

tion and acceptance of equal rights and obligations for oneself and for men from other cultures have yet to be achieved.

Changes in this situation have not been pushed to their logical conclusion because of the relatively recent development of Canadian awareness of international co-operation and the lack of individual participants from the Third World in this trend — and for a host of other reasons. Yet these reasons may themselves be explained by the fact that the limitations implicit in any reasoning on these matters are a reflection of liberalism, even if the thinker is trying to differentiate himself from the liberals.

Examination of such questions as those concerning non-governmental organizations (NGOs) in the context of dictatorial regimes shows how much ground has been covered (since these questions are finally being asked) and how much remains to be covered (since such questions are still being asked). Moreover, it is not a coincidence that these political questions are being asked today, for they are part of the initial reaction to the consequences of the takeover of co-operation by governments.

Government takeover

Now that governments have divested co-operation of the trappings of humanist philosophy and have bound it in a bureaucratic strait-jacket, it has become an instrument of political power. All governments, either directly through government agencies or indirectly through non-governmental organizations, have set up so-called international co-operation programs for the purpose of reaping short- or long-term benefits. A study of the material, political and ideological interests that are brought into play by or that motivate these programs helps to identify certain aspects of co-operation as it really is. Co-operation appears as a means of legitimizing government actions (since the recipient government uses the friendly attitude of the donor government to justify its repressive policies towards its own citizens) or as a means of persuasion (since the donor induces the recipient to carry out the policies that the donor wishes) or as a means of dissuasion (since the donor encourages the recipient to abandon policies the latter has already worked out).

Governments are eager to turn to their own advantage the desire for justice and the feelings of generosity and brotherhood by which advisers and workers concerned with co-operation are often too naively motivated. Under coercion, the latter may be manipulated and may un-

willingly become agents of their own power abroad, helping to establish recipient countries not only service change structures but also power structures.

This is why it is important to give careful consideration to the plans of advisers in the general donor-recipient strategy, and to establish the aims of co-operation very clearly. But first we must remember that real co-operation, begun on equal terms and never diverted from the pursuit of its objective (the liberation of people), is not an end in itself but is one of a number of means of liberating

Aims of co-operation

It is important to distinguish the goal of establishing new bonds of brotherhood from the possibility of temporarily improving often subhuman material conditions in just one area and from the probable outcome of co-operation — the perpetuation, perhaps not intended, of existing societies in as definitely contributed to by foreign investment, of existing societies in as countries.

These goals are carried by agents who are achieved through action. Agents who are not unbiased; their presence in dependent social structures is insignificant. Every individual or collective agent brings a history, a culture, a system and a view of the world. Action implies a preference for a particular civilization and involves specific goals. A result, after aiming for the ideal, then making every effort to achieve it, is possible, the end-product is generally a form of social reproduction. The question is, therefore, one of determining the place of co-operation in terms of agent action, irrespective of what the agent would like his action to be. In other words, intentions must yield to facts, and facts clearly show that, in general, the bonds of dependence between the ruling classes of the centre and the classes of the periphery have so far tightened. This is no accident.

Third World dictators try to maintain the structures of exploitation by force, an even more reprehensible trend in the developing, particularly in Latin America, towards stronger repressive measures. The cause power is being contested not only by those elements of the ruling class that are isolated from the decision-making wealth-producing centres but also by farmers, the workers and the progressive elements of the lower middle class. They find the current situation untenable, less, therefore, internal power relations

*International
co-operation
for the purpose
of reaping
benefits*