

ing rather than the basis for power plays by the non-nationals. The goal has been called "polycentric nationalism", a notion of a world in which nations strive to coexist with each other and also to avoid being manipulated by those extra-national, non-national forces that are indifferent to the value of ranges of different styles and preferences.

There is, today, a lot of talk about the loss of national ability to provide a sort of military "hard shell" of invulnerability for a nation's citizenry against attack. This is seen as creating a corresponding decrease in the functional need for the unit of the nation state. Similarly, given the enlargement and increasing interdependence of economic units, the nation state seems to have lost its important function as a marketing and producing unit. The only new functions offered as substitutes are co-operative ones, not really national and, indeed, seen as valuable because perhaps only a way-station to the abolition of nations. Yet, as I have suggested, this co-operation, particularly in new functional

areas, has not made vast strides, and the expected mergers of the nations do not seem to be occurring. Instead we have the non-nationals, and we have as a result a new function for nations — that of becoming sufficiently cohesive human communities that they can tie down, control and regulate these stateless entities that have learned to aggrandize themselves among the unevennesses of the international system. Only some version of the nation state has the history, the shared experience, that can provide a framework for such a community, and the machinery for the legitimate use of coercion, forceful or otherwise.

Canada is much taken by the myth of American (or Soviet) imperialism. This myth has one valuable result: it mobilizes intellectuals, governments and, eventually, populations to resist what they think is attacking them. The risk is that, to defend themselves, they will copy what they think of as their enemies, and create more of the class of non-nationals who are indifferent to everything but themselves.

Attractions mingled with fear at advent of the multinationals

By Bernard Bonin

The two principal objectives of this article are, first, to outline a method of analyzing relations between multinational enterprises and governments that will be broad enough to apply, *mutatis mutandis*, to all countries and, secondly, to present a brief analysis of Bill C-132 based on this method.

There can be no question here of seeking to review the experience of any great number of countries. The idea is, rather, to provide a general notion of the type of question a country would be inclined to consider if it wished to derive maximum benefit from direct foreign investment or to minimize the disadvantages. This scheme of analysis offers the advantage of being extremely broad in scope, and a good many studies of the question made elsewhere in the world have, in some way or other, been inspired by it.

There are, indeed, areas of harmony and areas of tension between multinational firms and governments and this is why studies of multinational enterprise were not long in concentrating on relations between these two institutions. For, while Canada no doubt holds a unique position in the world when it comes to foreign presence, the number of multina-

Professor Bonin, who has his doctorate in economics from the University of Paris, is professor at L'École des Hautes Études Commerciales in Montreal. He has written widely in the field of economics, with a number of works devoted to the role of multinational corporations. Last year he prepared for the Department of External Affairs a study on the relations between multinational firms and Canadian foreign policy. He is co-director of the Canadian Journal of Economics. The views expressed in the accompanying article are those of Dr. Bonin.