

We requested the respondents to score, on a scale of one to seven, Australia, Canada, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden in terms of their commitment to the UN, independence in the UN, leadership in the UN, role as consensus builder, and support for self-determination, peacekeeping and international development. Sweden emerged as the front runner by all criteria. Averaging the seven ratings, Canada (5.2), came out decidedly below Sweden (5.9), but slightly ahead of Norway (5.2) and substantially ahead of the Netherlands (5.0) and Australia (4.6). It led the Netherlands and Australia on each of the seven items. Canada was considered much stronger than Norway in "leadership," but trailed in "support of self-determination"; it was slightly ahead of Norway in support of international development, even though Norway's contribution, in terms of per capita GNP, was considerably greater. Canada's score was highest for "peacekeeping" (6.0), "commitment to the UN" (5.8), and "support for development" (5.7); it was lowest on "leadership" (4.5), "independence" (4.8), "consensus promotion" (4.8) and "support for self-determination" (5.0).

Had this been an *all-inclusive* popularity contest, Sweden might still have emerged at or near the top. Considerably smaller than Canada, it is also more single minded in soliciting Third World support. One Swede told us, with at least a trace of embarrassment, that his government decided that, since the UN was the Third World's club, Sweden would play by the Third World's rules. Its nonaligned foreign policy obviously made this easier. Several Third World countries, such as India and Yugoslavia, would almost certainly out-rank Canada and Norway in popularity. Canada's ranking in the "good company" of the Scandinavians, the Netherlands and Australia was nevertheless impressive.

### Canada's best and worst features

We proceeded to ask the respondents to specify the *best* and the *weakest* characteristics of Canada's UN diplomacy. For the "best," a quarter cited our familiar roles as mediator, moderator or consensus-builder. Almost as many relied on flattering adjectives such as straightforward, consistent, fair, reliable, honest, frank, principled, sensible, pragmatic, pacific, friendly, likeable and able. Our diplomats were always well briefed, it was stressed, and up on the fine print. A smaller portion cited Canada's function as "friendly critic" of the United States, and praised its willingness to take "tough," "independent" stands. One respondent noted that Canada's main strength was that it was seldom a "demandeur." It was refreshing, after all this, to be asked by one interviewee: "But *does* Canada have a UN diplomacy?"

Far less consensus emerged when we turned to the perceived weaknesses. With a membership approaching 160, it should hardly be surprising that many of our respondents had had little opportunity to focus on Canada. Some of our respondents could think of *no* defects in Canada's UN performance. Some suggested the same characteristic, such as "honesty" or "modesty," that they had cited as its strength — and could usually explain why. Almost a third raised Canada's close association with the United States: a