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Monsieur le président,
chers présidents,

Je suis très heureux de me retrouver ici aujourd'hui et je vous remercie sincèrement de cette opportunité. Il me fait particulièrement plaisir d'être à nouveau invité parmi vous, un an et demi déjà après avoir répondu à votre invitation de prononcer une allocution à l'occasion de l'importante conférence que l'AUCC a tenue à Montréal et qui portait sur le rôle croissant des universités canadiennes dans le domaine de la coopération internationale.

Je ne suis pas vraiment certain de la définition qu'il faut donner à l'expression "coopération internationale". Je suppose que si l'un d'entre nous pouvait rester à Toronto jusqu'à demain et trouver les fonds nécessaires pour se procurer un billet pour le Skydome, nous serions les témoins privilégiés d'un événement international qui ne relève pas tout à fait de la coopération, mais qui dépend tout de même d'un régime coopératif. C'est beaucoup mieux qu'une guerre!

Je voudrais vous entretenir aujourd'hui de l'impact du Sud sur le Nord. Pour bien faire comprendre à quel point c'est de la pure folie de prendre pour acquis que notre position privilégiée durera indéfiniment, dans l'allocution que j'ai donnée à Montréal j'ai fait allusion au slogan de Malcolm Forbes,
célèbre expert financier et multimillionnaire. (On le voit souvent en compagnie de Elisabeth Taylor, il possède son propre yacht de haute-mer, et vole dans son propre Boeing 727.) M. Forbes dit souvent "By the time you've made it, you've had it." (Une fois que vous avez atteint votre but, vous êtes à bout.) Je crains que ces paroles ne soient un mauvais présage pour notre Nord si bien nanti.

Some of you may have seen recently a newspaper reference to a 1940 speech by Walter Lippmann to the AAAS. In it, he characterized American college curricula of the period as a combination of "improvisations and spontaneous curiosities" of students and professors. "There is no common faith, no common body of principle, no common body of knowledge, no common moral and intellectual discipline", he said, "yet graduates of these modern schools are expected to form a civilized community."

In my occupation with issues in the developing countries, and my attempts to assess the implications for the industrialized countries of those issues, Lippmann's description seems to me to be a not inaccurate summary of the North in its attitudes towards the South. The policies of governments are subject to so many vicissitudes, take so many twists and turns, are revised and reversed so frequently that the term
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"improvisation" fits pretty well. And for the public, those tens of millions of people whose awareness of the South is sourced virtually exclusively in TV newscasts, what better term could be coined than "spontaneous curiosities". A few seconds of Sahelian drought tonight, a Bolivian narcotics raid tomorrow, a terrorist event in Trincomalee the following night, all quickly followed by the "real" news, the stuff close to home.

And almost never is there the slightest endeavour to explain the linkages, the impacts, the likely outcomes. No common faith, no common principle, no common knowledge, no common discipline. Yet, if I am correct, our survival as a species depends on our ability to form not just Lippmann's civilized community, but a civilized global community. We have some distance to go.

What's to be done? And who is to do it? In two words, "much" and "us".

In certain respects we find ourselves in a better position to get underway than were the audiences of Lippmann's day. For one, the planet's vital life signs are now in much worse shape than they were a half century ago, thus demanding attention. Second, governments profess awareness of these
circumstances and regularly volunteer undertakings of imminent action. Third, we are possessed of technologies able to communicate and inform, as well as to reverse much of the damage that has been done. Fourth, there are repositories of knowledge called universities where motivation and stamina combine in often-novel, multi-disciplinary patterns to illuminate appropriate pathways.

Whether that combination is adequate or will be timely is yet to be determined. The evidence, it seems to me, is not reassuring. Indifference within the industrialized countries to the impact upon them of events in the developing countries is, if anything, increasing. In late September, the World Bank revealed that the net flow of financial resources from the poor of the South to the rich of the North had grown. From a net flow of US$43 billion in 1988 up to US$50 billion in 1989. As you know, that means that after all concessions are included, all aid accounted for, and all commercial transactions compiled, governments and institutions of the North enjoyed a $50 billion advantage. There are several things that one can say about that. The first, certainly, is what the New York Council for Foreign Relations said: "a massive, perverse redistribution of income." The second is what Enrique Iglesias of the Inter-American Development Bank has noted - that a combination of factors,
including foreign debt servicing, has since 1982 reduced the standard of living by 10% in every single Latin American country. The third is the calculation of the Overseas Development Council that the downturn of the developing country economies, and the direct decline of United States exports, cost the U.S. 650,000 lost jobs in the period 1980 - 1985 alone, statistics that have their Canadian counterpart according to the North-South Institute. The fourth is the response of some bankers to the endeavours of U.S. Treasury Secretary Brady to offer some relief to the heavily indebted countries and to ensure continued flows of needed investment capital and trade credits. J.P. Morgan & Company has increased its loan-loss reserves to 100%, indicating that it does not intend to make any further loans to developing countries. Allan Taylor, the Chairman of the Royal Bank of Canada, has stated that his Bank is adamantly opposed to any form of debt forgiveness. The majority of Canadian bank chairmen share his view. The fifth of these "what can be saids" is the contention of the Hon. John McDermid at the Washington Bank-Fund meetings last week that "Canada's continuing commitment to development is well-known", to be compared with the Hon. Michael Wilson's statement on budget night last April that his reductions in aid funding "will result in savings [my emphasis, but his word] over the next five years of almost $1.8 billion."
US$50 billion is a lot of money. Annual financial South-North flows of many tens of billions of dollars are of course clearly not sustainable. Brazil failed last month to make a scheduled interest payment of $1.6 billion. These flows, nevertheless, are becoming a structural part of northern economies. When they cease - and make no mistake, they shall cease - we in the North shall be in acute distress. If developing countries with populations of some 4 billion begin to withdraw from international economic activity, much more is at stake than simply economic loss for the North. Resultant reduced living standards in the South will increase social disorder, extend political turbulence, place even more strain on an already vulnerable eco-system.

Perhaps the greatest error of all is to assume that governments of developing countries are able themselves to address these issues satisfactorily. They are not. And as urban concentrations increase, median ages decrease, social pressures rise, and well-armed dissidents proliferate, the propensity for unpleasantness directed against and by governments will undoubtedly increase. Until recent weeks, Southern Scotland and Southern Niger had nothing in common. Neither, until this year, did Fredericton, New Brunswick and Medellin, Colombia. We now
know better; we are all connected. The links in the chain are as much ignorance and indifference as they are hatred and violence.

Prime Minister Mulroney had it exactly right when he told Parliament in 1986 on the occasion of the visit to Canada of Prime Minister Nakasone of Japan that "There is a shared understanding that perhaps the greatest threat to the prosperity of the developed world is the poverty of the developing world." Just last week, President George Bush expressed the same sentiment to the U.N. General Assembly. He said "the new world of freedom is not a world where a few nations live in comfort while others live in want." Messrs. Bush and Mulroney were reflecting in modern language the argument of Adam Smith 200 years earlier in 'The Wealth of Nations'. "What improves the circumstances of the greater part can never be regarded as an inconvenience to the whole. No society can surely be flourishing and happy, of which the far greater part of the members are poor and miserable."

Words, however, are not guarantors of automatic action. If the governments of Canada and Japan were of a single mind in 1986, their subsequent policies have been far from similar. Japanese Official Development Assistance increased this year by
$1 billion; Canadian ODA dropped by $160 million. Measured as a percentage of GNP, Canada's record remains superior. It is the trend that concerns me, however.

Why is this? Why, in the face of overwhelming evidence, are governments which should know better able to back away - even turn their backs - on issues of such importance to their populations? There is no shortage of incidents which confirm what I say. We in the West have for long been convinced by those paid to convince us that 1) the real threat to our long-term security is from international Communism, and 2) that the developing countries are unimportant because the people who live there are unimportant. The first of those positions is a product of ideology, but not only, I quickly add. The second is a product of racism. One of the great dangers of motivating factors of those kinds is that they are obsessive, seldom reflect nuances, are often impervious to argument, and are highly resistant to change.

Graphic and, I think, broadly illustrative examples of the dominance of these points of view are found in the North-South press references in the months preceding the 1988 United States Presidential election. Then, op-ed pages and opinion columns in American newspapers referred quite frequently to the
developing countries (unlike Canada during our simultaneous federal election campaign when parties, politicians and press displayed virtually zero interest in development issues). The U.S. commentators for the most part found themselves in one of two schools of thought. The first argued that as tensions ease in the U.S.-Soviet relationship, the dangers of conflict in Europe will diminish, and the locus of the adversarial relationship will move out of the NATO-Warsaw Pact region and into the Third World. There, in the developing countries, the inevitable antagonisms between East and West will be continued. The developing countries will become the surrogates of the superpower alliances. Because of differences in terrain and climate, of course, weapons systems and tactics will be forced to adapt. We will be able to breathe slightly easier, however, in our knowledge that the unavoidable mayhem and destruction of war will no longer threaten the triumphant renaissance architecture and the civilized populations of Europe. Because we must never let our guard down, and must be prepared to continue the heavenly-sanctioned struggle against the perversities of Communism, it will now be at the expense of untold multitudes of non-Caucasians.

The second community of American commentators adopted a quite distinct interpretation of the post-perestroika era, one
which saves the Third World from our military escapades but forsakes it completely to its own alien pastimes. This school of thought argued that with the decrease in East-West tensions, there would be a world-wide easing of hostility. The surrogate activities of the military alliances would thus cease because the causa causans of our interest in the developing countries - our appeal to hearts and minds by exposing the disingenuous underpinnings of Communism - that interest would disappear and we could turn our attention to the now more important interests - those that deal with relations among the industrialized countries. This being so, no reason would continue for the involvement of the North in the South.

Views of these kinds were not restricted to the newspapers, but appeared as well in the respected, refereed journals. Lest you think I exaggerate, (none of you who know me would ever suggest that I do!), let me quote William Hyland, editor of Foreign Affairs, writing in Foreign Policy: "The fate of Indochina, Thailand, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore and Bangladesh is of diminishing concern to the United States." This is American geo-strategic reality. In the course of a quarter century the fear of the domino has transformed itself into virtual indifference. In neither instance sadly - tragically -
was there displayed much awareness or concern for the underlying socio-economic problems faced by those regions.

But surely, you'll say, the United States Government is more sensitive, more sensible. Well, hear this. The following foible may be important, or not, but it leads to tears more than laughter. In the State Department, a policy planner is currently attracting attention to his thesis that we are in the beginning phases of centuries of tedious boredom because the great Crusade against Communism is coming to an end, with the resultant loss of capacity to mobilize emotions. What alternate activity should be substituted? A refurbishing of the nation's educational system, you say? A transformation of the insidious military-industrial axis into socially productive activities? Possibly even an all-out campaign to respond to the nutritional and health deficiencies of the children of the developing countries? No to all of those. No, too, to environmental undertakings. The proposal: SETI - Search for Extra-Terrestrial Intelligence - described by its proponent as "an enlightened understanding of humanity's place and destiny in the universe." Lest you university administrators laugh at the outrageousness of all this, be informed that an organizational structure is in place, and that there is NASA funding.
My response is one of measured incredulity. At a moment when burgeoning population pressures in the South are coincidentally devastating the environmental base on which they depend for sustenance and contributing to massive migrations which are gradually but surely altering the demographic composition of any number of Northern countries, when collapsing economies place at risk Northern exporters of goods and capital, when savage civil wars engulf or threaten countries formerly acknowledged to be among the most peaceful and sedate of societies - Sri Lanka, Lebanon, Cambodia (and in the recent past, Uruguay), - and turbulence is the norm in dozens of others from Afghanistan to Zaire, when terrorism arises out of the seeds of discontent and strikes deeply into our own protected territories, when one out of every five persons on this planet exists in a state of impoverishment so severe that her or his daily nutritional intake is inadequate to give the strength to work - in the face of these circumstances, I would put forward the modest suggestion that we all seek as our first priority an enlightened understanding of humanity's terrestrial place and destiny. If we can make some progress on this planet, perhaps then bodies of intelligence elsewhere in the universe would be inclined to search for us.
You and I both know that we should not expect NASA support for anything quite so mundane as research to reduce infant diarrhea. You and I both know as well that it is increasingly difficult to obtain adequate financial support for similar kinds of activities from any source, and you've been talking about those problems this week in Toronto. Perhaps, some will say, this section of the State Department is right. Perhaps there is now such a philosophic vacuum, such a disenchantment with ever more materialistic scientific activity, that we in research institutions should replicate the life-style of medieval monks, turn our buildings into cloisters, our green areas into vineyards, and endeavour to preserve what knowledge we now possess. But we shouldn't expect success if we do so. The forces of darkness don't rest. In Phnom Penh, the Khmer Rouge transformed the National Library, literally, into a pig-sty, just as the Nazis utilized the Czar's palace at Petrodvorets as a stable. Neither the extreme left nor the extreme right will offer us much solace or respite if we fail in our struggle to resolve underlying tensions.

Nous avons encore la possibilité de contribuer à la qualité de ce siècle finissant. La bonne réputation historique de tout le 20e siècle repose encore dans la balance. Se souviendra-t-on de nous pour les concepts stratégiques, et en
définitive très barbares, de 'capitulation inconditionnelle' et
de 'guerre totale', ou nous distinguérons-nous pour avoir mis fin
à l'époque de la défense des "Ordres supérieurs", le siècle au
cours duquel la Conférence des Evêques Catholiques des Etats-Unis
a renoncé à la théorie de "guerre juste" et a choisi d'adopter la
doctrine chrétienne de la "non-violence"? La question demeure
ouverte. Il nous reste dix ans et trois mois pour choisir la
bonne réponse. C'est tout le temps qu'il nous reste pour
démontrer que la minorité des riches et des privilégiés n'a pas
protégé ni tiré profit de sa situation avantageuse au détriment
de la majorité des pauvres et des démunis. (Seldom is French
inadequate for the task. Here it is. 'Des pauvres et des
démunis' doesn't convey the strength of the English:
'impoverished and wretched'.

What, then, are we to do? How do we come to grips with
the several disequilibria which, if unchecked, will certainly
engulf us in years to come? How do we respond to our awareness
that indifference is not benign, that the status quo is not
sustainable? Especially, what should we as Canadians, and
especially we very privileged of Canadians, be doing in a period
where public debate on these issues exists virtually nowhere, not
within Parliament, not without?
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For one thing, I submit, we must take a hard-headed look at the concept of development. We must remind ourselves that in each of its major dimensions - economic, social, and political - development is primarily driven from within. Lloyd Barber will confirm that the developmental accomplishments of western Canada - the design of appropriate cultivation techniques, the operation of school and municipal districts, the engineering of rural electrification projects - came from within the prairie communities and were not received from without. Father MacKinnon has similar tales to tell from the Atlantic region. So, too, with the developing countries. Without question, their development is influenced to a considerable extent by outward circumstances. Far the most powerful of those external influences, however, are negative - the denial of markets through protectionism or through quotas (e.g. the Multi-Fibre Agreement); the existence of barriers to knowledge and technology; the closure of future opportunity as in the occupation of geostationary satellite positions or radio frequencies, or the blockage of the seabed authority; the withdrawal of trade credits; the depression of commodity prices. The positive external influences, primarily through ODA contributions, while still necessary, are of increasingly limited value to the LDCs. This value diminishes even further should the aid be subject to highly conditional, bilateral terms. Or, I
hasten to add, should multilateral assistance in the form of financial transfers have attached to them penurious or contradictory policy conditions.

Where does this leave us, as concerned Canadians? First, I suggest that we may assume that the majority of our fellow citizens have a genuine sympathy for the plight of people in the developing countries. Second, we may assume that that sympathy is in most instances quite amorphous and far from a primary concern. If that latter is to change, a major educational effort is required. Third, I anticipate that Canadian government support for ODA is not likely to burgeon in the years immediately ahead. It matters not at this moment whether ODA funding policies are perceived by some to be short-sighted or self-defeating or reflections of ignorance on the part of policy-makers, ODA levels are not suddenly about to blossom. You are all acutely aware that the Canadian government pledged to the General Assembly of the United Nations in September 1984 that Canada's ODA, measured as a percentage of GNP, would reach 0.7% by 1990. As of April, 1989, that pledge had disappeared, and that 1990 target had changed into a vague possibility by the year 2040. Fourth, if I am correct in my first three observations, it means that those of us dependent for funding on the Canadian Government should not expect sustained major new levels of...
resources for development activities. Equally, however, it may be that much scholarly work of immense importance to the developing countries doesn't require much new funding at all.

How so? Let me explain, starting from my assertion that many industrialized country policies and practices hurt the developing countries much more than our aid helps them. That being the case, some of the most effective developmental work that Canadian scholars can engage in can be done right on their own university campuses, often within already-funded, ongoing research programs. In saying that, I am certainly not diminishing the importance, and the need, to continue those many activities of research and training, some of them in cooperation with IDRC, that now link Canadian universities and faculty with counterparts in the developing world. That kind of scientific activity, that kind of human resource building is what, after all, IDRC has been engaged in ever since its creation 19 years ago. That kind of work must continue, and must be funded adequately to permit it to continue. IDRC remains immensely indebted to the dedication and support of Canadian universities. Quite simply, the Centre could not function without them. What I'm about to refer to is a quite different, and additional, range of activities.
There is at this moment a considerable body of opinion, and any number of assertions, that policy and practice must change if events now in train in the South are not increasingly going to affect us - and negatively - in the North. Much of what I have been saying in the past few minutes falls into that category. Yet when politicians or journalists press for empirical evidence to support those assertions, there is all too little to offer them. An immense body of scholarly thought is much needed. There is not time today to do more than throw out a few examples of what I have in mind.

- If current North-South terms of trade, driven in part by protective and discriminatory policies in the OECD countries, including Canada, are not in our long term interests, where are the figures to support that argument? Which sectors of the Canadian economy would suffer if current import restrictions were modified, which would benefit? What adjustments would be necessary?

- If it is current government policy to support the Brady plan, as it is, what policies are required to overcome the resistance to that plan of the chartered banks? What role is played by Canadian regulatory agencies and
Canadian tax policies in influencing bank decisions with respect to loan-loss reserves?

What economic linkages can be traced between specific Canadian communities, specific Canadian industrial service and agricultural sectors, and the developing world? How many Canadians now rely upon the export of goods and services to the developing countries? In what respects?

If developing countries increase their use of energy from fossil fuels, particularly through industrialisation, the present trend towards global warming will accelerate. What will be the effects on Canada? What will happen to the fragile ecology and resource base of the Canadian north as polar ice melts more rapidly? What will happen to the already hard pressed Prairie farmers when droughts become more frequent and more intense and our southern neighbours are clamouring for more water to be transferred to the parched regions of the American southwest? Will Canada be able to reduce its energy consumption in order to permit LDC growth with some semblance of world consumption levels being stabilized?
As developing countries seek a better standard of living for their people, the increased use of CFCs in consumer goods such as refrigerators will likely exacerbate the ozone holes over the Arctic and Antarctic. What will be the impact on the health of Canadians exposed to more ultraviolet radiation from the sun, living as we do in northern latitudes?

What is the impact in Canada so far of the migration of people and capital from developing countries? What has happened to job markets, to real estate markets, to capital markets, to balance of payments? What will happen under differing hypotheses? What is the impact currently on our schools and other social services?

What are the security implications to Canada - in their broadest sense - of increased turbulence and warfare in developing regions? What social and political pressures may we expect in coming years? What vital commodities may be interdicted, what transportation routes lost, what blockages to the free circulation of people and ideas? Is there a role for the Canadian Armed Forces or the RCMP? Are they trained, equipped, prepared?
- What is the role of law, of international legal regimes? Are present dispute settlement mechanisms adequate? What elements of Canadian experience, both national and international, are relevant? What peculiarly Canadian contributions may be offered to the international financial institutions, to multi-lateral organizations both universal and regional?

- What courses should we be offering to Canadian students to acquaint them with this real world, to encourage them to pursue a much more enquiring, much more responsible role than have the majority of their parents?

Some of those questions were doubtlessly addressed by you in the past three days. I hope that your faculty colleagues will take your lead and pursue these and related issues with vigour.

I'm not suggesting that these issues are not now being pursued by Canadian academics. I am saying that the volume of that research, perhaps also the validity of conceptual frameworks and methodologies, as well as the priorities attached to these areas by scholars and by learned journals, is surely less than it...
might be or, in my view, should be. Nor do I exempt the several research councils and funding bodies from that observation.

A further observation, if I am permitted, without offending your hospitality. More an expression of worry, perhaps. No; more. Hand in hand with the active pursuit of knowledge in these and related areas, I feel that there is not adequate effort made to convey that knowledge to lay publics. In any event the lay public is not receiving it.

Public and governmental attitudes are shaped by a multitude of sources, some of them well-informed, some of them not. The means employed by those sources varies widely. Partly because ours is a parliamentary form of government, partly because ours is a courteous - some say diffident - society, the techniques of persuasion employed by Canadians have not been identical to those used in the United States. I doubt that any of you would accept, however, that university professors - either individually as scholars or collectively through, their institutional representatives - are or have been nearly as effective as we would all wish were the case. This being so, and accepting for purposes of argument my contention that a meaningful fraction of our peers believes that South-North issues are of significant importance to our future as a society, then
there lies a burden upon the community of scholars in Canada to be better communicators. Each one of you knows that that proposal will arouse among many of your faculty colleagues a shudder almost of revulsion. 'I am a scientist', you will be told, 'not a politician.' 'I let my work speak for itself.' 'Dealing with the press or with politicians is a mug's game. We who are cultured can't win at it.' 'We leave that to our Presidents.'

I tend to be short-tempered about those attitudes. (I get practice, for they are certainly not unknown within IDRC, I assure you.) If scholars insist that they are exempt from public debate, perhaps they should have taken vows of silence and entered holy orders, not universities and research institutions. If issues which we regard as vital to our society are not well understood by the public, or not adequately respected by government, we all - as informed citizens - have a responsibility to speak out, and to determine ways in which our voices will be heard and be influential.

In this respect we have much to learn. The Americanization of political practices worldwide means that we must adjust to the new rules and techniques of engagement. For one thing, we have to overcome our natural, but often
misdirected, Canadian sense of modesty. For another, we must insist that politicians and governments organize themselves to listen and by that I mean listen intelligently.

Partly because of the relative absence of public sector advocates, the field has been abandoned to private sector lobbies - Ottawa's new growth industry - which gain increasing private access to Members of Parliament both front and back bench. Needed on the part of Parliament and Government is more transparency, more quality access, and more competent staff members able at least to give the impression that they understand the substance of issues and arguments. Needed most of all, however, is a ready, insistent, persuasive body of information that is aimed as much at the public at large as it is at governments. In a democratic system, we are duty-bound to strengthen democratic practices. How seldom do we do so. With the single exception of your political science departments, is there among you one who can say that faculty members are regularly taking their disciplinary findings to the general public? It is not that way in the United States where op-ed pages and electronic media are familiar instruments for scholars. It has not always been that way in Canada, either. The newspapers and the CBC were at one time well-supplied by solid material from academics; CKUA had an immense listening audience...
for professors as well as for classical music and, I hope, Dr. Davenport, it may yet. The purpose was not self-glorification, it was the sharing of knowledge. And there was an audience anxious to receive it.

The fact is, today, that notwithstanding all the muttering in the faculty club lounges, Canadian scholars have abandoned the popular media, abdicated their public role to those who work for the tabloids, and look with apparent disdain at those few among them, and there are some fine Canadian examples, who retain the desire to communicate and who are able effectively to educate large audiences. I think that it sad that there are not more, and that they are not more enthusiastically supported by their peers.

Si nous, de la communauté universitaire, croyons comme nous le devrions, que nous avons des responsabilités particulières, et que notre mission est de contribuer à l'avancement de la civilisation, alors nous ferons tout ce qui est en notre pouvoir pour nous acquitter de cette tâche. Si nous voulons être relativement indemnes en arrivant au 21e siècle, nous devons accepter en partant qu'aucun gouvernement à lui seul, ou avec d'autres, ne possède la capacité de mener à bien cette tâche. Si nous les riches, qui proclamons notre expérience et
notre compétence, ne démontrons pas notre maturité de façon plus efficace et persistante, l'image du meilleur des mondes se ternira encore davantage.

Pourant, les concepts d'honnêteté, de justice, d'équité et d'éthique ne se ternissent pas. Ils brillent d'un plus grand éclat parce que les puissantes technologies qui ont été mises de l'avant par les scientifiques du 20e siècle nous obligent à remettre en question une quantité de normes établies pendant l'ère moderne. Nous ne devrions pas envisager le respect et la dignité comme des buts lointains d'une société juste. Considérons-les plutôt comme les outils essentiels pour atteindre cet objectif.

Those among you who may have been present in Montreal a year and a half ago at that large AUCC sponsored conference on universities and international cooperation will realize by now that I seldom have anything new to say. On the other hand, it relieves me of charges of inconsistency. I advocated then, for reasons of simplicity (and acknowledged the intellectual perils in doing so) the pursuit of three A's: awareness - to be increased; attitude - to be changed; action - the sooner the better. Seventeen months later, I'm playing that tune still. If it encourages a Canadian step towards a 'civilized global
community', I'll keep doing so. Certainly I congratulate AUCC wholeheartedly for its dedication to these tasks (and Claude Lajeunesse and John Berry for their unflagging zeal and courtesy). Equally, I'm grateful to you all for giving me this opportunity to repeat myself, to encourage you to continue the vital work in which you are engaged. Never before, in my judgement, has the role of universities been more critical in our efforts to understand the meaning and the role of our species. Thank you. Merci.