

regions in the hardship category). Nothing seemed to work against the grain of normal market forces. The government could never pick winners. It was routinely stuck instead with losers. Perhaps it should give the effort up, and go with the flow. Labour, it was argued, would then move to where the jobs were – as labour is moving now in droves to Alberta – and the economy of the country as a whole would then be better off, even if the economy of Cape Breton continued to languish (as indeed it has). A controversial sketch, you may say, and of course I agree it's not the whole story. I draw it only to make the point that if we cannot do the job in Cape Breton (whether we prime the pump or leave it to the invisible hand) – if the challenge defeats us even in our own polity, with all the advantages and resources that we enjoy – what on earth makes us think we can do it in Haiti? Or in the Sudan? Or Somalia? And what makes us think we can find a more lucrative crop than poppies for farmers in Afghanistan, even if we discovered how to keep the extortions of the warlords and the gangsters off their backs? In the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that some of the best-intentioned have given up, and are suggesting instead that we find more constructive ways of using the narcotics that the poppies generate. Not that *that* is likely to work, either.

*Problem 4* – *The Model requires that we do things that run counter to our own public philosophy.* There is a fourth inhibiting factor at work, too, and it comes from our own liberalism. (I hasten to say that I am here using the term generically, and without partisan intent. Presumably we can agree that all political parties in Canada, even if they have different priorities, emanate generically from the same western liberal tradition.) As we all know very well, part of the on-site resistance to the social engineering that we have in mind comes from the fact that the indigenous populations – in whole, or in substantial part – think differently from the way we do. When they are grown up, moreover, they are very human in not wanting to cope with the intellectual and psychological effort involved in changing their minds, much less with the inconvenience of acting on the practical implications of doing so. The problem is compounded when they are illiterate, but that is not the main source of the difficulty. Its origins lie, as sociologists would put it, in the way they have been socialized – in what they have been taught is true by their parents, their religious leaders, their school teachers (if they have had any), their siblings, their spouses, and their peers. Yet our liberalism – strongly supported by our prudence – tells