

# CanadaWatch

PRACTICAL AND AUTHORITATIVE ANALYSIS OF KEY NATIONAL ISSUES

## EDITORIAL:

# Deep integration post-Bush

### AFTER DEEP INTEGRATION: THEN WHAT?

NAFTA promised North Americans a new future and an end to narrow, nationalist economic strategies. It was also bold in its vision of opening markets, reducing border hassles, and fostering closer cooperation among Canada, Mexico, and the United States. The events of 9/11 changed, dramatically and seemingly forever, the notion that there was a North American community waiting to happen.

For Mexicans who work in the United States but live on the Mexican side of the border, wait times hearken back to the bureaucratic orders of the 1960s. As in those days, it now takes three hours of

BY DANIEL DRACHE,  
JOSÉ LUIS VALDÉS-UGALDE,  
AND RICK VAN SCHOIK

Daniel Drache is Associate Director, Robarts Centre, York; José Luis Valdés-Ugalde is Director, CISAN at UNAM; Rick Van Schoik is Director, North American Center for Transborder Studies, Arizona State University

queuing and administrative red tape to cross the border. The defining issue is not the movement of goods but immigration into Canada and the United States. Millions of undocumented workers have become a flashpoint for backlash against Mexican immigrants. In Canada, there has been a steady growth in the number of undocumented workers, although

nothing of the magnitude seen in the United States. In Spain, Prime Minister José Luis Rodríguez Zapatero has recently put 800,000 immigrants on the path to legalization; in North America, there is no equivalent end to the Cold War on immigrants in sight.

### THE WEDGE ISSUES

Americans are deeply divided by the presence of millions of Mexicans without legal status. The bipartisan, compromise immigration bill sponsored by John McCain and Edward Kennedy will resurface because Mexican-American relations depend upon a resolution granting full legal rights to the Mexicans living, working, and paying taxes in the United States.

Deep integration post-Bush, page 3

# Still different: Canada and the United States

### COUNTERINTUITIVE DIFFERENCES

When my book on Canadian-American values divergence, *Fire and Ice: The United States, Canada and the Myth of Converging Values*, was first published in 2003, I was amazed at the number of people who approached me to enumerate the similarities between the two societies. They pointed quite rightly to language (with the obvious exception of Quebec), pop culture, commitment to democracy, seemingly identical suburbs, the ubiquity of McDonald's, and many other shared aspects of life in Canada and the United States. Some pointed to joint military projects of the

BY MICHAEL ADAMS

Michael Adams is the founder of  
Environics Research Group

past, or to the two countries' common European and Christian roots. These protestations surprised me, not because I disagreed with them, but rather because the two countries' similarities are so plain and so numerous that I wondered how anyone might imagine I was contesting them.

The argument was and is that despite the many similarities between the two countries—from common British origins right through to a shared curiosity about who will win the Superbowl—Canadians

and Americans are diverging on some very meaningful values.

### THE IMPORTANCE OF VALUES

Some have referred to these findings as evidence of “the narcissism of small differences”: a bunch of insecure Canadians

Still different, page 4

The contents of this issue are listed  
in the Features box on page 2.

YORK  
UNIVERSITÉ  
UNIVERSITY



redefine THE POSSIBLE.

# Deep integration post-Bush continued from page 3

George W. Bush's dictum "you are either with us or against us."

## FALSE BINARIES AND NEW POLICY SPACES

In a world dominated by false binary thinking, Canada, Mexico, and the United States have grown apart for good reason. Social diversity and the complex nature of life in North America require a more intellectual and level-headed response at the political and social levels. Transnational issues such as the environment, human rights, poverty, crime, guns, and drug smuggling cannot be addressed within a strictly Canadian, Mexican, or American framework. So North America needs to be rethought as the Bush presidency winds down and is pushed off the stage of history by anxious publics. As the policy space in the three countries is being redefined, the questions are: What do North Americans want? How will they effectively coordinate and address the things they share in common? How are we going to rebalance deep integration with the renewal of democratic politics triggered by the democratic primaries in the United States and new social movement actors throughout the continent?

The new geography of power in the global economy has marginalized NAFTA as an export platform.

The contributors to this special issue of *Canada Watch* focus on many of the old continuities from the free trade era and some of the most prominent new initiatives in transborder problem solving. The new North America is framed by security, immigration, the environment, income inequality, and social diversity. There is no ready-made consensus on these tough policy battles. In this issue, three framing articles provide new points of departure. First, there is Robert Pastor's seminal idea of the need for common institutions and the need to pool sovereignty among the three countries. Second, for Michael Adams, North America cannot acquire the legs to move beyond deep economic integration with-

out recognition of the different values that shape each country. Finally, José Luis Valdés Ugalde makes the powerful case that cooperation and mending fences post-Bush will require a very different set of power relations among the three countries.

The experts, the public, and North America's political classes are all trying to get their heads into the game to strategize the next steps. The circumspect reader of this issue will discover that leading academics themselves disagree on many of the fundamentals about security and deep integration. More significantly, though, all find common ground around the urgency to put at the top of North America's public policy agenda human rights, immigration, and environment. Commercial integration has to be framed by the new context. The end of deterministic thinking teaches us that even if markets lead, people are no longer automatic followers. Divergence across North America is highly visible and no longer the exception. The continent is engaged in an unprecedented political U-turn creating new options and even larger policy challenges. 

## Still different continued from page 1

trying desperately to show their specialness in the face of a richer, more powerful neighbour. The problem with the narcissism of small differences argument is that the differences between Canada and the United States are not small. Canadians and Americans articulate different values in areas such as patriarchy, gender, family organization, religion, tolerance, and greater acceptance of violence. These areas are anything but marginal to the way people live their lives.

Although Canadian acceptance of patriarchy and religion has registered a moderate increase during the past several years (driven primarily by the arrival of a quarter million new immigrants

a year, most of whom hail from countries with more traditional values than Canada's), Canadians remain much less likely than Americans to attend religious services regularly or to believe that "the father of the family must be master in his own house." Agreement with this statement in Canada reached 21 percent in our last binational measure in 2004, whereas in the United States more than twice the proportion of Americans (52 percent that year) agreed that Dad should be the boss.

The importance of family, and religion in particular, cannot be overstated: these are the crucibles of socialization, whose lessons—both explicit and im-

plied—we carry with us throughout our lives in all of our various roles and relationships. These are widely acknowledged to be crucial values dimensions, and they are used in the study of societies all over the world—not just pored over by anxious Canadian narcissists.

Indeed, the differences in Canadian and American values are all the more remarkable in light of the similar linguistic, pop-cultural, and consumer environments that Canadians and Americans navigate in their daily lives. The fact that differences in worldview underlie two cultures that are superficially alike makes those differences *more* interesting—not less.

## MODERATION AND EXTREMES

The roots of these differences may certainly be debated, but it is hard to dispute that the United States has been the nation that has—for better and worse—tended more toward extremes, while Canada has tended more toward moderation. From its revolutionary roots to its contemporary culture, where moral values rule election day and what happens in Vegas stays in Vegas, America has not been known for timidity, hesitation, or going halfway. Canada has been spared some of the excesses of that culture—its murder rates are lower, its poor less destitute, and its middle class less anxious—but it has also been “spared” the prosperity, innovation, and global influence of its neighbour.

The rub of living in a nation where anything is possible is that the possibilities are not all good ones. Canadians, in their relatively stable—some would say mediocre—social and economic environment, have felt secure enough to become increasingly autonomous: they have moved away from traditional religion, questioned traditional family models, and generally become a less hierarchical, more flexible people. This “heterarchical” flexibility is manifested in many ways, from the increased acceptance of flexible gender identities (including homosexuality, non-traditional employment roles for men and women, parity in expectations about childrearing and domestic labour, and acceptance of immigrants) to the changes in workplace dynamics and the management of human resources.

In the United States, risk is greater in many spheres of life: less generous social assistance in the event of unemployment, less certain health insurance in the event of illness (even among those with coverage), and more unforgiving punishment in the event of social or criminal transgression. In the last half-century, Americans have tended to rely more heavily than Canadians on traditional institutions to provide security—whether social, financial, martial, or existential.

# Canadians and Americans remain on their own distinct trajectories in terms of their values, their outlook on world affairs, and their domestic policies.

## THE END OF DIFFERENCE?

Some will argue that as the Bush administration slouches into exile (perhaps replaced by less hubristic Republicans, perhaps by Democrats of moderate or progressive strain) and as Canada's Conservative party continues to hold power (albeit in the form of a minority government), differences between Canada and the United States are palpably evaporating. It is true that at the political level, cross-border values differences are less obvious than they were when Jean Chrétien's Liberals had a firm grip on Canadian government and the Bush administration was at the height of its post-9/11 popularity. But even as the characters in each national capital change, the character of the two nations' values will not change overnight.

The federal Conservative victory in January 2006 did not mark a change in our values trajectory. If anything, it suggested that Canadians were sufficiently autonomous in their thinking to ignore the scaremongering that characterized two consecutive Liberal campaigns and to trust their own understanding of the agenda that a new Conservative government would pursue. Of course, there are those who are deeply dissatisfied with the progressive path Canada has travelled over the past several decades and remain ready to lash back. For most Canadians, however, in January 2006 it was time for a change—not a change in their values, a change in Ottawa. The Conservatives have spent the past year or so letting slide the legalization of same-sex marriage, welcoming immigrants to our shores, stroking Canada's ethnic minority communities and promoting multiculturalism, wooing the

“nation” of Quebec, and generally behaving like Canadian governments do. For all the talk of “Canada's new government,” the change has hardly been revolutionary.

## THE PERSISTENCE OF VALUES

Americans may well elect a Democratic president in 2008. This will not imply a major change in Americans' underlying values either. Canadians and Americans remain on their own distinct trajectories in terms of their values, their outlook on world affairs, and their domestic policies. South of the border, a new person will occupy the Oval Office—and it is by no means a trivial thing that this person might be female or black—but that person will continue to serve a population with distinct values. Recall that Hillary Clinton, although reviled by religious conservatives, has spent the past several years attending prayer breakfasts in Washington: just a part of life in the halls of power in a country where, according to the Pew Center, half the electorate say they would not vote for an atheist. Health care reform is anything but a sure bet, immigration will remain as contentious as ever, same-sex marriage might not be constitutionally banned but nor will it be promoted by any candidate who knows what's good for them. The economy and Iraq are a pair of 800-pound gorillas that the winning candidate will have to wrestle using every ounce of his strength, and only George W. Bush's god knows how either will turn out.

It is an uncertain world, and values are not immutable, but nor will they be undone in a day or even a decade on either side of the border—whatever the future might bring. 