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This article, by the distinguished historian at Queen’s University, Kingston, gets down to the fundamental realities of Canada’s external policy. He begins with the frank statement that « our foreign policy has been nebulous » and that « in respect to the outside world, Canada has been, not one community, but two. »

He then turns to the Debate in the House of Commons of April 29, 1948. Mr. St. Laurent, like Mr. Lapointe on March 31, 1939, and like the government of 1914, takes the position that Canada cannot contemplate a neutral attitude. With regard to the Conservatives and their attitude to Great Britain, which seems more realistic than it used to be, Professor Lower asks whether « it is too much to say that if within a few years, we do not get a Canadian flag, we shall certainly receive an American? »

He then boldly suggests that « Canada would do well to model her international deportment, not on that of Great Britain and the United States, but on that of such experienced and intelligent states as Holland, Sweden, and Switzerland », and that Canadian students « might do worse than pursue their studies, not in the universities of the great powers, where they meet a type of mentality which their own circumstances will never allow them to share, but in the universities of the small nations of Europe, whose historic cultures are quite as rich as those of the great. » Bi-cultural Belgium has given the world Monsieur Spaak. And neutrality is the positive basis of
Swiss freedom. « Without federalism, no neutrality; without neutrality no federalism. »¹

Professor Lower warns against assuming too much about French-Canadian opinion on the basis of the views of the French-speaking minister, and cites _Le Devoir_ and _L'Action Catholique_ as examples. And he adds, if French-Canadians are parochials, English Canadians are « generalized Anglo-Saxons. » « Britishism » is being replaced by « Englishism. »

Regarding Canadian opinion, the author says « only one affirmation seems safe, namely, that in case of war (any war), English Canadians will be for it and French-Canadians against it. »

« Are wars fought for ideological considerations, or for considerations of interest? » Professor Lower says « the weight of historical evidence is on the side of interest rather than ideology. » Mr. St. Laurent called upon « the free governments » to make democracy into « a dynamic political gospel. » If we can do this, Mr. Lower suspects that « we shall have to go for it to the other gospel with which we have long been familiar, » and not to such slogans as « free enterprise. »

« The major problem facing us, » he concludes, « is for us to learn to cut our coat according to our cloth. Canadians must come to realize that their country, while capable of much, is not capable of conduct appropriate to a great power. »
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