

has assimilated them, rather than they the culture.

This nationalism — of which Americans are not especially aware, since they have not had to defend themselves against others as in Europe — has often taken the form of universalism, a certain feeling of having brought together the best conditions for human development, a certain consciousness of purity that has manifested itself in foreign policy either through disdainful isolationism or through moralizing interventionism. When you are conscious of being pure, you become either a monk or a missionary! This idealistic candour has inevitably turned into a kind of intolerance and, with the passage of time, it has even become an “arrogance of power”.

Canadian nation

Canadians, on the contrary, faithful to their anti-republican choice, long refused to create a nation in the strict sense of the term. The French Canadians are the ones who have a long tradition of asserting their own nationalism — and at times a pan-Canadian nationalism. The Loyalists, in contrast, refused to nationalize their liberal ideology; they chose to practise their liberalism within the Empire “on which the sun never sets”. When their descendants created a country, it was to be a confederation. Their constitution was to be the British North America Act. It may be in part to this lack of English-Canadian nationalism that the French Canadians owe their survival: they were able to find a place among the wide variety of peoples making up the British Empire. Thus Canada was not to become a “melting-pot” but first a duality and then a mosaic. The lack of a flag, of a national anthem (until very recently) and, consequently, of a truly Canadian national mythology were to do little to rally the provinces behind a central government that nevertheless had considerable powers. All of this was to be reflected in foreign policy as what has already been termed a “federalist style” or even a kind of internationalism. Canadians have sometimes had a tendency to carry over into international meetings their experience from federal-provincial conferences. They have been able to feel at ease in international organizations and multilateral institutions. They have rarely practised the egotistical diplomacy that nationalism requires.

Canadians have discovered nationalism only recently. While their internationalism and their spirit of tolerance have occasionally enabled them to be of service

to their neighbours to the south, whose zeal they have attempted to curb, it might be said in return that the Americans are the ones who have forced Canadians to define a certain kind of nationalism in the face of the constant threat posed by the United States to the Canadian identity.

Another advantage of which Canadian diplomacy has had the benefit is that of having come into existence as part of British diplomacy, so to speak. This experience has been difficult at times because it has made the achievement of independence in foreign policy a long process. But it enabled Canadians, sooner than the Americans, to acquire a sense of the complexity of international relations. The Canadian Department of External Affairs was created at the turn of the century, at a time when Canada's foreign policy was necessarily part of imperial policy. So when Canadians entered the international arena, they took advantage of Britain's vast diplomatic experience and required of their own diplomats the universalism and good manners that had gained the British foreign service such high praise.

The Americans, on the other hand, have created their own type of diplomacy reflecting both the candour and the arrogance of their world view — to the point where the activist period following the Second World War has been compared to the Creation.

Public service

One of the characteristics of British diplomacy that distinguishes it from the sometimes improvised style of American policy is what is called “careerism”: that is, Britain's foreign policy is in the hands of civil servants for whom diplomacy is a career while, in the United States, the important positions are often held by people who have no experience in diplomacy. Canadians have followed the British example. This tallies with the historical experience; a large number of the Loyalists who left the United States following the Declaration of Independence were civil servants, so that Canada gained a long tradition of public administration. The quality of Canada's public service as a whole has often been praised. This quality is not unrelated to the original influx of public servants from the American colonies and, of course, is also connected with a form of society in which politics play a permanent supporting and stimulating role with respect to individual enterprise.

The United States, on the contrary, deprived from the outset of the administrative class from the colonial period, has

French Canadians' long tradition of asserting nationalism