

l appalled the public. The treaty did not
ct the nuclear-arms race significantly;
aking pr
ever, it demonstrated the power of
blic opinion to guide the collective
ision of states. This, then, is the only
e.

The age of technology has given con-
trated influence over the future of
nts to three specific groups of people,
y one of which is yet aware of its power.
s is the military establishment, which
prospering as a result of universal in-
urity and is committed to the arms
and to seizing the power of even
nal government in many countries.
er before has this group possessed so
ch destructive capacity or wasted such
at public resources. Its time is limited,
t will either destroy itself together with
rest of us or become redundant.

The second is the scientific and tech-
ogical establishment, which has hith-
seen itself as the servant of human

progress — and found itself manipulated
into the role of public executioner. If
human beings were to learn to take indi-
vidual responsibility for the long-term
effects of their actions, these men alone
could defuse the apparatus of destruction.
The third group is composed of the mass-
communications media, which recently
surprised themselves by bringing down the
Nixon Administration in Washington. The
personal triumph of the novelist Alexander
Solzhenitsyn over the will of the Kremlin
demonstrates that the power of the pen
is not limited to Western democracies.

Governments are vulnerable to polit-
ical pressure; and the influence of the
military establishment could well be
outweighed by the other two estates
privileged in our era, given a public de-
manding a right to the future. The suicide
of civilization begins with the illusion that
individuals cannot prevent it. But only
individuals *can*.

*Vulnerability
of governments
to political
pressure*

Co-operating with dictators or economic development

Renaud Bernardin

ew years ago, the possibility of "co-
ating" with a dictatorial regime would
even have been questioned. Provided
staff was available and means clearly
tified, a venture in co-operation would
e been undertaken without much hesi-
on. In recent years, however, there has
a gradual trend towards examination
e objectives pursued, the means used
tain them and the agents involved in
implementation process. As a result,
erson rationally considering the posi-
ity of venturing into the realm of co-
ation now asks about various aspects
o-operation, and particularly how ef-
ive his contribution would be in those
tries improperly referred to as being
erdeveloped and to what extent his
ts would be suited to their culture,
ong the subject of scorn and dis-
gement.

Nonetheless, the basic situation has
not changed. The approach to problems
and their solution is still marked by an in-
dividualistic and humanitarian philosophy.
The tendency to emphasize charity, phi-
lanthropy and paternalism in co-operation
at the expense of justice and of the accep-
tance of the differences inherent in men
from different cultures and of the rights
stemming from these differences, seems,
at least to judge from statements on the
subject, to have diminished. But recogni-

*Professor Bernardin teaches in the field
of international relations at the Collège
de Lévis and is a research associate of the
Centre québécois de relations internatio-
nales. He has published a number of
articles dealing with the problems of the
Third World. The views expressed here
are those of the author.*