessfully proposed at the start of the Industrial Revolution, to stop the march of technology. We all love our smartphones too much!

When it comes to trade, we need to introduce labour standards with real teeth, as Canada and the EU have done in our free trade agreement and as we [Canada, the United States and Mexico] are discussing as part of our ongoing modernization negotiations for NAFTA. It is long past time to bring the WTO up to date with the realities of 2018 and beyond. We need to seriously address non-tariff barriers to trade and forced technology transfers.

However, and overwhelmingly, the chief answer to the legitimate grievances of the middle class lies in domestic policy. The middle class and people working hard to join it need the security that comes from education in your youth, health care for your family, good jobs for your children, and dignity in your retirement. We need to think about what the jobs of the future for our citizens will be and ensure that those jobs will pay a living wage and that our people will have the skills to do them. Perhaps most importantly — and this is work that would benefit from international co-operation — we need to ensure that in a twenty-first century in which capital is global but social welfare is national, each of our countries has the durable tax base necessary to support the 99 per cent.

But setting our own house in order is just one part of the struggle. The truth is that authoritarianism is on the march — and it is time for liberal democracy to fight back. To do that, we need to raise our game.

One device strongmen use to justify their rule is the Soviet trick of “whataboutism” — the strategy of false equivalency that holds that because democracies are inevitably imperfect they lack the moral authority to criticize authoritarian regimes. We heard this species of cynical rhetoric, for example, from the Venezuelan foreign minister at the Organization of American States meeting in Washington just last week. We must be smart enough to see through it.

It is possible, indeed necessary, for liberal democrats to acknowledge that our democracies aren’t perfect. The record of my own country’s relationship with Indigenous peoples, for instance, is one of tragic failure.

But admitting our mistakes doesn’t discredit us. On the contrary, it is one of the things that make us who we are.

Authoritarianism is also often justified as a more efficient way of getting things done. No messy contested elections, no wrenching shift from one short-termist governing party to another, no troublesome judicial oversight, no time-consuming public consultation. How much more effective, the apologists argue, for a paramount leader with a long-term vision, unlimited power and permanent tenure to rule.

We need to resist this corrosive nonsense. We need to summon Yeats' oft-cited "passionate intensity" in the fight for liberal democracy and the international rules-based order that supports it.

Remember those great words at Gettysburg: "government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the Earth."

Preserving Lincoln's vision means striking back. It means resisting foreign efforts to hijack our democracies through cyber-meddling and propaganda. It means outshining the other models and encouraging those who are on the fence.

And it means governing with integrity. Facts matter. Truth matters. Competence and honesty, among elected leaders and in our public services, matter.

Now I'd like to speak directly to Canada's American friends and to my own many friends here in this room.

Let me begin by simply saying thank you.

For the past seventy years and more, America has been the leader of the free world. We Canadians have been proud to stand at your side and to have your back.

As your closest friend, ally and neighbour, we also understand that many Americans today are no longer certain that the rules-based international order — of which you were the principal architect and for which you wrote the biggest cheques — still benefits America.

We see this most plainly in the US administration's tariffs on Canadian steel and aluminum imposed under a 232 national security provision.

We share the world's longest undefended border. Our soldiers have fought and died alongside yours in the First World War, in the Second World War, in Korea, in Afghanistan and in Iraq. The idea that we could pose a national security threat to you is more than absurd: it is hurtful.

The 232 tariffs introduced by the United States are illegal under WTO and NAFTA rules. They are protectionism, pure and simple. They are not a response to unfair actions by other countries that put American industry at a disadvantage.

They are a naked example of the United States putting its thumb on the scale, in violation of the very rules it helped to write.

Canada has no choice but to retaliate — with a measured, perfectly reciprocal, dollar-for-dollar response — and we will do so. We act in close collaboration with our like-minded partners in the EU and Mexico. They too are your allies, and they share our astonishment and our resolve.

No one will benefit from this beggar-thy-neighbor dispute. The price will be paid, in part, by American consumers and by American businesses.

The price will also be paid by those who believe that a rules-based system is something worth preserving. Since the end of the Second World War, we have built a system that promoted prosperity and prevented smaller and regional conflicts from turning into total wars. We've built a system that championed freedom and democracy over authoritarianism and oppression. Canada, for one, is going to stand up in defence of that system when that system is under attack. We will not escalate — and we will not back down.

We remember a time when the United States believed great international projects like the Marshall Plan or the reconstruction of Japan were the pathway to lasting peace, when America believed that its security and prosperity were bolstered by the security and prosperity of other nations — indeed, that America could only be truly safe and prosperous when its allies were too.

This vision — the Greatest Generation's vision — was crucially dependent on the rules-based international order and the postwar institutions built to maintain it. It was based upon the willingness of all, especially the strongest, to play by the rules and be bound by them. It depended on the greatest countries of the world giving up, collectively, on the idea that might made right.

Now, the Second World War was seventy years ago. It is reasonable to ask whether our grandparents' hard-won wisdom still applies today. I am certain that it does and for some new reasons.

After the devastation of the Second World War, the United States was the unquestioned colossus, accounting alone for half of the world's economy.

Today, the US economy stands at just under a quarter of the world's. Together, the EU, Canada and Japan, your allies in the G7 and those beyond account for just a little bit more. China produces nearly 20 per cent of the world's GDP, and in our lifetimes its economy is set to become the world's largest.

Now, that is not necessarily a bad thing. Americans, Canadians and Europeans are much wealthier and healthier and live longer than our grandparents did.

The rise of the rest has been a chapter in the story of our own increased prosperity. And it is only natural that the 85 per cent of people who live outside the rich, industrialized West should over time account for a greater and growing share of the world's wealth.

But that shift leaves the Western liberal democracies with a dilemma. How shall we behave in a world we no longer dominate?

One answer is to give up on the rules-based international order, to give up on the Western alliance and to seek to survive in a Metternichian world defined not by common values, mutually agreed-upon rules and shared prosperity, but rather by a ruthless struggle between great powers governed solely by the narrow, short-term and mercantilist pursuit of self-interest.

Canada could never thrive in such a world. But you, still the world's largest economy, may be tempted.

That, of course, is your sovereign right. But allow me, as your friend, to make the case that America's security, amid the inexorable rise of the rest, lies in doubling down on an improved rules-based international order. It lies in fighting alongside traditional allies, like Canada, and alongside all of the younger democracies around the world — from the Americas to Africa to Asia to the former Soviet Union — who are so keen to join us and who yearn for leadership.

You may feel today that your size allows you to go mano-a-mano with your traditional adversaries and be guaranteed to win. But if history tells us one thing, it is that no one nation's pre-eminence is eternal.

That is why the far wiser path — and the more enduring one — is to strengthen our existing alliance of liberal democracies. To hold the door open to new friends, to countries that have their own troubled past, such as Tunisia, Senegal, Indonesia, Mexico, Botswana, Chile or Romania. To reform and renew the rules-based international order that we have built together. And in so doing to require that all states, whether democratic or not, play by common rules.

This is the difficult truth: As the West's relative might inevitably declines, now is the time when, more than ever, we must set aside the idea that might is right. Now is the time for us to plant our flag on the rule of law — so that the rising powers are induced to play by these rules, too.

To explain our faith in you, let me remind you of the city on the hill Ronald Reagan evoked in his farewell speech in 1989.

It was “a tall, proud city built on rocks stronger than oceans, wind-swept, God-blessed, and teeming with people of all kinds living in harmony and peace; a city with free ports that hummed with commerce and creativity. And if there had to be city walls, the walls had doors and the doors were open to anyone with the will and the heart to get here.”

This city — open to trade, open to immigrants — speaks to Canada's values too. Indeed, these are the values of liberal democracy. These values are under attack from outside our walls. Most corrosively, even inside the Shining City, some have begun to doubt them. My country, Canada, believes in these values. We are ready to defend them and the rules-based international order that unites all of the world's cities on the hill.

Our friends among the world's democracies — in Europe, in Asia, in Africa and here in the Americas — are shoulder-to-shoulder with us. We all know we will be strongest with America in our ranks — and indeed in the lead. But whatever this great country's choice will turn out to be, let me be clear that Canada knows where it stands and we will rise to the challenge.

APPENDIX F

The Davos Speech

This is probably the most widely quoted speech by a Canadian Prime Minister in decades. It is interesting to compare and contrast it to the two earlier speeches by Louis St. Laurent and Chrystia Freeland. It drove many to their phones in search of “hegemony” and “Thucydides,” and the Prime Minister’s use of the word “rupture” found its way into the title of this book. It was Mr. Carney’s “we’re not in Kansas anymore” moment, pointing to how “Only America First” has consequences for the world order unparalleled since the Second World War.

Principled and Pragmatic — Canada’s Path: Special Address by Mark Carney, Prime Minister of Canada, World Economic Forum Annual Meeting at Davos, Switzerland, January 20, 2026

It’s a pleasure — and a duty — to be with you tonight in this pivotal moment that Canada and the world are going through.

Tonight, I’ll talk about a rupture in the world order, the end of a pleasant fiction, and the beginning of a harsh reality where geopolitics — where the large, main power — is submitted to no limits, no constraints.

On the other hand, I would like to tell you that the other countries, particularly intermediate powers like Canada, are not powerless. They have the capacity to build a new order that encompasses our values, like respect for human rights, sustainable development, solidarity, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of the various states.

The power of the less powerful starts with honesty.

It seems that every day we are reminded that we live in an era of great power rivalry. That the rules-based order is fading. That the strong do what they can, and the weak must suffer what they must.

This aphorism of Thucydides is presented as inevitable — the natural logic of international relations reasserting itself. And faced with this logic, there is a strong tendency for countries to go along to get along. To accommodate. To avoid trouble. To hope that compliance will buy safety.

Well, it won't.

So, what are our options?

In 1978, the Czech dissident Václav Havel, later president, wrote an essay called *The Power of the Powerless*. In it, he asked a simple question: How did the communist system sustain itself?

His answer began with a greengrocer. Every morning, this shopkeeper places a sign in his window: "Workers of the world, unite!" He does not believe it. No one believes it. But he places the sign anyway — to avoid trouble, to signal compliance, to get along. And because every shopkeeper on every street does the same, the system persists.

Not through violence alone, but through the participation of ordinary people in rituals they privately know to be false.

Havel called this "living within a lie." The system's power comes not from its truth but from everyone's willingness to perform as if it were true. And its fragility comes from the same source: When even one person stops performing — when the greengrocer removes his sign — the illusion begins to crack.

Friends, it is time for companies and countries to take their signs down.

For decades, countries like Canada prospered under what we called the rules-based international order. We joined its institutions, we praised its principles, we benefited from its predictability. And because of that, we could pursue values-based foreign policies under its protection.

We knew the story of the international rules-based order was partially false. That the strongest would exempt themselves when convenient. That trade rules were enforced asymmetrically. And we knew that international law applied with varying rigour depending on the identity of the accused or the victim.

This fiction was useful, and American hegemony, in particular, helped provide public goods: open sea lanes, a stable financial system, collective security, and support for frameworks for resolving disputes.

So, we placed the sign in the window. We participated in the rituals, and we largely avoided calling out the gaps between rhetoric and reality.

This bargain no longer works.

Let me be direct. We are in the midst of a rupture, not a transition.

Over the past two decades, a series of crises in finance, health, energy, and geopolitics have laid bare the risks of extreme global integration.

More recently, great powers have begun using economic integration as weapons, tariffs as leverage, financial infrastructure as coercion, and supply chains as vulnerabilities to be exploited.

You cannot “live within the lie” of mutual benefit through integration when integration becomes the source of your subordination.

The multilateral institutions on which the middle powers have relied — the WTO, the UN, the COP — the architecture, the very architecture of collective problem solving — are under threat.

As a result, many countries are drawing the same conclusions. They must develop greater strategic autonomy: in energy, food, critical minerals, in finance, and supply chains.

This impulse is understandable. A country that cannot feed itself, fuel itself, or defend itself has few options. When the rules no longer protect you, you must protect yourself.

But let us be clear-eyed about where this leads. A world of fortresses will be poorer, more fragile, and less sustainable.

And there is another truth. If great powers abandon even the pretence of rules and values for the unhindered pursuit of their power and interests, the gains from transactionalism will become harder to replicate. Hegemons cannot continually monetise their relationships.

Allies will diversify to hedge against uncertainty. They'll buy insurance, increase options, in order to rebuild sovereignty — sovereignty that was once grounded in rules, but will increasingly be anchored in the ability to withstand pressure.

This room knows this is classic risk management. Risk management

comes at a price, but that cost of strategic autonomy, of sovereignty, can also be shared. Collective investments in resilience are cheaper than everyone building their own fortresses. Shared standards reduce fragmentation. Complementarities are positive sum.

The question for middle powers, like Canada, is not whether to adapt to this new reality. We must. The question is whether we adapt by simply building higher walls — or whether we can do something more ambitious.

Now, Canada was amongst the first to hear the wake-up call, leading us to fundamentally shift our strategic posture.

Canadians know that our old, comfortable assumptions that our geography and alliance memberships automatically conferred prosperity and security — that assumption is no longer valid.

Our new approach rests on what Alexander Stubb, the President of Finland, has termed “value-based realism” — or, to put it another way, we aim to be both *principled and pragmatic*.

Principled in our commitment to fundamental values: sovereignty and territorial integrity, the prohibition of the use of force except when consistent with the UN Charter, and respect for human rights.

Pragmatic in recognising that progress is often incremental, that interests diverge, that not every partner will share all of our values. We are engaging broadly, strategically, with open eyes. We actively take on the world as it is, not wait for a world we wish to be.

We are calibrating our relationships so their depth reflects our values. We are prioritising broad engagement to maximise our influence, given the fluidity of the world order, the risks that this poses, and the stakes for what comes next.

We are no longer just relying on the strength of our values, but also the value of our strength.

We are building that strength at home.

Since my government took office, we have cut taxes on incomes, capital gains, and business investment, we have removed all federal barriers to interprovincial trade, and we are fast-tracking a trillion dollars of investment in energy, AI, critical minerals, new trade corridors, and beyond.

We are doubling our defence spending by the end of this decade, and we are doing so in ways that build our domestic industries.

We are rapidly diversifying abroad. We have agreed to a comprehensive strategic partnership with the European Union, including joining SAFE, Europe's defence procurement arrangements.

We have signed twelve other trade and security deals on four continents in the last six months.

In the past few days, we have concluded new strategic partnerships with China and Qatar.

We are negotiating free trade pacts with India, ASEAN, Thailand, Philippines, and Mercosur.

We're doing something else. To help solve global problems, *we are pursuing variable geometry*. In other words, different coalitions for different issues, based on common values and interests.

So, on Ukraine, we are a core member of the Coalition of the Willing and one of the largest per-capita contributors to its defence and security.

On Arctic sovereignty, we stand firmly with Greenland and Denmark and fully support their unique right to determine Greenland's future. Our commitment to NATO Article 5 is unwavering.

We are working with our NATO allies (including the Nordic Baltic 8) to further secure the alliance's northern and western flanks, including through Canada's unprecedented investments in over-the-horizon radar, submarines, in aircraft, and boots on the ground, boots on the ice. Canada strongly opposes tariffs over Greenland and calls for focused talks to achieve our shared objectives of security and prosperity in the Arctic.

On plurilateral trade, we are championing efforts to build a bridge between the Trans-Pacific Partnership and the European Union, which would create a new trading bloc of 1.5 billion people.

On critical minerals, we are forming buyers' clubs anchored in the G7 so that the world can diversify away from concentrated supply.

On AI, we are co-operating with like-minded democracies to ensure we will not ultimately be forced to choose between hegemons and hyperscalers.

This is not naive multilateralism. Nor is it relying on their institutions. It is building the coalitions that work, issue by issue, with partners who share enough common ground to act together. In some cases, this will be the vast majority of nations.

And it is creating a dense web of connections across trade, investment, and culture on which we can draw for future challenges and opportunities.

Middle powers must act together because if you are not at the table, you are on the menu.

But I would also say that great powers can afford to go it alone. They have the market size, the military capacity, and the leverage to dictate terms. Middle powers do not. But when we only negotiate bilaterally with a hegemon, we negotiate from weakness. We accept what is offered. We compete with each other to be the most accommodating.

This is not sovereignty. It is the performance of sovereignty while accepting subordination.

In a world of great power rivalry, the countries in between have a choice: to compete with each other for favour or to combine to create a third path with impact.

We should not allow the rise of hard power to blind us to the fact that the power of legitimacy, integrity, and rules will remain strong — if we choose to wield it together.

Which brings me back to Havel.

What would it mean for middle powers to “live the truth”?

First, it means naming reality. Stop invoking “rules-based international order” as though it still functions as advertised. Call it what it is: a system of intensifying great power rivalry, where the most powerful pursue their interests using economic integration as coercion.

It means acting consistently, applying the same standards to allies and rivals. When middle powers criticize economic intimidation from one direction but stay silent when it comes from another, we are keeping the sign in the window.

It means *building what we claim to believe in*, rather than waiting for the old order to be restored. It means creating institutions and agreements that function as described.

And it means *reducing the leverage that enables coercion*. Building a strong domestic economy should always be every government's immediate priority. Diversification internationally is not just economic prudence; it is the material foundation for honest foreign policy, because countries earn the right to principled stands by reducing their vulnerability to retaliation.

Canada has what the world wants. We are an energy superpower. We hold vast reserves of critical minerals. We have the most educated population in the world. Our pension funds are amongst the world's largest and most sophisticated investors. In other words, we have capital, talent, and a government with the immense fiscal capacity to act decisively.

And we have the values to which many others aspire.

Canada is a pluralistic society that works. Our public square is loud, diverse, and free. Canadians remain committed to sustainability.

We are a stable, reliable partner — in a world that is anything but — a partner that builds and values relationships for the long term.

Canada has something else: a recognition of what is happening and a determination to act accordingly.

We understand that this rupture calls for more than adaptation. It calls for honesty about the world as it is.

We are taking the sign out of the window.

We know the old order is not coming back. We should not mourn it. Nostalgia is not a strategy.

But we believe that from the fracture, we can build something better, stronger, and more just.

This is the task of the middle powers, the countries that have the most to lose from a world of fortresses and the most to gain from a world of genuine co-operation.

The powerful have their power. But we have something too — the capacity to stop pretending, to name reality, to build our strength at home, and to act together.

That is Canada's path. We choose it openly and confidently.
And it is a path wide open to any country willing to take it with us.

Mark Carney, “‘Principled and pragmatic: Canada’s path’ Prime Minister Carney addresses the World Economic Forum Annual Meeting” (speech), January 20, 2026, <https://www.pm.gc.ca/en/news/speeches/2026/01/20/principled-and-pragmatic-canadas-path-prime-minister-carney-addresses>.