

Canada's Role as a Global Resilience Solution Provider: Exporting Strategies for Sustainable Development and Crisis Management

Li Guangqi

Department of Social Science, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, Oude Markt 13, 3000, Louvain, Vlaams Brabant, Belgium

Abstract :

This paper critiques the European Union's resilience policy, particularly in terms of its external governance approach and the challenges it faces in effectively implementing resilience strategies in developing countries. The concept of resilience, as developed by C.S. Holling, emphasizes the capacity of systems to maintain their identity amidst disturbances, a principle which the EU has incorporated into its global strategy. However, the EU's approach often results in fragmented and inefficient strategies that lack local recognition and engagement, thereby limiting the impact of its resilience projects in neighboring countries. In contrast, this study proposes that Canada, with its robust domestic experience in resilience through policy formulation, social mobilization, and technological innovation, particularly in sectors such as energy, agriculture, and the environment, could provide a more effective model. By exporting the "Canada Model," which includes significant achievements in renewable energy, precision agriculture, and environmental management, Canada can offer a comprehensive resilience strategy that is both adaptable and applicable to the needs of developing nations. This research employs a comparative analysis between Canada's strategies and those of South Asian countries, highlighting the potential for Canadian practices to improve resilience in these regions. Ultimately, by adopting Canadian methodologies, developing countries could enhance their social, economic, and environmental resilience, thereby achieving greater global stability and reducing regional vulnerabilities.

Introduction:

The concept of resilience was originally proposed by Canadian ecologist C.S. Holling and is defined as the ability of a system to maintain its function, structure, feedback capabilities, and identity in the face of disturbances. The European Union has emphasized the concept of resilience in its global strategy (EUGS), reflecting a shift in its foreign policy and aiming to enhance the response capabilities of member states and neighboring countries in the face of shocks and crises. Initially, the EU defined resilience narrowly, focusing mainly on humanitarian and food security areas. Over

time, this definition has gradually broadened to include a wider range of policy areas and is seen as the ability of states and societies to adapt, resist and recover from crises. Although the EU has invested heavily in resilience projects, funding several projects involving climate change adaptation and urban planning, the actual implementation and actual results at the local level have shown some problems. In many cases, despite the investment of large amounts of money and resources, the actual benefits to local countries and communities have been relatively limited. Although some EU projects are intended to enhance local disaster response capabilities, in practice they often lack effective communication and participation with local communities, causing these projects to become externally expanded EU governance. The results are ineffective and have been widely criticized. Among countries with its neighborhood policy, the EU's resilience practices have shown a hypocritical stance and have been criticized as being motivated mainly by considerations of safeguarding its own security and the neoliberal order rather than genuine concern for the long-term well-being and development of its neighbours. The short-sighted and self-interested nature of this strategy undermines the EU's credibility and influence on the international stage. Judging from the effectiveness of the OECD's resilience projects, the resilience construction projects have not made a significant contribution to the local lack of basic economic security capabilities, which means that it is difficult to achieve real social resilience based on basic capabilities such as economy, energy, and agriculture. protection. However, the EU is already in a leading position among OECD countries in terms of resilience building, and resilience building in other countries is more concentrated domestically. With the outbreak of the global epidemic and the onset of the Russia-Ukraine war, the EU had to turn most of its energy to these two issues, which further weakened its investment in external resilience projects.

In this case, resilience cannot continue to exist as an external governance solution for the EU, and the real needs of developing countries for resilience will be ignored. Canada can effectively support the resilience building of developing countries in the face of social, economic and environmental challenges by sharing its domestic resilience experience in policy formulation, social mobilization, technological innovation and environmental management. Through the groundbreaking export "Canada Model", developing countries can gain growth in their economic, energy and agricultural industry capabilities. On this basis, they can further ensure social resilience and truly realize the original intention of resilience: export less trouble to the region and the world.

Methodology :

This article will explore how resilience theory can be applied to enhance community or national resilience to disasters through capacity improvement in agricultural, energy, and environmental dimensions. It aims to methodologically reinvigorate current resilience research. The primary research method involves a comparative analysis of Canada's resilience-building strategies with those of Pakistan and India, highlighting Canada's capability to offer comprehensive solutions. Initially, the paper will focus on Canada's achievements in establishing energy security and adaptive capacities to climate change, comparing these with projects in India and

Pakistan. It will demonstrate why Canada's successful strategies are applicable and potentially replicable in South Asian contexts. Furthermore, the paper will analyze the development of agricultural and social resilience in Canada, juxtaposed with similar efforts in South Asian countries, elucidating the interconnections between climate/energy resilience, and broader social and economic resilience strategies.

The Disenchantment of Resilience

Although the concept of resilience has garnered significant attention within the realms of global governance and international relations, its practical application presents several critical challenges that undermine its efficacy. Firstly, the concept suffers from definitional ambiguity across different disciplines, leading to potential misalignments in policy formulation and execution. This variability complicates the strategic integration of resilience into coherent policy frameworks. Secondly, resilience is frequently perceived as a mechanism to perpetuate the existing economic and social order. By highlighting the adaptive capacities of individuals and communities, it risks deflecting attention from systemic social issues, consequently diminishing the accountability of governments and corporations in fostering social welfare and environmental stewardship. Moreover, resilience initiatives often inadequately address the disparities in resource distribution, notably failing poorer and marginalized communities who lack the necessary resources to achieve genuine resilience. Additionally, the deployment of resilience can serve to obscure entrenched social and economic disparities, conditioning populations to accommodate rather than confront and rectify structural inequities. Lastly, the prevailing focus of resilience strategies on response and recovery tends to overlook the importance of addressing the fundamental causes of environmental and societal disruptions. The imperative, therefore, lies in redefining and operationalizing resilience not merely as a tool for adaptation within extant frameworks, but as a transformative force capable of driving substantial socio-economic restructuring.

Part 1, Energy and Climate Change

In Canada, proactive policy frameworks, robust investments in renewable energy, and community engagement initiatives have successfully built resilient infrastructure adapted to climate change. Canada's strategies include substantial government funding and support for green technology innovations, which stabilize the energy grid and ensure its sustainability. In contrast, India and Pakistan face significant challenges, including a heavy reliance on fossil fuels and inadequate infrastructure, coupled with a lower emphasis on sustainable practices. Despite these challenges, both countries possess significant potential to harness solar and wind energy due to their geographical advantages.

As two rapidly developing economies, India and Pakistan need stable and efficient energy supplies. However, the current pace of renewable energy development does not meet the demand in many areas. Notably, both countries operate many inefficient and polluting power plants that contribute significantly to carbon dioxide emissions and

have profound impacts on local health. The intervention of Canadian energy companies could help these countries begin phasing out outdated power generation capacities, thereby improving efficiency and reducing emissions of carbon dioxide and other harmful substances.

The applicability and replicability of Canada's strategy in South Asia hinge on several factors. South Asian countries could adopt proactive and comprehensive policy frameworks that prioritize sustainability in energy planning and infrastructure development. With Canada's advancements in green technologies, structured technology transfer programs could assist India and Pakistan in leapfrogging to cleaner energy solutions. Furthermore, Canada's model of public-private partnerships in renewable energy projects could be adapted in the South Asian context, possibly supported by international financial mechanisms that reduce investment risks associated with transitioning to renewable energy. Additionally, Canadian energy companies could reach cooperation agreements with local governments to assist in building traditional or renewable energy projects that reduce emissions of harmful substances and carbon from the source. Strengthening regulatory institutions and frameworks in South Asia could also emulate Canada's regulatory success, ensuring that policies are not only formulated but effectively implemented.

Part 2, Agricultural Resilience

Although there are notable differences between the agricultural resilience of Canada and that of India and Pakistan, Canadian experiences can still be relevant and beneficial to South Asia. Firstly, Canadian agriculture, as a fully commercialized and mature industry, boasts a high degree of information flow. This fluid exchange of information is a cornerstone of the resilience seen in Canadian agriculture. Furthermore, Canada has accumulated substantial expertise in addressing climate change and enhancing agricultural sustainability. This expertise is particularly valuable in South Asia, a region frequently afflicted by extreme weather events.

Canada's advanced agricultural technologies and resource management strategies offer significant learning opportunities for South Asian nations. These include precision agriculture, which ensures the efficient use of inputs like water, fertilizers, and pesticides, and the strategic management of water resources to combat scarcity and reduce waste. Additionally, Canada's approach to fostering a comprehensive regional market for mutual assistance, along with promoting sustainable small-scale farming operations, could be adapted to suit the diverse and densely populated agricultural landscapes of South Asia. By integrating these strategies, South Asian countries could enhance their agricultural resilience, better manage their natural resources, and improve their overall response to climatic challenges. This adaptation would not only address immediate agricultural needs but also contribute to broader socio-economic stability in the region.

Conclusion:

This article critically examines the European Union's resilience policy, arguing that systemic challenges hinder the EU from advancing the conceptual norm of resilience. It suggests that the EU's policy framework struggles with local reconfiguration in developing countries and essentially become a part of EU's external governance, which often results in fragmented and inefficient resilience strategies. In contrast, Canada, with its extensive domestic experience in resilience governance, is well-positioned to assume a leadership role in this arena. Canada's approach to resilience in non-social sectors, such as energy, agriculture, and the environment, showcases a comprehensive and coordinated strategy that could serve as a model internationally. By exporting its governance models and construction methodologies, Canada could establish itself as a norm-setter in resilience construction. This includes pioneering advancements in precision agriculture, sustainable energy practices, and environmental conservation efforts that have proven successful domestically.

By taking on this role, Canada can enhance its international stature as a normative leader. This leadership could manifest through leading global discussions on resilience, influencing international policy, and providing a blueprint for other countries to enhance their own resilience mechanisms. This strategic shift would not only benefit Canada's global image but also promote greater global stability and preparedness against a range of environmental, economic, and social challenges.

References:

Barbé, E., & Morillas, P. (2019). The EU global strategy: the dynamics of a more politicized and politically integrated foreign policy. *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 32(6), 753-770. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2019.1588227>

Chandler, D. (2013). International Statebuilding and the Ideology of Resilience. *Politics*, 33(4), 276-286. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9256.12009>

Gudalov, N. N. (2020). The resilience of the EU neighbours to the South and to the East: A comparative analysis. *Croatian International Relations Review*, 26(86), 6-41.

Joseph, J. (2013). The EU in the Horn of Africa: Building resilience as a distant form of governance. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 51(5), 937-953. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12085>

Joseph, J., & Juncos, A. E. (2019). Resilience as an Emergent European Project? The EU's Place in the Resilience Turn. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 57(5), 981-998. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcms.12881>

Juncos, A. E. (2017). Resilience as the new EU foreign policy paradigm: a pragmatist turn? *European Security*, 26(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2016.1247809>

Korosteleva, E. A. (2020). Reclaiming resilience back: A local turn in EU external governance. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 41(2), 241-262.

Masood, T., Israr, A., Zubair, M., & Qazi, U. W. (2023). Assessing challenges to sustainability and resilience of energy supply chain in Pakistan: a developing economy from Triple Bottom Line and UN SDGs' perspective. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy*, 42(1), 268-288. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14786451.2023.2189489>

Sparf, J., & Petridou, E. (2019). Resilience in Practice: A survey of recent European Union projects. RCR Working Paper Series.

Tocci, N. (2020). Resilience and the role of the European Union in the world. *Contemporary Security Policy*, 41(2), 176-194.