

articles on Canadian foreign policy. These include the International Journal, Commentator, Canada Month, Canadian Dimension, the Canadian Forum, and the Queens Quarterly, of which only the first deals exclusively with international politics. No French-Canadian journal deals with foreign policy, and consequently few French-Canadians have done any work in this area. Furthermore, only an extremely limited number of articles dealing with Canadian foreign policy have appeared in foreign journals.

A second set of factors arises as a result of the relationship between the academic community and the Government. In Canada the academic interested in foreign policy operates under more restrictive limitations than his American counterpart. Unlike the American experience there is virtually no job mobility from university to government and back again. Furthermore, the problem of governmental secrecy, and the fifty year rule on many government documents makes research on contemporary issues most difficult, and in some cases impossible. Whether the academics should pursue a more active role in attempting to overcome these handicaps, and whether the Government should try to induce more academics to do research on foreign policy issues is an interesting question, but it certainly seems desirable. Consequently, the role of the academic in the area of foreign policy research has been minimal compared to other areas. However, there has been enough written on the question of Canada's role in NATO to make meaningful generalizations concerning attitude patterns.

In this study academics are defined as those individuals who either teach at a Canadian university or, are in a position so that much of their time is spent on academic research and contribute to scholarly journals (John Holmes). Excluded are those individuals who write on international politics, but would normally be classified as journalists (John Gellner and Blair Fraser). Also excluded are those individuals who have contributed to scholarly journals or have written books discussing Canadian policy, but whose main occupation is not academic research or university teaching (Mike Pearson, Paul Martin, Andrew Brewin, Walter Gordon, James Minifie). Academics are either 'active' academics - those who have written on Canadian foreign policy; or 'non-active' academics - those who have not written on Canadian foreign policy, but have an opinion and in all probability express it in face-to-face contact with other faculty members and students. This form of attitude expression may be just as important as that taken by the 'active' academics, since the 'non-active' group is by far the largest and the university provides an adequate forum for the expression of opinion. No attempt will be made to discuss the attitudes of the non-active academics.

In the following section active academics will be classified according to their general attitude patterns toward NATO. After classification an analysis of why NATO has been rejected or supported will be undertaken. A concluding section will make comparisons between the selected attentive public groups and the general public.

#### General Academic Attitude Patterns:

Since the number of active academics is quite small, and only four (James Eayrs, John Holmes, Peyton Lyon and Kenneth McNaught) have consistently written on Canadian foreign policy over a number of years, it is difficult to classify academics by specific issues. What is possible, and perhaps more worthwhile, is to classify them according to general attitude patterns. Nearly all the active academics fall into one of two categories: