

difficult to focus on it than on the U.S. impact on the Canadian economy, perhaps because the many affinities between Canadians and Americans tend to make any concept of a threat unreal. On the whole, the general directions of Canadian policy in the cultural sector have been set and they have been pursued with reasonable success. Perhaps we have already turned the corner. But it remains for these policies to be extended to other vulnerable areas and to take account of the further impetus that the new technologies may give to the cultural thrust of the United States as it affects Canada.

This is, fortunately, an area in which there is broad convergence between the perceptions and goals of the federal and provincial governments. It would not be unrealistic, therefore, to look to a high degree of co-operation between the two levels of government in creating the kind of climate we shall need over the next decade or two if Canadian themes are to find their distinctive expression.

It is also one of the areas in which Canadians can act with the least risk of external repercussion. It has been said that culture is imported rather than exported. This is not wholly true. But to the extent that cultural influences are brought in willingly, they can be shaped domestically without affront to the exporter.

The following quotation has a familiar ring to Canadians examining their current problems: "The true sovereigns of a country are those who determine its mind, its mode of thinking, its tastes, its principles; and we cannot consent to lodge this sovereignty in the hands of strangers". It is, in fact, an excerpt from an address delivered at the University of Philadelphia in 1823. Americans today will be no less understanding of Canadian concern in trying to follow the same advice.

IV. Summing Up

In looking into the perspectives for the Seventies, *Foreign Policy for Canadians* focuses on "the complex problem of living distinct from but in harmony with the world's most powerful and dynamic nation, the United States". The phrase is intended, presumably, not only to identify the problem but to define the parameters of the relationship. It is the requirement of both distinctness and harmony, therefore, that any option for the future of Canada-U.S. relations must be seen to satisfy, among others.

In essence, distinctness should be im-

plicit in any relationship between two sovereign countries such as Canada and the United States. The very fact that it has to be singled out as an objective of foreign policy says something about the Canada-U.S. relationship. The relationship is characterized by an array of links that, given the disparity in power and population, impinge on the sense of Canadian identity. This might be a sustainable challenge if evidence were not accumulating that the underlying trend in the Canada-U.S. relationship may be becoming less congenial to the conception of Canadian distinctness.

Distinctness has no autonomous virtue of its own. It is not an end in itself. In the process of nation-building, however, it is a substantial factor of cohesion. In the case of Canada, in particular, it is arguable that the perception of a distinct identity can make a real and discernible contribution to national unity.

The whole conception of distinctness is, of course, changing. There are challenges facing modern society that transcend national boundaries. There are areas of economic activity that can no longer be performed efficiently except on a scale that exceeds national dimensions. There is a whole host of linkages that lend cumulative substance to the reality of interdependence. This is a global trend from which Canada can neither claim nor expect to be exempt. It is a fact, nevertheless, that the Canadian situation in relation to the United States is unique in two respects: the linkages are probably more numerous and more pervasive than between any other two countries and the affinities between them are also such as to put particular strains on the definition of the Canadian identity. On both counts the problem of living distinct from the United States is only marginally related to the larger issue of global interdependence, which is a fact of life for all countries.

If Canadians say they want a distinct country, it is not because they think they are better than others. It is because they want to do the things they consider important and do them in their own way. And they want Canadian actions and life styles to reflect distinctly Canadian perspectives and a Canadian view of the world.

Against this yardstick the first option — seeking to maintain our present position with minimum policy changes — is not likely to represent much of an advance. On the contrary, if the continental pull is, in fact, becoming stronger, we may,