

exaggerated faith in applied social science. It reflects, that is, the Enlightenment view that natural laws of human behaviour are out there to be discovered, and that, once found, they can be used to shape the construction of heavenly cities on earth. It accepts as well the Enlightenment corollary that the truths thus revealed are universal.

I am fully aware that expressing scepticism in this field is more than a trifle out of fashion. At the very least I risk the charge of making the best the enemy of the good. Even the hard-headed Standing Senate Committee, after all, found it appropriate to entitle its recent report, *Managing Turmoil*—apparently confident that the turmoils we all have in mind can, in fact, be 'managed.' Governments have changed, of course, and official views on these matters may ultimately change, too, if they have not already done so. But the fact remains that a great deal has been made in recent years of our desire to rescue failed and fragile states, and to do so in task force style— with the help, that is, of the "3 D's", or the "3 D's and T", or even "whole of government" operations, or more recently still (it is hard to keep up!), "all of government" operations. In National Defence they prefer to talk more modestly of "three block wars," but the general conception is much the same. The premise is that by pulling several levers at once— manipulating a number of variables simultaneously— we can fundamentally transform the society, the polity, the economy, even the culture, of the communities we target.

In thinking this way, moreover, we are far from alone. The British, among many others, have the same disposition. So, it would appear, does NATO. The U.N., replete with its Specialized Agencies, has reflected loosely comparable concepts from its very beginning, although not so ambitiously and intrusively at the start as it sometimes seems, with enthusiastic Canadian encouragement, to do now. The Americans, even when they are thinking on their own, toy lightly with the idea, too.

But in Canada it has become something of a mantra— if not generally, then certainly among the politically attentive. The basic argument, while variously expressed by different players, goes something like this: State X has failed, or is fragile and therefore in danger of failing, or to an unreasonably extreme degree is oppressively constructed at home and malevolently intentioned abroad. It therefore needs to be fixed. This requires first that its citizens be made secure from military menace. The polity itself then needs to be democratized, and buttressed by the rule of law and respect for human rights. An honestly-administered physical and