

Book Reviews

sured by sales, it is found that foreign subsidiaries involved in the paper-making industry conduct more research than their Canadian counterparts. Other findings, while not as conclusive, are nonetheless far from invalid, unlike current macroeconomic comparisons which contribute heavily to watered-down R&D policies for Canada.

Palda and Pazderka provide a workable option, but are our policy makers prepared for such detailed measurements?

Barry Nanne is a free lance journalist in Ottawa.

Letters to the Editor

Letters to the Editor

Tilting at Lyon

Sir,

Professor Peyton Lyon's argument ("Canada's Middle East tilt," September/October 1982) that if Canada would only cease its ignorant and domestically politically opportunistic "tilt" towards Israel, then Ottawa's stature abroad would rise, it would be able to contribute more effectively to the peace process and, as an added benefit, Canada would be able to trade more with the Arabs and the Third World, betrays an incredible overestimation of Canada's influence in the current international setting. He also shows how easy it is for an otherwise sage observer of Canadian foreign policy and international relations to come under the trendy spell of the global exercise in hypocrisy directed against Israel.

Of all the nations in the world, the country with the most influence in the Middle East and the one which has done the most to encourage realistic approaches to peace, is Israel's ally, the United States. Far from being a liability, America's friendship with Israel is regarded in the Arab world as key to any settlement. No Arab leader understood this more than Sadat. If Canada were to tilt away from Israel, it would hardly encourage Jerusalem to heed Ottawa's advice. Canada would simply become yet another country ritually protesting Israeli policies, while courting Arab money. Nor is a tilt towards the Arabs likely to increase Canada's standing in the Arab world.

For what could Canada offer the Arabs in the way of substantial benefits? To be sure, the Arab governments will

praise Ottawa's new "even-handedness." But they will know, as every other government concerned knows, that Canada has little to contribute to the peace process. The best hope for peace in the Middle East rests with the Camp David process begun by President Carter and given new life by President Reagan's September proposals. The best contribution that Canada can make to this process is to support the United States and avoid loud and meaningless declarations of even-handedness, self-satisfying as those declarations might be.

As to Canada's standing in the Third World, here again Professor Lyon offers no solid evidence that Canada's stature in the Third World would rise because governments in Africa or Latin America would be won over by the position Canada takes on the Arab-Israeli dispute. Does he really believe that these nations care about Canada's stand? Does he really believe that they calculate their global self-interest so exclusively on the basis of what is happening in the Middle East? Moreover, every Arab state and most of those nations which condemn Israel find no difficulty in trading with the United States.

Midway through his article, Professor Lyon reveals what could be the only real benefit for Canada of a tilting away from Israel — not peace and justice in the Middle East, but trade with the Arab oil producers and energy security. How much trade? He cannot say. But it would be a good idea if Canada dropped legislation making it illegal to discriminate against Jews when Arab oil money is at stake. On energy security one can only point out that those so eager to reduce Canadian dependence on its major ally and