



### Assessing the graphic turn in Canadian foreign policy

|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |
|------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Journal:         | <i>Canadian Foreign Policy Journal</i>                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                |
| Manuscript ID    | RCFP-2021-0013.R1                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                     |
| Manuscript Type: | Special Issue Article                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                 |
| Keywords:        | systemism, Canadian foreign policy, pedagogy, visualization, Mario Bunge                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                              |
| Abstract:        | <p>This assessment of the graphic turn in Canadian foreign policy focuses on the visualization of our text, <i>The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy (PCFP)</i>. We note the apparent disjuncture between systemism as an approach to understanding society on the one hand, and the graphic exercise that is at the core of the Visual International Relations Project. Focusing on the latter rather than the former, we assess what the graphic visualization of PCFP demonstrates about our text. We find that the visualization not only accurately portrays the main lines of argument, but also clearly identifies some of the key weaknesses and silences in the text. We also conclude that a key utility of the visualization project lies in its contribution to pedagogy, providing students with ready and accessible guide to works in IR and instructors with a useful tool to assess possible course adoptions.</p> |
|                  |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                       |

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

## Assessing the Graphic Turn in Canadian Foreign Policy

### *Abstract*

This assessment of the graphic turn in Canadian foreign policy focuses on the visualization of our text, *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy (PCFP)*. We note the apparent disjuncture between systemism as an approach to understanding society on the one hand, and the graphic exercise that is at the core of the Visual International Relations Project. Focusing on the latter rather than the former, we assess what the graphic visualization of *PCFP* demonstrates about our text. We find that the visualization not only accurately portrays the main lines of argument, but also clearly identifies some of the key weaknesses and silences in the text. We also conclude that a key utility of the visualization project lies in its contribution to pedagogy, providing students with ready and accessible guide to works in IR and instructors with a useful tool to assess possible course adoptions.

1  
2  
3 Systemism, Sarah Gansen and Patrick James assure us in the introductory essay in this  
4 issue of *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal*, provides a useful way to grapple with the  
5 increasingly complex field of IR that continues to expand and diversify. Through the use of a  
6 standard notation, systemism allows the easy portrayal of analytical reality, capturing the  
7 essential argument of a richly detailed historical analysis in a simple one-page graphic. In the  
8 case of *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy* (hereafter *PCFP*), a picture, it turns out, really  
9 is worth 172,000 words: as the authors of this introductory text on Canada's international policy,  
10 we found it at once sobering and edifying to see our book's essential arguments represented  
11 graphically in this way (see the *PCFP* visualization on p. 00). In this brief assessment, we look at  
12 the nature of systemism, its relationship to the visualization project, and what a graphic portrayal  
13 revealed about our textbook. We conclude that this graphic turn in the Canadian foreign policy  
14 field not only reveals analytical assumptions and key silences in the literature, but also provides  
15 significant pedagogical benefits for students and professors alike.

16  
17 To assess the graphic turn, we begin with a brief excursus into the nature of systemism.  
18 Systemism was the name Mario Bunge, a philosopher of science at McGill University, gave to  
19 his particular approach to understanding society. Bunge posited an alternative to the dominant  
20 conceptions of "the nature of society" as either a collection of individuals who create social  
21 structures that do not have any systemic properties (commonly referred to as individualism) or "a  
22 totality transcending its membership" where "society acts on its members more strongly than  
23 they act on society" (or holism or collectivism) (Bunge 1979, p. 15–16). He argued that  
24 individualism paid too little attention to social relations, while for its part holism tended to ignore  
25 the impact of the individual. Bunge's preferred alternative conceptualized society as "a system of  
26 interrelated individuals, i.e., a system, and while some of its properties are aggregations of  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 properties of its components, others derive from the relationships among the latter (*systemism*)”  
4  
5 (Bunge 1979, p. 13–14). Over the next two and a half decades, Bunge refined his arguments  
6  
7 about systemism and how it worked (see Bunge 1996, pp. 264–281; Bunge 2004).  
8  
9

10 In their introduction, Gansen and James maintain that systemism is an *approach* rather  
11  
12 than a *theory*. Indeed, they argue that very utility of systemism lies in the use of graphics as a  
13  
14 means of arriving at explanation. They suggest that the use of a standard notation allows the  
15  
16 transcendence of methodological quarrels (qualitative vs. quantitative, for example) or even rival  
17  
18 sets of theoretical assumptions. Gansen and James also claim that “the essence of systemism is  
19  
20 its emphasis on *graphic* communication” as a means of explanation (202X, 00). Indeed, the  
21  
22 graphic component is a key element of the systemist approach: “systemist graphics can convey  
23  
24 arguments from any source.” Moreover, because of the approach’s “rigor and lucidity, results in  
25  
26 them being more comprehensible in comparison to appearance in words alone” (202X, 00).  
27  
28  
29

30  
31 To be sure, when Gansen and James assert that systemism is an approach rather than a  
32  
33 theory, they are faithfully reflecting Bunge’s contention that “systemism is only an approach,”  
34  
35 and not a theory. Systemism, he maintained, should be seen as “just a skeleton to be fleshed out  
36  
37 with specific hypotheses and data” (Bunge 1996, p. 265). However, systemism is hardly  
38  
39 atheoretical. As Andreas Pickel points out, systemism is an attempt to provide a “dialectical  
40  
41 solution” to the problem of the deep ontological divisions in social science over whether holism  
42  
43 or individualism more accurately captures social reality: “Bunge’s solution to this problem,  
44  
45 implicitly practiced by many who intuitively sense the inadequacies of both positions, is to reject  
46  
47 yet affirm both” (Pickel 2001, p. 73).  
48  
49  
50

51 But the positing of a third option that both rejects and affirms holism and individualism  
52  
53 does not necessarily resolve the original theoretical tension between these two approaches. Slava  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Sadovnikov, for example, uses the case of the role of Mikhail Gorbachev in accounting for the  
4 collapse of the Soviet Union to suggest that systemism might “assimilate well both individualism  
5 and holism but does not reconcile them” (2004, p. 559–573). Systemism may provide a skeleton,  
6 but that skeleton is still very much shaped by theoretical assumptions: systemism assumes that  
7 what is to be explained are *systems*, with properties that are linked to its component parts but do  
8 not characterize them; systemism seeks to account for both individual agency and social  
9 structure; and that explanatory variables operate at both the macro and micro levels. In short,  
10 systemism is more than just an approach.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21  
22 Central to Gansen and James’s exploration of Canadian foreign policy in this issue of  
23 *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* is the use of graphics. But here we find an odd disjuncture.  
24 Gansen and James assert that “the essence of systemism” is its graphic representation; the clear  
25 implication is that the graphic elements outlined in the systemist notation have been derived from  
26 Bunge and his work. In fact, the notation system outlined in Gansen and James for this issue of  
27 the *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* was adapted from recent work by James (2019) and James  
28 and Michael R. Pfonner (Pfonner and James 2020) for a larger project of which this collection is  
29 a small part — the Visual International Relations Project (VIRP).  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 In other words, the notation system used by James and his collaborators to visualize IR  
41 scholarship in the VIRP appears to have been *inspired by*, rather than *taken from*, Bunge. While  
42 James might argue that the *shape* of the visualization system — stressing explanatory  
43 completeness and an insistence on links between macro and micro — reflects Bunge, in effect  
44 the genealogical links between Bunge’s work and the VIRP are quite indirect. One small  
45 indicator of this is the use of graphics in Bunge’s systemist scholarship. The only graphics in the  
46 1979 article that first outlined systemism were the mathematical symbols Bunge used to express  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 his understanding of the nature of society as a formal model. By 1996, Bunge was still using a  
4 mathematical approach, but the exposition of his theory of systemism in that book was  
5  
6 predominantly rendered in prose. Likewise, his effort in 2004 to explain the social mechanisms  
7  
8 that were supposed to make systemism work was decidedly lighter on mathematical graphics; the  
9  
10 commonest graphic in that piece was the causal arrow.  
11  
12  
13

14  
15 The notation system used by James and his team for the VIRP was developed relatively  
16 recently. While James has been a systemist enthusiast since the early 2000s, his earlier  
17 exploration of the contributions of Bunge's work to international relations — his examination of  
18 the potential of systemism for the assessment of scientific progress, using the International Crisis  
19 Behavior Project as a case study (James 2004) – used none of Bunge's graphic stylings (in this  
20 article, there is but one graphic, and that one was borrowed from the ICB Project itself). It was  
21 not until much later that the notation system used for the VIRP was developed (C. James and P.  
22 James 2017; James 2019; Pfonner and James 2020).  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 To note that the colourful notation system used in the VIRP (see Gansen and James  
34 202X, Table 1, 00) was developed by James and members of the VIRP team rather than taken  
35 from Bunge is by no means a criticism. While the symbols and their linked connections do  
36 require learning, the VIRP notation system used to capture the essential arguments of the works  
37 they represent is considerably more accessible than Bunge's mathematical formulae: for  
38 example, the graphical representation of the totality of the social structure of a given society – P  
39  
40  $(S) = \{ P_i(S) | P_i(S) = S/\sim_i \ \& \ \sim_i \in \sim \ \& \ 1 \leq i \leq n \}$  (Bunge 1979, 20) – would be accessible only to  
41 those with expertise in formal modelling who also had engaged in a close reading of Bunge's  
42 textual explanations. As James himself admits, with considerable understatement, mathematical  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 models “entail high barriers to entry” (James 2019, 785). By contrast, the VIRP’s one-page  
4  
5 visualizations are instantly and immediately understandable to a wide range of readers.  
6

7  
8 If we assess the VIRP exercise as an exercise in graphic depiction of IR scholarship in  
9  
10 one-page summaries rather than as an attempt to operationalize Bunge’s systemic approach to  
11  
12 the social sciences, the utility of the visualization exercise becomes much plainer. As Pfonner  
13  
14 and James have argued, the VIRP tries to go well beyond classical argument mapping by trying  
15  
16 to create “a standardized graphic means of accurately conveying the logic of a theory” (2019,  
17  
18 200). Indeed, the one-page visualization of *PCFP* does lay out the logic of our approach well.  
19  
20 But in the process it also reveals some of the weaknesses in our text.  
21  
22

23  
24 Gansen and James identified one key gap in their introductory essay: the framework we  
25  
26 use in *PCFP* lacks two important “downward” connections. First, we do not explore as explicitly  
27  
28 as we should have the many ways that factors exogenous to Canada and Canadians affect foreign  
29  
30 policy-making. Of course we all know that what happens outside Canada’s borders always has a  
31  
32 major impact on Canadians; but the influence of “the world” on Canadians is left implicit. The  
33  
34 second “downward” connection that is not explored is the impact of the state in Canada on  
35  
36 Canadian society. While *PCFP* embraces Nordlingeresque assumptions about the autonomy of  
37  
38 the democratic state (Nordlinger 1981; Nossal, Roussel and Paquin, pp. 11–12), we do not  
39  
40 examine the many ways the autonomous democratic state can and does shape civil society.  
41  
42  
43

44  
45 But further gaps are revealed by the visualization. The VIRP exercise seeks to show a  
46  
47 work’s theoretical assumptions, and the one-page visualization for *PCFP* reveals the degree to  
48  
49 which it is a text very much in the mainstream, undergirded theoretically by an admixture of  
50  
51 statism and realism, both neoclassical and English School. By the same token, however,  
52  
53 significant silences are also revealed in the variables that do *not* show up in the visualization. It  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 is, for example, immediately clear that *PCFP* does not explore foreign policy in Canada from a  
4  
5 gendered perspective, even though there were the beginnings of a gender mainstreaming turn in  
6  
7 Canadian foreign policy well before the fourth edition was published (von Hlatky 2020). That  
8  
9 silence in *PCFP* reflects a broader tendency, identified by Edna Keeble and Heather A. Smith  
10  
11 (1999), for Canadian foreign policy analysis to exclude women and gender, often attributed to  
12  
13 the dominance of realism in theorizing about international relations. In the case of *PCFP*,  
14  
15 however, Deborah Stienstra, Claire Turenne Sjolander, and Heather A. Smith argue that it is  
16  
17 *PCFP*'s unambiguous mainstream definitions of what constitutes the appropriate focus for the  
18  
19 study of Canadian foreign policy that excludes gender theorizing (2003, pp. 5–6).  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 Likewise, the 2015 edition of *PCFP* has just four mentions of indigeneity, all *en passant*,  
25  
26 reflecting a common observation that Canadian foreign policy analysis has been almost  
27  
28 completely silent on Indigenous peoples (Beier 2010; King 2017; Sarson 2020). Given the  
29  
30 glancing treatment afforded to Indigenous politics in *PCFP*, it is hardly surprising that  
31  
32 indigeneity does not feature in the VIRP visualization. But there a deeper silence than that at  
33  
34 work. J. Marshall Beier (2010, 186) reminds us that the study of Canadian foreign policy is  
35  
36 deeply state-centric, and thus “treats as settled those questions regarding who or what count as  
37  
38 legitimate actors in global politics and what may constitute meaningful diplomatic practices.” In  
39  
40 this framing, Indigenous politics is not assumed to play an important role in understanding  
41  
42 Canada in the world. Hayden King goes further, arguing that a text like *PCFP* “normalizes and  
43  
44 affirms settler colonialism” by “crafting a common sense around what counts as a legitimate  
45  
46 politics of the international” (King 2017) — articulating, legitimizing, and perpetuating  
47  
48 assumptions about the Canadian state, state sovereignty, and the “national interest” in an  
49  
50 “anarchic environment.” As the VIRP visualization makes clear, *PCFP* does not come close to  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 acknowledging what Leah Sarson accurately calls the “Janusian tensions” in Canadian foreign  
4 policy analysis (Sarson 2020, pp. 190–194).  
5  
6

7  
8         There are a number of other silences revealed in the visualization: variables like class,  
9 political economy, or race do not appear because *PCFP* does not explore these factors or  
10 attribute explanatory power to them in its analysis of Canadian foreign policy. For alternative  
11 (and often contradictory) analytical/explanatory insights, one would need to go to other scholars,  
12 and other texts: Jerome Klassen (2014) on class and political economy; J. Marshall Beier and  
13 Lana Wylie (Beier and Wylie, 2010; Wylie 2020) on critical theory; or Laura Madokoro and  
14 Francine McKenzie (2017) on race. We acknowledge that the silences revealed so clearly by the  
15 VIRP visualization have broader political implications, particularly when books are used as  
16 course texts (Smith, Stienstra, and Turenne Sjolander 2003, pp.13–17). As Heather A. Smith and  
17 Jérémie Cornut remind us, “By asking certain kinds of questions, directing students to look at  
18 some issues or ignore others and providing them with certain conceptual tools and methods,  
19 teachers have an important long-term influence on them” (2016, p. 228).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34

35         Finally, graphic visualization also can identify key variables that should be there but are  
36 not. The visualization reveals how ambiguously *PCFP* treats the role of individual decision-  
37 makers in shaping Canadian foreign policy. The “idiosyncratic variable,” as James N. Rosenau  
38 originally called the impact of the individual on foreign policy outcomes (1971, p. 108n), is not  
39 explicitly identified in *PCFP*, suggesting that broader structural variables should be privileged in  
40 an exploration of Canadian foreign policy. But the fact that the individual variable is absent from  
41 the visualization reveals a key weakness in how *PCFP* represents the impact of individual  
42 policy-makers. For a reading of *PCFP* reveals in fact that foreign policy outcomes often depend  
43 on *who* is in office at the time. Implicit in our analysis is our belief that every policy-maker –  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 whether elected or bureaucratic – has particular conceptions of the national interest, particular  
4 ideological perspectives, particular abilities to generate followership, and particular personal  
5 foibles. Implicit in our discussion of policy is the assumption that every policy-maker involved  
6 in shaping policy outcomes has very particular power, authority, and influence, and that therefore  
7 it *matters* who is involved in the process. And yet, we do not provide any overt discussion in  
8 *PCFP* of the role of the individual; in failing to provide readers with an account of the relative  
9 importance of individual versus structural factors for explaining outcomes, we are as ambiguous  
10 as Bunge on this issue (Sadovnikov 2004). Instead, the reader is left to absorb the inference –  
11 how? by osmosis? – that foreign policy is not robotically or automatically shaped by structure;  
12 but the reader is also left to try to figure out precisely what the impact of the individual and  
13 individual agency is.

14  
15 In sum, the visualization exercise's utility is that it exposes at a glance the main elements  
16 of a work's theoretical approach. It also exposes the gaps and silences. That one-page "reveal"  
17 may provide the kind of benefits identified by Pfonner and James, such as providing a common  
18 means of communication for conversations within an IR field that continues to become more  
19 eclectic, more global, and more complex, reducing the "cognitive load" on scholars (Pfonner and  
20 James 2019, 211).

21  
22 But in our view, more immediate and more substantial benefits will be realized in the  
23 realm of pedagogy, just as Gansen and James suggest. There can be little doubt that students will  
24 find this approach useful. The VIRP project will provide for international relations students,  
25 from undergraduates to doctoral students, a summary-at-a-glance, capturing immediately the  
26 essence of a work and its major arguments. But the VIRP visualizations are not some kind of  
27 Coles Notes/SparkNotes/CliffsNotes for IR. Unlike study notes, which often dumb down the

1  
2  
3 work they are summarizing and often prompt students to think they do not need to read the  
4  
5 original, the VIRP visualizations are in essence a read-along guide for students as they read the  
6  
7 original.  
8  
9

10 But we should not forget the other side of the pedagogical coin: the archive will have  
11  
12 considerable utility for course instructors who are looking for readings to assign their students.  
13  
14 The graphic representations in the VIRP archive could readily be used to winnow the field in the  
15  
16 search for works that fit the instructor's desiderata, of the precise sort that the VIRP visualization  
17  
18 revealed in *The Politics of Canadian Foreign Policy*.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

## 24 **References**

25  
26 Beier, J. Marshall. 2010. "At home on native land: Canada and the United Nations  
27  
28 Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples." In *Canadian Foreign Policy in Critical*  
29  
30 *Perspective*, edited by J. Marshall Beier and Lana Wylie, 175–86. Toronto: Oxford University  
31  
32 Press.  
33  
34

35 Beier, J. Marshall, and Lana Wylie (eds.). 2010. *Canadian Foreign Policy in Critical*  
36  
37 *Perspective*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.  
38  
39

40 Bunge, Mario. 1979. "A systems concept of society: Beyond individualism and holism."  
41  
42 *Theory and Decision* 10: 13–30. [https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2F978-1-4020-1263-2\\_2](https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2F978-1-4020-1263-2_2)  
43  
44

45 Bunge, Mario. 1996. *Finding Philosophy in Social Science*. New Haven: Yale University  
46  
47 Press.  
48

49 Bunge, Mario. 2004. "How does it work? The search for explanatory mechanisms."  
50  
51 *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 34(2): 182–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393103262550>  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Gansen, Sarah, and Patrick James. 202X. "A graphic turn for Canadian foreign policy:  
4 Insights from systemism." *Canadian Foreign Policy Journal* 2X(X): 000–00.  
5

6  
7 Hlatky, Stéfanie von. 2020. "Women and gender dynamics in Canadian foreign policy."  
8 In *Canadian Foreign Policy: Reflections on a Field in Transition*, edited by Brian Bow and  
9 Andrea Lane, 255–68. Vancouver: UBC Press.  
10  
11

12  
13 James, Patrick. 2004. "Systemism, social mechanisms, and scientific progress: A case  
14 study of the International Crisis Behavior Project." *Philosophy of the Social Sciences* 34(3): 352–  
15 70. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393104266438>.  
16  
17  
18

19  
20 James, Patrick. 2019. "Systemist international relations." *International Studies Quarterly*  
21 63(4): 781–804. <https://doi.org/10.1093/isq/sqz086>.  
22  
23

24  
25 James, Carolyn C., and Patrick James. 2017. "Systemism and foreign policy analysis: A  
26 new approach to the study of international conflict." In *Advancing Interdisciplinary Approaches*  
27 *to International Relations*, eds. Steve A. Yetiv and Patrick James. Cham: Springer International  
28 Publishing.  
29  
30  
31  
32

33  
34 Keeble, Edna, and Heather A. Smith. 1999. *(Re)Defining Traditions: Gender and*  
35 *Canadian Foreign Policy*. Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.  
36  
37

38  
39 King, Hayden. 2017. "The erasure of Indigenous thought in foreign policy." *Open*  
40 *Canada*.  
41  
42 <https://opencanada.org/erasure-indigenous-thought-foreign-policy/>.  
43  
44

45  
46 Klassen, Jerome. 2014. *Joining Empire: The Political Economy of the New Canadian*  
47 *Foreign Policy*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.  
48  
49

50  
51 Madokoro, Laura, and Francine McKenzie. 2017. "Introduction: Writing race into  
52 Canada's international history." In *Dominion of Race: Rethinking Canada's International*  
53  
54  
55

1  
2  
3 *History*, edited by Laura Madokoro, Francine McKenzie, and David Meren, 3–24. Vancouver:  
4  
5 UBC Press.

6  
7  
8 Nordlinger, Eric. 1981. *On the Autonomy of the Democratic State*. Cambridge: Harvard  
9  
10 University Press.

11  
12 Nossal, Kim Richard, Stéphane Roussel, and Stéphane Paquin. 2015. *The Politics of*  
13  
14 *Canadian Foreign Policy*, 4th ed. Kingston and Montréal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

15  
16 Pfonner, Michael R., and Patrick James. 2020. "The Visual International Relations  
17  
18 Project." *International Studies Review* 22(2): 192–213. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ist/viaa014>.

19  
20  
21 Pickel, Andreas. 2001. "Mario Bunge's philosophy of social science." *Society*  
22  
23 (May/June): 71–74. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12115-001-1026-5>.

24  
25  
26 Rosenau, James N. 1971. *The Scientific Study of Foreign Policy*. New York: Free Press.

27  
28 Sadvnikov, Slava. 2004. "Systemism, social laws, and the limits of social theory:  
29  
30 Themes out of Mario Bunge's *The Sociology-Philosophy Connection*." *Philosophy of the Social*  
31  
32 *Sciences* 34(4): 536–87. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393104269199>.

33  
34  
35 Sarson, Leah. 2020. "Becoming comfortable being uncomfortable: Canadian foreign  
36  
37 policy and Indigenous global politics." In *Canadian Foreign Policy: Reflections on a Field in*  
38  
39 *Transition*, edited by Brian Bow and Andrea Lane, 189–203. Vancouver: UBC Press.

40  
41  
42 Smith, Heather A., Deborah Stienstra, and Claire Turenne Sjolander. 2003. "Engaging  
43  
44 the possibilities of magic: Feminist pedagogy and Canadian foreign policy." In *Feminist*  
45  
46 *Perspectives on Canadian Foreign Policy*, edited by Claire Turenne Sjolander, Heather A.  
47  
48 Smith, and Deborah Steinstra, 12–21. Toronto: Oxford University Press.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57

1  
2  
3 Smith, Heather A., and Jérémie Cornut. 2016. "The status of women in Canadian foreign  
4 policy analysis." *Journal of Women, Politics & Policy* 37(2): 217–33.

5  
6  
7 <https://doi.org/10.1080/1554477X.2016.1152874>.

8  
9  
10 Stienstra, Deborah, Claire Turenne Sjolander, and Heather A. Smith. 2003. "Taking up  
11 and throwing down the gauntlet: Feminists, gender, and Canadian foreign policy." In *Feminist*  
12 *Perspectives on Canadian Foreign Policy*, edited by Claire Turenne Sjolander, Heather A.  
13 Smith, and Deborah Steinstra, 1–11. Toronto: Oxford University Press.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60