

ally, "Canadian vulnerability" refers to the easy and cheap availability of American communications media to the vast majority of Canadian citizens. The assumption is that availability ensures conviction and perversion — an assumption that is the key issue in the current controversy about pornography, and one in which Canadian intellectuals tend to take a dramatically opposite position in that context to the one they adopt regarding "Americanization". In my judgment, people prefer to read, listen to, and watch what is best tailored to their taste, but to use the results as a sort of echo-sounding procedure that enables them to determine where they really stand. There is no reason to think that the easy and cheap availability does more to "Americanize" Canadians than it does to remind them of why they are happy not to be Americans — especially as the American cultural media are free to express reasoned (and even unreasoned) dissent from official

American policy. In fact, one could argue that Canadian exposure to reasoned American opposition to official American policy is, in large part, responsible for the surge of Canadian interest in Canada's "distinctiveness" since the escalation of the war in Vietnam.

One postscript on a positive note: a sense of Canadian identity would be greatly strengthened if more young Canadians from the Hamilton-Ottawa-Montreal triangular industrial centre of Canada were assisted and/or obliged to spend a year or two of working life in one of the other regions of Canada.

*Dr. Johnson is professor of economics at the University of Chicago and the London School of Economics. During the current year, he is visiting Irving Fisher professor of economics at Yale University, engaged in studies for the Cowles Foundation for Research in Economics.*

## Shedding innocence and dogma

By Abraham Rotstein

In a liberal society, the parentage of documents, no less than of persons, deserves to be set aside in a consideration of their intrinsic merits. Invidious voices would remind us that within the same period of the election campaign we were offered 80 acres of redeveloped waterfront in Toronto and the makings of an independent foreign policy. The disclaimers that either policy had anything to do with the federal election were delivered with an unblinking sincerity that commanded the highest awards for dramatic performance. Gift horses are to be welcomed, however, and dental scrutinies only to be done later. More than one good public policy has been the child of political expediency.

The Department of External Affairs continues to produce the most elegant prose in Ottawa — writing with lucidity, moderation and a logic that is as compelling as it is comprehensive. But it is the substance of the document that stands out, elevating the Department from keepers of the quieter arts of protocol to spokesmen for a new mood. Indeed, a new generation of civil servants

is articulating fundamentally reoriented ideas on behalf of the entire nation. It almost ventures the suggestion that we have become educators extraordinary, an old guard congenitally fearful of confronting the dimensions of the Canadian dilemma.

To think of *Canada-U.S. Relations: Options for the Future* solely as a document in foreign policy, however, would miss the point. In regard to policy toward the United States, the distinctions between foreign and domestic preoccupations have long since blurred. Indeed, once the *Foreign Policy Review* of 1970 had been defined, quite rightly, the national interest as the touchstone of foreign policy, one could have foreseen some such document as the logical outcome. At the core of the national interest must be national independence — a categorical imperative for policy-makers, who must necessarily look first to the survival of the state. Thus we have the following question: "The fundamental question for Canada is whether and to what extent interdependence with the United States